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ABSTRACT

The present study examined dual language (DL) teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding effective second language instruction. DL teachers are expected to integrate language teaching and content instruction. However, balancing the two areas of instruction has been proved challenging. It has also been reported that bilingual educators lack pedagogical skills and hold incorrect beliefs about second language acquisition. Five DL educators participated in the study. Data about the teacher's beliefs were collected using semi-structured interviews, and data about their classroom practices were gathered from their teaching journals. Second semi-structured interviews were conducted to reveal the factors influencing the enactment of stated beliefs. The data were analyzed qualitatively using the template analysis with pre-determined themes. Findings showed that the participants' articulated beliefs about effective second language instruction were generally in alignment with current thinking in the field of second language pedagogy and suggested approaches to language instruction in the DL classrooms. The participants' reported practices were generally congruent with their beliefs, except for some specific strategies. School and classroom factors appeared to be the most significant supports and hindrances to the enactment of the teachers' beliefs. These results have the potential significance for teachers to encourage self-reflection. They also offer schools some insights into understanding the challenges DL teachers face and the types of supports they need for effective second language teaching. Based on the findings, teacher preparation programs could consider an approach to professional development that attends to the pedagogical beliefs of individual teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Teachers’ beliefs have been found to profoundly influence teachers’ assumptions about pedagogy, instructional materials, and their students (Johnson, 1994; Pajares, 1992). Consensus holds that teachers’ beliefs inform teaching practices (Borg, 2011) and shape how teachers orient their instructions, which in turn affect students’ outcomes (Fives & Buehl, 2012). Research shows that English language teachers’ beliefs are associated with their students’ performances. Pettit (2011) reviews the work on this topic and concludes that teachers are more likely to work successfully with English learners in K-12 settings if their beliefs align with research-informed ideas of how to best support this group of learners. In their review of literature on teachers’ beliefs about English language learners, Lucas and colleagues note that teachers frequently hold negative perspectives about English learners; as a result, the teachers’ instructional practices are shaped in ways that often negatively impact the learners (Lucas et al., 2015). As Fang (1996) has underlined, teachers’ beliefs about various aspects of teaching and learning can embody their expectations about students and ultimately guide their instructional behaviors. Understanding teachers’ beliefs is therefore necessary for improving instructional practices and ultimately for promoting their students’ outcomes (Silvern & Isenberg, 1990).

Teachers’ beliefs include a variety of topics: self, knowledge, students, context, teaching and learning, as well as moral and ethical issues related to their teaching. According to Fives and Buehl (2012), the beliefs teachers have about teaching may play the most crucial role in shaping their practice, including lesson planning, classroom interactions, and their engagement in professional development. In particular, teachers’ decisions about what and how to teach (e.g.,
practical methods, interactions, learning process, and assessment) and other immediate classroom actions are guided by their pedagogical beliefs (Fives et al., 2015). Given the inextricable links between teachers’ beliefs about instruction and their classroom practices, the present study seeks to examine the beliefs dual language (DL) teachers have about effective second language teaching and learning in the dual language classrooms.

Dual language teachers’ beliefs about second language instruction deserve special attention given the distinctive characteristics of dual language programs, which could be highly demanding for the teachers. For example, since dual language learners receive instructions in two different languages (Lessow-Hurley, 2013), DL teachers need to possess highly sophisticated linguistic and pedagogic skills that enable them to use the instructional languages strategically and effectively (Christian, 1996; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Scholars (e.g., Howard et al., 2018; Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2012; Met, 2008) have pointed out the critical roles of language development for the success of dual language learners. Proper language instruction has been cited as one of the keys to the effectiveness of dual language programs (Cloud et al., 2000). Moreover, since DL programs typically rely on content-language integration (Cloud et al., 2000; Fortune et al., 2008; Met, 2008), DL teachers must find some balance between content instruction and language teaching, which has proved difficult to undertake (Fortune et al., 2008). DL teachers must also address the three-pronged goals of dual language education, including academic success, bilingualism/biliteracy, and biculturalism (Lindholm-Leary, 2012). Adding to these challenges are numerous non-instructional factors that have been identified as instrumental to the successful implementation of dual language programs. These include school and district policies, standardized assessments, and parents and community supports (Howard et al., 2018). As such, DL teachers must expect to work in a very challenging
educational environment (Lindholm-Leary, 2005). Fang (1996) has maintained that one way or the other teachers’ performances may be significantly affected by their beliefs about various aspects of the educational program in which they are working.

The literature review on this topic exposes a paucity in the research on dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction. Most studies on the area have sought to uncover DL teachers’ beliefs about the conceptual dimensions of DL education, such as language and literacy (López & Fránquiz, 2009), bilingualism and multilingualism (Bernstein et al., 2018), equity (Sugarman, 2013), language ideologies (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Zúñiga, 2016), translanguaging (Martínez et al., 2015), and culturally relevant pedagogy (Freire & Valdez, 2017). A few studies have examined specific teaching practices, for example, the use of technology (e.g., González-Carriedo & Esprívalo Harrell, 2018). Little attention has been accorded to the beliefs dual language teachers hold about effective second language instruction.

Understanding DL teachers’ beliefs regarding effective second language instruction is fundamental since one of DL education's goals is to foster learners’ bilingual proficiency. To this end, DL teachers must facilitate second language acquisition following the principles that equally support both language groups (Baker, 2011; Gort & Pontier, 2013). Research shows that while it might be easier for DL teachers to adopt this pedagogy by adjusting their language of instruction, it is difficult for them to modify their beliefs and principles, teaching strategies, and their views of dual language learners (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008). An added challenge is that since no specific language subject is offered in DL education, teachers are expected to teach language and content areas concomitantly (Christian, 2011). Researchers (e.g., Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fortune et al., 2008) have reported that DL teachers often struggle to balance these two subjects and that they tend to focus on the content area. Since language proficiency is the
key to academic success in the DL programs (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010), it is important to examine DL teachers’ beliefs about effective second language teaching and learning.

Additionally, given the dynamic links between teachers’ beliefs and practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015), it is necessary to investigate how DL teachers’ beliefs are related to their classroom practices and what factors might affect the relationships. Past researchers (Bernstein et al., 2018; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Freire & Valdez, 2017; González-Carriédo & Esprívalo Harrell, 2018) have found that DL teachers’ beliefs and practices are often incongruent owing to ideological or practical issues. Tensions at times occur between what DL teachers believe and what is demanded by programmatic policies. The incongruence between teachers’ beliefs and the policies, in turn, affects the teachers’ instructional behaviors, such as their literacy practices and language use (e.g., López & Fránquiz, 2009; Martínez et al., 2015; Zúñiga, 2016). These studies are invaluable in expanding our insight into the topic. However, more works are needed to explore the issues as they pertain to second language instruction, especially given the unique characteristics of DL programs. As Buehl and Beck (2015) write, the connections between teachers’ beliefs and practices may be affected by numerous variables at the school, district, and state levels. Examining internal and external factors associated with DL programs and their impact on teachers’ belief-practice (in)congruence is therefore critical.

Problem Statement

Lucas et al. (2015) state that “teachers need to critically reflect on their beliefs in light of the current thinking in the profession to identify beliefs they hold that conflict with the above foundations for teaching” (p. 454). Given the distinctive nature of dual language education which integrates language instruction and content learning (Genesee, 2008) and the crucial roles of
language proficiency in meeting the goals of dual language programs (Cloud et al., 2000; Met, 2008), the beliefs of dual language teachers demand scrutiny. This study seeks to gain information about dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding effective second language instruction. Several issues concerning the topic under investigation have warranted the need for the current investigation.

Research has discovered that bilingual teachers’ beliefs about L2 teaching and learning might not align with second language acquisition (SLA) theories. For example, teachers commonly held that dual language learners will become fluent English speakers within a year and that the best way to help them achieve this proficiency is by discouraging them from using their native language in and outside school (Walker et al., 2004). This view contradicts what has been established in the field of SLA. That is, it takes between 5 and 7 years for children to develop academic proficiency in a second language (Cummins, 2000; Freeman et al., 2005). Besides, home language literacy supports the development of, and is transferable to, second language literacy (Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 2002). In addition to having incorrect beliefs about the SLA process, many bilingual instructors feel that they do not have adequate knowledge in pedagogy and second language acquisition related to classroom instruction (Fortune et al., 2008; Oberg De La Garza et al., 2015).

Many DL teachers also assume that since dual language learners receive content learning and language instruction concurrently, they can effortlessly acquire a second language by merely exposing them to the target language (Genesee, 2016). Therefore, they believe that there is no particular need to provide explicit language instruction (Howard et al., 2018). However, it has been argued that although content-language instruction can promote communicative skills and
academic achievement, it might not optimally develop dual language learners’ grammatical competence (Genesee, 2008) and native-like oral ability (Howard et al., 2018).

Although several studies on dual language teachers’ beliefs have been conducted, there has been minimal attempt devoted to the teachers’ beliefs regarding second language instruction. This study aims to fill this gap in the literature. Furthermore, it is essential to examine the connections between DL teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices and what factors might affect these connections. Buehl and Beck (2015) have shown that four patterns of teachers’ belief-practice relationships are possible, including (a) beliefs inform practices; (b) practices influence beliefs; (c) beliefs and practices do not influence each other; (d) beliefs and practices are reciprocally connected. The present study operates under the assumption that dynamic relationships exist between DL teachers’ beliefs and their classroom practices. These connections might be shaped by a confluence of various internal and external factors related to the specific context of a dual language program.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of the study was to examine patterns of relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their instructional practices regarding effective second language teaching in the context of dual language programs in Florida, USA. To this end, the study sought to (1) uncover what beliefs dual language teachers held about effective second language teaching and learning, (2) investigate the extent to which these beliefs were consistent with the teachers’ instructional practices in the classrooms, and (3) identity factors that the teachers perceived as influencing the enactment of their belief about effective second language teaching and learning.
The study was guided by the following research question: How are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction related to their classroom instructional practices? To gain answers to this question, the researcher posed the following subsidiary questions:

1. What were the beliefs of dual language teachers about effective second language instruction in dual language programs?
2. To what extent were dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction convergent with their self-reported teaching practices?
3. What factors influenced the relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practices regarding effective second language instruction?

**Significance of the Study**

Scholars (e.g., Fang, 1996; Silvern & Isenberg, 1990) have recognized the importance of studying teacher beliefs because it can offer valuable insights for policy-making, teacher training, and school administration. The present study aimed to examine DL teachers’ beliefs in the hope of providing more empirical work that informs the policy and practice of dual language education. One feature of an effective DL program is related to instructional practices (Lindholm-Leary, 2005). This study offers insights into the extent to which DL teachers’ beliefs align with research-informed strategies for supporting dual language learners (Buysse et al., 2014). Zepeda et al. (2011) maintain that prospective teachers of dual language programs need to develop a strong familiarity with topics related to children’s language development, first and second language acquisition, and strategies to work effectively with dual language learners and their families. A better understanding of dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding
effective second language instruction can provide insights for meeting these needs. By identifying factors that hamper the enactment of teachers’ beliefs, schools can offer necessary supports. Also, teacher educators can design teacher professional development experiences that equip the teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to address issues related to second language instruction. Ultimately, understanding this phenomenon can offer leverage for enhancing the unique benefits of dual language education, especially for language minority students (Jacoby & Lesaux, 2019).

**Conceptual Framework**

The Construct of Teachers’ Beliefs

The construct of teacher belief has been described throughout the literature using a plethora of synonymous terms, such as perceptions, assumptions, implicit and explicit theories, judgments, opinions, preconceptions, and even attitudes (Pettit, 2011). Other researchers use such terms as principles of practice, personal epistemologies, perspectives, practical knowledge, or orientations instead of the term ‘teacher belief’ itself; thus, there was a lack of consistency in referring to the same construct (Kagan, 1992). Different conceptualizations of teachers’ beliefs have also been offered, making it more challenging to define this construct (Johnson, 1994; Pajares, 1992). According to Pettit (2011), one of the difficulties in defining teachers’ beliefs stems from controversy regarding the relationship between beliefs and knowledge: are they the same, different, or somehow related? In fact, the development of teachers’ beliefs as a concept has been evolving around the beliefs-knowledge quandary (Levin, 2015).

In her discussion of how teachers’ beliefs develop, Levin (2015) highlights the different perspectives regarding the relationships between beliefs and knowledge since the rise of interest
in research on teachers’ beliefs. In the 1980s, teachers’ beliefs were assumed to be a subset of teachers’ cognition (e.g., Clark & Peterson, 1986). According to Clark and Peterson (1986), two major domains are involved in the process of teaching: (1) teachers’ thought processes, or teacher cognition, and (2) teachers’ action and their observable effects. Teacher cognition includes three fundamental types of thought processes: teacher planning, teachers' interactive thoughts and decisions, and teachers' theories and beliefs. In the 1990s, researchers distinguished beliefs and knowledge based on how each construct conceives the truth or falsity of a proposition. Beliefs tend to be subjective, whereas knowledge is based on the fact that is agreed upon by a community (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996).

Current thinking in the field acknowledges that while beliefs and knowledge are two distinct constructs, they are interrelated one way or the other. Lundeberg and Levin (2003) posit that the subjectivity of beliefs and the objectivity of knowledge may be connected. An individual’s personal judgment or evaluation (beliefs) is often based on their understanding and interpretation of fact (knowledge) being held as true or false by community members. This new understanding has led current researchers to view the construct of teachers’ beliefs as “influenced by the social, cultural, political, and historical contexts teacher experience during their career” (Levin, 2015). Also, teachers’ beliefs are understood as part of a more extensive belief system within every individual, and different beliefs have different roles and functions in relation to actions (Fives & Buehl, 2012). Given the complexity of this construct, teasing out how belief is related to knowledge is insufficient for understanding the construct. Several other characteristics of teachers’ beliefs have been cited at varying degrees in the proposed definitions of this enigmatic construct.
The Characteristics of Teachers’ Beliefs

Five and Buehl (2012) point out that the construct of teachers’ beliefs is even more difficult to understand owing to the inconsistencies found across the definitions of teachers’ beliefs, particularly concerning four aspects of the construct. These include (1) whether the beliefs are explicit or implicit to the teachers; (2) whether teachers’ beliefs are stable over time, (3) the extent to which teachers’ beliefs are connected to context; (4) what are their locus within the individuals; and (5) whether and how they are related to knowledge. According to these authors, the construct of teachers’ beliefs is best understood as possessing the following characteristics. First, teachers’ beliefs exist within a continuum of stability. Some specific beliefs are subject to change, whereas others tend to be stable. Second, there are implicit beliefs that teachers are unaware of, and there are explicit beliefs that teachers are cognizant of. Third, teachers’ beliefs vary regarding their level of particularity. There are general beliefs that tend to be context-independent, and there are some specific beliefs that are more context-dependent. Next, teachers’ beliefs represent a larger, integrated system. Finally, teachers’ beliefs may or may not be related to knowledge (Fives & Buehl, 2012).

Skott (2015) notes that various definitions of teachers’ beliefs share a common core to the concept, which is formed by four key aspects. First, although beliefs can be related to knowledge, they are two distinct constructs. Beliefs may inform and complement knowledge; however, while beliefs are more subjective to the individual holding them, knowledge tends to be more objective and refers to consensually accepted facts. The second fundamental aspect is that beliefs are configured by both the cognitive and affective dimensions. The cognitive elements are more dominant and relatively more stable. The affective elements of beliefs play a role in shaping how information is understood. Next, beliefs are generally stable over time and across
contexts, and they are resistant to change. Some beliefs, such as epistemological beliefs (i.e., beliefs about knowledge and the nature of knowledge), are not easy to modify. Others, such as pedagogical beliefs, can and do change over time. Finally, beliefs can be very influential in teachers’ interpretation and engagement with practical issues. In summary, the concept of teachers’ beliefs has been used in recent literature to refer to “individual, subjectively true, value-laden mental constructs that are relatively stable results of substantial social experiences and that have significant impact on one’s interpretations of and contributions to classroom practices” (Skott, 2015, p. 19).

Functions of Teachers’ Beliefs

Fives and Buehl (2012) describe three functions of teachers’ beliefs, with different beliefs playing different roles depending on the contexts and situations. The first function of beliefs is to filter how teachers interpret new information and experiences. Thus, what a teacher “would do” with newly encountered information and experiences is determined by their current beliefs about the new information and experiences. Presumably, if the new information/experiences are congruent with the existing beliefs, they are likely to be adopted, and vice versa. For instance, teachers are more likely to adopt teaching strategies that echo their espoused beliefs about effective instruction. According to Fives and Buehl (2012), the filtering function of teachers’ beliefs may be influenced by personal epistemology, students, and teachers’ role. Once the new information or experiences are filtered, teachers’ beliefs serve to define or frame a problem or a task. The framing function of teachers’ beliefs is affected by context, teaching practices, or pedagogical approach. For instance, teachers who focus on fluency would frame students’ errors differently from those who emphasize accuracy. Finally, after the problem/task is framed and
defined, teachers’ beliefs determine whether or not subsequent action(s) need to be taken, and if they do, how much effort would be exerted on it and how persistent they would be. All of these, in turn, affect the quality of the teachers’ practices (Fives & Buehl, 2012).

The Relationships Between Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices

Buehl and Beck (2015) show that research has suggested four possible patterns of teachers’ belief-practice relationships. First, beliefs influence pedagogical practices, which is the typical pattern observed by most researchers (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). Secondly, practices shape beliefs. For instance, after engaging with specific practices in professional development programs or field practicum, practicing teachers may change their beliefs, especially those related to ability, such as capability beliefs (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Next, beliefs and practices can be disconnected or misaligned. For example, in a study by Liu (2011), despite the participants’ support for constructivist practices, their classroom behaviors reflected a more traditional approach. The other possible pattern is that beliefs and practices may influence each other (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Researchers (e.g., Potari & Georgiadou–Kabouridis, 2009) show that a long-term engagement with specific teaching practice may shift the belief held by a teacher about teaching a particular content, which then shapes his or her subsequent instructional actions.

External and Internal Factors Affecting the Enactment of Teachers’ Beliefs

Buehl and Beck (2015) identify a variety of multi-leveled external and internal factors that may facilitate or impede the enactment of teachers’ beliefs. External factors stem from classroom and school contexts, and variables at the levels of nation, state, and district. At the classroom level, the enactment of beliefs might be influenced by student ability, student attitudes, classroom management, and class size. At the school level, possible factors include
administration, school culture and community, parental support, colleagues, and resources. Education policies and curriculum standards are among the external factors at national, state, and district levels that may shape teachers’ belief-practices relationships (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

Internal factors are related to the teachers themselves, including the teachers’ other beliefs, knowledge of content and pedagogy, and self-awareness and self-reflection (Buehl & Beck, 2015). These authors explain that since teacher’s beliefs about many different topics are varied, multidimensional, and often contradictory to each other, certain beliefs may facilitate or hamper the enactment of other belief(s). Another internal factor is self-awareness and self-reflection, that is, the extent to which teachers are aware of their beliefs and willing to reflect on the (in)consistency of their beliefs and practices. A lack of such awareness about their beliefs may contribute to belief-practices inconsistency (Roehrig et al., 2009). However, if teachers are aware of the inconsistency, they may modify their beliefs or practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

Possible Explanations for Teachers’ Belief-Practice Incongruence

According to Skott (2015), teachers’ belief-practice incongruence can be attributed to four major factors: (1) conceptual or methodological issues; (2) individual or institutional variables; (3) the multifaceted nature of teaching; and (4) context. Regarding the first factor, since teachers hold multiple beliefs and their beliefs serve different functions, different methods for studying the construct may tap into different beliefs and functions (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Factors related to individual teachers can also explain why teachers’ beliefs and practices are inconsistent (Skott, 2015). While teachers indicate that they are inclined towards a specific teaching approach, their lack of pedagogical knowledge about the approach may hinder them from enacting it. Another possible reason for the misalignment of teachers’ stated beliefs and
observed practices is the multifaceted, interactional nature of teaching. Classroom contingencies can cause teachers to modify their planned instructional actions into ones that may, slightly or fully, deviate from their espoused beliefs (Fives & Buehl, 2012). The enactment of espoused beliefs may also be challenged by contextual factors, such as school culture, administrative support, resources, classroom environment, and immediate instructional interactions (Skott, 2015).

In summary, teachers’ beliefs are complex and multidimensional. They may be implicit or explicit to the teachers; they may be dependent or independent to context; they can be resistant or subject to change; they may or may not be related to knowledge; and they represent an integrated system within individuals (Fives & Buehl, 2012). Besides, one teacher may hold multiple, dynamic beliefs (Skott, 2015). Beliefs function to filter new information and experiences, frame or define problems and tasks, and guide actions (Fives & Buehl, 2012). Teachers’ beliefs and practices may or may not connected (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Specific beliefs can have dynamic links with specific practice(s) (Flores & Smith, 2008). The enactment of beliefs may be affected by internal factors (i.e., the teachers’ other beliefs, knowledge of content and pedagogy, and self-awareness and self-reflection) and external factors (i.e., the classroom, school, and various factors at the national, state, and district levels) (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Four major factors have been cited as the main reasons teachers’ stated beliefs are not aligned with their classroom practice. These include conceptual or methodological issues, individual teacher factor or institutional variables, the multifaceted and interactional nature of teaching, and contexts (Skott, 2015).
Dual language education is one approach to the education of English learners, the others being submersion, English as a Second Language (ESL), and transitional models – all these include learners whose first language is not English (Ray, 2008). Unlike the other three models that primarily aim for the expeditious acquisition of the English language, DL education seeks to promote learners’ acquisition of a second language while continuing to develop their home language (Roberts, 1995). DL is distinguished from other types of bilingual education because it embraces an additive nature of bilingual education (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2008), that is, adding other language skills into students’ existing linguistic repertoire (Valdes, 1997). For this reason, DL education has been considered as enriched education (Cloud et al., 2000). In contrast, remedial or transitional models strive to increase learners’ proficiency in the second language only. Such an approach often leads to subtractive bilingualism, or the attrition of one language due to the existence of another (May, 2008).

Dual language is defined as “any program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages and that promotes bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and sociocultural competence” (Howard et al., 2018, p. 3). Howard et al. (2018) use dual language program to refer to dual language instruction offered in a school, be it a strand or a whole-school program. A dual language program is regarded as a ‘strand’ when it is only a school part. For example, a Spanish-English dual language program is offered only in one out of two or three classrooms at every grade level. In the other classes, English is used as the primary language of instruction (Palmer, 2007).

Dual language programs can be implemented either one-way or two-way, depending on the demographic composition of the student being served. Figure 1 presents the subtypes of dual
language programs and how they differ in terms of the students' linguistic backgrounds. A one-way dual language program includes students who share the same linguistic background. Included in this type of program are (1) developmental or maintenance bilingual education, which serves students from a minority language; (2) foreign language immersion, which is composed of students who speak the majority language; and (3) heritage language program, which is attended by majority language students but whose parents, grandparents, or other ancestors are minority language speakers (Cloud et al., 2000). In a two-way dual language program, there is an approximately equal proportion of monolingual students who are dominant in English and students who are proficient in a partner language (the language other than English) when they enroll in the program (Howard et al., 2018).

Figure 1
Types of Dual Language Programs Based on Demographic Composition of Students (Cloud et al., 2000; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2008)
There are two major variants of dual language programs: the 90/10 and 50/50 models (Christian, 1996). In a 90/10 model, 90% of instruction is delivered in a partner language, e.g., Spanish, and the remaining 10% in the majority language, typically English. This model is usually implemented in the primary grades, where English is gradually spoken more frequently throughout the higher grades until an equal proportion of the use of both languages is established, e.g., by grade 5. Under the 90/10 setup, English-dominant students are fully exposed to the partner language. In contrast, non-native English speakers are initially taught in their native language, and then they are gradually exposed to English.

The 50/50 models maintain a balanced proportion of L1 and L2 as the medium of instruction throughout the program (Christian, 1996). In implementing the model, the school or the school district decides the allocation of time to each language. For instance, a balanced proportion could be set up so that L1 is spoken on certain days or time blocks during the day, whereas L2 is used in the other. Alternatively, the time for each language to be spoken is equally distributed among the content areas. Whichever time allotment is being used, both teachers and students are expected to speak only one language at a time (Palmer, 2007).

Advantages of Two-Way Dual Language Programs: Theory and Practice

Two-way dual language programs have three goals: (1) to develop bilingualism and biliteracy, (2) to foster high academic achievement in two languages, and (3) to promote positive intercultural attitudes and high levels of self-esteem (Christian, 1996). The underlying assumption for the first goal is that students will acquire a second language more effectively if they are constantly exposed to the language and are provided with ample opportunities to use the language for meaningful communication at school (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2008). Regarding the
second goal, Cummins (1979) posits that the academic success and cognitive abilities of minority-language students are increased when they can access curriculum content using their native language while at the same time being immersed in the target language. Cummins (1979) and others (e.g., Christian, 1996; Krashen, 1991; Valdes, 1997) further argue that higher-order thinking skills in students’ native language can lead to the same skills in the second language. It is also believed that the development of students’ linguistic and literacy skills in the two languages will contribute positively to their intercultural competence (e.g., Feinauer & Howard, 2014). As Howard et al. (2018) put it, dual language schooling offers “multiple opportunities for students to develop positive attitudes about themselves and others, and to develop cultural knowledge and a sense of their and others’ identities—ethnic, linguistic, and cultural—in a non-stereotyped fashion” (p. 34).

Substantial research has consistently provided evidence to support the advantages of the dual language model of bilingual education. DL education is proved effective for developing bilingualism. Scholarly literature on DL programs has repeatedly reported the high levels of linguistic proficiency acquired by English learners in their home language and English (Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 2002). Dual language learners with high levels of bilingual proficiency demonstrate increased academic and cognitive development (Genesee et al., 2006). The academic achievement of students attending dual language programs was generally higher than that of their comparable EL peers enrolling in other bilingual models and their native English-speaking counterparts (Christian, 1996; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Dual language education also benefits learners from diverse backgrounds. In her review of literature on the topic, Lindholm-Leary (2012) draws two important conclusions. First, dual language education promotes the academic achievement and bilingual proficiency of both ELs and native English-
speaking students. Second, dual language programs are beneficial for students coming from diverse cultural, socio-economic, linguistic backgrounds, as well as students with special needs.

Defining Dual Language Teachers

The term dual language learners (DLLs) has often been used in several works to include English Language learners (ELLs) or English Learners (EL). For example, Jacoby and Lesaux (2019) and Sawyer et al. (2017) consider their study population as dual language learners (DLLs) because they are instructed in two languages at schools. However, the schools in question do not run a dual language program in its official form. Zepeda et al. (2011) use DLLs to refer to all children whose primary language of communication is not English and attend any types of bilingual instruction, be it one-way or two-way models. The current study focuses on teachers' beliefs and practices in two-way dual language programs, and in the interest of clarity it is necessary to elucidate the similarities and differences between DL teachers and teachers of ELs.

School-age children in the U.S schools who have not yet proficient in English language skills have been identified using multiple terms. These include “limited English proficient” (LEP), “second language learner” (SLL), English-language learner (ELL), “culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD), and “bilingual” (Rhodes et al., 2005; Webster & Lu, 2012). The U.S. Department of Education uses the term “English learner” (EL) (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). In this research study, the term ELs (English learners) is used to indicate students (1) whose dominant language is other than English; and (2) who are in the process of attaining grade-level proficiency in English listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Nutta et al., 2014).
Figure 2

Demographic Composition of Students Served by Dual Language Teachers and Teachers of English Learners (ELs)

Figure 2 illustrates how teachers of ELs and teachers of DL learners share a commonality and difference in their students’ linguistic backgrounds. It is common today for K-12 teachers in the U.S to work with students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). A typical mainstream classroom may comprise native English-speaking students plus students whose dominant language is not English (e.g., French, Spanish, German, Arabic, Chinese) and are not yet proficient in the English language. In most cases, two-way dual language teachers work with a group of students who speak English natively and their peers who speak the same home language, e.g., Spanish (Lessow-Hurley, 2013). Thus, a commonality between general teachers and DL teachers is that they both have English-dominant students. The difference lies in the English learners: while general teachers work with students from various
linguistic backgrounds, DL teachers serve students who predominately share the same linguistic background.

DL teachers have something in common with ELLs teachers since they all work with learners coming from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. They concern not only with the linguistic but also the cultural competence of their learners. What makes two-way dual language teachers unique is that they must attend to both the majority and minority languages. DL teachers are responsible for helping children who speak the minority language (e.g., Spanish) to acquire the majority language (i.e., English), as well as for the English-dominant students to learn the minority language (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

**Definition of Terms**

To better clarify the content and context of the proposed study, the researcher offers the following operational definitions.

- Teachers’ beliefs refer to “individual, subjectively true, value-laden mental constructs that are relatively stable results of substantial social experiences and that have significant impact on one’s interpretations of and contributions to classroom practices” (Skott, 2015, p. 19).

- Dual language education is a type of education that aims to foster students’ linguistic proficiency, literacy and sociocultural competence in two languages, as well as to promote their academic achievement at various grade levels. Instruction is delivered in two languages, maintaining minimally a 50/50 proportion during at least one academic school year, through the integration of content learning and language instruction.
(Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2008; Howard et al., 2018). In the current study, the majority language is English, and the minority one is Spanish.

- Dual language program refers to any dual language education offered in schools either as a strand or as a whole-school program (Howard et al., 2018).

- One-way dual language program is a model of dual language program that is attended by students who predominantly share the same linguistic background, be it a majority language or a minority one (Howard et al., 2018).

- Two-way dual language program is a model of dual language program which serves approximately the same number of students who speak the majority language (e.g., English) and students who speak the minority language (e.g., Spanish) (Howard et al., 2018).
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews the scholarship on language teachers’ beliefs. According to Buehl and Beck (2015), past research on this construct has specifically addressed five topics: (a) beliefs about self, (b) beliefs about content, (c) beliefs about context, (d) beliefs about general teaching approaches, and (e) beliefs about specific teaching strategies. The focus of the following literature review is on the last two topics, which is in line with the study's interest in DL teachers’ beliefs regarding second language teaching methodology. The researcher discusses scholarly literature on English language teachers’ beliefs regarding English language learners (ELLs) and second language instruction in the context of English as a second language (ESL). Studies on the beliefs teachers have about teaching Spanish as a foreign language in high school contexts in the USA are also explored. This second exploration is germane to the study’s concern with dual language programs that provide instruction in English and Spanish.

Research on ESL Teachers’ Beliefs About Second Language Instruction

Over the past three decades, researchers have examined ESL teachers’ beliefs about various aspects of L2 instruction. Some studies looked into general second language pedagogy (Brown, 2009; e.g., Johnson, 1994; Kissau et al., 2012); others concentrated on more specific areas. In his review of past research on this area, Borg (2003b) noted that two mostly explored areas had been literacy instruction (e.g., Farrell & Ives, 2015; Graden, 1996; Johnson, 1992) and grammar teaching (e.g., Borg, 2003a; Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Phipps & Borg, 2009). These works suggest that L2 teachers’ beliefs regarding effective L2 instruction tend to reflect popular
contemporary approaches in second language teaching at the time of the study (Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Johnson, 1992, 1994; Kissau et al., 2012). However, the enactment of these beliefs are often challenged by a variety of factors such as students proficiency levels and attitudes (Graden, 1996), classroom realities and time constraints (Kissau et al., 2012), students’ motivation and affectivity (Farrell & Bennis, 2013), and the teachers’ other competing beliefs (Johnson, 1992, 1994).

A narrative study by Johnson (1994) considered teachers’ beliefs about second language teaching and learning and determined the influence of these beliefs on the teachers’ instructional practices. Participants of the study were four preservice teachers who were doing their 15-week teaching practicum as part of a master-level program in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) in which they were enrolled. The researcher collected data from written journals, observations, and interviews. It was inferred from their journals that these ESL teachers’ beliefs regarding second language teaching and learning were complex and somewhat contradictory to each other. Some beliefs aligned with a teacher-centered pedagogy, and such beliefs were rooted in the participants’ experiences with formal language learning. Others were more reflective of a student-centered perspective, most likely influenced by the teachers’ informal language learning experiences. Conflicting beliefs were evident, for example, in the teachers’ views about innovative ideas for fostering second language learning, such as the use of authentic materials, mnemonics strategy for learning new vocabulary, and learner strategy training. At times, the participants had mixed feelings regarding the effectiveness of these strategies. The competing beliefs were found to embody the teachers’ instructional practices. For example, although the teachers were cognizant of the inadequacy of teacher-directed pedagogy, they often found it challenging to shift to a more student-directed instruction as mandated by their teacher.
preparation program. This difficulty was associated with various factors, such as a lack of procedural knowledge, a lack of alternative models for their instructional practices, and hindering classroom contexts (Johnson, 1994). The researcher concluded that the participants’ judgment of second language theories, methods, and materials was often based on their personal experiences in second language learning (Johnson, 1994).

Johnson (1992) studied teachers’ theoretical beliefs about the teaching of reading in English as a second language. Theoretical beliefs are referred to as “the philosophical principles, or beliefs systems, that guided teachers’ expectations of student behavior and the decisions they make during reading lessons” (Johnson, 1992, p. 84). Thirty practicing ESL teachers at different grade levels in K-12 programs participated in the two-phase study. The first phase determined the extent to which the teachers’ beliefs were in line with skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches to second language teaching. Data analysis showed that 60% of the ESL teachers aligned themselves with particular methodological approaches, with the majority adhering to function-based teaching. Johnson (1992) speculated that the prevalence of this approach was associated with communicative language teaching that was popular at the time of the study. Another discovery was that several participants subscribed to multiple theoretical approaches, suggesting that their beliefs were still random or not fully developed yet. In the second phase, the study found that the relationships between literacy practices and theoretical orientations were more consistent among the ESL teachers who adhered to one theoretical approach. These findings led the author to conclude that (1) ESL teachers’ instructional behaviors tend to reflect their theoretical beliefs, and (2) ESL teachers who adopt different theoretical beliefs may perform different literacy instructions (Johnson, 1992).
Graden (1996) conducted a qualitative study with six ESL teachers in the USA to explore their beliefs and practices regarding reading and reading instruction. Data analysis revealed that these educators characterized effective L2 reading instruction with (1) the provision of ample opportunities for students to read frequently, (2) the use of the target language for reading instruction, and (3) a strict focus on reading comprehension with minimal to no interference of oral reading. It was also suggested that the (mis)alignment between teachers’ stated beliefs and their actual practices could be profoundly affected by various contextual factors. Although generally there was a convergence between the teachers’ stated beliefs and their practice in the classroom, the enactment of these beliefs was at times hampered by the students’ reading ability, time constraints, and lack of appropriate materials. According to the researcher, that the teachers subordinated their beliefs to these factors suggested that several competing beliefs at play. For example, the teachers’ belief in the merits of frequent reading for increased comprehension could not always be enacted due to issues concerning the students’ motivational needs, which the teachers considered equally essential to address. Thus, the teachers’ specific beliefs regarding effective reading instruction were often in conflict with their other beliefs (Graden, 1996).

In their recent investigation, Farrell and Ives (2015) used a case study design to explore the espoused beliefs and observed practices of a novice teacher who taught a high-beginner level L2 reading to 20 ESL students. Data were obtained by conducting a series of interviews and classroom observations over four weeks. Findings showed that overall the subject’s specific beliefs about the teaching of L2 reading were interwoven with his other beliefs regarding general language teaching and effective language learning. In the participant’s view, the primary roles of ESL teachers were: (1) to assist students in the development of their general language abilities (beliefs about language teaching), (2) to promote students’ reading skills and strategies (beliefs
about teaching L2 reading), and (3) to help students become active language learners (beliefs about language learning). Overall, these beliefs were consistent with the teachers’ classroom practices. For instance, the teachers’ beliefs about the importance of skimming, scanning, and contextual clues for reading comprehension were evident in his teaching practices. There were, however, several instances of inconsistency in the form of (1) some beliefs that were not enacted in practices and (2) some practices that were not part of stated beliefs. Such discrepancies stemmed from the classroom environment, student factor, and teacher factor. Regarding the last factor, these researchers suggest that when certain beliefs are still implicit to them, the teachers may not have the ability to determine the links between what they believe and what they practice (Farrell & Ives, 2015).

Concerning grammar teaching in English as a second language, a case study by Farrell and Bennis (2013) examined the articulated beliefs and observed practices of one novice and one experienced ESL teacher. Data were collected over one week using a background survey, non-participatory observations, and interviews. It was revealed that both novice and experienced teachers valued inductive and deductive approaches to grammar teaching. However, they also expressed more vigorous support for the inductive approach because they believed that it leads to better learning retention. These instructors recognized communicative activities, valued the importance of lessons that are interesting and relevant to the students, emphasized fluency over accuracy, and considered it necessary to provide ongoing error correction. Data about their observed practices generally confirmed past findings suggesting that experienced teachers are more likely to demonstrate belief-practice congruence than are their novice peers (see Basturkmen, 2012). Some practices that diverged from the teacher’s beliefs were attributed to contextual factors such as time constraints. This kind of contextually-driven act, according to
these authors, is considered normal as teachers usually adjust their teaching plan to the moment-to-moment situation in the classroom (Farrell & Bennis, 2013).

Research on Teachers’ Beliefs About Teaching English Language Learners

Given that dual language teachers principally work with second language learners, it is particularly relevant to discuss research on teachers’ beliefs about teaching English language learners (ELLs). In a most recent analysis of studies on this topic, Lucas et al. (2015) identify five common themes, which were somewhat troubling. First, many teachers feel inadequately prepared to teach this population of students. Teachers in a study by Rodrigues et al. (2010) indicated that their preparation programs did not provide them with sound theoretical knowledge nor opportunities for practices they needed to be able to support ELLs in the classrooms. Similar results were noted in studies involving bilingual instructors (e.g., Fortune et al., 2008; Oberg de la Garza et al., 2015). However, despite their feeling of unpreparedness, many teachers express a lack of interest in attending professional development programs related to English learners (Reeves, 2006), with some teacher candidates believing that positive attitudes are all they needed to help ELLs (Marx, 2002). The second theme is related to various major challenges to teaching ELLs cited by general education teachers. These include (1) lack of competence to communicate with students and their families, (2) limited time available to teach the language and content, (3) the vast variations of English learners in terms of their English proficiency level and academic abilities, (4) insufficient tools/appropriate materials, and (5) lack of qualified bilingual and ESL educators (Lucas et al., 2015).

The third theme emerging from the literature review on the topic by Lucas et al. (2015) is that educators tend to have negative attitudes toward the academic ability and potential of
English learners. Many teachers view ELLs’ home language as a liability that interferes with their learning of the target language (Escamilla, 2006; Rodriguez et al., 2010). Therefore, they believe that ELLs should be included in general education classes rather than in their class (Karabenick & Noda, 2004). The fourth theme of the review is that many general teachers have beliefs about English language learning that did not align with SLA literature. For instance, they hold misconceptions about the process of second language acquisition. Even if certain correct beliefs (e.g., beliefs about diversity and multilingualism) are espoused, they are not consistently enacted in the classrooms.

Lucas et al. (2015) point out four primary variables that might be associated with the less than favorable beliefs many general education teachers held about ELLs. These include prior experiences with ELLs from diverse backgrounds, educational experiences, individual factors (language, ethnicity, gender), and contextual factors. According to Lucas and colleagues, teachers are more likely to have positive views about ELLs if (a) they have extensive exposure to ELLs and diversity; and (b) they are trained with teaching skills and knowledge that are responsive to meeting the needs of ELLs. It was also suggested that positive attitudes toward ELLs are more commonly held by female teachers, bilingual/multilingual speakers, and/or teachers with Hispanic/Latino backgrounds. Teachers’ attitudes toward ELLs might also be positive if the context within which they are working values diversity and multilingualism.

When analyzing studies that examined how general education teachers’ beliefs about ELLs influenced their instructional behaviors, Lucas et al. (2015) found consistencies between stated beliefs and classroom practices. In two case studies by Yoon (2007, 2008) that they reviewed, three teachers had three different views regarding whether or not it was their responsibility to teach ELLs, and their observed classroom practices aligned with a particular
view being adopted. In Sharkey and Layzer’s (2000) study, some teachers believed that the academic success of ELLs depends on their ability to adapt and assimilate into the school culture. As a result, these educators strove to meet the social and emotional needs of the students by placing them in academically less challenging yet more comfortable classes. Lucas et al. (2015) comment that the findings should be interpreted with caution because these studies collected data through surveys rather than direct observation, and classroom practices are shaped by a myriad of factors.

**Research on Spanish Teachers’ Beliefs About Effective Foreign Language Instruction**

A discussion of this area is relevant because dual language programs aim to develop learners’ linguistic proficiency in a language other than English, which in this study is assumed to be the Spanish language. Despite the prevalence of courses on Spanish as a foreign language in the K-12 system in the USA, as reported by the *American Councils for International Education* (2017), less attention has been directed to the beliefs held by teachers of Spanish in high school contexts in the USA. Past research on the topic predominately involved instructors from various foreign languages such as German, French, and Spanish (Bell, 2005; Kissau et al., 2012). Only a few exclusively investigated Spanish language teachers (e.g., Gebel & Schrier, 2002). These studies indicate that teachers of Spanish as a foreign language had beliefs and practices that reflect current theoretical views in language teaching, e.g., the orientation toward communicative competence, the integration of technology, and the shift from the teacher-centered to the more student-centered paradigm.

Gебel and Schrier (2002) investigated Spanish language teachers’ beliefs about second language reading instruction and examined the extent to which their stated beliefs were
implemented in the classroom. About 58% of 500 invited high school teachers of Spanish responded to a survey designed to identify their beliefs about the construct of reading in a foreign language. The study found that, by and large, the respondents had a conviction about the critical roles of reading for L2 acquisition. For this reason, they advocated the teaching of reading at an early age and the utilization of technology in reading instruction. They also believed that reading activities should be integrated into the classroom and that reading activities should focus on comprehension rather than pronunciation and structure. It was further discovered that, despite their strong beliefs in reading, the majority of the respondents felt unprepared for teaching this language area due to a lack of formal training to teach the skill in a second language and their unfamiliarity with reading research.

Gebel and Schrier (2002) further noted that some of the secondary Spanish teachers’ beliefs corresponded with their practices, and some did not. The highest degree of consistency was observed in their belief-practice connections regarding comprehension as the primary goal of reading instruction. Several inconsistencies were also seen in various aspects. For instance, while most of the teachers (96%) valued prereading strategies in reading activities, only one-third of them reported using the strategy. Although about 70% believed in the positive influence of technology in reading instruction, only less than 20% actually utilized it. Another discrepancy was that while about 85% agreed with the idea of giving more time for students to perform free reading activities in the classroom, only about 11% practiced it. These discrepancies, Gebel and Schrier (2002) commented, were mainly rooted in a variety of factors related to the school and classroom environment, notably time constraints and the pressure of end-of-the-year examination, which demanded a focus on grammar and vocabulary.
Bell (2005) investigated teachers’ perception of effective foreign language teaching and learning. The participants were 457 postsecondary instructors of French, German, and Spanish. Of these, approximately one-third were Spanish teachers. About half of the participants had taught Spanish in K-12 classrooms. The respondents completed an 80-item questionnaire covering various topics relevant to second language acquisition (SLA) and foreign language teaching. Data analysis showed that most teachers agreed on more than 50% of items related to the Standard for Foreign Language Learning (Yonkers, 1996) and subscribed to communicative approaches to foreign language teaching. Most participants also valued small group work and negotiation of meaning, the positive impact of learning strategies on mastering a foreign language, and the importance of assessment. However, these teachers remained uncertain about the role of error correction, the place of grammar instruction in communicative teaching, and the effect of learning differences. According to the researcher, the teachers’ beliefs reflected the debates in the field of SLA at the time of the study. Although the communicative language teaching approach was highly recognized, there was no consensus regarding such issues as corrective feedback, focus on grammatical form, and individual differences of language learners (Bell, 2005).

In their large-scale study, Kissau et al. (2012) compared the teaching-related beliefs of L2 teachers across several demographic groups. germane to this literature review is the study’s findings regarding teachers of different language backgrounds (i.e., Spanish, German, French, Chinese, Japanese, Latin, and Portuguese). Of the 222 participants, almost two-thirds were teachers of Spanish as a second language in K-8 and high school settings. All participants completed a survey addressing various topics of teaching beliefs that were organized into five subscales: language and culture, teaching strategies, individual differences, assessment and
grammar, and second language acquisition theory. Results suggest that regardless of the participants’ linguistic backgrounds, they generally had similar views about effective L2 teaching. These instructors valued the use of L2 and the integration of second language culture into the L2 classrooms, the importance of differentiated instruction and different learning strategies for students, and the supportive roles of grammar for communicative goals. They recognized the significant roles of error correction and the need to reduce students’ anxiety. They also understood effective teachers use different tools and strategies, incorporate technology, promote group work, and maintain a connection between core content and the use of the target language in the classroom (Kissau et al., 2012). While quantitative data suggested a commonality in the teaching-related beliefs, interview data revealed some discrepancies. For example, the Spanish language teachers were quite uncertain of effective teaching strategies and methodology, making them feel unprepared to teach the language. Kissau et al. (2012) concluded that while all L2 teachers in their study appeared to hold similar beliefs regarding effective L2 teaching, these beliefs were still unique across the participants owing to such factors as experience, training, type of program, and teaching assignment.

To sum up, extant studies on teachers’ beliefs regarding effective second/foreign language instruction have offered the following insights. First, there is a tendency for language teachers’ beliefs to align with popular approaches in language teaching. Second, complex relationships exist between the teachers’ beliefs and their actual practices in the classrooms. Third, the confluence of factors associated with students, teachers, and contexts shapes the implementation of certain beliefs, with the latter factor exerting the most profound effect on teachers’ belief-practice relationships. The works on the topic of teachers’ beliefs within this particular area have shed light on teacher cognition and actions and how they are related to each
other, particularly as far as second/foreign language teaching is concerned. The following sections consider these issues of second language instruction within the context of dual language education.

**Research on Dual Language Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices**

Several researchers (e.g., Freire & Valdez, 2017; Martínez et al., 2015; Ray, 2008; Sanchez, 2011) have attempted to examine DL teachers’ beliefs about various aspects of dual language education. However, limited attention has been devoted to teachers’ beliefs about second language instruction. As such, this literature review provides additional insights into the essential roles of language instruction and teachers’ beliefs as they relate to dual language programs. Additionally, the analytic focus is on the connection between teachers’ beliefs and practices, as well as factors that may facilitate or hinder the enactment of these beliefs in the dual language environments.

Despite the growing popularity of dual language instruction in the United States (Ovando & Combs, 2012; Valdez, Freire, & Delavan, 2016), research on the beliefs and practices of dual language teachers are still rare. Past works on teachers’ beliefs in bilingual education have generally involved teachers of English learners with minimal reference to dual language groups. For example, in Moore’s (1999) review of literature on diversity and its relationship to teacher thinking, the studies discussed were all set out to analyze teachers’ beliefs about diversity in relation to English learners. More recently, in their *Handbook of Research on Teacher Beliefs*, Fives and Gill (2015) include a chapter on teachers’ beliefs about cultural diversity and another on teachers’ beliefs regarding English learners, two sections in the volume that address the issues as they pertain to bilingual education. While these reviews provide excellent sources for a better
understanding of teachers’ beliefs about English language teaching and learning, more studies on language teachers’ thinking and practices in the context of dual language education are needed (Fortune et al., 2008).

**Dual Language Teachers’ Beliefs**

Fives and Buehl (2012) have categorized various investigations of teachers’ beliefs into five topics: (1) beliefs about self, (2) beliefs about students, (3) beliefs about context, (4) beliefs about content or knowledge, (5) beliefs about specific strategies, and (6) beliefs about teaching approach. Based on this framework, one may find that existing studies on teachers’ beliefs in the contexts of dual language programs tended to concentrate on beliefs DL teachers have about content and knowledge. DL teachers’ beliefs about self, students, specific strategies, and pedagogical approach appear to be under-researched (see Table 1). Given the integration of language instruction and content learning (Genesee, 2008) and the crucial roles of language in meeting the goals of dual language programs (Cloud et al., 2000; Met, 2008), dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices about effective second language instruction demand scrutiny.

Table 1 presents the relevant literature on dual language teachers’ beliefs regarding various topics. In this table, each work is classified into one of the five topics modeled by Fives and Buehl (2012), and the specific topic of beliefs being examined is indicated. As shown in the table, studies on dual language teachers’ beliefs tended to focus on the conceptual dimension of DL programs, such as language ideologies and literacy practices (López & Fránquiz, 2009), language, bilingualism and multilingualism (Bernstein et al., 2018), language ideologies (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Zúñiga, 2016), translanguaging (Martínez et al., 2015), and culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) (Freire & Valdez, 2017). These works suggest that DL
teachers often found themselves in a tension between what they believe and what is demanded by programmatic policies. In turn, the tension affects the teachers’ classroom behaviors, especially their literacy practices and language use. The following sections explore these studies.

Table 1
Topics and Foci of Past Studies on Teachers’ Beliefs in Dual Language Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Belief topic (based on Fives &amp; Buehl, 2012)</th>
<th>DL teachers’ beliefs about</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>López and Fránquiz (2009)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Language and literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martínez et al. (2015)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zúñiga (2016)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Home language (as a problem versus as a resource)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. (2017)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Language, bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freire and Valdez (2017)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Culturally relevant pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein et al. (2018)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Language, language learning, and bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>González-Carriedo and Esprívalo Harrell (2018)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Use of technology in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martínez et al. (2015) investigated teachers’ beliefs and practices about translanguaging, or “the ways in which they and their students moved fluidly across languages and dialects in their everyday classroom interactions” (p. 27), and how these beliefs influenced their use of language and instructional practices. In practice, translanguaging occurs when teachers instruct a
lesson using two languages in a systematic way (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012), i.e., through the use of code-switching (García & Sylvan, 2011). Data were collected from two Spanish-English dual language elementary classroom teachers using observations, video recordings of instructional times in the classrooms, and semi-structured interviews. Findings revealed that the participants had ambivalent views regarding translinguaging. On the one hand, they perceived translinguaging as an ideology that supports language separation in the classroom; on the other hand, they valued translinguaging because it promotes bilingualism (Martínez et al., 2015). These conflicting views embodied their everyday language use and instruction in the classroom. Thus, although their DL programs encouraged compliance with the language separation policy, the teachers could not help but occasionally mixed the two languages themselves and saw no problem with their students orally engaging in translinguaging. When it came to writing tasks, however, the teachers did not allow code-switching, indicating their support of language separation ideology.

The work of Martínez et al. (2015) demonstrated the influence of language ideologies, defined as “beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds” (Krosktrity, 2004, p. 498), on teachers’ instructional behaviors, in this case, their everyday language use in the classroom. The dual language teachers in the study appeared to hold complex and sometimes contradictory beliefs about language use, which were strongly influenced by policy context, which in turn shaped their instructional practices (Martínez et al., 2015). Unfortunately, the study did not provide any clues as to how these different language ideologies influenced the teachers’ instruction beyond the issues of language use. Given the critical roles of language input and output in developing the second language competence of DL learners (Howard et al., 2018; Lindholm-Leary, 2005), it would be interesting to examine how teachers’ beliefs about language
use impact their views and practices related to second language instruction. Notwithstanding, the study is valuable because it suggests the tensions and contradictions within the institutional contexts, and DL instructors may adopt different perspectives regarding certain aspects of the program (Martin–Beltrán, 2010).

Similar results were reported by Zúñiga (2016), who studied how language orientations impacted the language practices of dual language teachers when preparing their students for their state’s standardized assessment. The study drew on the language orientations model laid out by Ruíz (1984), who posits that language education policies and experiences in the United States have been framed by three different views about the minority language: language-as-problem, language-as-resource, and language-as-right. Using a case study methodology, Zúñiga (2016) worked with two 3rd grade English-Spanish dual-language teachers and collected data using video- and audio-recorded classroom observations, interviews, and relevant artifacts. Findings suggest that the teachers’ linguistic practices echoed an ideological tension between language-as-problem and language-as-resource orientations, the former being the “orientation that language is a social problem to be identified operationally and solved through treatments like transitional education” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 21), and the latter “the assumption that language is a resource to be managed, developed and conserved” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 28). Specifically, one of the participants generally acknowledged Spanish as a resource facilitating English acquisition; however, she frequently positioned bilingualism as an impediment to their students’ success on an English state test. The other teacher recognized the language separation policy as a resource. However, he also felt the urgency of mixing Spanish and English languages to ensure that his Spanish students were well-prepared for their English assessment (Zúñiga, 2016). The study indicates that the teachers’ language practices may not consistently align with the dual language model that
features the language separation policy. Zuniga’s (2016) study also shows that dual language teachers’ understanding of language informs their instructional decisions. Like Martínez et al. (2015), Zúñiga (2016) uncovered the tensions and contradictions between teachers’ perceptions about linguistic use and the expectation of their dual language programs.

The issue of language ideologies and literacy practice in two-way immersion education has also been explored by López and Fránquiz (2009). In their work, interviews were carried out with ten educators, including the bilingual director, campus principal, biliteracy specialist, librarian, and six teachers. Several types of documents were examined, and classroom practices were observed with a focus on literacy instruction. López and Fránquiz (2009) concluded that although both the program and the participants support bilingualism and biliteracy, there are conflicting ideologies when it came to practices. For example, while the teachers firmly acknowledged the importance of teaching all languages to their students, their classroom practices reflected a monolingual ideology.

In their work with 323 dual language educators, Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. (2017) revealed ideological tensions within district-wide bilingual education programs that implemented a top-down policy regarding language and bilingualism. The participants were surveyed using the Educators’ Beliefs about Language (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2011). Factor analysis identified eight different language ideologies with varying intensities within a continuum between language-as-problem and language-as-resource stances (Ruíz, 1984). Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. (2017) noted that competing ideologies were found not only across the sample but also within individuals. For instance, some participants valued their students’ ability to communicate in multiple languages, indicating their adherence to the languages other than English (LOTE) endowments ideology. However, these educators also voiced support for English as the primary
medium of instruction, a view that represents the *language as a symbol of majority influence* ideology (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017). Besides these ideological tensions, the participants felt that the implementation of language policies as mandated by DL programs was impeded by inadequate support and conflicts between the district, program, and accountability policies (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017).

Bernstein et al. (2018) reported slightly different results from their study on the beliefs dual language teachers and paraprofessionals have about language, language learning, and bilingualism. The researchers drew on a framework that distinguishes two language ideologies: pro-monolingual and pro-multilingual. It has been suggested that teachers holding the pro-monolingual ideology tend to view students’ home language as a barrier to second language learning. Therefore, they discourage students from speaking their home language in the classroom. Teachers embracing the pro-multilingual idea would do the opposite. The researchers employed mixed methods to study twenty-eight teachers in 14 pre-kindergarten classrooms during their first month of implementing a dual language model. Data were gathered using a survey of teachers’ beliefs about language, language experiences survey, a test of knowledge of DLE terminology, and semi-structured focus group discussion. Findings indicated that, first, many participants considered multilingualism as an asset rather than a problem. Second, this view was positively correlated with a pro-multilingual ideology adopted by the teachers. Another result was that teachers who had experiences with second language study and teacher education were more likely to adopt a pro-multilingual ideology than their peers who had not. The study also uncovered practical issues that the respondents perceived as significant barriers to implementing their beliefs. However, it did not delve deeper into how these beliefs were put into practice.
A few studies have investigated teachers’ beliefs about specific instructional practices in dual language programs. For example, using a phenomenological, multiple case-study design, González-Carriedo and Espósito Harrell (2018) studied DL teachers’ attitudes toward the use of technology to develop dual language learners’ bilingual and biliteracy skills. Nine dual language teachers were interviewed and asked to complete a questionnaire. Results showed that the participants articulated positive beliefs toward the role of technology in enhancing language acquisition and content-area learning of both majority and minority language learners. However, these teachers did not consistently enact their stated beliefs due to pedagogical and practical challenges (González-Carriedo & Espósito Harrell, 2018).

Dual Language Teachers’ Belief-Practice Connections

Several dual language researchers expanded their investigations into the extent to which DL teachers’ beliefs align with their pedagogical practices and what factors might influence the relationships between beliefs and practices. It has been suggested that incongruent belief-practices relationships may stem from ideological issues, practical problems, or a combination of both. Bernstein et al. (2018) showed that two factors impeded the enactment of DL teachers’ positive beliefs about bilingualism/multilingualism. First, a misalignment of priorities occurred between the school district and the DL program. Second, there was a dearth of bilingual textbooks, a lack of educators’ proficiency in the minority language, and a lack of teaching assistants’ confidence. Dual language educators in a study by Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. (2017) cited both ideological problem (i.e., a conflict between district and DL program requirements) and practical issues (i.e., lack of support for training, time, and teaching resources in the Spanish language) as factors contributing to their belief-practice incongruities.
In their study of elementary Spanish-English dual language teachers, Freire and Valdez (2017) identified four impediments to implementing culturally relevant pedagogy. These include time constraints, lack of culturally relevant materials, limited knowledge about the pedagogy, and the belief that social justice topics were inappropriate for young children. González-Carriedo and Esprívalo Harrell (2018) found that despite DL teachers’ favorable view of technology’s role in schools and their willingness to use technology, their implementation was impeded by practical barriers, including (a) insufficient time for technology-enhanced activities, (b) lack of training specific to the implementation of technology in DL classrooms, (c) inadequate resources in the Spanish language (e.g., computer software, websites, applications), and (d) insufficient number of technological devices such as computers and tablets (González-Carriedo & Esprívalo Harrell, 2018).

In summary, research on teachers’ beliefs about various aspects of dual language programs has mainly focused on the linguistic and cultural aspects of dual language instruction, such as bilingualism and multilingualism (Bernstein et al., 2018), translanguaging (Martínez et al., 2015), language ideologies (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; López & Fránquiz, 2009; Zúñiga, 2016), and culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) (Freire & Valdez, 2017). Although they reported mixed results, these works suggest that incongruities frequently exist between dual language teachers’ beliefs and related program implementation. Ideological and practical issues might inhibit the enactment of teachers’ beliefs. These studies are valuable because they shed light on the complex relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices. Also, they offer insights into how teachers’ beliefs and practices intertwine with the unique features of dual language education, such as language policy, language ideologies, and perspective on culture. However, there is a paucity of research on the beliefs dual language teachers hold about teaching
and learning a second language and factors that might influence the enactment of the beliefs. More investigations into this topic are therefore needed, especially given the critical roles of language development in the academic success of dual language learners (Howard et al., 2018; Lindholm-Leary, 2005, 2012; Met, 2008). The next section provides further rationales for the study by exploring issues concerning second language instruction in dual language education. It will be demonstrated why it is imperative to address these issues.

**Language Teaching and Content Instruction in Dual Language Programs**

Dual language education is distinguished from other bilingual models because it typically integrates language teaching with content instruction (Cloud et al., 2000; Fortune et al., 2008; Met, 2008). In dual language programs, teachers deliver the academic content using the target language, e.g., English and Spanish. The underlying assumption is that dual language students can benefit linguistically from content instruction because it allows the students not only to master the content area but also to learn the target language (Genesee, 2008). Second language acquisition is expected to occur naturally as a result of learning academic skills and knowledge through contextually meaningful activities in the classroom (Cloud et al., 2000) and further enhanced through social interactions outside of the classroom (Genesee, 2008).

Researchers, however, are somewhat inconclusive regarding the effectiveness of language-content integration in dual language programs. Some authors (e.g., Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2001) support this paradigm. They cite evidence to suggest that dual language students demonstrated a significantly higher level of proficiency in the second language and academic achievement than did their counterparts attending other types of bilingual education. In contrast, others claim that extended exposure to the target language does not always lead to
higher language proficiency, especially in terms of grammatical competence (Genesee, 2008) and native-like oral production (Howard et al., 2018).

Notwithstanding this inconclusiveness, DL teachers have been found to have a misconception about content instruction and language teaching. Met (2008) reported that many DL instructors believe that their students would naturally acquire the target language as they learn content-area information. Therefore, they should not be taught specific aspects of the language. Similarly, Tabors (2008) noted that many immersion teachers assume that second language acquisition occurs by osmosis without the need for teachers to offer special effort. Research also indicates that bilingual instructors tend to emphasize the teaching of content rather than on language (Fortune et al., 2008; Walker & Tedick, 2000). In their work involving immersion teachers, Fortune et al. (2008) found that despite their support for integrating language instruction in their content teaching, they did not use the balanced approach consistently and systematically.

There have been suggestions for incorporating more direct, explicit language instruction in immersion programs, including that of dual language education (Cloud et al., 2000; Day & Shapson, 1990; Genesee, 2008; Lyster & Mori, 2008; Norris & Ortega, 2000). Genesee (2008) argues that linking students’ communicative needs in the classroom with more explicit instruction focusing on problematic linguistic areas can help to alleviate deficiencies in students’ grammatical competence. Norris and Ortega (2000) believe that content-based instruction with explicit language instruction that addresses formal properties of the target language can enhance the second language development of dual language students.

Cloud and colleagues (2000) acknowledge that although immersion programs principally rely on meaningful, contextual, and relevant interactions for dual language learners to acquire the
target language, they do not necessarily eschew direct teaching of specific language components. In fact, in their view, to optimize second language learning, direct instruction of language should be offered in dual language classrooms. Cloud et al. (2000) recommend using a lesson plan that includes two foci: a non-language focus that delivers academic content and a language focus that addresses language-specific issues. In this regard, the academic content provides meaningful contexts for the direct teaching of language components (Cloud et al., 2000). For example, after engaging students with reading activities, teachers can draw the students’ attention to specific grammar points (e.g., the tenses, the prepositions, the adverbs) that they encounter in the book. Similarly, Lyster and Mori (2008) offer a type of form-focused instruction which they call “instructional counterbalance … to ensure continued growth in the immersion language by providing opportunities for students to use target forms instead of recalcitrant interlanguage forms that are more readily available” (p. 134, emphasis in original). To implement this strategy, Lyster and Mori (2008) suggest that teachers choose the right moment during meaning-oriented classroom activities to direct students’ attention on select language areas that they are having difficulty with.

In a more recent text, Howard et al. (2018) highlight the importance of incorporating focused instruction into the teaching of second language linguistic forms, such as vocabulary, syntax, and morphology in dual language education. However, these authors caution that the need for formal instruction in the second language should not entail a return to traditional approaches such as translation and memorization of grammar and vocabulary. What educators should do, according to Howard et al. (2018), is to implement language arts curriculum in which problematic linguistic items are identified and explicitly addressed by integrating them in the teaching of content area. By highlighting the need to incorporate language teaching into content
instructions, Howard and colleagues join the others (Cloud et al., 2000; Lyster & Mori, 2008; Met, 2008) who suggest strategies for delivering more explicit language instruction. One could see this as a shift of the issues from ‘whether or not to teach language explicitly’ to ‘how to teach it,’ and this brings up a fundamental question of why effective language instruction is critical to the success of dual language education. The following section tackles this issue.

**Critical Roles of Effective Language Instruction in Dual Language Programs**

Cloud et al. (2000) underscore the centrality of language in all education, including dual language. The critical role of language, they succinctly write, is two-fold: “It is both a prerequisite to successful education, and it is an important outcome of successful education” (Cloud et al., 2000, p. 1). Met (2008) points to the fundamental roles of language in developing students’ literacy, linguistic, and academic achievement, especially in the context of dual language education. A considerable challenge for DL teachers is how to ensure that learners grasp content instruction that is delivered in the second language (Met, 2008). For this reason, Met asserts that bilingual educators must always be aware of the critical roles of language in literacy development and academic competence.

Proper language instruction is one of the critical keys to ensuring the effectiveness of dual language programs (Howard et al., 2018; Lindholm-Leary, 2005, 2012). In her review of research and best practices found on successful dual language programs, Lindholm-Leary (2005) highlights seven factors that are substantially contributive to successful students’ outcomes. One of these is related to instructional practices. In this respect, several practices have been observed to result in effective instruction in dual language classrooms. These include (a) the use of techniques that cater to different learning styles and levels of language proficiency; (b) positive
teacher-student as well as student-student interactions; (c) the use of reciprocal pedagogy that encourages teacher-learner dialogues aimed to boost higher-level cognitive skills; (d) the use of cooperative learning that promotes student interaction and sharing of experiences; and (e) language input that is comprehensible, interesting, relevant, adequate, and challenging (Lindholm-Leary, 2005).

In addition to sufficient language input, it is essential to provide dual language learners with ample opportunities to produce the language. In their *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, Howard et al. (2018) underline the need to use a variety of instructional strategies in order to effectively facilitate dual language learners’ acquisition of the target language. Instrumental to this objective is the use of specific strategies for providing comprehensible input to learners, with the goal of developing oral production and literacy proficiency. According to these authors, language input is crucial because students are expected to learn a target language by exposing them to the language through meaningful interactions and content learning that is delivered in the target language. According to Howard et al. (2018), since dual language learners are typically at their beginning stage of second language acquisition at the time of their enrollment in dual language programs, teachers need to ensure that the language input they receive is comprehensible. This can be accomplished using:

- Slower, more expanded, simplified, and repetitive speech oriented to the here and now
- Highly contextualized language and gestures
- Comprehension and confirmation checks
- Communication that provides scaffolding for the negotiation of meaning by constraining possible interpretations of sequence, role, and intent (Howard et al., 2018, p. 47)

On top of this, Howard et al. (2018) underscore the importance of providing considerable attention to developing dual language learners’ oral proficiency and literacy competence.
Howard et al. (2018) suggest that oral language proficiency can be promoted by providing both structured and unstructured opportunities for language production, and literacy competence can be developed through the teaching of reading skills.

Summary of the Literature Review

The theoretical benefits and potential of dual language programs have been well-documented. Several empirical studies have indicated the effectiveness of dual language programs in promoting the academic performance, bilingual literacy, and cultural awareness of dual language learners. However, Lindholm-Leary (2012) cautions that merely getting children to attend dual language programs will not necessarily lead them to these benefits – qualified dual language teachers are the critical key to the success of dual language programs. The unique nature of dual language education – two-language instruction, the integration of content and language teaching, three-pronged goals, and equal attention to the native and partner languages – means that DL teachers’ work is highly challenging. Research has shown some troubling aspects of bilingual teachers’ beliefs about this topic: beliefs about teaching that misalign with established SLA literature and negative perspective about ELLs (Lucas et al., 2015). Many bilingual educators also express concern about their unpreparedness and lack of competence to work with ELLs (Fortune et al., 2008; Oberg de la Garza et al., 2015).

The integration of content teaching and language learning characterizes dual language programs (Cloud et al., 2000). However, studies show that dual language teachers have difficulties balancing content instruction and language teaching in dual language classrooms; thus, they tend to focus more on content instruction (Fortune et al., 2008). While dual language education can facilitate general communicative skills and academic achievement, lack of
attention to language may hamper the development of learners’ language accuracy (Genesee, 2008) and native-like oral proficiency (Howard et al., 2018). For these reasons, several authors (e.g., Genesee, 2008; Howard et al., 2018; Lyster & Mori, 2008; Norris & Ortega, 2000) have advocated for more direct, explicit instruction of the second language in the DL classrooms.

The roles of language instruction in dual language education are crucial (Cloud et al., 2000; Met, 2008). Effective language instruction, which concerns language input and oral productivity, is likely to lead to desirable outcomes in dual language programs (Howard et al., 2018). Given the crucial roles of teacher’s beliefs about teaching and learning for their instructional behaviors (Fives et al., 2015), dual language teachers need to hold beliefs that align with current thinking in the literature, particularly as far as second language teaching is concerned. Although several studies on language teachers’ beliefs about this topic have been conducted, work that involves dual language teachers is scarce. Past research on dual language teachers’ beliefs has primarily focused on topics related to the conceptual dimensions of dual language education. To date, no study has looked into the beliefs dual language teachers have about effective second language instruction and how these beliefs are linked to their classroom practices. This study attempted to fill this gap.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

This study aimed to investigate the relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding effective second language instruction in dual language classrooms. The goal of the study was to examine the extent to which teachers’ stated beliefs were congruent with their classroom instructional behaviors and what factors might contribute to their belief-practice relationships. The research question guiding the study was: “How are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction related to their instructional practices in the classrooms? To arrive at some answers to the research question, the following sub-questions were posed: (1) What are the beliefs of dual language teachers about effective second language instruction in dual language programs? (2) To what extent are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction convergent with their teaching practices? (3) What factors influence the relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practices pertaining to effective second language instruction?

Design of the Study

The current investigation was designed as a cognitive study of dual language teachers' beliefs and practices, using interviews, teachers’ journals, and instructional materials. A general approach to qualitative inquiry was employed because the primary goal of the study is to “simply seek to discover and understand a phenomenon, a process, or the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved” (Merriam, 1998, p. 11). Creswell (2007) stated that qualitative research is a viable option when researchers aim at a complex, detailed understanding of an issue of interest that can only be achieved “by directly talking with people, going to their home or places of work,
and allowing them to tell the stories unencumbered by what we expect to find or what we have read in the literature” (2007, p. 40). Olafson et al. (2015) maintain that, given the ‘messiness’ of teachers’ beliefs (Pajares, 1992), acquiring an in-depth understanding of this construct seems best attempted through qualitative approaches whereby a researcher can talk directly with teachers, observe their classrooms, and listen to what they have to say regarding the issue.

**Study Procedures**

Before conducting the study, the researcher sought approval from the university’s internal review board (IRB) for research involving human subjects. The IRB approval was granted on March 18, 2020 (Appendix A). On June 22, 2020, potential study participants were contacted via e-mail, and four dual language teachers confirmed their agreement to participate in the study. More participants were recruited in August 2020. The initial plan for conducting in-person classroom observations at schools proved extremely difficult, if not impossible, to execute due to the strict school policy resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. At the end of July 2020, the researcher submitted a study modification to the university IRB requesting its approval for a change of data collection method from observations to teachers’ journals. The IRB approved the study modification on August 4, 2020 (Appendix B).

The researcher collected data from semi-structured interviews, teachers’ journals, and samples of instructional materials. First semi-structured interviews, aimed to reveal the beliefs dual language teachers have about effective second language instruction, were carried out with each participant. The interviews took place online for approximately 45 minutes and were audio-recorded. Interview transcriptions were subsequently produced for data analysis. To obtain data about the teachers’ instructional practices in dual language classrooms, the participants were
requested to keep a short and informal journal about dual language instructional practices that they performed across four weeks. Specifically, they were asked to write about two instructional units that they selected to focus on, with each unit addressing a different subject (i.e., one unit per subject, such as one math unit and one science unit). Several questions were supplied to guide the teachers’ writing. Appendix G offers a list of specific instructions for writing the journal. The other source of data about the teachers’ practices was their instructional materials, such as lesson plans, teaching materials, and other relevant documents for dual language instruction. The materials could be the ones that they used in the teaching and learning activities they documented in their journal, or they could be the ones that they have created but did not use on these occasions.

Second semi-structured interviews were conducted to determine factors that affected the participants’ belief-practice relationships regarding second language instruction in the DL classrooms. The interviews last approximately 45 minutes and was carried out online. During the interviews, the researcher engaged the participants in discussing how their beliefs about specific areas of second language instruction under investigation had been implemented in the instructional practices that they performed across the four weeks, as documented in their journal. The teachers were also encouraged to reflect on factors that have supported or hindered their belief-practice connections. An interview guide was used during the sessions (Appendix H).

Data obtained from all these sources were analyzed to obtain some answer to the research question, namely “How are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction related to their classroom instructional practices?” Table 2 is a research questions/sub-questions matrix that offers an overview of how data collected were analyzed to
arrive at some answers to the sub-questions, which then provided answers to the research question.

Table 2
Matrix of Research Question and Sub-Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Research sub-questions</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Collection method and instrument</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How were DL teachers’ beliefs about effective L2 instruction related to their instructional practices in the classrooms?</td>
<td>What are the beliefs of DL teachers about effective L2 instruction in dual language classrooms?</td>
<td>Teachers’ beliefs about effective L2 teaching and learning in the DL classrooms</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview</td>
<td>Identify what beliefs the participants had about effective L2 instruction in terms of the teaching goals, focus areas, instructional strategies, and the roles of home language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are DL teachers’ beliefs about effective L2 instruction convergent with their teaching practices?</td>
<td>Teachers’ instructional practices for developing students’ L2 proficiency in the DL classrooms</td>
<td>Teachers’ journals and samples of instructional materials</td>
<td>Identify which stated beliefs about effective L2 instruction were enacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors influenced the relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practices about effective L2 instruction?</td>
<td>Internal factors affecting belief-practice congruence</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview</td>
<td>Identify which internal and external factors facilitated congruent belief-practice in a DL program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External factors affecting belief-practice congruence</td>
<td>An interview protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify which internal and external factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Selection and Recruitment

This study concerned dual language teachers in Florida, the United States of America. Participants were selected using the criterion sampling method. Firstly, participants must have been teaching in a DL program for a minimum of one year. This criterion was essential to ensure that all selected participants were familiar enough with dual language instruction. Secondly, it was desirable to obtain a sample of participants from different schools so that relatively diverse contexts of dual language education could be represented. The third criterion for inclusion in the study was related to the teachers’ role in the DL classrooms. Roughly equal numbers of DL teachers representing three teaching roles typical in dual language education were involved, namely, (1) DL teachers who teach English only, (2) DL teachers who teach the partner language (i.e., Spanish) only, (3) DL teachers who teach both English and the partner language.

It was initially expected that five to six dual language teachers from various schools in central Florida could be recruited to participate in the study. Patton (1990) writes that “the size of the sample depends on what you want to find out, why you want to find it out, how the findings will be used, and what resources (including time) you have for the study” (p. 184). A small number of samples was considered appropriate for the current study since it sought to obtain in-depth information. The construct of teacher’s beliefs to be investigated is also so complicated that the study aimed to explore depth rather than breadth.
To recruit participants, the researcher contacted TESOL faculty, doctoral students, and alumni who could connect the researcher with the potential study population. The researcher gained information about dual language teachers in Florida from TESOL faculty at a university in the state. The teachers’ information included their name, email address, grade level taught, school and district name, and DL program (90/10 or 50/50) being implemented in their school. A total of twenty-five potential study participants were identified. They happened to be attending a graduate teacher certification program at a university in Florida. The program, called DL STEPS, aimed to equip teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to work effectively in the dual language classrooms.

The researcher listed six teachers who met the criterion for inclusion. On July 22, 2020, these candidates were emailed and invited to participate in the study (see Appendix C for the email script). Each participant was provided with an explanation of research (Appendix D). Five of the invitees replied, with four agreeing to become study participants, one declining, and one never responding. Three of the four teachers who were willing to participate discontinued their participation after the first interviews. Two of these teachers were unable to handle one more thing besides their very high teaching loads, which resulted from schools' adjustment to their delivery modes following the COVID-19 outbreak in March 2020. The other one, who went by the pseudonym Carmen, withdrew from the study due to a health problem. Thus, as of September 2020, only one teacher, whose pseudonym was Andrea, completed the whole data collection process (i.e., participating in two semi-structured interviews, submitting teaching journals, and sharing relevant instructional materials).

In August 2020, the researcher identified and emailed six new potential participants. Two declined and four – whom the researcher later identified with the pseudonyms of Erika,
Bertha, Daniela, and Jenny – agreed to take part in the study. All were able to complete their first interviews, submit their teaching journals, and participate in the second interviews, except for Jenny. Jenny dropped out after the first interview because she felt that her very demanding teaching responsibilities did not allow for another commitment. Fortunately, Carmen, who withdrew from the study in the previous month, was able to resume her participation. The researcher obtained the remaining data from her (i.e., teaching journals plus relevant artifacts and the second interview) in November 2020. At the beginning of December 2020, the researcher was eventually able to gather a reasonable amount of data for the current study from five dual language teachers: Andrea, Bertha, Daniela, Carmen, and Erika. Table 3 provides the participants’ background information and teaching characteristics.

Table 3

Participants’ Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Grade level currently taught</th>
<th>School level</th>
<th>District (pseudonym)</th>
<th>DL class taught</th>
<th>DL model</th>
<th>Years of teaching in DL program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Greenwoods</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Greenwoods</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief Description of Study Participants

Andrea

Andrea has a B.A. in psychology and was currently completing her master’s degree in elementary education. She began teaching in 2015 after completing all teacher exams, starting as a general education instructor to fifth-grade students. She taught the class for two years, with the first year teaching all subjects (i.e., Reading, Writing, Social Studies, Math, and Science) and the second one working on English Language Arts (reading) and Writing. Andrea had been instructing her school’s the dual language program since 2017, during which she served in 2nd grade. In 2020, Andrea was teaching English Language Arts to 4th grade, and she was excited about meeting her former dual language students.

Her school provided a 50/50 model of dual language up to 4th grade, and it planned to expand the program to 5th grade in 2021. The dual language class was a whole-school program, although it was not offered to every class. For each grade, there were only two dual language units/classes, with one receiving Spanish in the morning and the other English in the afternoon. Kindergarten had four units/classes of dual language instruction.

Andrea was very enthusiastic about dual language education and showed great excitement with the present study. The first interview with her took twice longer than the scheduled time, making it the most extended discussion in this study. During that time, she passionately talked about her thoughts and experiences with dual language instruction. She revealed, for example, that she had a very strong personality to the point that a student’s parent had complained about it, although in the end the student loved her. Andrea also expressed her firm conviction about her teaching approaches while being open to learning new strategies.
Andrea speaks the English and Spanish languages, and she has taught English to adults in a language school.

Bertha

Bertha has a B.A. in International Trade-French and an M.A. in French Studies. She had been a dual language instructor at an elementary campus for six years. She first started teaching in the second grade for two years, most of the time on the English side, before transferring to pre-K classrooms. When her schools transitioned to remote learning due to the COVID-19 crisis, Bertha returned to the 2nd grade. In its first inception, the school implemented a 30/70 model (i.e., 30% of language instruction was Spanish and 70% in English). In 2017 the school shifted to a 50/50 model offering dual language instructions from kindergartens to 4th grade. The 5th grade was still doing a 30/70 model but it was projected to have a 50/50 model in 2021. At the beginning of the study, the dual language program at her school offered English instruction in Math and English Language Arts. Three other subjects (i.e., Spanish Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science) were delivered in the Spanish language. The 50/50 model at the school provided instruction in one language in the morning and the other language in the afternoon. For instance, dual language students would receive Spanish in the morning with her; in the afternoon, they would go to the English teacher, and Bertha would take care of the ones who were with the English teacher in the morning.

At the time of the study, Bertha was the teacher of Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies for 2nd grade, offering instruction in the Spanish language. This was her first year working on the Spanish side of dual language program, and she felt very excited about it. Bertha also understood the challenges associated with the teaching tasks. She expressed her enthusiasm
in the dual language certification program she was currently attending, where she expected to
learn new instructional tools and strategies. During the interviews with the researcher, Bertha
was not hesitant about sharing her thoughts, feelings, and experiences as a dual language
instructor. Her talk about her dual language students was full of passions and desires to help
them succeed. She also shared how she felt about the support from her administration and
colleagues and how challenging was the current teaching processes due to the COVID-19 crisis.

Carmen

Carmen holds a B.A. in Elementary Education and an M.A. in TESOL. She had been a
bilingual instructor for sixteen years. Her first four years were spent at an elementary school
where she instructed in 5th grade and then moved to 3rd grade to provide the Spanish component
of the dual language program. She was currently working in a magnet middle school that offered
dual language and foreign language programs. The middle school requires certified teachers who
are proficient in teaching the language. Carmen was the coordinator of dual language program at
the school. In the dual language programs, 6th and 7th-grade students took Language Arts through
Spanish and a Science class, each being one period a day. At the time of the study, Carmen was
teaching all grade levels in the middle school. Besides, she was the instructor of Advanced
Placement (AP) in Spanish Language and Culture to 8th-grade students and Language Arts
through Spanish class.

During the interviews with the researcher, Carmen spoke at length about her thoughts and
experiences working with students and other teachers in her dual language program. Being one
of the two middle school teachers in the present study, she provided exciting insights into the
unique characteristics of dual language students at middle school level and the challenges associated with them.

Daniela

Daniela has been teaching for about twenty-five years in language immersion settings. Before working in the dual language program, she had taught Spanish to non-Spanish speaking children, whose all classes (Math, Social Studies, Science, Reading, and Language Arts) were instructed in the language. At the time of the study, Daniela was teaching 4th grade on the English side, but she would be working on the Spanish side in 2021. Her elementary school offered a 50/50 model of dual language instruction that was implemented on a weekly basis. Thus, for example, a group of students would receive Reading and Language Arts delivered in Spanish in the morning. In the afternoon, they would be taught Math, Science, and Social Studies in English. This arrangement would run for one week and then switch in the following week.

Daniela has a master’s degree in education, and her master’s paper was on second language learners’ brain development. During the interviews, she shared her thoughts about effective second language instruction in the dual language classroom, linking them with her understanding of second language acquisition topics, such as critical period hypothesis, affective filter, and comprehensible input. Daniela also discusses how developments in the first and second languages are related. Being one of the most experienced educators in the present study, Daniela talked about her extensive experience working with Spanish language learners and how she anticipated teaching English in the near future.
Erika

Erika had been a middle school educator for nineteen years and she taught two high school credit courses, Beginning Spanish and Spanish 1. She started working in dual language program in 2016, teaching World History for 6th-grade students in Spanish in one day and English in the other. Although her school has predominantly Hispanic students, it provided a 50/50 model to all three grade levels. Three subjects (World History, Civics, US History) were instructed in dual language, following a one-day-one-language setup.

Erika holds a bachelor’s degree in Spanish education and a master’s degree in education. She studied pedagogy on teaching a second language and had a certificate in social studies, which was one of the main reasons she qualified for teaching dual language at the middle school level. Erika was a coordinator of a district-wide program aimed to help underachieving students gain access to colleges and universities. She has been trained for many years in various instructional strategies. Erika has taught Spanish as a Foreign Language teacher for Beginning and Spanish I in the middle school, where she worked with English monolinguals, as well as Spanish for Spanish Speakers, also for middle school students. Her parents were scholars who shared similar interests in second language pedagogy. During the second interview, she revealed how all these factors had impacted her perspectives and practices in the dual language settings.

Data Collection

Data about dual language teachers’ beliefs and pedagogical practices concerning effective second language teaching and learning, as well as factors that influence the enactment of these beliefs, were collected using (1) two semi-structured interviews, (2) teachers’ journals, (3)
samples of instructional materials. Table 4 gives an overview of data collection stages, procedures, types of data to be obtained, and frameworks to guide the data collection process.
Table 4

Stages of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Aim(s)</th>
<th>Procedure &amp; Instrument</th>
<th>Framework(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Semi-structured interviews    | To obtain data about teachers’ beliefs regarding effective L2 instruction | An interview (approximately 30 minutes) was conducted with each participant             | Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013):  
• the goal of L2 teaching  
• the roles of students’ native language and culture |
|       |                               |                                                                        | An interview protocol was used (see Appendix F)                                        | Horwitz (2008):  
• the nature of the teaching/learning process  
• areas of focus in L2 learning |
| 2     | Teachers’ journals, Samples of instructional materials | To obtain data about teachers’ practices related to L2 instruction in the DL classrooms | Each teacher kept a brief informal journal about teaching practices performed across four weeks |                                                                                                               |
|       |                               |                                                                        | The journal covers two units, each addressing a different area  
Teachers write two or more journal entries for each unit                                               |                                                                                                               |
<p>|       |                               |                                                                        | Each teacher shared instructional materials (e.g., lesson plans, handouts, worksheets, students’ work, graphic organizers, anchor chart) that they have created or used in the DL classrooms |                                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Aim(s)</th>
<th>Procedure &amp; Instrument</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>To obtain data about factors supporting/hindering the enactment of teachers’ stated beliefs regarding effective L2 instruction</td>
<td>An interview (approximately 30 minutes) was conducted with each participant</td>
<td>Buehl and Beck (2015):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An interview protocol was used (see Appendix H)</td>
<td>• Internal factors (the teachers’ other beliefs, knowledge of content and pedagogy, and self-awareness and self-reflection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• External factors (the classroom, school, and other factors at the national, state, and district levels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Semi-Structured Interviews

The first stage of data collection involved semi-structured interviews with all participants, intending to elicit the teachers’ beliefs about effective second language teaching and learning. Interviewing has been considered a powerful way of gaining insights about ideas, intentions, values, and the beliefs of interviewees (Pring, 2000). A research interview is defined by deMarrais (2004) as “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in a conversation focused on questions related to a research study” (p. 55). The primary purpose of an interview is “to obtain a special kind of information” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 108). Creswell (2007) suggests that an interview in qualitative studies can be distinguished whether it is structured, semi-structured, or unstructured; whether it is one-on-one or in a group; and conducted via email, face-to-face, in the group, online, or via telephone. This study used a semi-structured, one-on-one interview with each participant, and all interviews were conducted online via a video-conferencing platform.

Instrument and Framework

An interview protocol was created to ensure that comparable data was collected across the participants. The protocol includes four main questions with several prompts and elicitations to uncover the teacher’s belief about effective second language instruction. The researcher developed the interview protocol by drawing on Larsen-Freeman & Anderson’s (2013) ten questions that these authors use to define various language teaching methods. Larsen-Freeman & Anderson’s framework encompasses several language teaching dimensions, from teachers’ goals to classroom interaction to error treatment. The framework proposed by Larsen-Freeman & Anderson (2013) also considers the aspect of students’ native culture and language, which is
relevant to one of the primary goals of dual language education (i.e., to promote bilingualism and biculturalism).

Another framework incorporated in the first semi-structured interview protocol was the teacher version of Horwitz’s BALLI, or the Belief About Language Learning Inventory, designed to gauge language teachers’ opinions about foreign language learning (Horwitz, 1985, 1988, 2008). A systematic critique of Horwitz’s model has been provided by Kuntz (1996), who raised several issues concerning its validity. The validity of this inventory has been statistically examined, and although researchers reported mixed findings (Khodadady & Hashemi, 2010), it is generally concluded that Horwitz’s instrument is a reliable tool for research on language learning beliefs in various settings (Nikitina & Furuoka, 2006).

Horwitz’s (Horwitz, 1985) BALLI addresses five areas of foreign language learning, including (1) difficulty of language learning, (2) foreign language aptitude, (3) the nature of language learning, (4) learning and communication strategies, and (5) motivations and expectations. Of these, the 3rd and the 4th areas were considered relevant to the present study since they apply to teachers’ beliefs about second language instruction. One aspect of L2 teaching related to the nature of language learning, namely the area of focus in L2 learning, was adapted into the interview framework. Also integrated into the interview was one topic from the 4th area related to the learning process.

To sum up, drawing on Larsen-Freeman and Anderson’s (2013) and Horwitz’s (2008) frameworks, the first semi-structured interview focused on the beliefs of dual language teachers’ about the following aspects of second language pedagogy:

(1) the goal(s) of teaching the second language

(2) the area(s) of focus in L2 learning
(3) the nature of the teaching/learning process

(4) the roles of native language and culture in L2 learning

Demographic data were also collected at the end of the interviews. Appendix F lists the specific questions that guide the first semi-structured interviews.

The questions and procedures used in the interviews were pilot-tested and refined by involving a colleague who has had experience with second language instruction. An interesting thing was noted during the pilot testing. When discussing her beliefs regarding effective instructional strategies, the interviewee tended to talk about her experiences rather than her thoughts. According to Kagan (1992), this phenomenon might be attributed to the fact that teachers often lack expressions to articulate their own beliefs. For Auerbach and Silverstein (2003), it might indicate that the participant was more inclined to talk about her issues than to address the researcher’s concern. What we should do as researchers, according to these authors, is “to find a connection between their concern and our concern” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 33). To achieve this, the researcher noted the importance of probing the teachers’ rationale(s) for favoring specific instructional tools or strategies. Considering this issue, the researcher refined the semi-structured interview guide by adding explicit probing question(s) in the prompts and elicitations subsection of the protocol.

Procedure

Five dual language teachers who agreed to participate in the study were contacted to arrange a first semi-structured interview. Before conducting an interview, the researcher provided a consent form (see Appendix E) for each participant to review. Each interview was conducted by the researcher using an interview protocol to guide the conversation. Each
participant was first asked to talk briefly about their experience as a dual language teacher. Next, the researcher asked four main questions designed to uncover the participant’s beliefs about effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms. To obtain more information and encourage elaboration, the researcher followed up with some sub-questions or elicitations.

All first semi-structured interviews with five DL instructors who had agreed to participate in the study took place online via a video-conferencing platform. Two interviews were conducted in July 2020, two in October 2020, and one in November 2020. The interviews lasted between 49 minutes and 1 hour and 18 minutes. The researcher took notes during the interviews, and all exchanges were audio-recorded. After the interviews, the researcher immediately erased video recordings, which were automatically produced by the video-conferencing tool, in order to maintain the privacy of the study participants. Each interview was transcribed using Otter (otter.ai), an online transcription tool, to allow for data analysis. The researcher subsequently checked for accuracy for all transcriptions by listening carefully to the original audio and correcting any wrong transcriptions of words and phrases. After cleaning up the transcription, the researcher used a coding tool, OpenCode4, to analyze the data. The process involved in using the software is detailed in the Data Analysis section.

Teachers’ Journals and Relevant Artifacts

The researcher used dual language teacher’s journals to gain data about their instructional practices in the classroom. The primary purposes of using the self-reported, qualitative data were (1) to corroborate, compare, and contrast the participant’s responses to the first semi-structured interviews, and (2) to look for instructional behaviors that were or were not congruent with the teachers’ stated beliefs. A form of teachers’ writing, teachers’ journals have been widely used as
a methodological tool in studies of beliefs (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Teachers’ journals allow researchers to access and explore teachers’ thinking processes (Erkmen, 2012). As a medium of self-study research, teaching journals encourage self-reflection on the teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding a specific topic (Bullough & Robert, 2015; Chien, 2013). Borg (2001) points out that studying teachers’ reflective writing is beneficial not only to understand the teachers’ thoughts but also to promote their professional activity and growth. While journaling might be loosely organized, several authors (Bullough & Robert, 2015; Chien, 2013; Chitpin, 2006; Many et al., 2002) strongly suggest highly structured and carefully guided writing. It is also critical for journal writing to have a clear, explicit focus so that irrelevant information can be prevented from being recorded in a massive amount (Debreli, 2011). Bullough and Robert (2015) also caution that journaling should not be too focused; otherwise, it may fail to provide rich data, and essential insights might be missed.

Instrument and Framework

The researcher requested all participants to keep an informal journal about instructional practices that they performed across four weeks in the DL classrooms. The participants were asked to document the instructional strategies they used to help develop DL students’ proficiency in the target language during the teaching of the units they had selected. Specifically, their writing was about two instructional units that they selected to focus on, with each unit addressing a different subject (i.e., one unit per subject, such as one Math unit and one Science unit). The length of the units they chose was flexible, but each unit should include two lessons or more. The following prompts guide the journal writing:
1. What were areas of focus in L2 learning (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, reading, speaking) in today’s lesson? What did you want your students to learn?
2. What were the instructional strategies that you used to teach these areas of focus? How did they go? What made them successful or less/not successful?
3. How did you manage student-teacher interactions and student-student interactions? How did they go? What made them successful or less/not successful?
4. How did you manage the teaching/learning process (e.g., seating arrangement, teaching aids, classroom management, technology & media, error treatments, etc.)? How did they go? What made them successful or less/not successful?
5. What other information could you write about your teaching of dual language learners today, especially those related to their second language learning?

Procedure

Specific instructions for journal writing (see Appendix G) were given to the participants. If they preferred, instead of writing, the participants could create an audio journal. They were expected to document their reflections soon after the lesson took place and email an electronic copy of the written or audio journal to the researcher. The number of teaching journals received by the researchers from each participant ranged from two to five entries. One participant submitted an audio-recorded journal entry. Table 5 presents essential information about these journals. As can be seen, two participants shared their journals of teaching in two different subjects. The other three teachers wrote about their teaching of one subject.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Unit/lesson</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Content area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Map words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Feasts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Reading - Informational Text</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spanish Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Reading - Informational Text</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spanish Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Forces, Gravity, and Magnetism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 4</td>
<td>Forces, Gravity, and Magnetism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 5</td>
<td>Los Exploradores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Word classifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish for Spanish Speakers 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Reading - Author’s purpose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish for Spanish Speakers 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Reading - Outcomes of being nomophobic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>AP Spanish Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Words necessary to talk about poetry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading and English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Haiku</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading and English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Features in poems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading and English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Reading - What caused the Boston Massacre?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Reading review - Causes of the Revolution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Reading - Andrew Jackson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samples of Instructional Materials

In addition to their teaching journals, the participants were asked to share some of their lesson plans, teaching materials, and other documents they used for DL instruction. The researcher clarified that the materials could be the ones they used in the teaching and learning activities that the teachers documented in their journals. The sample materials could also be the artifacts that the participants had created but did not use on these occasions. Table 6 provides a list of all relevant artifacts that the researcher received from each participant.

Table 6

Information about The Participants’ Teaching Artifacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Relevant Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2 (audio)</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary words and images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Vocabulary words and images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Vocabulary words and images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary words and images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 4</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary words and images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 5</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Vocabulary cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Reading text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>Writing template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>Sample text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Relevant Artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5  | Erika| Journal 1| Lesson plan  
Reading text  
Worksheet  
Handouts |
|    |      | Journal 2| Lesson plan  
Reading text  
Worksheet  
Handouts |
|    |      | Journal 3| Lesson plan  
Reading text  
Worksheet  
Handouts |

Second Semi-Structured Interviews

A semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant after the researcher analyzed data gathered from the first semi-structured interview, the teacher’s journals, and samples of instructional materials. The second interview aimed to elicit the teachers’ perception about their instructional practices in the DL classroom and gain insights into the factors that had facilitated and hindered the enactment of the participants’ espoused beliefs. Besides, it allowed for the researcher to clarify any missing information from the teachers’ journals.

Instrument and Framework

A protocol was developed to guide the second semi-structured interviews (see Appendix H) and refined through pilot testing with a colleague who has some experience with second language instruction. The protocol drew on the framework of supports and hindrances to teachers’ belief-practice connection as conceptualized by Buehl and Beck (2015). In these authors’ view, the execution of teachers’ beliefs may be mediated or challenged by external and internal variables. External supports and hindrances may derive from various factors at the state, district, school, and classroom levels. Educational policies and curriculum standards are two
significant variables at the national, state, and district levels. Examples of school-context factors include administration, materials, college, school community, and resources. At the classroom level, the enactment of teachers’ beliefs might be affected by such factors as classroom size, students’ attitudes, students’ ability, and classroom management. Internal supports and hindrances stem from the teachers themselves, such as their teaching knowledge and skills, their experiences, their self-awareness and self-reflection, and the teacher’s other beliefs (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

Procedure

As with the first semi-structured interviews, the study participants were first contacted to arrange a second interview. One interview took place in September 2020, three in November 2020, and one in December 2020. All interviews were conducted online using a video-conferencing tool, audio-recorded, and lasted between 25 and 43 minutes. These interviews were subsequently transcribed using Otter (otter.ai), an online transcription software. Ensuring accuracy, the researcher double-checked each transcription by listening to the original audio and correcting wrong transcriptions. OpenCode4 was used to analyze the data. A detailed explanation of the process involved in using the coding software is provided in the Data Analysis section.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this research study was to identify the patterns of relationship between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their pedagogical practices related to effective teaching and learning a second language. To meet this goal, the researcher gathered and analyzed data about (1) teachers’ beliefs about effective second language teaching and learning, (2) how these beliefs are implemented in their pedagogical practices, and (3) what internal and external factors
influence the enactment of the teachers’ beliefs. Figure 3 illustrates the step-by-step process of analyzing all data collected.

Figure 3

Stages of Data Analysis

Analysis of Data about Teachers’ Beliefs

Data about teachers’ beliefs were gathered through a semi-structured interview with each participant, and all interviews were audio-recorded. Interview data were subsequently transcribed verbatim using Otter, a web-based transcription tool. To ensure the accuracy of transcriptions, the researcher listened to each audio-recorded interview while going over each transcript, and any incorrect transcriptions were revised. The data were then systematically analyzed using the template gleaned from the theoretical framework. The analysis of interview data from each participant went through the following stages.
Stage 1: Coding

An a priori coding approach (Creswell, 2007) was used to guide the analysis process, and the analytical tool employed at this stage was template analysis (King, 2012). The template analysis technique is centered on hierarchical coding. It relies on the use of a coding template, which is usually developed based on a subset of data to be applied to further data, with the template being subject to refining and modification as necessary during the iterative process (Brooks et al., 2015). Brooks and colleagues (2015) outline the procedure for carrying out template analysis in six steps: (1) getting a sense of the entire database, (2) conducting a preliminary coding of the data, (3) classifying themes into clusters and organizing them into hierarchical relationships, (4) defining an initial version of the coding template, (5) trying out the template into further data and modifying it as necessary, (6) producing a final version of the template and applying it to the whole dataset.

Template coding was appropriate for analyzing the first semi-structured interviews because it allows for the refinement and redefinition of pre-existing codes along the way. The current study has already had some clear pre-defined themes (i.e., goal, focus, strategy, and native language and culture), and several codes associated with each theme had been determined. However, it was noticed upon reviewing the first transcript that the participants’ responses might not be as expected. For instance, when asked about her teaching goals, the first interviewee mentioned one thing that is not directly related to second language development. This type of response did not fit into any of the pre-defined codes for the Teaching goal category, i.e., language skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) and language components (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation). Therefore, it was necessary to create an overarching code for non-language-related goals to ensure that the one code representing the same idea could be applied to
the other transcripts. Otherwise, different transcripts can end up having several different codes, which in turn would make it very difficult, if not impossible, to synthesize the whole data set. As Creswell (2007) writes, the use of a priori coding should not close the door for additional codes that emerge during the analysis.

Development of Coding Template

In applying the template analysis technique, the researcher carried out the following steps. First, the researcher developed a greater familiarity with the whole data set by reading and re-reading the interview transcripts. During this process, notes in the margins were made, and bits of data were commented on. Second, based on the overview of the data, some preliminary themes and codes were developed. Brooks et al. (2015) suggest that it is possible to begin with some a priori themes by drawing from research, reading, or theory. To define the codes, the researcher referred to the four aspects of second language instruction that serve as the framework for understanding DL teachers’ beliefs about this topic. The first semi-structured interviews aimed to probe participants’ beliefs about effective second language instruction in dual language settings. Specifically, the beliefs under investigation were concentrated on four aspects of second language pedagogy: (1) the primary goal of teaching a second language, (2) the areas of focus, (3) instructional strategies, and (4) views about the roles of students’ native language and culture. These aspects served as the pre-determined categories/themes. Four categories were thus developed, including teaching goals, focus areas, instructional strategies, and the role of native language and culture. Several preliminary codes were defined and clustered under each category. At this point, an initial version of the coding template had been formulated and subsequently applied to another transcript. The initial template was tried out a couple of times, and it was modified as necessary. Finally, the final version of the template (see Table 7) was
produced and applied to the full data set. The researcher coded and analyzed each interview on multiple occasions in order to ensure that the codes were consistently identified and therefore generated reliable data (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Table 7

Developing Coding Template for First Semi-Structured Interview Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Initial codes</th>
<th>Final codes/subcodes (template)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching goals</td>
<td>Develop reading proficiency</td>
<td>Develop reading proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop writing proficiency</td>
<td>Develop writing proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop listening proficiency</td>
<td>Develop listening proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop vocabulary knowledge</td>
<td>Develop vocabulary knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop grammar knowledge</td>
<td>Develop grammar knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop overall language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop L1 literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus areas</td>
<td>Reading skills</td>
<td>Reading skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking skills</td>
<td>Speaking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>Writing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>Listening skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>All language skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: No particular focus on grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Special focus on grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Fluency over accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Accuracy over fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Fluency as important as accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gist vs. form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Gist over form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Form over gist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Initial codes</td>
<td>Final codes/subcodes (template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Gist as important as form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies</td>
<td>Teaching reading</td>
<td>Teaching reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching pronunciation</td>
<td>Teaching pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching writing</td>
<td>Teaching writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching listening</td>
<td>Teaching listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching grammar</td>
<td>Teaching grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>General strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal support</td>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Verbal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital media</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents’ involvement</td>
<td>Digital media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 support</td>
<td>Parents’ involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>L1 support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural elements</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The roles of native language and culture</td>
<td>Cultural elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of native language</td>
<td>The roles of native language and culture</td>
<td>Roles of native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The roles of native culture</td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: L1 plays a role in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: L1 plays no role in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles of native culture</td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Native culture plays a role in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subcode</strong>: Native culture plays no role in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coding

To analyze the data gathered via the first semi-structured interviews, the researcher used *OpenCode4*, a coding software, by going through the following steps. Firstly, the transcribed data set was loaded into the software, which breaks down the text into numerous lines, each consisting of a maximum of sixty characters. Secondly, the researcher carefully went over each
line to search for every bit of data that bore any relevance to the teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms. Specifically, the researcher sought the participant’s responses to the four main questions that were asked during the first semi-structured interviews, namely:

1. What is your main goal of teaching a second language in the dual language program?

2. What do you think is the most important part of learning a second language in the dual language classrooms?

3. What do you consider to be the effective methodology and strategies to help you achieve these goals in dual language classes?

4. What do you think are the roles of dual language students’ native language and culture in learning the second language?

In this first cycle of data analysis, the pre-existing codes were assigned to anything in the text (word, phrase, or sentence) that might contribute toward the researchers’ understanding of the four aspects of second language instruction above. At this point, OpenCode4 allows for assigning one or more codes to one or multiple lines. The researcher added memos to selected lines to record the researchers’ reflection, interpretation, or questions to the specific idea.

Categorization

The researcher used the “Synthesis 1” function of OpenCode4 software to classify the codes into the relevant categories as defined in the coding template. An example of the categorization process is given in Table 8. Thus, all segments of the transcript belonging to the Goal category were scrutinized to see what teaching goal(s) was/were indicated. The researcher also began to identify the focus areas, types of instructional strategies mentioned by the
participant, and how native language and culture are viewed. The categorization enabled the researcher to focus on relevant areas of data for further scrutiny.

**Table 8**

**Coding Example Generated from OpenCode4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Code 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Code 2</th>
<th>Synthesis 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Well, I can think of three main goals I focus on</td>
<td>Develop vocabulary knowledge</td>
<td>1. GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 personally. One is vocabulary. Another one that I like to</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>1. GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 focus on, even though it's not a part of the standards, is</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>1. GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 conversation. So basic, like “How are you?” and I will, I</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency, Teaching speaking</td>
<td>1. GOAL, 3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 will sit with the students and I will do that with them. I</td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 will say “good morning.” And they will, huh. And that to me</td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 is very important because when they move from one country</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>1. GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 to another. Not only do they not understand, but they can’t</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>1. GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 communicate with their peers, so they feel very isolated.</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>1. GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 So, for me, I like to say; even just showing, I'm okay or</td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 so, and that's something that I do and I have them practice</td>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 with each other those that it's called NES, non English</td>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 speakers. So, I have the NES students in a small group, and</td>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 I work with them on that big time. I definitely do and</td>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 slowly and slowly in the beginning, they're kind of</td>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 embarrassed, shy, they want their pronunciation to be</td>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 perfect, but I said no, it's, it's fine. Just try and they</td>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 slowly find out that they have things in common and they</td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 can connect better through small conversations that that I</td>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 tried to guide even then they do Spanglish. So English and</td>
<td>L1 support, Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Spanish, connected.</td>
<td>L1 support, Teaching speaking</td>
<td>3. STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2: Identification of the Teacher’s Beliefs**

Using the “Synthesis 2 Tree” function of OpenCode4, a summary of the teacher’s beliefs (see Figure 4) was produced based on the coding and categorization in the previous step. The summary allows for the researcher to capture the essence of what beliefs each participant held regarding the four aspects of second language instruction, i.e., (1) the goals of language teaching; (2) the areas of focus, (3) effective teaching strategies, and (4) roles of native culture and language. The summary also served as the springboard for further analysis of the teacher’s beliefs.
Another cycle of data analysis was carried out. The researcher scrutinized the transcript data to delve deeper into each of the categories and sub-categories. The researcher sought additional information, such as (1) the rationales for why certain stated beliefs are held; (2) examples of how the beliefs were implemented. The researcher consulted the memos created during the first cycle and saw if they contained the sought-after information. Any missing information was noted and to be addressed in the second semi-structured interviews. Finally, the themes that emerged from a participant’s perspectives on the four aspects of second language
pedagogy served as the basis for identifying the participant’s underlying belief about effective teaching and learning a second language.

Analysis of Data About Teachers’ Classroom Practices

Data about participants’ classroom instructional practices were gained from the participants’ journals about their instructional activities. The participants kept a written record of their actual teaching practices in the DL classrooms. One participant submitted an audio journal for one of her lessons, which was transcribed verbatim using Otter. The researcher relistened the audio file while going over the transcription and corrected a few inaccurate transcriptions. The journals were then content-analyzed to generate descriptions of the teaching process. The researcher carried out the following steps of analysis.

Stage 1: Coding

The template analysis technique (King, 2012) was used to analyze the teachers’ journals. Since the framework for scrutinizing the participants’ teaching practices was identical to that of their beliefs, the coding template used for analyzing the first semi-structured interviews was applied to the teachers’ writing. The coding started with the researcher going over each journal entry a couple of times to get a sense of the data. Then, each journal entry was examined closely to identify all teaching and learning activities that were directly or indirectly related to the development of second language proficiency. Guiding this process were the four aspects of language pedagogy (i.e., teaching goals, focus areas, instructional strategies, and views of the roles of students’ native language and culture), which served as the framework of teacher’s beliefs about effective teaching and learning a second language in this study. The researcher manually assigned pre-defined codes to every bit of data within the participants’ journal entries
that were relevant to any of these four aspects. Codes that went together were then grouped into the same category. For instance, all codes referring to activities involving student’s use of home language were categorized as *L1 support*, teachers’ instructional behaviors that organized interactions between/among students were classified as *managing interactions*, and so on.

**Stage 2: Identification of Themes**

The researcher identified salient theme(s) that emerge from each of the four aspects of second language pedagogy under examination. For example, based on the data gained from a participant’s journals, it would be determined what the teaching goal was, what types of instructional strategies were used, how student’s interactions were managed, and what verbal and nonverbal supports were utilized by the teacher. A summary of the teacher’s journals complemented with information gained from relevant instructional materials was developed to identify their classroom practices regarding the four aspects of second language instruction. The data about the teachers’ practices were then compared to the data about their beliefs as articulated in the first semi-structured interviews.

**Analysis of Data About Factors Influencing Belief-Practice Connections**

The second semi-structured interviews aimed to probe what the participants thought were the factors that have supported or challenged the enactment of their beliefs in the DL classrooms, particularly as far as second language teaching was concerned. All interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed verbatim using *Otter*. The researcher double-checked the accuracy of transcriptions by listening to each audio-recorded interview while going over each transcript and correcting any wrong transcriptions. As with the first semi-structured interviews, the second
interviews were analyzed using the template coding approach (King, 2012), and a priori themes were defined. Data analysis went through the following stages:

**Stage 1: Coding**

At this stage, Kings’ (2012) template analysis technique was employed. First, the researcher familiarized himself with the data by reading and re-reading the interview transcripts. During this process, the researcher took note in the margins and commented on bits of data.

Second, an initial coding template was developed using an a priori coding approach (Creswell, 2007). The process was guided by pre-determined themes, which refer to various external and internal factors that may shape teachers’ belief-practice relationships. External supports and hindrances may occur at the classroom, school, district, national, or state levels. Internal supports and hindrances are related to the teachers themselves, including their experience, knowledge, self-awareness and self-reflection, and other competing beliefs (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Then, the preliminary template was tried out with the other data set to see if the codes needed modification.

Results of the try-out showed that while no modification was necessary, a new code *students’ demographic composition* needed to be added. Table 9 shows the final version of the template, which was subsequently applied to all transcripts of the second semi-structured interviews.

Table 9

Template for Coding Data from Second Semi-Structured Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes and sub-codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External supports</td>
<td>Supporting national, state, and district-level factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> educational policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> curriculum standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting school-level factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Codes and sub-codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> school culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> teacher community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> students’ demographic composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting classroom-level factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> student ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> student attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal supports</td>
<td>Teacher’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s self-reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s other beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External hindrances</td>
<td>Hindering national, state, and district-level factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> educational policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> curriculum standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindering school-level factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> school culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> teacher community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindering classroom-level factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> student ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> student attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sub-code</em> students’ demographic composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal hindrances</td>
<td>Lack of teacher’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of teacher’s knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of teacher’s self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of teacher’s self-reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s other conflicting beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher employed *OpenCode4* to analyze the data. First, each transcription document was loaded to the software, which breaks down the text into numerous lines, each
consisting of a maximum of sixty characters. Next, the researcher carefully went over each line and search for any bits of data that point to any factors affecting the implementation of the teacher beliefs in the DL classrooms. Then, codes were assigned to the bit of data (word, phrase, or sentence) that were relevant to the various factors above. At this point, it is possible to assign one or more codes to one or multiple lines. Memos were added to certain line(s) to record ideas or key concepts that occurred to the researcher. An example taken from one of the interview transcripts is shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Example of Coding a Second Semi-Structured Interview Transcript using OpenCode4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Memo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each code was then grouped according to its relevance to one of the following categories: 
External supports, Internal supports, External hindrances, Internal hindrances. The researcher made this categorization using the “Synthesis 1” capability of OpenCode4. An example is provided in Table 11.
Table 11
Example of Codes Categorization using OpenCode4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Synthesis 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading text is lack of visual support</td>
<td>Hindering classroom factors</td>
<td>8. EXTERNAL HINDRANCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students had low reading ability</td>
<td>Hindering classroom factors</td>
<td>8. EXTERNAL HINDRANCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She had to use district-mandated materials</td>
<td>Hindering district-level factors</td>
<td>8. EXTERNAL HINDRANCES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2: Identification of Supporting and Hindering Factors

Following Buehl and Beck’s (2015) framework the researcher used to interpret this data, teachers’ belief-practice relationships may be influenced by (1) external hindering factors, (2) internal hindering factors, (3) external supporting factors, and (4) internal supporting factors. The researcher determined to which of these four groups each of the factors identified in the previous step fell. Using the “Synthesis 2” function of OpenCode4, the researcher generated a tree view that summarizes the factors that each participant perceived as facilitative and challenging to their second language instruction in the DL classrooms. Figure 5 is an example of a summary that OpenCode4 produces.
The Integration of All Data Sources Toward Answers to Research Questions and Sub-questions

As shown in Figure 6, analyzing data gained from the first semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to uncover the beliefs dual language teachers had about effective second language instruction. The journals of the participants’ classroom practices provided data about their instructional practices on second language teaching and learning. Then, data from the journals were compared with data from the first semi-structured interview to determine which professed beliefs were evident in the actual practices. Data from the second semi-structured interviews revealed what the teachers considered as the supports and hindrances to the implementation of their beliefs in the classrooms. Based on the data analysis, the researcher highlighted the commonalities and differences across all participants. Emerging themes were determined from each aspect of second language pedagogy under investigation. Thus, the researcher identified what teaching goals, focus areas, and instructional strategies were commonly shared by the dual language teachers in this study. Some surprising themes were also underlined.
Figure 6

The Integration of Data Sources Toward Answers to the Research Question and Sub-Questions

**Ethical Issues**

The researcher sought permission from the University of Central Florida's (UCF) Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct the interviews and collect teachers’ journals and samples of instructional materials. No data collection took place until the study had secured approval by the IRB. To protect the participants’ privacy, the researcher only kept the audio-recordings of all interviews. All video recordings that were automatically generated by the platform were immediately deleted after the interviews.

**Trustworthiness and Credibility**

The research employed the following strategies as an attempt to make this study trustworthy and credible.
Triangulation

Triangulation refers to the “combination and comparison of multiple data sources, data collection and analysis procedures” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003, p. 66). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggested four triangulation types: multiple methods, multiple sources of data, multiple investigators, or multiple theories to confirm emerging findings. In this study, three ways of collecting data were used to corroborate evidence: interviews, teachers’ journals, and documents. Specifically, the researcher checked what participants said in the first interviews about their beliefs against what they performed in the classroom as documented in their journals. Explanations for belief-practices (in)congruence were sought after via the second semi-structured interviews.

Peer Review

To minimize subjectivity, the researcher requested a colleague who has some knowledge about dual language instruction to review all transcripts from the first and second interviews. Pseudonyms were used in the transcripts to ensure the anonymity of all participants. During the reviewing processes, the reviewer went over each transcript and search for answers to specific questions. Four main questions guided the interviews about the participants’ beliefs regarding effective second language instruction in dual language classrooms. These include: (1) What should be the primary goal(s) of teaching a second language in the DL classrooms? Why?; (2) What is/are the most important part(s) of learning a second language? What should be the area(s) of focus? Why? ; (3) What are the effective approaches, methods, and strategies to develop the second language proficiency of DL learners? Why? ; (4)What are the roles of students’ native language and culture in learning the second language? Why?
When reviewing the transcripts of the second interviews, the reviewer located answer to two main questions: (1) What were the factors that have supported/helped the teacher to develop students' second language proficiency in the DL class?; (2) What were the factors that have challenged/hindered the teacher from developing students' second language proficiency in the DL class?

Member Checks

This strategy was aimed to maintain the credibility and accuracy of data interpretation and was carried out by soliciting feedback on the data from interviewees (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher conducted member checks throughout the interviews by confirming his understanding of each participant's responses to the four main questions that guided the first and second semi-structured interviews. Thus, after discussing the teachers’ beliefs about the primary goals of second language instruction in the DL classrooms, the researcher would rephrase the main points and ask for confirmation from the participants before proceeding to the next question.

Rich, Thick Description

This method, according to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), refers to “a description of the setting and participants of the study, as well as a detailed description of the findings with adequate evidence presented in the forms of quotes from participant interviews, field notes, and documents” (p. 257). A detailed, thick description is applied to enhance the external validity or transferability of the findings to other settings (Denzin, 1989). This method rendered a thick, rich description of the participants’ beliefs about various aspects of second language pedagogy.
Findings were described in detail and supported with verbatim excerpts from interviews and the teachers’ journal entries. The next chapter presents these findings.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

Introduction

This study concerned DL teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding effective second language instruction in dual language settings. It specifically aimed to examine the relationships between the stated beliefs and actual practices in the classrooms and what factors shape their connections. The following research question guided the study: How are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction related to their classroom instructional practices?

To arrive at some answers to the research question, the researcher posed three sub-questions:

1. What are the beliefs of dual language teachers about effective second language instruction in dual language programs?

2. To what extent are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction convergent with their self-reported teaching practices?

3. What factors influence the relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practices pertaining to effective second language instruction?

Data were collected through two semi-structured interviews, teachers’ journals of their classroom instruction, and relevant artifacts such as lesson plans, worksheets, and handouts. The data gathered from the interviews and journals were analyzed using the template analysis approach (King, 2012), where pre-defined themes were used and refined.

The following sections present data analysis results by providing a descriptive account for each study participant, namely Andrea, Bertha, Carmen, Daniela, Erika – all were
pseudonyms given by the researcher. Each description comprises four parts. First, brief information about the participant is given, including their teaching experience and DL assignments. The second part discusses the participant’s beliefs about effective second language instruction in DL classrooms, specifically the teaching goals, focus areas, instructional strategies, and the roles of DL learners’ native language and culture in their second language learning.

The third part presents the analysis of the participants’ instructional practices in the DL classrooms, as gleaned from their journals and related artifacts. The researcher examined how the participants’ reported practices were related to their stated beliefs regarding the four aspects of second language pedagogy mentioned above. The fourth part describes the various factors the participant perceived as facilitative and challenging to acting out their beliefs about effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms. Guiding the last part is the framework of supports and hindrances to the belief-practice connection as proposed by Buehl and Beck (2015). These authors make a distinction between external and internal supports as well as external and internal hindrances. According to Buehl and Beck, while external supports and hindrances may stem from various factors at the state, district, school, and classroom levels. Internal supports and hindrances derive from the teacher him/herself.

Andrea

Andrea was a dual language teacher at an elementary school in Stillwater, where a 50/50 model of dual language instruction was being implemented. She had three years of experience teaching dual language learners at all elementary grades. At the time of the study, she worked on the English side of dual language program with 4th-grade students.
Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction

Data about Andrea’s beliefs regarding effective second language instruction was collected through a semi-structured interview conducted on July 14, 2020. A summary of the teacher’s beliefs about the topic is provided in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Teacher’s beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>To develop speaking proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop vocabulary knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional strategy</strong></td>
<td>General strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on fluency over accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No special focus on grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand students’ L1 literacy level (those with low L1 literacy would need extra attention and treatments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reach all levels of proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend to students’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be mindful of students’ mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cater to different learning styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with paraprofessional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share materials and communicate with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching speaking</strong></td>
<td>Integrate with other skills (e.g., reading &amp; writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak slowly and enunciate clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects</td>
<td>Teacher’s beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Avoid using difficult words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Get students to have small conversations (for the lower grades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Allow code-mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategy</td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategy</td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategy</td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching pronunciation</td>
<td>Focus on targeted sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching pronunciation</td>
<td>Focus on sound-word relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>Only correct major errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>Conduct mini grammar lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>Small grouping – ideally, four students per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>Assign a task for each group member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>TPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Online resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Visuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Sentence frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Test modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 support</td>
<td>Bilingual dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 support</td>
<td>Allow the use of L1 in writing to assess students’ L1 proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of students’ home language and culture</td>
<td>Strong L1 literacy supports L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of students’ home language and culture</td>
<td>Maintenance of home culture promotes L2 learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Goals

Andrea held that second language instruction in dual language classrooms should primarily aim at developing students’ speaking proficiency, particularly conversational skills, and vocabulary knowledge. The reason for focusing on these areas is that her students, who are mostly newcomers to the country, need the basic speaking skills to communicate with their peers. When asked about her teaching goals, Andrea responded:

Well, I can think of three main goals. Yeah, I focus on personally. One is vocabulary. Yeah. Another one that I like to focus on, even though it's not a part of the standards is conversation. So basic, like how are you and I will, I will sit with the students and I will do that with them. I will say good morning. And they will, hm. And that, to me is very important because when they move from one country to another, not only do they not understand, but they can't communicate with their peers, so they feel very isolated.

Areas of Focus

Consistent with her view about the teaching goals, Andrea saw speaking skills and vocabulary as the most critical areas to concentrate on. As she indicated in the first interview, “And yeah, I use that I definitely do the conversation. That aspect, I do vocabulary.” Reinforcing the critical roles of vocabulary in reading comprehension, the teacher wrote in her journal for lesson #2, “The text is challenging, but starting off and introducing the vocabulary is absolutely crucial for me as a teacher for them to understand what they’re reading.”

Another important area of focus, which she mentioned later in the first interview, was pronunciation,

I did want to say one more thing before I move on. So one thing that I do focus on in the small group with my NES is pronunciation. So I can have, I like to focus and do like targeted sounds.
Andrea had no particular focus on grammar nor spelling, although she would address grammar issues that might lead to misunderstanding. She attended to the message her students are trying to convey rather than the grammatical accuracy of their writing. As she explained:

I, especially with those that are learning English, I do not focus on spelling. I do not focus on grammar, the differences between there, they’re, their, because there are three kinds of there… So I, I don't focus on that I because I understand their meaning. It doesn't change the message that they're writing, if that makes sense.

Instructional Strategies

Andrea believed that second language skills should be taught in an integrative manner. For instance, she would have her students read some texts of their choice and get them to talk about what they read. An example was offered:

Who wants to if you're reading a book and you like it, raise your hand, you're going to come up here and you're going to share a little bit about it, why do you like it? Do you recommend it? And that's how I've been focusing on their speaking abilities.

To promote students’ speaking skills, she would engage lower grade students in small conversations where basic interpersonal communication skills can be taught. When working with this type of learner, Andrea recognized the importance of providing language models through adjusted teacher talk to ensure that they are comprehensible enough to the students. Thus, she would model the language while talking slowly, enunciating it clearly, and using simple words. During speaking activities, students should be allowed to code-mix. She explained:

And when I would begin to talk, I would talk slow. I would make sure that I don't, you know, talk fast. That is not, I try to speak slow and enunciate clearly, so kind of form my words clearly. I avoid using any slang that might confuse them.

The teacher believed higher grade students should be engaged with more demanding tasks, such as presentations and debates where they can learn about and practice using academic words. Corresponding to this view, she recognized the need to emphasize both basic vocabulary...
and academic words. In teaching vocabulary, she relied on various nonverbal support, especially gestures, bilingual dictionaries, and visuals to facilitate the acquisition.

Andrea indicated that her teaching of pronunciation tended to focus on targeted sound and sound-word associations, especially English sounds that can be confusing to Spanish-speaking learners. She provided the following example:

So, for example, “sh”, and “ch”, I can show a picture of the letter “sh”, or “sh” and then, um, which word do I have with? Oh, I have a pair of shoes…. So I have a pair of shoes, and then the “ch,” I can't remember the picture but I will show it to them and when there's a word that has those but they say the opposite one because in Spanish it sounds it those two sounds can be confused easily when they're learning.

In managing students’ interactions, she saw small grouping, ideally four students per group, as the most effective technique for non-English speaking (NES) students. Small groups are deemed a safe place for these students to ask questions and interact with their peers. Group composition would depend on the lesson focus. In a language-focused session, she would put all NES students in small groups; when the focus is on the subject, she would mix students from diverse language backgrounds. In any case, she would ensure that each student in the group has a straightforward task.

Andrea believed that students should be allowed to make errors in the beginning. Teachers should only correct errors that cause misunderstanding or are prevalent among the students. A mini grammar lesson, approximately 10 minutes, could be devised to address the trending issues. She was fully aware, however, that too much correction on grammatical errors can be detrimental to students’ confidence, shooting down their willingness to speak and write in the target language. Andrea recognized the effectiveness of a variety of nonverbal supports for developing dual language students’ proficiency. Among the teaching tools that she valued were
the total physical response, modeling, scaffolding, visuals, sentence frames, and test modification.

In addition to the language-oriented instructional strategies, Andrea valued several general approaches to promoting students’ learning of the target language. First, teachers need to understand each student’s literacy level in the home language so that they can anticipate the amount of work they need to do to help their student. The view is centered on the belief that students’ proficiency in their native language plays a crucial role in their second language development. That is, more potent L1 literacy better facilitates L2 learning. A lower L1 literacy level would entail the need for extra attention and treatment for the students. To apply this principle, she would make every effort to assess her students’ level of L1 literacy, for example, by allowing them at certain times to express themselves in their native language.

Next, Andrea held that teachers should reach students of all levels of language proficiency, attend to their students’ needs, and cater to different learning styles. For this reason, she would endeavor to utilize a variety of supports that would benefit all students, such as images, actions, and think-aloud techniques. Finally, the teacher understood that it is critical to be mindful of students’ overall well-being and socioemotional comfort. Making students feel comfortable was one of the things she was always striving for; therefore, she would allow students to mix the Spanish and English languages, and she would ensure that the students’ needs were met. In particular, she did not correct grammatical errors too frequently because she believed it could damage students’ confidence. She explained:

Okay, but grammar is not a big thing. But I do try and incorporate, you know, little mini lessons that can that they can use in writing…. So, my main focus is not is not that. If you, if there's a new English speaker, there, their, they're, it sounds the same, if there's no difference, you know, so, for them to be able to look at the different spelling can help, but for them to determine which there it can be very challenging and can kind of hurt
their, their ego is that if you kind of understand that kind of can hurt their confidence in wanting to speak and wanting to write, because all this is too difficult. So, I'm very mindful of their, their mental health.

Involving parents and paraprofessionals was another strategy Andrea considered useful for the language development of dual language learners. In her view, sharing lesson topics and teaching resources with parents and communicating with them allows for the parents to help their children. She stated:

And, you know, I try to be a resource to the child and the parent because the parent will have to help them in their English studies and homework, especially if they are having difficulty. But I see that that does help the child, the parent desiring for the child to have an education In English.

The Roles of Students’ Home Language and Culture

Andrea recognized the crucial roles of dual language learners’ home language and culture. She understood that L1 literacy, especially reading, is transferable to the second language. As she commented during the first interview, “So, if the child can read in Spanish, they can, most likely I would say 80% be able to read in English, even though they might not understand the message.” For this reason, she felt it was imperative to be able to understand her students’ L1 literacy level:

Yes. For example, can they read? Can they write? Can they do they have good phonics in their in their native language? That is very, very important for me. Because if they do not have a good foundation in Spanish, then I have a lot of work to do with that student, a lot.

Also, she believed that maintaining dual language students’ native culture is beneficial because it makes students feel connected to their cultural roots. The teacher stated:

But ultimately, those students that do have, you know, their Spanish grandparents and Hispanic parents that's still hold true to their values, even to their religion, then I feel that the child is more whole, the child is more complete. And that is a part of them isn't ripped away from them. So I think that its benefits better for the child, from what I've seen it, does that answer your question or is …?
Andrea went on to explain that such connection has a positive impact on the dual language students’ attitudes towards learning the second language:

But I see that in the dual language class, the children learn so fast, and they're more comfortable, they're more happy because they have both. They have their Spanish teacher that that, I don't teach Spanish but I do speak it and, for example, my partner Miss Leone, and she, they love her, they have a connection with her that I don't have, because they speak with her in Spanish only.

Classroom Practices

Andrea submitted two journal entries, each addressing the same content area. The first journal entry described her Social Studies lesson for 2nd grade on map words, which she conducted on September 15th, 2020. The second entry was on the feast topic that she taught on September 16th, 2020. An analysis of these journal entries showed that most of her stated beliefs were enacted in practices. Table 13 summarizes the participant’s journals concerning specific aspects of belief about second language instruction.

Table 13

Summary of Andrea’s Teaching Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Lesson #1</th>
<th>Lesson #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching goals</td>
<td>Students used the new words accurately in a sentence, either in speaking or writing, to express their personal experience</td>
<td>Students acquired target words which they needed to understand their subsequent reading about maps, map elements, and how to use the maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of focus</td>
<td>Vocabulary – feast words Speaking</td>
<td>Vocabulary – map words Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies</td>
<td>Teacher used images (PPT) and a model sentence to elicit food words from students Teacher encouraged students to make the word-picture association</td>
<td>Modeling – teacher showed how to use a 2-column note to focus on the vocabulary needed to comprehend reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson #1</th>
<th>Lesson #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students talked and shared their ideas about foods and discovered things they had in common.</td>
<td>Scaffolding – teacher taught what each target word (drought, mitten, fertile) means as they read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher used a model sentence, “I would have in my feast…” to remind students to use the target vocabulary.</td>
<td>Verbal support – teacher used prompts and elicitations to encourage speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher made cultural connections of food (rare medium vs. well-done steak)</td>
<td>Nonverbal supports – teacher used images from an online resource to help students understand the meaning of words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Goals and Focus Areas

The goals of both lessons were consistent with what Andrea considered to be the primary goal of second language instruction in the DL classrooms. Lesson #1 had a vocabulary focus and aimed to teach students target words that they need to understand a reading text about maps. Her lesson plan indicates that the language skills to be addressed in this particular lesson included reading, writing, and speaking. Also specified in the artifact is the target vocabulary for each lesson. It is not surprising to see that, for the most part, the lesson itself featured vocabulary activities. In other words, although the lesson was on reading comprehension, Andrea focused a lot on vocabulary, which was consistent with the teacher’s professed beliefs about vocabulary as the necessary foundation of language skills. Additionally, the teacher integrated speaking instruction, in which she encouraged her students to talk and share their ideas. This was another classroom behavior that converged with her beliefs about the importance of developing students’ oral proficiency.

Lesson #2 concentrated on vocabulary and aimed at enabling students to use target words to express their personal experience in speaking and writing. As in lesson #1, Andrea recognized
vocabulary as the crucial element of language skills. An important thing to note was a slightly different focus regarding speaking. While in lesson #1 the teacher primarily aimed to make her 2nd grade students feel comfortable using the target language, she now looked to develop her 4th grade students’ speaking ability. The slight shift in the goal was attributed to the grade levels, as Andrea explained in the second interview:

So that was when I was a 2nd grade teacher. Now, my goals have shifted a little bit because they are more independent. So, these students since they, they are in dual language, they've known each other since kindergarten for the most part. So, they are very comfortable with each other. And they are able to express themselves freer than second graders. So, I am having them develop their communication skills based.

Instructional Strategies

The types of instruction Andrea provided in lesson #1 echoed her beliefs regarding effective teaching tools. Images, scaffolding, and modeling were utilized to facilitate vocabulary learning. To clarify what the word *drought* means, for example, Andrea pulled out some images from an online resource, which enabled her students to make a connection between their prior knowledge and the new word. She remarked in the journal for lesson #1:

But the images really helped them a lot for drought, I google *drought* and I showed them a picture of dry, cracked ground. And even students start to say, Oh, that's like my tile the tile on my ground. And I liked how they were making connections.

Andrea also used a scaffolding technique to help individual students who were still struggling with the new vocabulary items. In the second interview, the teacher described how she did it:

They did know what drought was, but they didn't know what antonym was. So, I said, Alright, and then I gave them an example. Alright. Let's take it simpler, antonym means opposite, and I wrote it on the board and actually erased it today. I could have shown you but antonym means opposite. And I said and yesterday we learned the word synonym, synonym, same s, s, synonym, same think of it. Synonym same, and I just repeated it. Antonyms opposite. And then I had them, it's like a coral, like I repeat. I say they say.
And so I said, What's the antonym of up? And I referred, and they pointed to the word opposite, because that's what it means. And they said, Oh, down. What's the antonym of hot? Oh, cold. And I said, you can use both words opposite and antonyms.

To get students to speak in the target language, Andrea used prompts and elicitations accompanied with images to help students understand what she wanted from them. As she wrote in the journal, “I used images and a model sentence. The word was not isolated. I tried to have students associate the word with the picture.” She then had students talk with their peers, sharing their ideas about the topic. A model sentence was provided to guide the students’ talk. She would typically do this in small groups; however, to comply with the COVID-19 protocols, she could only have students interact from a distance.

In lesson #2, Andrea used images and a model sentence to elicit words associated with the feast. Images were utilized to help students make the word-picture association. Given the constraints of the COVID-19, students were only able to interact with their peers from a safe distance, talking and sharing their ideas about foods as well as discovering things they had in common. The teacher provided a model sentence, “I would have in my feast …,” to ensure that her students used the target vocabulary.

**Elements of Students’ Home Language and Culture**

Lesson #1 tapped into the students’ native language and culture. For example, when asked about what could be included in their feast, many Spanish-speaking learners came up with the names and types of food associated with their home culture. In the second interview, Andrea described the situation:

A lot of the foods that were recommended, or that they had wanted in their feast was related to their culture. And some were even speaking in Spanish. And I understand why they would say those words in Spanish because their parents speak Spanish. And so the foods are probably most likely spoken in Spanish.
Students had the opportunity to use their native language in expressing themselves. In other words, they received support from their home language, which Andrea considered necessary in maintaining students’ engagement with the lesson and making them feel comfortable in the classroom. This practice was congruent with her stated beliefs about the essential role of students’ home language in supporting dual language education.

Factors Affecting Belief-Practice Relationships

Supporting Factors

During the second interview, Andrea cited full access to digital resources, online resources, visuals, and other supplementary materials as one crucial factor that supported her practices. For example, she indicated in journal #2 that quick access to digital images enabled her to make use of a teachable moment to scaffold for antonyms and synonyms. The teacher recounted:

And so today we focused on drought, mitten and fertile and it was it was a bit challenging for many of the students. However, as I saw them struggle, I gave, I quickly just searched as I, I had, did this lesson with the digital and they got it really quickly. So, I wasn't anticipating this like a struggle for my face-to-face group. But I did use images and, I'll send those to you.

The other factor was students’ motivation as they felt connected to the lesson. When asked about the secret behind her successful lesson, she revealed:

I think a big factor is their own motivation. If they're not feeling connected to what we're reading, or if they don't feel that there's a purpose, then they won't put as much effort into it. That's what I've noticed.

An example of this factor was evident in her lesson #1, in which she observed the students being highly enthusiastic with the topic of feast. The topic was closely related to their
everyday life, and it could be one of the reasons why the students were encouraged to participate in the lesson.

**Hindering factors**

Andrea indicated that significant challenges stemmed from the students and reading materials. The first factor was related to the fact that students often lose their focus on the lesson. She noticed that such a situation occurred because of the students being very familiar with each other. Therefore, they often found themselves engaging in oral exchanges about topics unrelated to the lesson. Bringing their focus back on the lesson was not an easy task for Andrea. As she pointed out:

I guess the same, their focus. And another is that they like to talk. They're very good friends, all of my students, because they've known each other they've been in the same dual language class. They, they have they have similar cultures, they're from similar countries. And so there's a lot of chatting in the class a lot. But I try and channel that, to have them do academic talks. And that's really, how I try and cope with that challenge, because they will talk and talk and talk and I'm like, Hey, guys listening.

She also noted that many teaching materials that were mandated by the district were too difficult for non-English speaking students (NES), especially the 2nd graders. She believed that this was largely due to their lack of visuals that can facilitate comprehension of the text.

Yeah, sometimes the textbook is not the best. At least I'm speaking now for second-grade but the visuals weren't as detailed as they should have been. And that kind of hindered students, because the text was already challenging and the pictures weren't as detailed as they should have been, or they could have been. And so comprehension was hindered, basically.

The teacher indicated this issue in her journal #2. Although the reading text is accompanied by some visuals, she still thought the text was challenging for her students. To deal with the problem, she decided to pre-teach some keywords needed to understand the material.
Creating supplementary texts was another solution, but she admitted that time constraints often hindered her from doing so. Andrea expressed her feeling about the situation:

We can provide supplementary, but that's where my challenge is, the time constraint. And the I have access to visuals and everything. But it's in that moment, when I realized they're not getting it, it's difficult for me to find it quickly.

During the second interview, Andrea cited two other hindrances associated with the current situation because of the COVID-19 pandemic. First, she was unable to get her students to work in small groups. As the teacher had indicated earlier, small groups are the safe place for students to interact with each other and the best place for her to address individual needs. Second, her adjusted talk, which Andrea considered important to ensure comprehensible input, did not work to the fullest since the mask she had to wear prevented her students from seeing how she articulated words. The impact was not insignificant, especially during a dictation activity where many students completely misunderstood her utterances. To deal with the issue, she came up with the idea of using a transparent mask in the upcoming classes.

Table 14
External and Internal Factors Influencing Andrea’s Belief-Practice Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>External supports</th>
<th>School-level factors</th>
<th>Full access to digital resources, online resources, visuals, and other supplementary materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External hindrances</td>
<td>School-level factors</td>
<td>Inaccessible mandatory reading materials</td>
<td>Lack of time to create supplementary materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations to grouping management and comprehensible input due to the COVID-19 situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-context factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ lack of focus on the lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 summarizes external factors that Andrea perceived influential to her second language instruction in the DL classrooms. It was clear from the data that, when it came to the topic, school factors contributed the most, both positively and negatively, to the enactment of the teacher’s beliefs. The most critical classroom-context variable was related to student factors.

Summary

Andrea’s second language instruction in dual language classes seemed to be centered on the beliefs that (1) the primary goals was to develop students’ speaking proficiency; (2) the focus should be on the gist rather than form, and (3) recognition of students’ home language is beneficial not only the students to feel more comfortable in the class, but also for the teacher to meet their students’ needs better. The teacher relied on instructional strategies that (1) incorporate vocabulary and oral activities, (2) utilize nonverbal supports that cater to different learning styles, needs, and language abilities, and (3) value home language and culture.

Evidence from her teaching journals suggests a high degree of congruity between these beliefs and her instructional practices in the DL classrooms. Consistent with her stated beliefs, Andrea emphasized vocabulary and integrated speaking elements in the lessons reported. She adjusted her speaking focus to suit the grade levels. A variety of teaching tools she considered sufficient, such as visuals, modeling, scaffolding, model sentence starters, was also utilized. Finally, some Spanish elements, mainly through cognates, were embedded in her lessons; and the use of the Spanish language was valued – all echoing her view of the importance of recognizing students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds. A notable incongruity was related to grouping strategies. The belief about small grouping as an effective way to encourage students’ interaction
and to aid individual students was not fully evident as students were only allowed to interact with peers from a safe distance.

Factors that she felt had supported her instructions included a school-level factor (access to resources) and a classroom-context factor (students’ strong motivation). The main hindrances stemmed from a district-level factor (i.e., difficult district-mandated reading materials) and several classroom-level factors (i.e., students’ reluctance to talk, students' lack of focus on the lesson, and students' lack of motivation). Effective grouping management and optimal comprehensible were constrained by the COVID-19 situation.

Bertha

Bertha was a dual language instructor at an elementary school in Greenwoods county. At the time of the study, she served on the Spanish side for Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies. Her school implemented a 50/50 model from kindergarten through 5th grade. English instruction was offered in Math and English Language Arts only, whereas Spanish instruction is offered in Spanish Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science. Bertha was teaching these Spanish-instructed subjects.

Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction

Data about Bertha’s beliefs regarding effective second language instruction was gathered through a semi-structured interview on October 17, 2020. A summary of Bertha’s beliefs about the topic is provided in Table 15.
Table 15

Summary of Bertha’s Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Teacher’s beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency with an emphasis on speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of focus</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies</td>
<td>General strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on fluency over accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand students’ L1 literacy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand students’ cultural background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend to students’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching reading</td>
<td>Use anchor chart with cognates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address phonemic awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies vary depending on grades and reading abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual work, small group, a whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>Use anchor chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach basic vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic units (focus on vocabulary use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing grammar errors</td>
<td>Address grammar issues only when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address grammar in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>Group students of different levels together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use various grouping techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal support</td>
<td>Place lower levels students closer to the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total physical response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The roles of students’ home language and culture</th>
<th><strong>Teacher’s beliefs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 is the foundation for learning L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 culture helps students make connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of students’ native culture helps with her teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Goals

Bertha understood that second language instruction in the dual language classrooms should aim to develop students’ proficiency in all skills. However, in her view, more attention should be devoted to basic interpersonal communication skills since the district standard had primarily focused on academic language. As she explained in the first interview,

> for me, it's basically being able to, you know, have the students be able to manipulate and use the language properly in all components, whether it's reading, speaking, listening, or writing, you know, …I know in our the dual language program, for example, because it's so rigorous and right now so standards standard-based, they're not getting as much as the basic, you know, communication skills that you would think they would, because it's all focused on academics, if that makes sense.

Bertha felt that while her non-Spanish speaking students might learn academic Spanish at school, they lacked the opportunity to practice their interpersonal skills in the target language outside the classroom. As she indicated,

> So like, my kids that are learning Spanish, they're learning so much the academic Spanish, they're not getting a lot of the basic, you know, the interpersonal skills, because in my case, those kids go home and they're doing English.
Areas of Focus

Bertha understood that all language areas are essential, and therefore they should be treated equally. However, she believed reading should take precedence. She offered her view:

That may be and it's, it's this is a hard one because it's so integrated, but I would say, because they're probably reading because they get so much of the vocabulary. And in the reading, vocabulary is something that they struggle with when they tried to communicate. And I mean, speaking, yes, you can pick them up. But if you're wanting to enrich the vocabulary, I would say reading as well as pronunciation.

It appeared that she recognized the importance of reading and pronunciation because of their supports for speaking skills. Reading facilitates vocabulary, which students need to communicate, and pronunciation is an essential element of speaking. Bertha’s orientation to the development of reading, vocabulary, and pronunciation towards speaking abilities was in alignment with her view about developing students’ oral communication skills.

Instructional Strategies

Bertha held that knowledge of students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds is the key to providing better instruction. As she remarked, “knowing their background, their culture or their language, it definitely will help you be a better teacher and be able to address possibly some of the needs they need.” Her reading strategies and approaches would vary depending on grade levels and reading abilities. For lower levels, she would center her reading instruction on the belief that (1) phonemic awareness and understanding of sounds are the foundations for reading fluency, and (2) the ability to read fluently is a pre-requisite for reading comprehension. She explained:

I guess it depends on the grade level, right, obviously, because the kids can't read unless they get a basic, a good basic foundation. And, you know, phonics, and, and understanding the sounds. So, I mean, that's the first step, because I find that many
students, especially a lot of ELLs, they have a hard time reading fluently. So that prevents them from being able to have that comprehension. So I would say, working on, you know, the basics, and then fluency.

Concerning this perspective, Bertha would utilize Heggerty phonemic awareness, an online tool for acquiring foundational reading skills. Once the foundations had been laid, she would get her students to learn how to identify new words from the reading. To help with vocabulary acquisition, the teacher would provide the students with an anchor chart, which they could use to review target words daily. Other nonverbal supports for learning vocabulary included gestures and body motions.

And then, as you go, individually, like in small groups, and then using the whole group time, to, you know, implement strategies for them to learn how do you identify vocabulary besides doing, you know, the, what do you call it the anchor charts and going over the vocabulary. Because I go over the vocabulary for stories that we do every single day, and we do motions.

One teaching approach Bertha considered highly effective for vocabulary acquisition, although she had no opportunity to apply it yet, is a thematic approach. She brought this up during the first interview, stating that despite some constraints to the implementation of this approach, "...it's something I would love to explore and see if we could do because I think it is a great way to give the students the chance to really work with the vocabulary and reuse it more than once." She described the thematic approach as experience-based learning where students practice their language skills not in the classroom but in the community that speaks the language.

Bertha emphasized fluency over accuracy, attending more to what her students are trying to say than to the grammatical or mechanical accuracy of their expressions. She reasoned:

You know, it's weird because we were learning about that, I mean grammar, and it is important, because it helps the students be able to, you know, use the correct information. But at the same time, I think it's more important to give them opportunity to, you know, speak, to write to a certain degree more freely at first and, and during class time trying to isolate moments where you can address, you know, some of the grammar.
The above excerpt also revealed the teachers’ view about error treatments; that is, she did not contemplate correcting every single error that students make, especially in the beginning stages of her lesson, because she wanted to build her students' confidence with the target language. As she maintained in the first interview, “I don't know that teaching grammar in isolation was very successful.” Therefore, she would only correct common errors, and she would do it in contexts.

In managing student-student interactions, Bertha would form groups consisting of either same-level or mixed-level students. Working with same-level groups allowed her to address common issues. In mixed-level groups, stronger student(s) could serve as a language model for their peer. Small groups were the best place for her to offer individualized instruction. As she explained,

Yeah, the way I would group them, like in smaller groups is that what you're saying? To ensure that I have someone who's a stronger Spanish speaker, along with, you know, maybe a medium and a lower Spanish speaker in this case, to be to work together so that, you know, the higher ones help the medium and the mediums are also there for the lower so you have a, you know, a group of different levels that can support each other.

The types of nonverbal support she would provide were digital media, visuals, repetitions, sentence starters, and total physical response. Also, she would engage students in hands-on activities, and she would place lower students closer to her for extra attention. When asked about the use of technology for instruction, the teacher was ambivalent. In her view, “it’s good, but it’s a distraction.” She felt that technology should be used with caution, especially when involving young learners who could be easily distracted from the lesson:

But the kids have learned to use a lot of different types of programs. And it's been good, but at the same time, and when you're trying to teach and talk to them, they tend to spend their time on the screen. So literally, I've had to say, okay, let’s take a short break right now, close the lid.
The Roles of Students’ Home Language and Culture

Bertha recognized the crucial roles of student home culture and language in facilitating second language teaching and learning. In her perspective, home language is a fundamental element in learning a second language. The stronger the students’ literacy in their first language, the better they will acquire the second language. Tapping into students’ home culture facilitates understanding of information presented in the new language. The teacher discussed her ideas:

It is very important, well they need the basic foundations, good foundations to be able to acquire second language more easily. We find that they don't always have those basic foundations, but, you know, they need to be able to make connections to the new language. So, finding ways to integrate their culture, or something that comes from their background, can help them understand something new in a different culture that may not be familiar with.

This view seemed to link to what Bertha indicated earlier regarding the critical roles of knowledge and understanding of her students’ language and cultural backgrounds in enabling her to offer better instruction.

Classroom Practices

Bertha submitted five journals that documented the lessons she taught to her 2nd grade learners. Two lessons were provided in the Spanish Language Arts class on October 19th and October 21st, 2020, both addressing the topic of informational text (text features, author’s purpose, and determining meaning of word). Two Sciences lessons about forces, gravity, and magnets were delivered on October 19th and October 22nd, 2020. One lesson was given in the Social Studies class with the topic of Los Exploradores. All these lessons were instructed using the Spanish language. Table 16 shows a summary of the participant’s journals in relation to the specific aspects of second language instruction.
Table 16

Summary of Bertha’s Teaching Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Lesson #1</th>
<th>Lesson #2</th>
<th>Lesson #3</th>
<th>Lesson #4</th>
<th>Lesson #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus &amp; goal</td>
<td>Vocabulary - determine word meaning within the text</td>
<td>Vocabulary - determine word meaning within the text</td>
<td>Vocabulary - review for the upcoming unit assessment</td>
<td>Vocabulary - review for the upcoming unit assessment</td>
<td>Reading – identify text features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>TPR &amp; examples to review vocabulary</td>
<td>TPR &amp; examples - for vocab review</td>
<td>Gallery walk to review all vocabulary targets</td>
<td>Demonstration Group work – hands-on activities</td>
<td>Group work – hands-on activities, identify text features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling – how to find meaning within the text</td>
<td>Modeling – how to find meaning within the text</td>
<td>Bridging L1 &amp; L2 – cognate words, cognate anchor chart</td>
<td>Visual aids - pictures</td>
<td>Whole class – go over answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pair work – to find meaning within the text for an unknown word</td>
<td>Pair work - find meaning within the text for an unknown word</td>
<td>The whole class went over the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence starter – to express ideas in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual aids – photos, anchor chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Goals and Focus Areas

Lessons #1, #2, #3, and #4 had a vocabulary focus. The goal of the first two lessons was to determine the meaning of unknown words within the texts, whereas the other two aimed at reviewing vocabulary for an upcoming unit assessment. Lesson #5 concentrated on reading and has the goal of developing skills for identifying text features. All the lessons were, one way or another, related to reading proficiency and they incorporated speaking elements as well. This practice was consistent with the teachers’ stated beliefs about speaking and reading as one of the primary goals and focus areas in the DL classrooms. The teachers’ conviction about teaching phonemic awareness was not evident in any of the lessons, although its absence could be attributed to the nature of the lessons. Table 16 offers a summary of the participant’s teaching journals.

Instructional Strategies

In lessons #1 and #2, the teacher used total physical responses and examples to review the target words. Using a PowerPoint file with photos and captions, Bertha modeled how to use textual clues (e.g., pictures, highlighted letters, captions) to locate the meaning of the words within the text. Next, she had students practice the strategy with a partner, allowing them to interact with each other, although due to COVID-19 precautions, they had to maintain a safe distance while performing the task. Sentence starters were provided for those who were still struggling to speak in Spanish.

After working in pairs, each student did the same task individually. An anchor chart with examples was utilized as a visual aid, which the students could refer to during their work. Finally, the students were asked to share their findings with the class. At this point, Bertha
provided scaffolding: first, students indicated their answers in an exit slip, which in this case was an online tool called *Time to Climb*, and was in a multiple-choice format; next, they wrote the answers with the aid of sentence starters; then, they wrote the answers in their own sentences.

Lessons #3 and #4 focused on reviewing the target words for an upcoming unit assessment. The teacher used lots of visual aids on these occasions. In lesson #3, Bertha relied on an anchor chart, which included several cognates, to help students make connections between Spanish and English words. Due to time constraints, group or small work was not possible, so the class simply went over the topic together. “We talked about –cción words normally ending in –tion in English, and –ad words often ending with –ity in English,” wrote the teacher in the journal.

The focus of lesson #4 was on magnets and what objects they attract. Bertha demonstrated how magnets behave and then engaged her students in a hands-on activity. They worked in a group while maintaining social distancing and made predictions about magnet attractions. The students were asked to discuss their outcomes and wrote their answers on a worksheet. Bertha reflected in her journal that while the students seemed to enjoy the hands-on activity, they were often too shy to talk. Nevertheless, the teacher valued the benefits of group activities that are meaningful and purposeful. Reflecting on the lesson, Bertha understood that “No matter which language you are teaching, setting clear expectations ahead of time will yield better results for everyone involved.”

Lesson #5 concentrated on reading skills, intending to teach students how to identify text features that can assist with comprehension. The teacher had students worked in small groups, discussing the type of text features they noticed and why they thought the author used each feature. Then the class went over the answers together, and any misconceptions were corrected.
Her lesson plan for this class indicated several guiding questions the teacher would ask regarding the text. However, no information was provided in the lesson plan nor in the relevant journal entry about how Bertha went about asking the teachers’ questions and what types of nonverbal support were used to help students understanding her questions.

**Elements of Students’ Home Language and Culture**

The integration of students’ native language was evident during the bridging of L1 and L2, which involved cognates, in lesson #3. Analysis of Bertha’s journal entries and relevant artifacts showed no specific cultural element embedded in the lessons reported. It must be noted, however, that the non-existence of cultural elements in these lessons did not necessarily suggest an inconsistency between the teacher’s classroom practices and her teacher’s stated belief about the critical roles of students’ home culture in second language learning.

**Factors Affecting Belief-Practice Relationships**

**Supporting Factors**

Bertha appreciated the critical roles played by her school in facilitating her practices in the DL classrooms. She felt supported by (1) the principal, who granted her flexibility in her dual language instruction; (2) administration staff, who provided access to multimedia resources; and (3) other dual language teachers, who cooperated with her to handle their DL classes. Also, she immensely valued opportunities for professional development offered by her school and access to updated information about dual language education. She explained:

So now I’m doing the dual language and second grade. But every summer, they have an academy for dual language that they have speakers, and they have different things that they do too. And they bring in the teachers that are in the dual language program to train them and provide updates and information.
Hindering Factors

Specific factors at the district, school, and classroom levels posed significant challenges to Bertha in acting upon her beliefs about effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms. The district-level factor was related to the curriculum standard. She felt that the time allotted to meet the curriculum standard in the dual language classrooms was insufficient. As she stated:

I would say that I feel like the way our system is it just kind of leaves kids behind in that, you know, here's the standard, you have this amount of time to do it. And then you move on to the next standard. Next standard, you have this amount of time to do it, and you have to get it done during this time, and then you can move on. So my ideal situation would be, you'll never be able to get the kids all the time. I know that's impossible, you know, but, you know, an ideal situation would be able to have more time to be able to do a lot more the strategies for the ELLs.

The next hindrance was associated with the district’s control over incoming students to magnet schools. She pointed out in the second interview that,

We have no control about who comes into the program because the magnet is selected. It's a raffling. So we all get these Hispanic names. And I don't know, maybe I don't know how they raffle it, how they figure it out. But we have no control over the kids that come in, so we get what we get.

Unsurprisingly, the district-level factor had contributed to the school-level and classroom-context issues. Bertha felt that her school lacked Spanish-speaking students; consequently, the demographic composition of dual language students was still far from ideal. As Bertha put it,

Well, currently, this year my, I don't have a very good model for that this year, just because my class even though it's a Spanish class, has mostly English speakers. So it's a challenge to I mean, I don't have really, a lot of I have like two native speakers in each of my classes. I don't have a lot of it, maybe with some being at home for distant learning. So it's a bit of a challenge because I don't have a lot of students that can model the language for the other ones.
The impact of this factor was indicated in her journal #1. She only had a few to no Spanish language models with whom her English-speaking students could practice using the target language. The teacher described how the situation hindered her from implementing the pairing technique, which she considered beneficial for language development:

so I don’t have a high ratio of Spanish speakers to pair with English speakers. In the PM class, I only have one strong Spanish speaker and one low to medium Spanish speaker. So again, the ratio mix of native speakers is low so it is hard to get good conversations between partners

Other school-level hindrances that Bertha thought had affected her belief-practice relationships included (1) limited resources and materials in the Spanish language and (2) non-standard teaching materials. In the second interview, Bertha explained the situation:

And, and the crazy part is that we have materials that aren't meeting the standards. I think the only thing that we're using is the language arts book, science books, not meeting the standards, so I can't really use it. The math materials is no longer meeting the standards. Like two years ago it was meeting their standards, and they've changed how they want us to teach. That's not meeting the standards. So, everybody's struggling having to find materials that meets the standards, but it's way harder in Spanish because you can't find it easily. It doesn't make sense but that's the reality of it.

At the classroom level, one of the challenges was students’ reluctance to participate in speaking activities. As she reflected in her journal #4, “Partner discussion is always a little challenging because some students are just naturally shy and don’t gravitate to having conversations.” The biggest classroom-context issue, however, was related to her Spanish-speaking students who lacked their home language foundational skills (especially reading and writing in Spanish). The teacher lamented:

Unfortunately, for whatever reason, my population of ELLs that are Spanish speakers in my class, understand English for the most part. They do not have a strong, they don't have enough of a strong base in their own language to be able to read even in Spanish. So, when they go, do it in English, they have no chance. So, they're failing, doing it in English.
Bertha also underlined time constraints as a great challenge. Although fully aware that this is probably the common issue in the educational world, she felt it was a harder one in the dual language setting because working on language proficiency requires extra time and effort on the teacher and the students. Bertha indicated that she and her students often struggle to complete district-mandated curriculum due to the lack of time:

It takes more time to go through materials in a dual language because the kids, it's not their native language, you have to spend more time trying to get them to understand the text. So, they need some time, then you have to figure out when to fit the bridging in. And you still have the same timeframe to do it as the English classes. And you're doing it in a foreign language. So, it is more constraining.

Two internal hindrances, or those that stem from the teacher herself, were revealed during the first and second interviews. The first one was the lack of knowledge about teaching strategies. When the researcher inquired about specific teaching tools that the teacher considers adequate for second language development, she responded, “that's a struggle for us right now. In Spanish, it's my first year doing it so I don't have tons of tools.” The response suggested her limited repertoire of strategies or tools.

Lack of knowledge about the students was another internal factor that impeded Bertha from enacting her espoused beliefs in practices. In her journal for lesson #1, the teacher acknowledged this limitation:

I normally would have a better understanding of my students learning; however, I got 6 new students in one class, and 3 in another after these students moved from virtual to face-to-face last week. So, I don’t have data on them yet from the beginning of year baseline assessments, and I am trying to figure out their strength and weaknesses to see how to best to support them.

Clearly, this issue had something to do with the current situation due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on teaching modes at schools. Nevertheless, it was clear that knowledge
about students’ strengths and weaknesses, or lack thereof, could profoundly influence Bertha’s classroom practices.

Table 17
External and Internal Factors that Influenced Bertha’s Belief-Practice Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>School-level factors</th>
<th>District-level factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External supports</td>
<td>Available resources of updated info about dual language education</td>
<td>Lack of Spanish-speaking learners due to district’s control of incoming students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited time allotted to meet curriculum standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited resources and materials in the Spanish language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-standard materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External hindrances</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student’s reluctance to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student's lack of foundational skills in Spanish (reading and writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of language models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-context factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal hindrances</td>
<td>Teacher’s knowledge</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge about teaching tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of knowledge about students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Bertha held that (1) while developing all language areas should become the primary goal, speaking skills should take precedence; (2) much focus should be emphasized on reading that facilitates vocabulary learning and pronunciation – both are important for speaking abilities. Besides, the teacher recognized the role of students’ home language literacy as the foundation for
learning the target language and their home culture as a means of connecting to the new language. She believed that reading instruction should aim at building students’ foundational skills before fostering their reading fluency. The teacher valued reading strategies that (1) were adjusted to students’ grade level and reading abilities; (2) incorporated vocabulary learning, (3) highlighted cognates, and (4) allowed for optimal interactions among students so weaker students could learn the target language from the stronger ones or the native speakers of the language.

Evidence from her teaching journals indicated a remarkable degree of congruity, as well as a few incongruities, between these beliefs and her instructional practices in the DL classrooms. Her teaching goals and areas of focus lined up with her stated beliefs regarding speaking and reading proficiencies. Vocabulary and speaking elements were embedded in her reading instruction. The use of scaffolding and sentence starters echoed the teacher’s view about differentiated instruction for different proficiency levels. Supports in the form of cognates, visuals, total physical response across the lessons provided further evidence for the belief-practice consistency.

One belief that was not fully implemented was related to interaction management. The teacher could not maximize student-student oral interactions due to the lack of language models and students’ reluctance to speak with their peers in the target language. Also, to maximize oral exchanges in the target language, Bertha would ideally pair an English speaker with a Spanish-speaking peer. However, as she wrote in the journal, this was not feasible due to a low Spanish speaker ratio in her class. Another belief that was not evident was the teaching of phonemic awareness and sounds, which she considered fundamental for reading fluency. However, its
absence might be due to the nature of the lessons and, therefore, should not be construed as a belief-practice inconsistency.

External supports to the enactment of her beliefs predominately came from school-level factors, including access to resources, support from administration, and colleagues’ assistance. Two internal hindrances were cited: (1) lack of knowledge about teaching tools and strategies; and (2) lack of knowledge about her students’ proficiency levels. It could be that these factors accounted for why Bertha had difficulties encouraging her shy students to talk – she might not have the instructional ideas to do so. Besides, the second hindrance might have prevented her from tailoring her lessons to meet the need of different language proficiency levels; as a result, although students understood the lessons, they had a hard time expressing themselves in the target language.

Carmen had been working in dual language settings for sixteen years. At the time of the study, she was a dual language instructor for all grade levels at a middle school. She taught Advanced Placement (AP) in Spanish Language and Culture to 8th-grade students and Language Arts through Spanish class.

Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction

On July 16, 2020, the researcher conducted a semi-structured interview with Carmen to uncover her beliefs about the topic. A summary of the teacher’s beliefs about effective second language instruction is provided in Table 18.
Table 18

Summary of Carmen’s Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Teacher’s beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency with an emphasis on speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of focus</strong></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies</td>
<td>General strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make students feel connected to the target language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build students self-pride in learning the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain parental supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend to students’ specific needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching reading</td>
<td>Partner reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>Vary depending on grade levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach vocab in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate vocabulary into other skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>Attend to both fluency and accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use the target language as much as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have students do lots of oral activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have students work with native-speaking peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate speaking with other skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews (8th graders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral presentation (8th graders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-developed speaking materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching writing</td>
<td>Journal writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on the message of the writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grammar</td>
<td>Address grammar issues only when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Teacher’s beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Ideas for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create interesting grammar activities, not just drills and repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing interactions</td>
<td>Group students of different levels together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vary grouping techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal supports</td>
<td>Visuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The roles of students’ home language and culture

L1 is the foundation for learning L2

Recognition of L1 culture helps students feel connected

Teaching Goals

Carmen believed that although second language instruction in dual language classrooms needs to develop students’ proficiency in all areas, speaking should take precedence. She noticed that while her students were generally proficient in reading and writing, they still lacked speaking proficiency. As she explained in the first interview,

One of the things that have always been a hinder or maybe it's not used as much as is the speaking component, because reading, they learn how to read, they learn how to write. And obviously, that listening and speaking is going hand in hand. So many of my students I've seen that they're good readers, they're good at, at least at, you know, at intermediate level of proficiency in writing, but it's the speaking component that they need more reinforcement in.

The teacher felt that her students need more opportunities for connecting what they had learned in reading and writing to speaking. In her view, being literate in a language does not necessarily mean being orally proficient, especially in the academic language. The teacher pointed out:

And that's when I had to, when I had to basically teach that colleague that just because you speak a language doesn't mean that you understand how to speak it correctly.
Because let's say that a just like if you look at BICS [Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills] and CALP [Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency], that academic setting in the academic language is not the same when you're using it in the social language. So, it's basically making them understand the social language and academic language are two different things.

Dual language learners, according to Carmen, should be able not only to learn the language form but also to use the language in context. She indicated,

I tried to find strategies that yes, the students understand how it's written, and how it's, you know, how it's said. But I want them to be able to use it in the context, so they know how to use it in the context.

Areas of Focus

Consistent with her view about the primary goal of second language instruction, Carmen held that although all language areas are important, speaking should be given more emphasis. She explained her perspective:

So, what I try to do is that in basis of what I see, the needs are for each student or each class. That's where I put more push into it, adding everything else obviously, embedding all the listening and the reading and the writing skills. But if I see that maybe this class needs more help in the oral component.

Her specific focus for speaking proficiency might vary depending on the grade level. She would emphasize basic interpersonal communication skills in 6th grade and address academic language proficiency in higher grades. Thus, she would focus on daily conversations to lower grade students and engage higher-level students with more demanding activities such oral presentations and interviews.

Instructional Strategies

Carmen underscored several general principles for working with dual language learners. First, she believed in the importance of making students feel connected to the target language
and culture, enabling students to see the long-term benefits of learning the new language.

Applying this principle was especially critical when working with middle school students given their maturity level, as she explained:

Well, the first thing that I always want them to feel is connected with the language and the culture. Being middle schoolers, it's hard for them because they're going through a transition in general just to have you know, behavior, persona, hormones and all of that. So middle school is a whole different world. But I think that they feel connected to who's teaching the language and how it is being involved in their daily settings, how are they going to see it in the long run, how it's going to be beneficial for them professionally.

Additionally, Carmen found it extremely important to build her students self-pride in learning the target language, showing them that learning Spanish is more than just knowing another language. She would try and make her students understand that

Yes, you're learning a second language. Yes, it will give you benefits in the long run. Yes, you will be successful, you'll be able to speak to other people, you will be able to travel to many countries, and be and be self-aware of how to speak, but at the same time, you have to have that inner pride in yourself that you are claiming you are acquiring levels, strategies, experiences that many have chosen not to take. And you are different from others because you dare to be to... to do something different like acquiring a second language.

The second principle was that teachers should make every effort to make their students feel comfortable in the classroom. One way to accomplish this was by avoiding too frequent error corrections. She described how she would use a recasting technique to treat errors gently:

One of the things that I try to do is that I try to make them feel comfortable, meaning that I will not correct them step by step on what they say. So, if they make a mistake orally, I restate what they're trying to say correctly. So, they can catch what they said. So you, I just think that when I try to embed the speaking components, I don't want them to feel penalized of making a mistake orally and I will correct them, they can make those oral mistakes. But at the same time when I repeat it back to them, I say it correctly,

Next, Carmen believed in the critical role of parental supports in their children’s learning of the second language. Therefore, she would involve parents throughout the process of learning the target language. Sharing her lesson topics and successfully communicating with the parents
were her ways to ensure that parents are familiar and comfortable with their children's learning in the classrooms. As she indicated,

   Before I even begin the course, I always let the parents know what topics we cover, just in case they're not comfortable with their children going over specific topics, then I know how to modify specific things. So, I always make sure that the parents are aware of what we're going to discuss. So, it doesn't take them by surprise. And that's one thing that I always make sure that the parents are aware of. And the parents are very supportive. So, if they do not understand something specific, they always contact me and they let me know, Oh we didn't understand this point. Can you help us? So that's the communication between parents and is very successful.

   Finally, Carmen valued differentiated instruction in order to ensure that student's individual needs are met, in turn boosting their motivation. In particular, middle school students need special attention because, in her view, “they're going through so many personal aspects. And then trying for them to feel motivated is something really big.” She explained:

   So, this is something that I will continue to research and find ways of. Yes, I know. I want to be able, I have a class of 20-25 students, but I want to make sure that I'm reaching each of those students needs so differentiation will play a key component in my instruction and finding those scaffolding and finding those strategies that I can, yes, I can give a class in a whole, but at the same time, I am supporting each of my students’ needs.

   Effective second language instruction, according to Carmen, should integrate two or more language areas, i.e., speaking, listening, reading, and writing. In particular, she highly valued the integration of speaking skills into other language skills. For instance, she would include speaking components into her 8th-grade lessons with a reading or writing focus. As she offered in the first interview,

   And then if you come into my eighth grade class, well, that is my AP class, which is Advanced Placement in Spanish language and culture, there you're going to see more, a little bit of more reading comprehension and writing essays and talking about more of the aspects of how the language and culture is affecting our daily life settings.

   Another strategy was to develop an assessment that encompassed the four elements, as she indicated below:
So, I try to drill a lot of the strategy of speaking and listening in the class. So, for example, when I provide an assessment, I have all levels. So, my assessment can have four components, it will have a reading, listening, speaking, and writing component, so they can, so they can constantly practice those skills.

In teaching speaking skills, Carmen would provide her students with maximum oral exposure and ample opportunities for using the second language in the classrooms, the only environment where they would be exposed to the target language. As she revealed, “95% of the time, I will be using the targeted language which in my case is Spanish.” Her students were expected to speak the language as much as possible in the classrooms. She stated:

I one-hundred percent, even though there's sometimes that in the instruction part, I might use a little bit of English just to you know, clear those out, but when the students are talking to me, I use 100% of the language because sometimes they only hear the language when they're with me. Because when they go back home, many of the students have nonnative parents. So, I try to as to work a lot with the speaking it's a little bit it's hard sometimes because obviously some of them feel more comfortable speaking in English.

Carmen considered both fluency and accuracy as essential for speaking proficiency. She explained that:

They go, they go hand in hand, but sometimes just because a student is fluent doesn't mean that they're accurate. So, you have students that can speak fluently, but they really don't speak correctly. And, and that's a common mistake that we have with many of our, our native speakers.

To develop students’ speaking proficiency, Carmen would get students to practice their oral skills a lot. Believing that students would benefit from interacting with their peers who speak the target language, the teacher would put English-speaking learners and their Spanish-speaking peers in the same group so that they can talk with each other. She commented, “I work a lot in cooperative groups. And they're always helping each other. They're always working with each other. So the blending of native and non-natives is very functional, because they feed from each other.”
Working with higher-grade students, Carmen would engage them with more challenging speaking tasks, including interviews, one-on-one connections, and oral presentation. She explained:

I love having the students do oral presentations. And, and they can be oral presentations of specific topics. Or you can just give them a topic to talk. It doesn't even have to be long one, maybe within the class it could be one-minute monologues, skits, and plays from a great art.

Furthermore, she recognized the benefits of getting students to speak freely out of their creativity and imagination. She would have her students talk about a self-developed material of their choice, thereby allowing them to practice using the language, especially some targeted vocabulary items. As Carmen articulated,

Sometimes I have them make their own little skits using vocabulary words. So, I'm not giving them what they have to do. I'm just giving them the idea. So out of all of these words, you're going to create a play but make sure that it makes sense, but the words are embedded. So, I allow that imagination and that creativity for the students to use those vocabulary words but in the second language and they could talk about anything. So, they're speaking freely, but they know that they're they have to have in that speech part they have to have those vocabulary words embedded.

In teaching reading, Carmen considered partner reading and reading aloud as effective strategies. In her view, partner reading was an excellent way for students not only to comprehend better what they are reading but also to interact with their peers, providing them with an opportunity for oral practices. She stated that “Sometimes when they read with each other, they feel more confident, and they're able to, to express those thoughts and it boosts those, those inquiry levels. They could ask questions to each other.” Likewise, reading aloud can be engaging and it provokes students to think and talk. She gave an example from her class: when such an activity was conducted, her students would stop and say, “Oh, if this what happened or if the writer or the author is talking about this, how would it be expressed?” Carmen’s belief in the
merits of incorporating speaking in her reading instruction echoed her support for an integrated approach to language teaching.

In teaching writing, Carmen pointed out journal writing as an effective way to develop dual language students’ proficiency in this area. The reason was that it allows students to write freely without worrying about making errors. She described the benefits of journal writing:

Journal writing is great because they get to, because it's not graded. It's something that they feel free writing on. And you're still, even though they might have mistakes, but they're still writing in that second language. And as a teacher, you read them and you give them feedback of what they wrote, not how they wrote it. So that's something that promotes them to want to continue writing. Knowing that Oh what I'm writing? Yes, it might have some mistakes, but I am writing in that second language.

It is interesting to note how the teacher expressed two different perspectives towards fluency and accuracy concerning speaking and writing areas. While she would attend to both aspects when teaching speaking, the teacher emphasized fluency when it came to writing. She maintained that “as a teacher, you read them and you give them feedback of what they wrote, not how they wrote it. So that's something that promotes them to want to continue writing.” It was clear that, when dealing with her students’ writing, Carmen tended to concentrate on the content and message of the product, an approach she considered constructive to the development of her students’ writing proficiency. This perspective lined up with her belief about the need to focus on gist over form.

Carmen believed that a particular focus on grammar was necessary when the need arises for addressing problematic grammatical points, such as parts of speech. She explained:

I've seen myself at points of focusing on the grammar, and I think it's because some, obviously because you want them to be able to understand how it's set up properly. So, I, yes, I've seen myself focused on how, you need to remember the verb has to be like this or the verb has to be like that, or the adjective has to be placed correctly.
She pointed out that grammar activities should be enjoyable for the students. As she put it, grammar is “something that they need to learn, but it's something fun for them, not just repetition and drills.” Apparently, while recognizing the place for grammar teaching in the dual language classroom, Carmen did not espouse the traditional approaches to grammar instruction.

Carmen had the view that vocabulary was best taught in contexts. In the following excerpt, she described an example of how she taught vocabulary via music and songs, which also resonated with her perspective about an integrated teaching:

I play a video for them and they firstly watch the video. And then the second time we play the video I give them the lyrics with words missing or misguided words or miswritten words. And they listen, they don't see the video anymore. They're just listening to it. And when they're listening to it, they have to plug in the vocabulary words that I have put on maybe a word box, they have to plug it into the lyrics, or they have to correct the ones that are not written correctly.

Her vocabulary teaching strategies might vary from grade to grade. For lower grades, vocabulary learning was best embedded in reading, with the primary aim being to facilitate comprehension. In this case, students would be expected to pick up the new words through reading. For higher grades, she would offer more direct vocabulary instruction, in which students would be given specific words and definitions. The students, however, would not just learn the words and their meaning; they would also practice using them.

Finally, corresponding to her view about integrated instruction, Carmen understood that listening should be taught in conjunction with other language skills. Listening to cultural music and songs was an effective way of promoting students’ listening ability. She mentioned that

And for listening, I love music, so having the students enjoy music, listening to different types of music from different countries and dancing to it and embracing that, that that culture that the music provides. But as well, they have this they have the lyrics of the song. So, you have the reading there and they can sing to it. So, you have the speaking there. I think that's great.
The Roles of Students’ Home Language and Culture

Carmen believed that a stronger foundation in the home language benefits L2 learning. She explained how literacy in the first language affects second language learning:

If they had any lacks of the, you know, education, they're going to have lacks in their first language. And it's hard because then when they come here and they try to acquire the English in this case, there, it's going to be a little bit troubling for them because they still lack the foundation in their first language and, you might know that a strong base of the first will carry on to their second.

She also appreciated the role of dual language students’ home culture in developing their native language. In her perspective, maintaining students' cultural identity is of utmost importance because not only does it promote students’ multicultural competence, but it also facilitates their language learning. She remarked:

I think culture is one of the pivots of learning a language. It's very important. Students have to feel identified with their language, their culture, I embrace called up, embrace their culture in any of them as much as they can so they could feel identified and feel proud of where they come from, and want to continue keeping that culture embedded.

Clearly, Carmen saw the inextricable link between language and culture, and she felt the necessity to embed as many cultural elements as possible in the lessons. Doing so, she believed, would positively affect the students’ attitudes toward the culture itself and their learning of the language associated with the culture.

Classroom Practices

Carmen shared three journal entries about her lessons in her DL classrooms. Lesson #1 was provided on October 28th, 2020, in the Spanish for Spanish Speakers 1 class and addressed the topic of Acentuación. Lesson #2 was about the author’s purpose and was offered on September 22nd, 2020, in Spanish for Spanish Speakers 2 class. Lesson #3 was given on October
30th, 2020, in the Advance Placement Spanish Language & Culture class, in which *La ciencia y la Tecnología* (Science and Technology) was discussed. Table 19 presents a summary of Carmen’s teaching practices in relation to the specific aspects of second language instruction under investigation.

Table 19

Summary of Carmen’s Teaching Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Lesson #1</th>
<th>Lesson #2</th>
<th>Lesson #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus &amp; goal</td>
<td>Grammar – students can classify words</td>
<td>Reading – students can identify authors’ purpose in an article</td>
<td>Reading &amp; speaking - Students learn the outcomes of being nomophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Independent work – students did an interactive instructional game to review word classification</td>
<td>Independent work – students did a close reading</td>
<td>Breakout groups – students created commercials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout groups – students reviewed the word classification together</td>
<td>Whole class – all reviewed and answered comprehension questions</td>
<td>Grammar – teacher provided feedback on grammatical errors in students’ written products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary – class discussed new words found in the text</td>
<td>Vocabulary – class discussed new words encountered in the text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Goals and Focus Areas**

Of these lessons, only lesson #3 had goals and focus that were markedly aligned with the teacher’s stated belief about the importance of developing students’ speaking proficiency. Lesson #1 focused on grammar and aimed to introduce how Spanish words are classified according to the rules of accentuation. Lesson #2 emphasized reading skills, especially how to identify the author’s purpose in an article. Lesson #3 concentrated on reading and speaking, with the goal of...
learning the outcomes of being nomophobia, which refers to a fear of being without a mobile device.

**Instructional Strategies**

In lesson #1, the teacher utilized *Boom cards*, an interactive instructional game, which she considered the best option given the constraints of the COVID-19 situation. The teacher modeled the activity and then had her students work in breakout groups to review one of the classifications of words. She also provided support for the first language (i.e., English). In lesson #2, Carmen employed different grouping strategies. First, she had students work independently and did a close reading to annotate the main idea of the text. Then, the class worked as a whole group and answered comprehension questions. Vocabulary learning was incorporated in the lesson as the students learned new words while engaging with the text. The teacher explained:

For the seventh grade, which was the reading article, basically, they did a close reading. So, they read it first and then they recognize the words that they are not familiar with, and we would go over them. And then with the reading, words that are not common in the language, they were in the bottom with numbered, numbered, so I did not isolate the vocabulary on its own. It was more when we were reading that we would, you know, talk about the word and what its meaning. So I didn't give them the word and what it means.

In lesson #3, her eighth-grade students were tasked with creating and presenting commercials about nomophobia. Carmen first had the class go over the instructions for accomplishing the task as well as the rubric. After reading an article about the topic, students worked in breakout groups to produce a presentation using video and narrated slides. Carmen wrote in the journal that, under normal circumstances, she would engage them with a hands-on activity. Ideally, she would pair second language learners with their native-speaking peers. However, due to the COVID-19 situation, some students were learning remotely from home. As a result, it was difficult for her to ensure that these students focused on the lessons.
In the second interview, Carmen indicated that she used Spanish in these classes most of the time. In lessons #1 and #2, students were strongly encouraged to speak in the Spanish language with their peers. In lesson #3, students’ products had to be written and presented in the target language. It appeared that although the three lessons differed in goals and foci, they all contained speaking elements. This practice was consistent with the teachers’ view about the importance of maximizing exposure to the target language and providing opportunities for practice to promote speaking proficiency.

Carmen addressed grammar issues by directly correcting any mistake in the student’s written product. As she pointed out in the second interview, “So if they made any grammatical mistakes, they were given feedback when they submitted the assignment.” It was clear that while the teacher would emphasize the fluency aspect of her students’ journal writing, in lesson #3, she would also attend to the accuracy aspect, which was understandable given the nature of the writing assignment.

**Elements of Students’ Home Language and Culture**

Carmen stated that first language support was always provided in her classes, especially in the seventh grade. Some Spanish cultural elements were also embedded in the three lessons that she journaled. In the second interview, the teacher described how she addressed this area:

Yes, there's cultural aspects in all three, in the sixth grade, even though there's grammar all of the words are words that are found in different countries. And the different activities are done in the seventh-grade reading. There's cultural embedded about because the reading is about a Scotch doctor. So, I went a little bit more not a Spanish speaking culture but more world around and that because it was about the creator of the penicillin. So, we embedded where he was from and how he was raised and all that. And with the eighth, eighth grade class, it's the cultures when they read before creating the commercial, they read an article about a study that was created in Spain, about the nomophobia which is obviously the fear of not having their cell phones.
Factors Affecting Belief-Practice Relationships

Supporting Factors

One school-level factor and one classroom-context variable appeared to significantly support Carmen in acting upon her beliefs in the DL classrooms. In the second interview, the teacher revealed that she felt fully supported by her colleagues, who would share knowledge and skills about best practices in the DL classrooms. Carmen explained:

So, I teach the subject by myself. So, it's basically myself, but my other colleagues that offer the languages, they're always there to support…. So, we work together. We do not teach the same subjects, we teach the same language, but not the same subjects. But we're always there to support each other with different strategies and what works best for our class.

At the classroom level, students’ positive attitudes and good motivation to learn were cited as the key to Carmen’s successful lessons. Such affective variables stemmed from the students’ understanding of the benefits they can reap from learning the Spanish language. As the teacher underlined, “Those are very important, and trying to make sure that they, that whatever we do is relatable, so they can understand why is it used and why they're doing it.” It is noteworthy that the students’ positive attitudes toward the lessons were likely the result of the teachers’ efforts in raising their awareness of the importance of learning another language for their future. In the earlier section that addressed general instructional strategies, Carmen had indicated that building students’ pride in learning the target language would boost their motivation.

Hindering Factors

Carmen mentioned two hindrances at the school level. First, there were insufficient materials that were written in the Spanish language; as a consequence, she had to develop
materials that suited her students' needs. As she said, “in general, it's hard to find materials in a second language. So, I normally have to create many of them, or modify the ones that I find to be able to meet my students’ needs.” Second, there was an unequal proportion of students from the two linguistic backgrounds, which hindered her from pairing native and non-native speakers of the Spanish language, a strategy she believed would effectively promote language learning. This factor, however, derived from the COVID-19 situation, which had forced schools to offer remote learning. Consequently, Carmen did not have enough face-to-face students for pair work.

The greatest hindrance at the classroom level was associated with the students. She admitted that she often had difficulty getting her middle school students to concentrate on the lessons. She stated in the second interview that “trying to reach them the way that you would want to, it's getting very, it's very hard, especially with middle schoolers, because middle schoolers are everywhere. So, keeping their attention on what they need to. It's, it's very hard.”

It was clear that, in Carmen’s case, student factors played major roles in her instruction as they can have both favorable and unfavorable effects. One student factor (i.e., their motivation to learn) can support her instruction, whereas another (i.e., lack of focus on the lesson) may present a serious challenge. The current COVID-19 situation has also prevented her from engaging students with cooperative learning, which she highly valued. Besides, it was complicated for her to maintain the attention and reach the needs of students who did remote learning. Table 20 summarizes Carmen's perception about the primary supports and hindrances in acting upon her beliefs about effective language teaching and learning.
Table 20

External and Internal Factors Influencing Carmen’s Belief-Practice Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>External supports</th>
<th>External hindrances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-level factor</td>
<td>School-level factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom-context factor</td>
<td>Limited resources and materials in the Spanish language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disproportionate composition of students from the two language backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unequal number of face-to-face and learn-from-home students due to the COVID-19 situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ lack of attention to the lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ positive attitudes and high motivation to learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Carmen held the beliefs that (1) while the development of all language areas is essential, speaking skills should take precedence; (2) different language areas should be taught integratedly, (3) whenever possible, speaking and vocabulary components should be embedded in every lesson. In addition, the teacher valued home language literacy as the critical foundation for learning the target language; therefore, she believed that maintaining dual language students’ cultural identity is the key to fostering biculturalism.

Carmen’s second language instruction was centered on the principles that: (1) oral proficiency should receive more attention, that is, students should be able to use the target language in context, as well as to connect what they read and write with speaking; (2) both fluency and accuracy were necessary, with one aspect might be more emphasized depending on the language skills and areas; (3) students should feel comfortable in the classroom, which could
be achieved by building a connection between the students and the target language and culture, developing their self-pride and motivation in learning the new language, and meeting their individual needs.

Evidence from Carmen’s teaching journals suggested a high degree of consistency between these beliefs and her instructional practices in the DL classrooms. In terms of goals and focus, only the third lesson reflected the teacher’s professed belief about emphasizing students’ speaking ability. Notwithstanding, upon scrutinizing the classroom activities in the first and second lessons, it was clear that some speaking elements were incorporated as well, albeit they were not as rigorous as the third one. The integration of speaking was consistent with the teacher’s view about the importance of maximum exposure to the target language and opportunities for using it. Moreover, almost all the espoused strategies for teaching speaking were enacted, especially in the third lesson. Also evident in the classroom practice was her conviction that vocabulary was best taught contextually and incorporated with reading, as shown in lesson #2.

One external contribution to the belief-practice connections was the support she received from her colleagues, who would share each other’s knowledge and experiences with the best strategies to use in the DL classrooms. Another support was in the form of students’ positive attitudes and good motivation to learn. Three main hindrances to her second language instruction included (1) the lack of materials in the Spanish language, (2) a relatively unbalanced number of students from Spanish and English linguistic backgrounds. (3) the difficulty in maintaining the attention of students who were learning remotely. Also, since the class had very few face-to-face students, Carmen did not have enough students to get them to do pair work in the classroom.
Daniela

Daniela had been working for twenty-five years in language immersion settings at an elementary school. She had instructed various subjects (i.e., Math, Social Studies, Science, Reading, and Language Arts), all delivered in Spanish. At the time of the study, the teacher was providing English instruction to fourth-grade students. She anticipated switching to the Spanish side of the dual language program at her school in 2021.

Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction

To uncover Daniela’s beliefs about the topic, the researcher conducted a semi-structured interview on November 2nd, 2020, which lasted approximately 30 minutes. Table 21 summarizes the teacher’s beliefs about second language instruction in the dual language classrooms, specifically in terms of teaching goal(s), area(s) of focus, effective instructional strategies, and the roles of students’ home language and culture.

Table 21

Summary of Daniela’s Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Teacher’s beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of focus</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategy</td>
<td>General strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiate instruction based on students’ proficiency levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide comprehensible input in all language areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects</td>
<td>Teacher’s beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Ideas for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching reading</td>
<td>Adjust teachers’ talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>Apply similar strategies for first language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching speaking</td>
<td>Teach conversational strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching writing</td>
<td>Apply similar strategies for first language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>No direct corrections for younger learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct common errors by older students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No correction on individual errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on meaning and intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give examples of correct and incorrect versions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use recasting techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directly correct errors in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal supports</td>
<td>Sentence frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence starters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total physical response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of students’ home language and culture</td>
<td>L1 is the foundation for learning L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 culture helps students feel connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add L1 support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embed cultural elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Goals**

Daniela believed that second language instruction in dual language classes should aim at developing students’ skills in all four language areas, ideally to the level that approximates native proficiency. She maintained that “we want students to be proficient not only in speaking and listening, but in reading and writing. And if we can get them as close to native proficiency as possible, all the better.”
Areas of focus

In alignment with her belief about the goal of dual language teaching, Daniela understood that all language areas needed to be treated equally. When asked about the most critical areas to concentrate, she mentioned reading, writing, and speaking:

Hmm. That's a good question, because I think most are important. I think reading and writing are automatically there. And we do need to focus on those because those are the weaker areas. But, and even writing and speaking, the productive areas of language are usually where children fall behind when they're learning a second language.

She observed that her second language learners were often struggling with speaking and listening and attributed this situation to the lack of attention for the two areas. Daniela, therefore, maintained that all language areas should be addressed equally:

So, we really need to increase our emphasis on speaking in the second language, listening in the second language, that has to be more intentional. And I don't know, I don't think there's any one thing that's most important, but they all need to be treated equally. And we do not treat speaking and listening equal with reading and writing. So, we need to increase that.

Daniela valued the teaching of grammar, although her grammar approaches would differ depending on the learners' age. In her view, grammar should not be imposed on younger learners since they cannot yet handle abstract concepts. The effective way, according to the teacher, was to constantly expose young learners to the target language, which would allow for natural acquisition. She explained:

So, we do teach grammar. But that's not the focus, it's a much more natural way to learn language, because the kids are not ready to really grasp those abstract ideas of grammar structures. With lots of examples and constant conversation, they will pick them up.

She held the belief that a focus on grammar was more appropriate to learners at the secondary level because they are cognitively more ready to grasp abstract ideas. As she stated,
And secondary is where grammar education, explicit grammar teaching is more effective, because the kids have reached that point within their brain development where they can handle the more abstract areas.

**Instructional Strategies**

Daniela’s language instruction appeared to be based on at least two underlying principles. First, it was vital for her to be well-informed of specific levels of the learners. She would use this knowledge to differentiate her instruction to suit the students’ level of L2 proficiency and provide better support to meet the students’ needs. To obtain such information, she would rely on some kinds of assessment tool:

So, I think that one of the strategies is having a personal assessment of each student and their reading, writing, speaking and listening skills would be beneficial, because then my differentiation can be more effective. And I know I need to differentiate more, provide more support for certain students. But before doing that effectively I really need to know where they’re at.

The second principle was that effective strategies should offer comprehensible input and facilitate understanding, as she commented below:

And that goes with reading, writing, listening, and speaking, you know, you want to create comprehensible input. And then you use any strategy you can so that that happens. And anything that helps the students understand what they're reading, writing, listening to or speaking, then that those strategies are the most important.

In teaching second language reading and writing, Daniela’s instruction was grounded on the idea that the development of these areas in the second language mirrors that of the first language. The teacher explained, “Well, with the reading and writing that is very similar to teaching native speakers reading and writing, those kinds of skills are transferable skills.” Therefore, she assumed that strategies for teaching reading and writing in the second language should draw on how parents develop their younger children’s first language literacy.
Daniela espoused a similar view when it came to treating learners' linguistic errors. Based on her understanding of the similarity between first and second language developments, Daniela saw errors as an essential part of learning, which even native speakers may commit. She reasoned:

So native speakers, they start from infancy, or a second language speakers may start from kindergarten. And the development of that language goes pretty much along the same path. We see the same kinds of errors that native speakers make with overgeneralizations, and, you know, finding words that are close, but not specific. We see those same things in second language learners.

Daniela, therefore, suggested that teachers should not directly correct errors made by younger learners. Corrections, where necessary, should be conducted indirectly, for example, by using a recasting technique, and should focus on the meaning and intent rather than the structural accuracy of the language. She offered her perspective on this matter:

And how do we deal with errors with first language learners, we just repeat what they say with the correct form, we acknowledge their meaning and intent. And I think especially in the lower grades, that's how you need to address it. Just like you were raising your own children. You just acknowledge and expand their communication and clarify their communication, but we're not really teaching them or telling them they're wrong.

For older students, Daniela would attend only to the most common errors rather than individual ones. Doing the latter was not the best option because she believed it could be detrimental to the student's motivation to learn the second language. As she maintained, correcting every single error “raises the affective filter. It doesn't really help anything because they're not going to remember one correction.” If at all necessary, in her view, an excellent strategy to deal with common errors is by explaining correct and incorrect versions of the issue and addressing them repeatedly. She explained:

As the kids get older then I think, what I what I find is I look for common errors that everybody is making. And then I try to correct just those specific common errors, or we talk about it and give them examples of what is not correct and what is correct in English.
In teaching speaking, Daniela valued strategies that get students to talk and promote conversational skills. She would ensure that every child talk and in every class, and they have strategies for getting kids to speak in conversationally and presentationally. So that's what I've been working on rules for conversation, how do you get somebody involved? How do you stay on the topic? And then presentational, of course, we all work on the lifting your voice.

Daniela would provide lots of opportunities for students to practice using the target language. Her supports include adjusted teacher talk and various tools such as visuals, sentence frames, and sentence starters. She described her main strategies:

One is to speak more slowly and more clearly. Two is to make sure you have visuals at any level, children need visuals. And three to give them lots and lots of practice with the vocabulary with sentences, offering sentence frames, sentence starters, structures that they can learn to say, giving them examples of phrases to say.

The Roles of Students’ Home Language and Culture

Daniela considered the crucial roles of dual language learners’ native culture and language in their second language learning. She viewed culture as one of the critical elements of dual language education. While recognizing the efforts her program has been making to achieve the tri-pronged goal of dual language instruction (i.e., biliteracy, bilingualism, and biculturalism), Daniela saw that culture needs to be clearly taught. Furthermore, dual language programs should introduce learners not only to the different cultures coming from various Spanish-speaking countries but also the American culture. She articulated her perspectives:

The bicultural part is not always clearly taught. But I think needs to be clearly taught. When I taught in Spanish immersion, we would bring in the culture of all different Spanish speaking countries…. So, we did not focus on Mexican culture, or Puerto Rican culture, or Spanish from Spain culture. It was the Spanish-speaking world.

Daniela believed that this approach would promote students’ cross-cultural understanding. Offering an example, she explained:
And one of the things I explained to my kids last year was this idea of eye contact, that in the United States, you look at somebody if you're being honest. If you look away, people feel you are being dishonest, or you're hiding something, which is exactly the opposite of Hispanic culture, and this specifically Mexican culture. So those kinds of things, I hope that we are also teaching so that they can fit into American Culture and understand the differences.

She understood that culture means knowledge, which in turn contributes to understanding. Tapping into the students’ home culture was, therefore, an effective strategy for enhancing their understanding of the information presented in the target language. As the teacher maintained:

And culturally, you know, whatever we can tap into in their culture that works. We want you do want some of their culture brought into the classroom. So, there's familiarity with the topics. So, the background knowledge is already there. And that helps increased understanding. So, it's important.

Daniela also believed in the importance of dual language students’ literacy in their home language and how it may influence second language learning. Since L1 reading skills are transferrable to the second language, high L1 literacy facilitates L2 reading. The participant commented:

But, you know, reading in their native language, it would be great if they came in reading in their native language, because reading skills transfer from one language to another, except for decoding, many, many skills are the same, you know, comprehension skills are the same. So, a strong basis in their native language will make learning a second language even easier.

Classroom Practices

Daniela submitted three journal entries of the lessons on Reading and English Language Arts that she delivered to her fourth-grade students on October 29th, November 2nd, and November 3rd, 2020. Lesson #1 focused on vocabulary, specifically poetry-related words. Lessons #2 and #3 addressed the topic of self-expression using poems. Table 22 summarizes
Daniela’s journals, highlighting the specific aspects of second language instruction under examination.

Table 22

Summary of Daniela’s Teaching Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Lesson #1</th>
<th>Lesson #2</th>
<th>Lesson #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus &amp; goal</td>
<td>Vocabulary – words necessary to talk about poetry&lt;br&gt;Students can write a poem (non-rhyming) and understanding the concept of a “line” in poetry</td>
<td>Reading &amp; writing Students were able to identify a Haiku and write one</td>
<td>Vocabulary – features in poems&lt;br&gt;Writing and speaking – students discuss features in poems (writing and speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Vocabulary&lt;br&gt;A whole group guided reading and “note taking”&lt;br&gt;Demonstration - teacher used a video to demonstrate contour line drawing&lt;br&gt;Writing a poem – a template was provided for students to write their own poem.</td>
<td>Whole group textbook reading&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;I do&lt;/em&gt; - Video of an author explaining Haikus&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;We do&lt;/em&gt; - class wrote a haiku together&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;You do&lt;/em&gt; - Students worked individually to write their own haiku, finding inspiration from a picture.&lt;br&gt;Error correction – teacher addressed any spelling errors by directly telling the correct one.</td>
<td>The teacher showed various short poems&lt;br&gt;Students used sentence frames to identify features in poems&lt;br&gt;Whole group – class brainstormed ideas/concepts for writing poems&lt;br&gt;Brainstorming - teacher took note of students’ ideas and left them up for all to refer to when they wrote their own poem&lt;br&gt;Independent work – students used a fill-in template for their poem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Goals and Focus Areas

Lesson #1 was designed to introduce the concept of “line” in poetry and ultimately get students to write their own poem. Lesson #2 was presented to the same class. It emphasized
reading and writing areas, aiming to enable the students to identify haiku and write one. Lesson #3, also offered to the same grade and content area, had a vocabulary focus and the goal of introducing students to, and getting them to discuss, features of poems. Thus, despite their strong focus on vocabulary, these three lessons integrated reading, speaking, and writing components.

**Instructional Strategies**

In lesson #1, the teacher used a whole group guided reading. She led the activity using a document camera to project the reading text and focus on the target words. Showing some examples, she guided her students into locating the items, circling each word, and underlining its definition as they went over the text. Daniela indicated that typically she would have students do a hands-on activity for the vocabulary lesson. However, close interactions were limited, and small groups were not applicable because they were required to practice social distancing following the COVID-19 precautions.

The next activity was self-expression through drawing, which actually served as a break from the rather demanding activity they previously engaged with. After watching a video demonstrating how to draw a contour line, the students created their drawings. Following the short break was another main activity in which the students wrote their poem using a template that provides some sentence starters, or phrase starters to be exact since the students were asked to write several phrases instead of complete sentences. In this final part of the lesson, the teacher noticed a common grammatical mistake but decided to address it in a mini-lesson for the next class.

In lesson #2, Daniela did a whole class reading to introduce haikus. She presented examples and counterexamples to help her students distinguish haikus from other types of
poems. To guide the students into writing, the teacher used *I do, We do, You do* technique. First, she showed a video of an author explaining haikus. Next, the class wrote a haiku together. Finally, each student created their own haiku, getting inspiration from a picture. As with lesson #1, in compliance with the COVID-19 protocol, her students could not mingle and interact in small groups. Under normal circumstances, however, Daniela would have them work in small groups in order to enhance their learning.

In lesson #3, Daniela introduced some features of poem, such as alliteration, personification, and allusion. The students looked at various short poems and wrote down the features they identified, using a template containing sentence frames to guide their writing. Then, they shared their work orally. Again, following the COVID-19 protocol, student-student interactions were minimal. For the second activity, the output of which was to create a poem, the teacher first had the whole class brainstorm ideas, which she wrote and left up on the whiteboard for students to refer to. An independent work followed, with each student working on a fill-in template to produce their poems.

**Elements of Students’ Home Language and Culture**

There was no evidence to suggest any elements of students’ native culture and language being included in the three lessons that Daniela shared with the researcher.

**Factors Affecting Belief-Practice Relationships**

**Supporting Factors**

The first supporting factor was the flexibility of designing lessons, allowing Daniela to plan out lessons that are accessible to students as well as adjustable to time constraints. For instance, she had chosen to teach poetry because she believed it would boost students’
motivation. She explained that “by the time we got to that poem, they were comfortable with the imagery. They were comfortable with not having to do complete sentences. They were comfortable with line rather than paragraph.”

The second factor is the availability of materials for teaching the English language via poetry. Prior to her assignment in the DL program, she had created materials for teaching English as a second language. This experience turned out to be helpful for her dual language instruction. As she explained:

I've been teaching a second language, most of the time, you know, I was teaching Spanish as a second language, to English speakers. So, I've collected things over time. That is, that helps me, you know, once you do it over and over and over, then you have the materials, you know what's going to work.

Also facilitative to the enactment of her beliefs are the school's support in the form of full access to online resources. She indicated that “the school is supportive in that we have some resources that the school pays for that we can access like Enchanted Learning…. So, we have those kinds of supports, online supports.”

At the classroom-level, Daniela considers students’ attitudes towards the lesson as another supporting factor. First, some students were comfortable sharing their ideas, which the teacher permitted others to copy for language learning. She explained her rationale:

Sure, one of the things I do when children are writing, especially if I see a number of them struggling, I will have the other kids read what they have written, or read what they've written so far, to get the other students ideas…. And it doesn't bother me if the other kids copy their ideas. Because they're using language.

The next supporting factor associated with the students’ attitudes is that they do not have many behavior problems. Such a condition was greatly helpful to her teaching because Daniela felt that “that really hinders meeting objectives when you have discipline problems, and we really don't have any.”
Hindering Factors

For Daniela, the biggest challenge to her second language instruction is students’ reluctance to talk in the classroom, and she believed such a behavior could be linked to their cultural background. The teacher offered her thoughts:

And these kids, these beautiful, all Hispanic, mostly Mexican, of Mexican descent, or Guatemalan descent, the girls especially, do not speak up. They are not used to their voice being heard. And it is very hard to get them to talk and to present, and to have a strong voice, to be able to express their opinion. And that has been the biggest struggle, not to get them to be quiet, but to get them to talk. And that's just very cultural.

One school-level hindrance was related to the COVID-19 situation, which limited her students’ interactions in the classrooms. As a result, Daniela was unable to engage her students in a hands-on activity, nor could she get them to interact in small groups. Table 23 presents a summary of supports and hinders to belief-practice connections as perceived by the participant.

Table 23
External and Internal Factors Influencing Daniela’s Belief-Practice Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Administration supports</th>
<th>Classroom-context factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External supports</td>
<td>School-level factors</td>
<td>Students as language models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level factors</td>
<td>Flexible lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of materials for teaching poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum behavior problems and interruptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-context factor</td>
<td>Students’ reluctance to talk in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External hindrances</td>
<td>School-level factors</td>
<td>No opportunities for small grouping and hands-on activities due to the COVID-19 situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-context factor</td>
<td>Students’ reluctance to talk in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Daniela believed that there are two main goals of second language instruction in dual language classrooms. First, it should aim at helping students to reach native-like proficiency in the target language. For this reason, all language areas are essential, although she felt that more attention should be accorded to speaking and listening. Second, dual language instruction should promote biculturalism by embracing the various cultures associated with the home and the target languages. Daniela valued grammar teaching, but her approaches would vary depending on the age of the learners. Knowledge about students’ proficiency levels was the key to providing differentiated language instructions, which would lead to effective teaching and learning. Effective instructional strategies should (1) offer comprehensible input and (2) facilitate understanding. Daniela’s reading and writing instruction were centered on the perspective that second and first language developments follow the same path. A similar view was held when it came to treating errors. She espoused speaking strategies that promote conversational skills and vocabulary activities that offer many oral practices for using the target words. Tapping into the students’ native culture was an effective strategy for enhancing their understanding of the information that was presented in the target language. Daniela also maintained that a solid first language reading literacy facilitates second language literacy.

Evidence from her teaching journals showed that Daniela integrated two or more language areas (speaking, reading, and writing) in the lessons. Such an integrated approach was consistent with her beliefs about addressing all language areas while emphasizing oral abilities. There was evidence of vocabulary serving as the foundation for speaking and writing activities. Also congruent with her stated beliefs was how she responded to errors: instead of directly
correcting them, she created a mini-lesson and would deal with the issues on the next occasion. Sentence starters were used to support her dual language learners.

Daniela’s enactment of her beliefs were supported by several school-level factors (i.e., administration supports, flexible lesson planning, available teaching materials, supportive school environment) and classroom-context factors (i.e., available language models). On the other hand, students’ reluctance to speak in the target language was cited as the biggest challenge. Another hindrance was associated with the COVID-19 situation. The teacher could not offer hands-on activities nor getting her students to work in small groups, which she believed the excellent strategies for promoting their second language learning.

**Erika**

Erika had been a middle school teacher for nineteen years. She had taught two high school credit courses, Beginning Spanish and Spanish 1. Since 2016 she worked in the 50/50 model of dual language instruction at her school, teaching World History for 6th-grade students in Spanish in one day and English in the other. The first semi-structured interview with the teacher was conducted on October 14th, 2020, and the second one on November 9th, 2020.

**Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction**

The first interview with Erika, which lasted for 48 minutes, revealed her beliefs about second language instruction in dual language classrooms. Table 24 summarizes Erika’s beliefs regarding the topic, specifically in terms of teaching goal(s), area(s) of focus, effective instructional strategies, and the roles of students’ home language and culture.
### Table 24

Summary of Erika’s Beliefs Regarding Effective Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Teacher’s beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Develop overall language proficiency emphasis on reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of focus</strong></td>
<td>Reading&lt;br&gt;Fluency over accuracy&lt;br&gt;Grammatical structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional strategies</strong></td>
<td>General strategies&lt;br&gt;Understand the level of each student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teaching Goals

Erika held that the primary goal of language instruction in the DL classrooms is to develop students’ literacy, especially reading and writing, both in the target and their home languages. She cited the many benefits of being bilingually proficient: “…it provides the obvious better job opportunities, etc. But I also think that being biliterate allows for more critical thinking, it provides the student with a grasp of not just two languages, but two cultures, or various cultures.”

To the teacher, it was critical to foster not only students’ second language learning but also their home language literacy. She maintained that “I was a proponent of having those students maintain their native language, their reading and writing, their literacy, everything, so that they could have remained biliterate.” She stated that, to ensure biliteracy, teachers need to recognize both languages in the classrooms. In her view, “that, to me, is key in making sure that the skills in English and in Spanish are equal or above those of monolinguals, in both languages.”

Erika would put this perspective into practice by getting her students to do tasks that require them to interact and communicate with each other and by allowing the use of both their native and the new languages in the classrooms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Teacher’s beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas</td>
<td>Ideas for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing errors</td>
<td>No direct correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of students’ home language and culture</td>
<td>L1 literacy has a role in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 literacy helps make a connection to English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native culture has a role in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of biculturalism will fail L2 learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, they would consult with each other, and you would hear this beautiful translanguaging and this, this woven cacophony, that's beautiful. To me, it was a melody of English and Spanish swirling together to create this one activity, and they would be able to present it in Spanish, and feel confident in both that what they're saying and doing met the requirement and the same thing with English that those students would feel confident that they were able to produce, you know, and meet that task.

Erika also believed that allowing students to use their home language was an effective strategy for her to check their understanding of the lesson. She would then modify her instruction as necessary. The teacher indicated:

And I also encourage them at times if they need to, to speak in their native tongue. Because sometimes I need to know and this this is unfortunate, and the fact that I speak Spanish, but I need to know that they are comprehending and if they're not, what do I need to do to change my teaching to ensure that when they reading in English, that it is clicking.

**Areas of Focus**

Erika believed in the necessity to focus on reading, fluency over accuracy, and grammatical differences over grammatical rules. Reading is the key to providing the supports needed to acquire other skills, especially vocabulary, writing, and – to some extent – speaking. She explained:

I think reading drives everything. I think reading increases vocabulary, I think reading, it improves writing. And I think reading, even if, especially if you're reading out loud, would improve pronunciation. So I, I think reading would be the one that I would focus on the most.

Teaching reading in the DL classrooms should not only aim at enabling students to read in the second language but also developing critical reading skills. As she commented, her reading instruction would include “analyzing what you're reading, …, to decipher what you're reading and the importance of what is being read.” In the second interview she reinforced this idea,
stating that “I use a lot of reading. So, when they're doing reading, they are they aren't just solely reading, they are summarizing, they're analyzing, they're creating higher order questions.”

Erika would emphasize fluency over accuracy for two reasons. First, accuracy-focused lessons could be harmful to the students’ confidence. In her words, “what happens with ELL and second language learners is that if you focus on accuracy, you're shutting them down.” Second, she believed that accuracy would naturally develop through practices and reinforcement. By reinforcement, the teacher referred to how parents usually respond to errors made by children learning their first language. Thus, when Erika’s second language learners made an error, instead of pointing out the incorrect form, she would focus on the message the students are trying to convey. She would bring the issue to attention by recasting it into the correct form.

As far as grammar instruction was concerned, Erika valued both direct and indirect approaches, with the former to be offered only if the need arose. She clarified:

I believe a mix of both is necessary. I believe we are all language teachers and we are all reading teachers, regardless of content, but given state requirements and the like, teaching an explicit grammar lesson would only be done if I felt students were struggling and needed clarification.

For the most part, however, she would avoid explicit grammar teaching. In her view, although it might help to remember rules, such an approach would keep students from speaking fluently, and it would drive the focus on the form rather than the message. Despite this perspective, the teacher believed in the benefits of showing students how two languages are structurally different. She assumed that addressing grammatical structures, not rules, helps students understand the structure of the new language. As Erika put it, “I think it was important to understand the grammar, grammatical structure that for example, verbs change depending on
each subject…. I do think it's important to discuss the grammatical structure, I don't think it's important to teach grammar explicitly.”

**Instructional Strategies**

Erika understood that knowledge about students’ language proficiency level is the key to providing effective instruction. In the first interview, she articulated her thoughts:

Well, I think, at the very beginning, before I even start teaching, I think I need to understand the level of my students. So I think it's important to understand the WIDA levels, I think it's important for, for me to understand what an ELL student can do at the level that they're at with, with, you know, the, their ability in the English language…. So I need to make sure that I provide the scaffolding for them to get there. And I need to know what level they're at in order for me to understand what I need to do to get them there. So I think that's the very first thing.

As indicated earlier, Erika believed that reading should be given priority in the DL classrooms. She valued three essential tools for her reading instruction: cognates, margin magnets, and sentence structures, in addition to other supports such as visuals and technology.

The teacher notably recognized the roles of cognates in assisting with reading comprehension given the lexical connection between the Spanish and English languages:

And then I think, because I believe reading is, is key, and to vocabulary and to, I think I'll give you a perfect example of what I have done in the past. The first thing I do is I introduce cognates. I introduce the idea of cognates, that 40% of the English language are Spanish cognates, or vice versa, you know, maybe even more.

Margin magnets are the tool for taking notes of key ideas within each paragraph as students go over a text. Erika described how the tool works and what its benefits are:

So they write it on the side of the paper. And by writing it on the side of the paper, they know several things, the first thing they know is that that's the paragraph that discusses this, whatever it is that they wrote down, right. The second thing is that it demonstrates comprehension of the paragraph. Because you were able to decipher what that paragraph discusses.
Sentence structures are pre-determined sentence headers for students to formulate their ideas. Erika would use this type of nonverbal support to help students summarize the key ideas they gathered through margin magnets and to scaffold the students towards speaking. She explained:

and then I would also give them sentence structures. So, they would be able to summarize using those sentence structures and those margin magnets. So, as they felt more comfortable…. And then eventually they will they gain the confidence that they don't need those sentence frames, and they just have conversations.

Getting students to work in pairs or groups, in which everyone has a clear task, was the strategy Erika considered useful for optimizing her reading instruction. As she stated, “I introduce what I called reading activities, triads, or depends on if they're in groups of four, or, and, or in pairs. And each person has a task in the reading, triad, reading, square, reading, whatever.” One instructional strategy the teacher would use to assess students’ understanding of the reading topic was role-playing, in which students acted out what they had read. She revealed:

Okay, so a lot of times, I do a lot of acting, so that they demonstrate the comprehension of a of a subject matter by acting it out. And so, I would place them in groups where they would have to depend on one another…. And, and they each have a task. So, they each have to come up with their part before they act it out.”

When it came to reading, Erika assumed that students should work with leveled readers because it would be easier for them to understand books or reading materials written with grammatical structure and words that suit their proficiency levels. In her view, “leveled readers would be fantastic per reader level.” Erika appeared to support the view that reading comprehension was possible without having to know the meaning of every single word within the text. In other words, the primary goal of reading was to get the general gist of the text, a belief that echoed her perspective about focusing on the message rather than on form.
To Erika, effective vocabulary learning should be integrated with reading activities and should apply the two principles. First, there should be no over-reliance on dictionaries. Although she admitted that a dictionary could be a helpful tool, Erika felt that students should not lookup for every single unknown word they encountered during reading. The reason was that such a practice would leave the impression to the students that not knowing every single word in a text would hinder reading comprehension. She reasoned:

I introduced the idea that that a dictionary is helpful, but that they don't have to look up every single word. Because immediately that becomes a fear of theirs, they will receive, even if it's a paragraph, I'm not looking up every single word. And so they give up, right?... it is important for me to ensure that my students realize that the dictionary is a tool, but their brain is really the most important tool that they have. And they carry that with them all the time.

The second principle is that students should be taught some vocabulary learning strategies. For instance, she would ask her students to keep a vocabulary notebook, where they write down keywords they encounter in the reading text. However, instead of simply learning the words and their definition, students were encouraged to predict the meaning of unknown words in the text and see if their prediction makes sense; if they do not think so, they could consult a dictionary. Erika believed this was a highly effective approach to promoting vocabulary learning and retention. As she asserted:

And that empowers them. But it also by writing it down and keeping that the dictionary that they have of words, it allows them to continue to, to use those words, and then eventually, they don't need to look up that word, or they don't get because it's become a part of their vocabulary

Additionally, Erika would utilize graphics not only to clarify word meaning but also introduce difficult concepts, for example, in her Social Studies class, where many English learners were unfamiliar with the topic of democratic society. She would accompany her
graphics with questions to elicit responses and provoke thinking from the students. The teacher described her strategy:

   So if they don't come from a democratic society, voting and a constitution and all that stuff means nothing to them, right? So I have to provide that reinforcement and provide that background knowledge for them before we even get to the point of reading. Right? So oftentimes, I will do pictures, and I will have them ask questions.

The Roles of Students’ Home Language and Culture

Erika held the belief that literacy in the home language plays a significant role in second language learning. A strong literacy in the home language enables the student to connect their prior knowledge of the topic and its presentation in the new language. For this reason, the teacher fully supported the maintenance and reinforcement of DL students’ native language literacy. As she remarked, “those ELL students would begin to make connections to the English language by studying their native language in more depth.” This perspective reflected her view about one of the primary goals of dual language education, i.e., maintaining and fostering home language literacy.

Erika advocated equal attention to student's native culture and the one associated with the new language. To this end, all school community members needed to be on the same wavelength as far as biculturalism is concerned. She believed failing to do so would seriously inhibit second language teaching and learning. The teacher presented her arguments:

   if you are in a school that does not embrace the idea of second language and dual language, and your unit is only the classroom that you have, that's going to be a problem because it needs to be embraced by a community. We are a village and I mean, it needs to be embraced by the parents, it needs to be embraced by the administration and needs to be embraced by the teachers, especially the teachers. So I mean, obviously, and that needs to be embraced by the students. And, and the community itself, if you don't have that, if they're not for this idea of creating this blended situation where we're learning English and Spanish, at the same pace, then that it's not it's not, it's gonna fail, it's gonna fail.
Classroom Practices

Erika shared three journals on Social Studies lessons for her sixth-grade students. The topics of lessons #1, #2, and #3 were: What caused the Boston Massacre, Sugar Act, and Causes of the Revolution, respectively. No specific information was provided about the dates the lessons were delivered. A summary of the lessons can be seen in Table 25.

Table 25
Summary of Erika’s Teaching Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Lesson #1</th>
<th>Lesson #2</th>
<th>Lesson #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus &amp; goal</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Writing</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students were able to give their opinions about the topic, predict and question the topic, and reflect on the events described in the reading text</td>
<td>Students were able to predict what the reading text is about</td>
<td>Students were able to predict the topic and answer essential questions specific to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Reading steps</td>
<td>Reading steps</td>
<td>Reading steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discuss relevant vocabulary</td>
<td>- Identify unknown words, predict the meaning, confirm with the dictionary</td>
<td>- Read parts of a text at different reading stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Read the text</td>
<td>- Locate key terms and main ideas</td>
<td>- Identify unknown words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Answer questions</td>
<td>- Wrote margin notes</td>
<td>- Take notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal supports</td>
<td>- Cognate words</td>
<td>- Create questions</td>
<td>- Summarize the paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roleplay and drama</td>
<td>- Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acting out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>The teacher modeled the activity using I do, We do, You do structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 support</td>
<td>Students were permitted to write in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Goals and Focus Areas

All the lessons predominantly focused on reading, with the objectives being not only to comprehend a text but also to critically react to its content. These focus areas and objectives were aligned with Erika’s stated beliefs regarding (1) the importance of concentrating on reading and writing for literacy development and (2) the need to teach critical reading skills. Specifically, lesson #1 integrated reading and speaking areas and was aimed at enabling students to understand the text as well as to question the topic, to opine on the issues addressed, and to reflect on the events described in the text. In lesson #2, students were encouraged to pose questions on what they read. In lesson #3, students predicted the topic and answered specific questions.

Classroom Instructional Strategies

Most of the strategies Erika believed to be effective for reading instruction were practiced in the three lessons she shared with the researcher. In lesson #1, students were supplied with cognates to help them grasp the meaning of the English words. Images were used to facilitate vocabulary learning. In addition to reading the text and answering questions, the teacher had students role-play a specific event described in the article they had just read. In the first interview, Erika indicated that drama and role-play were valuable means of checking students’ understanding of the topic.

In lesson #2, the students created margin magnets while engaging with the reading text. Margin note is a tool Erika considered effective for facilitating reading comprehension. The students were asked to predict the meaning of unknown words before looking up a dictionary, a strategy that resonated with Erika’s idea regarding minimal reliance on dictionaries when
reading. The students were allowed to use their native language to express their ideas, which she had indicated as a reasonable means for her to assess students’ understanding of the lesson.

In lesson #3, students worked in small groups and utilized margin magnets to gather each paragraph’s ideas. They were asked to take notes of new words and add them to their vocabulary list. Keeping a vocabulary notebook was the tool that Erika thought beneficial for remembering new words, and she had implemented this vocabulary learning strategy in this particular lesson.

**Elements of Students’ Home Language and Culture**

The researcher found no evidence to suggest the incorporation of any elements of students’ native culture and language in the three lessons that Erika shared.

**Factors Affecting Belief-Practice Relationships**

**Supporting Factors**

Erika pointed out two main external supports to her instruction in the DL classrooms. First, since there was no specific district standard for dual language instruction, she had the freedom to modify her lessons and create materials to meet her students’ needs. She explained:

So, that, that helped me in modifying lesson plans to meet the needs of all of my students. So, the theme was the same, the assignments were different based off of their levels, right. So that helped me group students together.

Second, Erika received various kinds of supports from her school. The principal trusted her capability in finding the best teaching strategies. As she stated, “I think being allowed to explore, I think my administration, saying to me, we trust you, we trust your quality of teaching.” Besides, her school had an instrument to identify students’ language proficiency level, which she had indicated as the key to providing effective instruction. She found the instrument, called
Elevation, extremely helpful because it did not only classify students according to levels but also suggest appropriate level-based texts and activities. She noted that:

that program was phenomenal. It's just, it breaks down your students, it breaks them down into their levels, and what they can do, and what they can't. And here are some ideas or suggestions, and even articles of what you could use.

External supports also came from other dual language teachers in the school, who would share ideas and resources for teaching dual language learners. The most significant support for Erika derived from an ESOL specialist whom she saw as the best resource. She described how she felt about this type of support:

“So that's why I said My ESOL specialist has been like a godsend because she gave me access to that across the whole school. She bought materials for me that were extremely helpful in the social studies classroom. She even hired me to tutor in the mornings. So I would tutor a lot of my dual language kids in English or in math, or whatever they needed help with.”

An important internal factor that facilitated Erika’s instruction in the DL classroom was her vast experiences as a former Spanish teacher. She revealed that it was during her time teaching Spanish, which was prior to her work in the DL setting, that she learned to design separate lessons for different levels of proficiency while maintaining the same theme and goals. Besides, Erika was a district coordinator of a program specially designed to help prepare underachieving students for college and university entrance. As the coordinator of the strategic program, she had the knowledge and skills for language instruction, which were later proved essential to her dual language teaching. The participant explained:

So I taught that and I was trained in that for many years. So, I was trained in reading strategies, and I was trained in writing strategies and note taking, etc. So, all of these things helped me kind of create the dual language classroom.
Hindering Factors

Erika saw the lack of adequate materials written in the Spanish language as the primary barrier to her second language instruction. In the second interview, she described how she felt about the issue:

So, I think one of the frustrating things for me is that there are no textbooks. So, I had to translate everything. And I had to create the materials, especially for Civics. Because when you're teaching World History, you can find textbooks from Chile, and you can find textbooks from Venezuela because it's world history. It is it, you know, it happened, no matter what. But when you're talking about civics and US history, it either comes from a company in the United States that will produce information that affects the United States, or it doesn't. And that has been my biggest frustration.

One notable impact of this limitation was that Erika could not implement her belief about providing students with leveled readers as the best material for promoting reading proficiency. As her teaching journals indicated, no such reading material was used – all students read texts with the same level of difficulty.

This constraint, however, also offered something positive for the teacher. In dealing with the constraint, Erika was often left with no option but to develop her own teaching materials, and she would seize the opportunity to her advantage. As the teacher revealed,

I actually, you know, for as much as I complain about the fact that there aren't materials in dual language like they're not good solid materials in middle school, especially, and in probably in high school that are in both English and Spanish, which meant that I had to kind of create my own or translate from here and there. It gave me the opportunity to create the lesson how I wanted to.

Table 26 is a summary of what Erika perceived as the supports and hindrances to the enactment of her beliefs about effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms.
Table 26
External and Internal Factors Influencing Erika’s Belief-Practice Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>External supports</th>
<th>School-level factors</th>
<th>Flexible lesson planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External supports</td>
<td>Flexible lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level factors</td>
<td>Administration support and trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available instruments to identify students' levels of language proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports from an ESOL specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports from other DL teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal supports</td>
<td>Teachers’ knowledge and experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences as a district coordinator of a developmental program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences teaching Spanish as a foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External hindrance</td>
<td>School-level factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of good materials in the target language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Erika considered two main goals of second language instruction in the dual language settings: (1) to develop biliteracy, and (2) to promote overall language proficiency. She believed that reading is the key to achieving these goals; therefore, reading skills should be emphasized. The teacher would also focus on fluency over accuracy. The teacher valued grammar teaching; however, she assumed that highlighting grammatical differences between the first and second languages was more beneficial for students than teaching grammar rules. Reading instruction, in her view, should be informed by knowledge of students’ linguistic competence in the target language and geared towards critical reading skills. Cognates, margin magnets, and sentence structures were among the effective tools for supporting reading instruction. Roleplay and drama were adequate for assessing students’ understanding of what they read. Erika understood that
strong literacy in the first language and equal attention to L1 and L2 cultures are pivotal to second language acquisition.

Evidence from the teacher’s teaching journals suggests that almost all her stated beliefs were enacted in the classrooms. First, all the three lessons had a strong focus on reading. Second, they aimed at building students’ comprehension as well as critical thinking skills. Also, specific teaching tools Erika considered effective, such as cognates, margin magnets, and visuals were utilized. Roleplay was performed, and the use of the native language was permitted, especially in writing. An incongruity between Erika’s belief and practice concerning the reading materials was notably evident. While the teacher espoused the use of leveled reading texts, which she believed would be more accessible to students with different levels of proficiency, the three lessons she reported only used one text for all students.

Erika identified several external and internal variables that had mediated her instructional practices. At the school level, supports included administration trust, flexibility in lesson planning, available instruments to assess students’ entry levels. Also facilitative were the supports she received from her colleagues and an ESOL specialist. Internal supporting factors were derived from her knowledge and experiences in second language instruction. The biggest challenge was present at the school level: the lack of suitable instructional materials for language teaching.

**Connecting Findings to the Research Question and Sub-questions**

**Patterns of Teachers’ Belief-Practice Relationships**

The study’s research question is: How are dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction related to their classroom instructional practices? Data analysis
showed strong relationships between the beliefs the study participants had about effective second language instruction and their self-reported practices in the DL classrooms. The most robust connections occurred in the general aspects of second language pedagogy, including teaching goals, focus areas, and the recognition of home and native culture. In terms of the specific aspect, i.e., instructional strategies, the degree of belief-practice associations varied. Overall, the current study's findings confirmed the notions of general and specific beliefs, with the former tending to be more consistent and the latter being contextually-driven (Fives & Buehl, 2012). School-level and classroom-context factors exerted the most significant influences on the participants’ belief-practice connections.

**Dual Language Teachers’ Beliefs**

The first sub-question of the study is: What were the beliefs of dual language teachers about effective second language instruction in dual language programs? The following sections present the answers to sub-question #1. Data were synthesized to determine commonalities and differences in the beliefs about the topic, particularly the four aspects under investigation (i.e., goals of language teaching, areas of focus, instructional strategies, and views of the roles of native language and culture). Common themes emerged on (1) language teaching goals, (2) focus areas, (3) strategies for teaching speaking, reading, and vocabulary, and (4) the roles of native language and culture. No sufficient data was available to comment on strategies for teaching writing, listening, and pronunciation.

**Goals: Developing Overall Language Proficiency, Emphasizing Speaking Abilities**

Most participants recognized the importance of overall proficiency in the target language; therefore, they believed that all language areas (i.e., reading, speaking, listening, and writing)
should be addressed in the DL classrooms. This perspective was not surprising given that one of the goals of dual language instruction is to help students achieve a full range of linguistic proficiency in both languages. Several participants, however, felt that speaking should take precedence. Andrea considered speaking as the most critical area to develop because she primarily worked with Spanish-speaking dual language learners who were newcomers to the country and had very little to no ability to speak English. Bertha shared the same view, underscoring the need to emphasize basic interpersonal communication skills because she noticed that her DL program had placed a much stronger focus on academic language proficiency. In Carmen’s case, while her students were generally proficient in reading and writing, they still lacked speaking proficiency.

Focuses: Speaking and Reading

When it came to focus area(s), a belief shared among these teachers was that second language instruction in the DL classrooms should concentrate on speaking and reading. While the idea to attend more to speaking was consistent with the prevalent belief regarding the primary goal of DL education, it was interesting to see that reading was recognized as well. Daniela saw reading as one of the weaker areas in her classes. Bertha and Erika believed in the critical roles of reading in developing vocabulary and, to some extent, pronunciation, both of which are essential for speaking. It appeared that these study participants acknowledged the significant contribution of reading lessons to the development of vocabulary knowledge and speaking proficiency.
Focuses: Fluency Over Accuracy, No Explicit Grammar Teaching

Most participants supported fluency over the accuracy, or gist over form, in second language instruction. Bertha, Daniela, and Andrea assumed that in the beginning, it was more important to attend to what students are trying to express than to whether they are using the correct form. In their view, students should be granted the opportunities to speak and write freely to a certain degree. Common grammatical issues can be addressed in isolated moments, for example, through mini-lessons. They believed this approach would build students’ confidence in learning the new language. Erika cautioned the harmful effect of accuracy-focused lessons on language learners’ motivation. Carmen, however, asserted that fluency and accuracy were important for speaking proficiency; therefore, both aspects need equal attention.

Unsurprisingly, the focus-on-fluency perspective influenced how these educators viewed errors, especially in speaking. Since they did not value direct correction to every single error, they would address specific issues only. Andrea would treat grammatical errors that might seriously change the meaning or might lead to misunderstanding. Bertha would do the same, and she would treat errors in contexts. Daniela and Erika would correct errors indirectly, for example, through a recasting technique. Carmen would apply the same technique so that her students would not feel penalized for making mistakes. It must be noted that while the focus-on-fluency approach described above was referred to speaking lessons, the accuracy aspect might be emphasized in other areas. For instance, Daniela would directly correct errors in writing.

An interesting finding related to the area of focus is the teachers’ perspective about grammar teaching. While most teachers did not espouse direct or explicit grammar teaching, Erika thought that, depending on the grade levels, both approaches were important. In her view, explicit grammar instruction could benefit older learners since they are cognitively ready to
grasp abstract grammar concepts. The teacher, however, made a distinction between teaching grammatical rules and showing grammatical differences. While she did not believe that the former approach would help students retain grammar rules, she held that teaching grammatical differences between the two languages would facilitate learning the second one. Andrea shared a similar view. Although grammar was not one of her focuses, she would highlight the structural differences in both languages and show her students that direct translation does not always work.

General Strategy: Understanding Students’ Proficiency Levels in Both Languages

Each participant mentioned several general strategies for improving the effectiveness of their second language instruction. Nonetheless, one commonality emerged: they all believed that understanding students’ proficiency level, not only in the new language but also in their native tongue, was the key to providing effective instruction. Andrea stated that by knowing her students’ literacy level in their first language, she could anticipate the amount of work to support them. She understood that the students with weaker L1 literacy would need increased attention and treatment. For Bertha, this type of knowledge is crucial to meeting their individual needs. Daniela and Erika would use this knowledge to create differentiated instruction that suits their students’ proficiency levels. Bertha found it necessary to have adequate knowledge of her students’ levels. If the school did not provide such information, she would conduct her self-developed formative assessment to obtain it.

Teaching Reading: Creating Interactive Tasks, Utilizing Nonverbal Supports, and Integrating with Other Areas

Three similar strategies for promoting reading proficiency were noted across the participants. First, they emphasized reading in groups or with peers. Carmen valued partner
reading activities where her students could feel comfortable interacting and communicating with each other. Bertha would group same-level students to allow her to address common issues, or she would have mixed-level groups where the stronger student(s) could assist their peers. Erika would maximize students’ interactions by assigning a specific task to each student in the group.

Second, most participants believed in the merits of nonverbal supports, such as anchor charts, graphics, online and digital resources, sentence structures, and margin notes, to scaffold reading comprehension. The third similarity was that reading should be integrated with other language areas, such as speaking, writing, vocabulary.

One notable difference was related to the focus of reading instruction as perceived by two participants. Bertha would first build foundational skills, such as phonemic awareness and understanding of sounds, which she saw as the pre-requisite for reading fluency. The teacher had this focus because her students’ reading literacy was so weak that they often had difficulty reading fluently. Erika, on the other hand, would aim for critical reading skills. She would get her students to predict, question, and evaluate what they read. Erika appeared to adhere to a meaning-oriented approach to reading comprehension, whereas Bertha seemed to adopt a decoding-oriented approach.

Teaching Speaking: Addressing both Social and Academic Language Proficiency, Providing Comprehensible Inputs, and Maximizing Interactions

Four out of the five participants indicated speaking as another area requiring extra attention in the DL classrooms. Although different strategies for effective speaking instruction were mentioned, two commonalities were identified. First, they all recognized both social interpersonal communication skills and academic language proficiency. Bertha noted that while
her students had learned much about academic language, they still lacked interpersonal communication skills. Andrea would emphasize social communication skills in the lower grades and academic language in the higher grades. To ensure that her students develop their social and academic language skills, Daniela would teach both conversational and presentation strategies.

The next similarity was related to the importance of providing maximum exposure to and opportunities to produce the target language. Daniela and Andrea would adjust her teacher talk by talking slowly, enunciating clearly, and using simple words. Also, Daniela would supply words, provide examples, and scaffold for speaking. Andrea would teach small conversations to her students in lower grades and engage those in the higher grade in more demanding activities such as debates and presentations. Carmen would encourage the use of the target language as much as possible in her classrooms. She would speak the language most of the time and have her students do a lot of oral activities.

Teaching Vocabulary: Using Cognates and Integrated Activities

Most participants recognized the crucial roles of vocabulary knowledge in second language learning. These teachers mentioned various strategies, but they shared at least two commonalities. First, they valued cognates for helping students make connections between the first and the second languages. Erika introduced cognates to her students to show how the two languages are more similar than different. Bertha indicated that cognates facilitate interlinguistic transfers of knowledge and skills. In Andrea’s perspective, cognates allow students to draw on knowledge from one language during instruction in the other. The second commonality was that these participants believed in the benefits of an integrated approach to teaching vocabulary. For
example, Carmen would incorporate vocabulary into reading and speaking, aimed to facilitate comprehension, and into speaking in order to assist with oral skills.

Two distinct strategies for teaching vocabulary were adopted by Erika. She believed that students should not be overly reliant on dictionaries during vocabulary learning. In her view, while dictionaries can be helpful, they can be confusing or even misleading if they only provide the meaning of word roots. Besides, Erika was the only participant who mentioned vocabulary learning strategies. She would ask her students to keep a vocabulary list or glossaries.

Utilizing a Variety of Verbal and Nonverbal Supports

All study participants valued the merits of various tools for supporting the second language development of dual language learners. Andrea mentioned total physical response, modeling, sentence frames, graphics, and online resources. Bertha used anchor charts, body motions, repetitions, and visuals. She would also give extra attention to lower-level students by placing them closer to her. Carmen emphasized visuals and digital devices. Daniela utilized sentence frames, sentence starters, total physical response, and visuals. While these educators might have other tools in their repertoire that they did not indicate during the interviews with the researcher, three types of accommodation stood out from data analysis: visuals, sentence frame/starter, and total physical response/body motions.

Native Language and Culture Have Essential Roles in Second Language Learning

All participants attached importance to dual language learners’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds. They held that high L1 literacy facilitates L2 learning. Bertha saw a strong literacy in the home language as an excellent foundation to acquire the second language more easily. Carmen believed that a strong base of the first language would carry on to their second.
Similarly, Daniela and Andrea understood that first language skills, especially reading, are transferrable to the second language. Erika pointed out that it was critical for dual language instruction to foster students’ home language literacy.

These participants also had the belief that embracing students’ home culture benefits their second language acquisition. Andrea understood that the recognition of home culture helps students feel connected. She noticed that her students felt more comfortable working with a teacher who shares the same cultural background, which positively impacted their attitudes towards learning the language. In Carmen’s view, maintaining students’ cultural identity is critical for developing their home language literacy, which is vital to second language learning. For Daniela and Bertha, culture means knowledge, which leads to the understanding of the information presented in the target language. Erika had a conviction that cultures associated with the first and second languages must be equally recognized not only in the classroom but also by the entire school community; otherwise, she believed that second language learning would fail.

Teachers’ Belief-Practice Relationships

The second sub-question of the present study is: To what extent were dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction convergent with their self-reported teaching practices? Overall, evidence from the participants’ teaching journals suggested a high degree of congruity between the reported practices and their espoused beliefs. The most robust connection was found concerning the teaching goals. It was evident that all participants aimed most of their lessons towards what they believed to be the primary goal(s) of second language instruction in the DL classrooms. Close belief-practice relationships were also discernible in the
areas of focus and use of nonverbal support. The participants’ stated beliefs about these aspects were confirmed in their reported lessons.

Andrea’s teaching journals suggested a high degree of congruity between what she practiced in the classroom and what she believed. Consistent with her beliefs, the teachers’ reported lessons aimed to develop vocabulary knowledge, and they were integrated with speaking skills. Andrea utilized several nonverbal supports she considered useful. To facilitate vocabulary learning, she used images, scaffolding, and modeling. To guide students’ talk, the teacher provided a model sentence. She also tapped into some cultural elements and allowed home language use (i.e., Spanish). What was not evident in the lessons was her belief about small groups as the safe place for students to interact with each other and the best place for her to address individual needs. Due to the COVID-19 situation, her students could not work in small groups.

Evidence from Bertha’s teaching journals indicated a high degree of congruity between her instructional practices and her stated beliefs. Four out of her five reading lessons integrated vocabulary learning, which reflected her belief that vocabulary was best learned through reading. Another belief-practice consistency was evident in her nonverbal support, including total physical response, visuals, modeling, and anchor chart with cognates and examples. There was no evidence from Bertha’s fifth journal to suggest that she addressed literacy foundational skills, such as phonemic awareness and sounds, which she felt essential for reading fluency. However, the absence of this component might be associated with the nature of the lesson itself.

It was clear from Carmen’s teaching journals that there was a reasonable degree of consistency between what she believed and what she performed in the DL classrooms. This consistency was evident, for example, in the use of an online resource to learn word
classifications in the first lesson. Integrated teaching was demonstrated: vocabulary learning was embedded into the reading lesson; reading and writing were incorporated into the speaking lesson. In these lessons, Carmen indicated the maximum use of the target language, and first-language support was offered only when necessary. The teacher directly corrected any grammar errors in her students’ written product, echoing her belief about the importance of fluency and accuracy. Her belief about the merits of peer interactions for language acquisition was not evident as the COVID-19 precautions limited her students’ opportunities to interact orally with each other.

Data from Daniela’s journals showed some consistencies between her beliefs and her practices. The teacher, for example, integrated two or more language areas (speaking, reading, and writing) into her reported lessons. This specific behavior lined up with her perspective regarding the need to address all areas while emphasizing oral abilities. In the lessons, vocabulary served as the foundation for speaking and writing activities. Also congruent with her stated beliefs was how she responded to errors. Instead of providing a direct correction, she decided to create a mini-lesson and to deal with the issues at an isolated moment. Sentence starters were predominately used as a tool for supporting the learners. Daniela’s belief in the importance of hands-on activities was not implemented in the reported lessons because interactions among students were severely limited by the COVID-19 situation.

An analysis of Erika’s teaching journals revealed that almost all her stated beliefs were enacted in the classrooms. Corresponding to her espoused beliefs, all the three lessons she journaled had a strong focus on reading. Besides, they aimed at building not only students’ reading comprehension but critical thinking skills as well. Specific teaching tools Erika considered useful (i.e., cognates, margin magnet, and visuals) were utilized and home language
support was offered, especially in writing. Her belief about the importance of using leveled readers, however, was not evident in all the lessons she journaled.

Factors Influencing Teachers’ Belief-Practice Relationships

The last sub-question of this study is: What factors influenced the relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practices pertaining to effective second language instruction? Data analysis revealed that various external and internal factors at the district, school, and classroom levels had impacted the participants’ belief-practice connections in the DL classrooms. The majority of supports and hindrances occurred at the school and classroom levels. These findings suggest that both school and classroom factors exert the most significant influences, positively and negatively, on the teachers’ belief-practice relationships regarding second language instruction.

Supports

The participants routinely cited school-level and classroom-context variables as crucial to activating their beliefs about effective instruction for language development in the DL classrooms. At the school level, the most critical factor was the school administration's support. Three participants associated their successful instruction with a considerable degree of flexibility their school granted in adjusting their instruction. For example, Bertha and Erika were afforded a high degree of freedom by their administration to modify lessons and create materials to meet their students’ needs. Carmen enjoyed the same support, which had allowed her to select poetry as her primary teaching materials. Other essential affordances from school include (1) access to instructional materials, digital resources materials, and online platforms, (2) supportive school community, (3) assistance from other dual language educators, (4) well-balanced students
demographic composition, (5) available instrument to assess students’ language proficiency level, (6) access to updated information about DL education, (7) opportunities for professional development, and (9) connections with experts in second language education.

At the classroom level, student variables appeared to be the critical type of support. Andrea cited her students’ good motivation as the primary supporting factor for her instruction. Instrumental to Daniela’s successful lessons was the availability of students who could act as language models to their peers. In this kind of environment, her students could learn the target language from their native-speaking partners, which she saw as an excellent strategy for fostering their language acquisition.

Internal supports, or those stemming from within the teachers themself, were indicated by one participant. For Erika, her knowledge and experiences in language education significantly facilitated her instruction in the DL classrooms. Before serving in the DL program, she had taught Spanish as a foreign language for many years. Also, she had been the district coordinator of a program aimed at helping high school students from underrepresented populations to succeed academically and gain access to higher education. These experiences had provided her with useful knowledge and skills for her DL instruction. For example, she became well-versed in creating differentiated instruction while maintaining the same theme and focus of the lesson.

**Hindrances**

Analysis of data discovered several external hindrances at the district, school, and classroom levels. Two hindering factors associated with the district were found. The first one was the time constraint. Bertha felt that the curriculum standard for dual language instruction that her school must meet is way too much to cover within the allotted period. Another factor
was associated with the district policy regarding incoming students to magnet schools. Bertha lamented that due to the policy, her school has no control over the number of new students to enroll in their DL program. As a result, a desirable composition of English- and Spanish-speaking learners in the classrooms is yet to be achieved. At the school level, the most prevalent concern was to do with instructional materials. Bertha bemoaned that not only were resources and materials in the Spanish language very limited, but also the existing teaching materials were non-standard. Carmen found it extremely difficult to find suitable materials for her Spanish learners. Andrea complained about district-mandated reading materials that were relatively inaccessible to her students due to the lack of visual elements in the texts.

At the classroom level, significant challenges to second language instruction appeared to be associated with (1) students’ reluctance to talk, as indicated by two teachers, (2) student’s lack of focus on the lesson, as suggested by two participants, and (3) students’ lack of motivation, as pointed out by one teacher. Two internal hindrances were suggested by Bertha. She admitted that her instruction in the dual language classroom was often constrained by her limited knowledge about teaching tools and her lack of understanding of students’ proficiency levels. It must be noted that the latter factor might also derive from the school level, that is, lack of information about students’ proficiency levels in the home and target languages.

Finally, some impacts of the COVID-19 crisis were palpable throughout the teachers’ practices. A discernable belief-practice incongruence was observed in how teachers managed their students’ interactions. Since students were only allowed to interact with peers from a safe distance, most teachers were unable to have students work in small groups, which they considered as an effective way to maximize students’ interaction as well as to aid individual students. Carmen felt that given the pandemic, there was a lack of opportunity for her students to
interact orally with their peers, and she saw this as a severe threat to language acquisition. An added obstacle to her, as well as to Daniela, was that they had no opportunity to engage students with hands-on activities, which both teachers highly valued. In Bertha’s case, as a result of her school transitioning to remote teaching and learning, she had to work with new students whom she had little to no knowledge about in terms of their current levels of proficiency in the two languages. Lack of such essential knowledge presented a big challenge for Bertha to provide differentiated instruction. Another issue for Carmen was that since most students were learning remotely from home, ensuring that her students kept their attention to the lessons was not an easy task.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Analyzing data about dual language teachers’ belief-practice relationships regarding effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms allowed the researcher to understand the three main topics under investigation. First, the researcher was able to make inferences about the most prevalent beliefs among the participants. Additionally, the study's findings offered insight into the extent to which the participants’ stated beliefs were convergent with their reported classroom practices. Finally, analysis of the data identified significant variables, both internal and external, that might be influencing the teachers’ belief-practice connections, especially within the context of dual language instruction. The setting for data analysis in this study was elementary and middle school campuses that implemented the dual language approach of bilingual education. Therefore, to contextualize the study, the discussion begins with an overview of the characteristics of the DL model of education, with an emphasis on the specific issues concerning second language teaching and learning.

Dual Language Programs and the Roles of Second Language Instruction

A model of bilingual education, dual language instruction exhibits one distinctive characteristic, that is, it adopts an additive approach to instruction (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Unlike other models, DL programs recognize students’ home language and culture as a resource rather than a deficit, seeking to add a second language and culture to the students’ repertoire (Mora et al., 2001). In other words, the unique characteristic of dual language programs is their
attention to both the language minority and majority populations, and such an approach is believed to be the key to meeting the challenging goals of DL education (Ray, 2009).

A premise of dual language instruction is that bilingualism fosters cognitive processing skills (e.g., Krashen, 1991; Smith & Arnot-Hopffer, 1998), which lead to higher academic achievement (e.g., Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). Central to these processes is the teaching and learning of both the minority and majority languages. As Ray puts it, “DL programs support increased academic achievement for both ELLs and native English-speaking children by developing the learners’ thinking processes through pedagogically sound second language learning strategies.” (Ray, 2009, p. 113). Many variables at the societal and teachers’ levels influence instruction in dual language classrooms (Freeman et al., 2005). At the teacher’s level, their thoughts and beliefs about various aspects of DL education can profoundly shape their instructional behaviors (Ray, 2008). The following section addresses specific issues associated with second language instruction in the DL contexts. Then, the findings of the study are discussed and contextualized within these issues.

Second Language Teaching and Learning in the Dual Language Classrooms

Although dual language education has the goal of developing proficiency in two languages, “the second language is not taught as a subject. Rather, it is used as a medium of instruction in an educational setting” (Christian, 2011, p. 3). Thus, dual language teachers offer instruction for subject matter content, such as sciences and social studies, in the target language. Students are expected to learn the new language primarily through their engagement with content areas. In principle, second language teaching and learning serves to attain the goal of bilingualism and biliteracy. In practice, dual language instruction adheres to local curriculum
standards, with two curricular adjustments: (1) language objectives are incorporated into curriculum planning; (2) two languages of instruction are used to deliver the curriculum (Christian, 2011). DL teachers serve in either the minority language side (e.g., Spanish), the majority language side (e.g., English), or both. The designation of language sides, however, only indicates the language being used for instruction in the classrooms, not the specific language to be learned on their own.

Christian (2011) notes that such an approach to second language teaching and learning has two critical implications. First, instruction is always oriented towards the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence. Second, language teaching is integrated with content instruction. In this respect, DL teachers must ensure that students receive sufficient and appropriate support to access the content knowledge that is delivered in the new language. According to Christian, instrumental to learning the second language are quality input, ample opportunities for students’ interactions and outputs, and attention to individual needs.

The integration of content instruction and language teaching has given rise to at least two issues that are unique to dual language education. The first is related to the use of language in the classrooms. Some authors support the idea of separating language of instruction, i.e., using one language only in a dual language class, on the grounds that sustained periods of immersion in the language promote language development (Howard et al., 2018). In this vein, the use of the target language among students should be encouraged, and the other language must be discouraged (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). In contrast, others have indicated the benefits of some mixing (code-switching), or also known as translanguaging (García et al., 2017; García & Wei, 2014; Lewis et al., 2012). The argument is that code-mixing is not only more socio-linguistically authentic
but also more beneficial for students' bilingual development and their learning efficacy (Jiang et al., 2014).

The second issue concerns the place of form-focused instruction. Dual language educators tend to eschew explicit second language instruction, assuming that learners will be able to pick up the second language naturally as they learn the subjects through the language (Howard et al., 2018). Researchers (e.g., Harley, 1998; Tedick & Young, 2016), however, have found that such an approach might not lead to a native-like fluency and grammar ability, especially on the part of the minority language speakers. Therefore, several authors (e.g., Larsen-Freeman & Tedick, 2016; Lyster, 2011; Lyster & Mori, 2008) have advocated for more formal language instruction in the DL classrooms.

Discussion

Language proficiency is the key to performing academically in the DL programs (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). Research suggests that attaining high levels of oral proficiency in the target language requires a long-term commitment in DL programs (Genesee, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2003; Lindholm-Leary & Ferrante, 2005). Given the non-existence of a specific language subject in DL education, teachers are expected to deliver language and content areas concomitantly (Christian, 2011). However, DL teachers often struggle to balance these two areas (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fortune et al., 2008). The present study offers an insight into how DL teachers work to address the language components of dual language instruction amidst the pressure of meeting the three-pronged goals of DL education.
The Participants’ Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction

Findings of the study showed that the participants tended to hold that the primary goal of second language instruction in the DL classrooms is to develop overall language proficiency, with a focus on speaking competence. Additionally, they had the conviction that instruction should (1) concentrate more on the speaking and reading areas, (2) attend to fluency over accuracy, and (3) provide no explicit grammar teaching. Generally, these beliefs resonate with the communicative language teaching approach, which emphasizes productive language skills, attends to meaning over form, and views errors as a learning step (Farrell & Jacobs, 2020). In other words, the DL teachers in this study tend to align themselves with an approach to second language teaching that was popular at the time of the study. Similar tendencies have been discovered by studies involving second language teachers in the non-DL settings (e.g., Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Johnson, 1992, 1994; Kissau et al., 2012).

When situating the findings within the DL context, one would notice that the teachers’ perspectives also aligned with some features of effective instruction in dual language programs as outlined Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education by Howard and colleagues (2018). These authors write that DL programs should give special attention to oral and literacy skills; the former can be promoted by offering structured and unstructured opportunities for students to produce the target language and the latter through the teaching of reading skills. As the study’s Chapter 4 indicates, although all participants valued the four language skills, they saw the need to prioritize speaking and reading. The following sections elucidate these two areas.
Teaching Speaking: Approaches and Strategies

There was a variety of reasons as to why the study’s participants considered speaking as the most critical language area to develop in the dual language classrooms. For Andrea, it was simply because she mainly worked with Spanish-speaking dual language learners who were newcomers to the U.S., and their English speaking abilities were extremely low. As a result, these elementary school students had a hard time not only understanding the lesson but also interacting with their peers. Another teacher, i.e., Bertha, felt that a much stronger focus on academic language proficiency in the DL program had rendered a lack of basic interpersonal communication skills among her Spanish-speaking learners. Carmen noted that despite being quite proficient in reading and writing, her middle school students still had limited Spanish-speaking abilities. In Daniela’s view, there has been a lack of proper attention to speaking and listening in the DL program; consequently, dual language learners were generally deficient in these areas. Thus, the classroom's immediate context seemed to play a significant role in forming the teachers’ specific beliefs about this aspect of second language instruction.

That lack of dual language students’ oral abilities had caused great concern to the participants in this study might be understandable. Dual language learners would begin their DL schooling at different stages of bilingualism: some are fully proficient in the two or more languages; some are proficient in one language only; some were limited in both languages (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Murphy, 2014; Santos & Ostrosky, 2002). DL educators may have to serve students with limited knowledge and skills in the target language. However, the concern about students’ low speaking abilities was expressed not only by the participants who worked at elementary schools (i.e., Andrea, Bertha, Daniela) but also by the teacher who instructed in a middle school (i.e., Carmen). As Carmen explained, although her middle school
students had participated in the dual language program in their elementary school and were generally proficient in reading and writing in the Spanish language, their speaking skills were less advanced. In other words, lack of oral proficiency may occur not only to students who just begin their dual language education at elementary school. It may also be an issue with those in secondary levels who had participated in a dual language program in their previous schooling.

The situations all these teachers reported confirm what past research has documented regarding the long-term impact of DL programs on students’ oral proficiency in the minority language. It has been reported that it took six to eight years of participation in two-way bilingual programs for English-speaking dual-language learners to be highly functional in various classroom and social exchanges in the Spanish language (Lindholm-Leary, 2003; Lindholm-Leary & Ferrante, 2005). An early immersion study on the English-French immersion program even suggested that students might need ten or more years’ participation in the program before they could achieve native-like proficiency in terms of grammar and vocabulary, as well as pragmatic competence, in the French language (Genesee, 2004).

The participants in this study spoke about a variety of classroom activities they considered effective for promoting students’ speaking competence. Examples include conversations, oral presentations, and one-on-one interviews, which would be integrated into the content area along with other language areas, especially reading, writing, and vocabulary. The participants’ approaches would vary depending on the grade level. Despite the variations, one commonality was noted: there was a shared belief in the necessity of maximum oral exposure to the target language. Language input has been cited as one of the vital elements of DL instruction especially given the fact that dual language learners are young children who are at their early stages of second language acquisition (Howard et al., 2018). Hence, the belief the participants
hold regarding the critical roles of oral exposure to the second language seemed to line up with the principles of effective dual language instruction as posited by Howard et al. (2018).

It must be noted that teachers’ language input might not be sufficient unless the input is comprehensible to the students (Krashen, 1992). Larsen-Freeman and Tedick (2016) have suggested several strategies to make teachers’ language input in the second language comprehensible. First, teachers should adjust their talk, using slow speech and simple words and ensuring that students can reference the content of the talk to the immediate context. Second, the input should be accompanied by nonverbal supports, such as gestures and body motion. Next, teachers should keep on checking students’ understanding of the input. Finally, scaffolding should be provided to assist with interpretation. In other words, oral exposure to the target language is likely to lead to language acquisition if (1) verbal support is provided in the form of adjusted talk, (2) nonverbal supports and scaffolding are offered to aid comprehension. Some participants in this study seemed to be aware of this issue since adjusted talk and nonverbal supports (especially visuals, gestures, and body motions) were routinely mentioned as valuable tools and strategies.

Teaching Reading and Vocabulary: Approaches and Strategies

Reading was the other language skill the participants highly regarded. The most frequently cited reason was that reading facilitates vocabulary development, and it acts as a springboard for speaking and writing activities. Since the second language is not instructed as a separate subject in dual language programs (Christian, 2011), one should assume that the reading skills are not taught in isolation; instead, they are incorporated into content areas. Such incorporation was evident in the participants’ teaching journals. Whenever reading activities
were reported, the reading materials and questions were all about the topics related to the academic subject matter being taught. Therefore, in addition to speaking, reading was understandably seen as the most critical area to develop in DL programs. As one participant asserted, dual language students with poor reading abilities have considerable difficulty acquiring the content knowledge.

The participants’ special attention to reading reflects the centrality of this language area in the DL classrooms. A similar phenomenon has been found in the non-DL settings. Teaching component skills of reading to English language learners in U.S. schools has been considered the key to developing literacy in the second language (August et al., 2014). In their review of past studies on the topic, August and colleagues identified several general and specific strategies proven effective for teaching reading skills and vocabulary to second language learners. General strategies for fostering these areas include (1) differentiated instruction to cater to different proficiency levels, (2) varied and repeated learning activities, (3) frequent practices and reviews, and (4) utilization of first language support.

The findings of the present study showed that at least two of these ideas were shared by most of the participants. First, they saw the necessity of differentiated instruction. Andrea, for instance, held that such an approach allows her to reach all levels of proficiency and to accommodate different learning styles. Bertha and Carmen considered it essential to meet their needs of individual students and to provide better support for each learner. August et al. (2014) have shown that effective instructional differentiation is built on first language proficiency and literacy. It also considers individual differences in terms of proficiency levels in the target language, needs, learning ability, and learning rates. These characteristics were reflected in the participants’ beliefs about effective instruction for reading and vocabulary.
Second, all participants fully recognized the roles of DL students’ first language in their learning of the target language. As data have shown, some participants in the current study appeared to be embracing several ideas for effective use of the students’ native languages that past researchers have suggested. For example, teachers could utilize bilingual resources (e.g., dictionaries and glossaries), cognate knowledge, and reading text written in students’ first language (August et al., 2014). In addition to utilizing bilingual dictionaries, Andrea allowed her students to use their home language in writing, not only to serve as L1 support but also for the teacher to gauge students’ L1 proficiency level. Other participants routinely cited cognates as the tool to help students make connections between their first and the second languages. Erika, for instance, introduced cognates to highlight the similarities between the two languages. Bertha believed that specific knowledge and skills in the native language were carried over to the second language through cognates.

August et al. (2014) also identify specific strategies for teaching reading and vocabulary. For reading, these include (1) explicit instruction to each of the component skills (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension), (2) varied and repeated reading activities, and (3) a combination of decoding-oriented and meaning-oriented approaches (August et al., 2014). Effective vocabulary teaching and learning is characterized by explicit instruction that addresses difficult words, the use of nonverbal supports (e.g., visuals, physical motions), and the teaching of vocabulary learning strategies. Although these strategies were discovered in studies involving English learners, August et al. (2014) assume that they also apply to other languages. Hence, Howard et al. (2018) strongly support their implementation in the DL classrooms. Interestingly, most of the strategies described above were cited by this study’s participants, as subsequently explained.
While the participants had varied beliefs on what constitutes adequate instruction for reading and vocabulary, their views were generally aligned with what August et al. (2014) have recommended. The participants commonly held that: (1) visuals and body motions are highly effective nonverbal supports, and (2) reading should be incorporated with other language areas. Then, when it came to specific instructional strategies, different ideas were expressed. Bertha would focus on phonemic awareness and sound, which she saw as the foundational skills required to read fluently. Daniela would mirror the strategies parents usually use to develop their young children’s literacy in the first language. Erika would aim for critical reading skills by encouraging students to predict, question, and evaluate what they read. Carmen would challenge her students to think by posing questions throughout the reading process. Thus, there was a dual language teacher who seemed to adopt decoding-oriented approaches, such as Bertha. Some appeared to be taking meaning-oriented approaches, including Erika and Carmen. Of course, each teacher in this study has their rationale for selecting the focus and strategies for their instruction. Notwithstanding the reasons, their perspective of reading and vocabulary instruction in the DL classrooms was generally compatible with what has been suggested as the best practices in these language areas (Howard et al., 2018).

**Perspectives on Grammar Instruction**

Another belief held by most participants was that grammar was not one of their focuses and that they would address grammar issues only when necessary. Past studies (e.g., Larsen-Freeman & Tedick, 2016; Lyster & Mori, 2008; Met, 2008; Tabors, 2008) have suggested that DL instructors tended not to give a particular focus on the target language itself, assuming that second language acquisition would occur naturally as an outcome of content instruction.
According to Howard et al. (2018), such assumptions were inaccurate, citing evidence that shows the lack of grammar accuracy of dual language learners. Therefore, Howard and colleagues see the importance of formal grammar instruction in the DL language classrooms. The integration of more direct, explicit language instruction in immersion programs has been advocated by several researchers (Cloud et al., 2000; Day & Shapson, 1990; Genesee, 2008; Lyster & Mori, 2008; Norris & Ortega, 2000). It was, however, cautioned that such a proposal does not mean a return to traditional approaches to grammar teaching that rely heavily on translation and memorization (Howard et al., 2018).

It is important to stress that when the participants in the present study expressed their view about no-grammar-focus in the DL classrooms, they were specifically referring to how to respond to grammatical errors during oral activities. In this case, the participants believed that direct correction to errors would be harmful to students’ confidence and undermine their willingness to speak in the target language. Nevertheless, they still considered the need to address any grammatical issues that interfered with understanding, albeit they would do it in different moments and to struggling students only, usually through mini-lessons. In other words, to these participants, it was not a question of to teach or not teach grammar – it was about what should be addressed, how to address it, and when to address it. While they did not support explicit grammar instruction, to some extent, they recognized the place of grammar in their lesson. Some saw the merits of highlighting grammar structures but not grammar rules. It was believed that addressing grammatical structures helps students see how the first and the second languages are structurally similar or different. In turn, the students can develop a better understanding of the structure of the new language. This particular perspective corresponds with
the idea of teaching metalanguage skills to help DL students understand how language functions (Howard et al., 2018).

The call for a more direct, explicit language instruction in dual language programs is well-grounded on the research that shows a lack of students’ native-like fluency and grammar ability due to minimal to no formal language instruction. Given that dual language programs do not offer a specific language subject (Christian, 2011), it is not feasible to dedicate a considerable amount of class time to formal language instruction. For this reason, several ideas for embedding explicit language teaching into content instruction have been advanced. For instance, Cloud et al. (2000) suggest that teachers create lesson plans that have (1) a non-language focus and (2) a language focus, with the former concentrating on academic content and the latter addressing language-specific issues. In this case, the subject matter area serves to provide a meaningful context for the teaching of specific linguistic items, for example, grammar points (e.g., the tenses, the prepositions, the adverbs) in the reading texts. Lyster and Mori (2008) recommend that teachers choose the right moment during meaning-oriented classroom activities to direct students’ attention to problematic language forms. A strategy recommended by Howard et al. (2018) is that teachers identify the most problematic linguistic items for dual language learners and then integrate and explicitly address them during the teaching of the content area.

How dual language teachers would implement these strategies and whether dual language teachers would find these proposals helpful are important questions yet to be explored. One thing, nonetheless, is quite sure from the data of the present study: the dual language teachers seem open to embracing the idea of grammar instruction, which is a positive sign. What should be noted is that this idea entails the need to equally address language teaching and content instruction. Unfortunately, many bilingual educators have difficulty maintaining such a balanced
approach in the classrooms (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fortune et al., 2008). Thus, the next intriguing question is if dual language teachers were willing to attend more to grammatical accuracy, how could they do it in the most effective ways that can be seamlessly incorporated into content instruction?

Native Language and Culture Have Essential Roles in Second Language Learning

The study’s participants fully recognized the vital roles of dual language learners’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds in second language learning. They held that L1 literacy influences L2 learning; thus, high literacy in the home language lays a strong foundation for second language acquisition. The participants understood that first language skills, especially reading, are transferrable to the second language. This view corresponded with how researchers on bilingual education consider the relationships between L1 and L2 literacies. Cummins (1980), for example, has explained that there are significant correlations between L1 and L2 reading abilities, especially the linguistic proficiency, conceptual understanding, and learning strategies, as well as other literacy aspects, such as phonemic awareness.

The participants also had the belief that tapping into students’ home culture benefits their second language acquisition because (1) it helps students feel connected, and (2) it facilitates understanding of the information presented in the other language. One teacher asserted that equal attention to the cultures associated with the first and second languages by the entire school community is critical to second language learning. Recognizing home language and culture in the classrooms has been seen as the vital element to achieving the goal of sociocultural competence (Sleeter, 2016). It is also instrumental to “the development of competency in English, student retention, academic success, and readiness for college and/or careers for all
students” (Murphy, 2014, p. 191). Clearly, the views that the study’s participants had about the roles of student’s home language and culture perfectly aligned with how these topics are understood in dual language education. It is also obvious from these findings that the participants substantiated the importance of students’ linguistic and cultural elements in their second language development.

The Teachers’ General and Specific Beliefs

While each participant had distinctive beliefs about the topics under examination, it was possible to determine some patterns of beliefs in terms of their levels of specificity. According to Five and Buehl (2012), there are general beliefs that are context-independent, and there are specific beliefs that tend to be more contextually-driven. In the present study, the general belief appeared to be the importance of addressing all language areas in the DL classrooms. The need to focus on one or more area(s) was the specific belief that was influenced by the classroom context, which might be unique from teacher to teacher. Another general belief is related to the critical role of maximum exposure to the target language and opportunities for practice using it. However, diverse ideas existed regarding how to provide exposure and opportunities in the classrooms. These ideas could be construed as specific beliefs since they appeared to be shaped by the contextual situations, such as grade levels, students’ proficiency levels, and the demographic composition of dual language students. The next general belief was that vocabulary is the key to developing language skills; therefore, it should be incorporated into the teaching of the four language areas. The different ideas for how to go about doing it constitute the specific beliefs, which were again associated with the contexts.
What was interesting to note was the participants’ views of grammar instruction. Some teachers had a conviction for not focusing on grammar. For example, Andrea explicitly stated that “I do not focus on grammar.” Bertha remarked that “I don't know that teaching grammar in isolation was very successful.” Carmen did not see the merits of the traditional approaches to grammar that rely on drills and memorization. To Erika, however, it was necessary to employ both direct and indirect approaches to grammar instruction. These beliefs could be understood as a general belief because they tended to be firmly held irrespective of grade levels, language areas being emphasized, content area, or students’ proficiency levels. On the other hand, in Daniela’s view, whether or not grammar is addressed directly depends on the learners’ age. Thus, this teacher’s perspective about explicit grammar instruction is contextually dependent; therefore, it could be regarded as a context-specific belief.

A larger context is also critical to the adoption and activation of certain beliefs (Buehl & Beck, 2015). All teachers in the present study articulated the importance of developing a solid foundation in students’ home language and tapping into their home culture. The fact that DL education has the goals of biliteracy, bilingualism, and multiculturalism might account for the participants’ strong beliefs about this topic. A similar finding has been revealed in a study by Zúñiga (2016) in which DL teachers expressed their support for language-as-resource ideology. In contrast, educators in the non-immersion settings tended to consider ELLs’ home language as a liability to their learning of the target language (Escamilla, 2006; Rodriguez et al., 2010).

It should be underlined, however, that working in a DL program does not necessarily lead to a positive perception of students’ home language and culture. Garrity and Guerra (2015) studied two DL teachers and found that one of them did not believe in the merits of a bilingual approach to classroom language use, and such belief was grounded on the larger socio-cultural
context. Thus, it was possible that in the present study, the teachers’ beliefs regarding students’ home language and culture were rooted in their personal and social life experiences beyond the school context. Insufficient data about this issue did not allow the researcher to further explore this topic.

The Participants’ Belief-Practice Relationships

In this research study, the participants’ beliefs were compared to their self-reported classroom practices documented in their teaching journals. Additional information about the teachers’ practices was gained from relevant instructional materials (such as lesson plans, reading texts, worksheets, handouts, graphic organizers) that they chose to share with the researcher. Results of analysis suggested that many participants’ professed beliefs tended to converge with their practices. The most robust connection was found regarding the goals of second language instruction. A high degree of belief-practice relationships was also observed in terms of focus areas and the use of nonverbal supports. When it came to specific instructional strategies, a few incongruities were discovered. For instance, many teachers did not implement their beliefs about effective ways to manage students’ interactions. One teacher did not use the type of reading materials she considered excellent for language development. Of course, such a discrepancy might have been related to the nature of the lessons documented in the teachers’ journals, especially if the lessons did not require the utilization of some specific teaching strategies and tools the teachers considered useful.

Fives and Buehl (2012) have cautioned that some incongruities are likely to emerge in qualitative studies that meticulously scrutinize teachers’ beliefs and practices but observe the practices on one or two occasions only. In such cases, the beliefs may not be (fully) implemented
due to the factors associated with contexts, the function of the beliefs, the firmness of the beliefs, and contradictions with other beliefs. It is also possible that what the teachers articulated was either not their true belief or not possible to be implemented in the contexts where the observations are conducted. These researchers point out that “With respect to the strength of the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices, …. there was never a perfect correspondence between beliefs and practices, nor a complete lack of relationship” (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 71).

Tables 27 and 28 offer two matrices of the participants’ beliefs about the primary goals and focus areas, respectively, and the extent to which they were evident in the reported journals. As can be seen from Table 27, by and large, the specific goal(s) that was/were indicated by the participants were to some degree consistent with their teaching practices. Three teachers (i.e., Andrea, Daniela, Erika) seemed to act upon their beliefs about teaching goals in all the lessons they shared with the researcher. Bertha’s beliefs regarding the topic were only evident in one of the five lessons, while Carmen’s beliefs were enacted in one of the three lessons she journaled.

Table 27

Summary of the Participants’ Beliefs and Practice Regarding the Goals of Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Beliefs about teaching goal</th>
<th>Implemented in lesson #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Develop speaking proficiency</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop vocabulary knowledge</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency with an emphasis on speaking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency with an emphasis on speaking</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Beliefs about teaching goal</td>
<td>Implemented in lesson #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Develop overall L2 proficiency with an emphasis on reading and writing</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ = the belief was evident in the lesson; ✗ = the belief was not evident in the lesson

As can be seen, there was a tendency that the teachers in the current study aligned their objectives for teaching language in the DL classrooms with their convictions about the primary goals of second language instruction. Although most teachers saw the need to address all language areas, they suggested speaking and reading as the critical areas to develop. In other words, these two language areas were considered instrumental to DL students’ performance in the classrooms. At this point, the framing function of teachers’ beliefs (Fives & Buehl, 2012) was at work, and a specific immediate classroom context might played its role in shaping the beliefs. For instance, Andrea believed that lack of oral skills would pose the most significant challenge for students to participate in her classes. The belief seemed to stem from her observation of dual language Spanish-speaking English learners who just arrived in the U.S. and had very limited to no ability to communicate in the English language. Bertha’s belief about developing students’ basic oral competence might be shaped by her noticing such deficiency among her students. She attributed this situation to the lack of interpersonal communication skills accorded by the DL program in her school. Carmen noticed the unbalanced skills demonstrated by her students, with them being proficient in reading and writing but lacking in speaking.

Erika’s belief about the need to aim for reading and writing development did not seem to be influenced by the immediate classroom reality. Instead, it appeared to be formed by her understanding of the pivotal roles of reading and writing in achieving one of the primary
purposes of dual language education (i.e., biliteracy). Researchers have shown that teacher beliefs about educating second language learners might differ depending on the teachers’ prior experiences working with this type of learners (García-Nevarez, Stafford, & Arias, 2005; Torres & Tackett, 2016). Erika was the second most experienced teacher in this study, with nineteen years of teaching experience, and it could be that her vast experiences in the field played a role in her viewing her language instruction from a broader perspective of DL education.

In terms of focus areas, it was discernable from Table 28 that, in general, the teachers embedded their content instruction with specific language areas that they considered essential to focus on. Andrea submitted her journals about two lessons: all contained speaking and vocabulary activities, and one included pronunciation. Erika emphasized reading in all the five lessons, and Bertha did it in three of her five lessons. Of the three lessons that Daniela shared, writing skills were incorporated into all the lessons, whereas speaking and reading were on two occasions. Carmen was the only teacher whose espoused focus area (i.e., speaking) was not evident in most of her lessons.

Table 28
Summary of the Participants’ Beliefs and Practice Regarding Focus Areas of Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Implemented in lesson #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Focus areas</td>
<td>Implemented in lesson #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ = the belief was evident in the lesson; ✗ = the belief was not evident in the lesson

It can be inferred that in most cases the teachers’ views about focus areas appeared to converge with their beliefs regarding the primary goals of second language instruction in the DL classrooms, suggesting some similar variables being at work in framing the beliefs about these two topics. Such convergence was the case with Andrea, who saw speaking and vocabulary as the most critical areas to concentrate; Carmen, who recognized speaking; Daniela, who suggested three language areas; and Erika, who would emphasize reading. Bertha was the only one who believed in promoting one language area (i.e., speaking) but saw the need to focus on another area (i.e., reading). Nevertheless, this did not necessarily imply a disconnection. Bertha felt her students’ struggling with speaking was owing to their limited vocabulary, and she believed that reading is an excellent means to learn new words in the target language.

Fives and Buehl (2012) explain that teachers’ beliefs may function as: “(a) filters for interpretation, (b) frames for defining problems, and (c) guides or standards for action” (p. 478). Thus, once the dual language teachers’ beliefs had framed their perception of the goals and focused areas in second language instruction, the third function of beliefs would determine whether or not the beliefs are to be enacted. Enacting espoused beliefs is probably the most challenging task for most dual language teachers. Second language teachers working in dedicated language classes would be able to design language-oriented lessons that reflect their beliefs. In the DL settings, teachers do not seem to have that luxury. Since a specific second language subject is non-existent in the DL programs (Christian, 2011), teachers’ ideas about the
best way to promote second language proficiency must be embedded into their content instruction. Thus, whether a certain belief is implemented or not is contingent upon whether the action-guiding function of beliefs was activated, but a confluence of factors may come into play.

According to Fives and Buehl (2012), many variables can potentially facilitate or hinder the enactment of teacher’s beliefs. Two important supporting variables are self-efficacy and task value; the former refers to the teachers’ confidence in their capability to act out their beliefs and the latter to the extent to which the action is worth taking. Possible hindrances derive from internal and external factors. Internally, the belief might only filter the information or frame the issue, but it does not lead to action. Another possibility is that the belief has not been established yet, or it conflicts with other belief(s). Externally, a specific context may not allow for the activation of certain beliefs. In this regard, various contextual factors at the classroom, school, district, and state levels may come into play (Buehl & Beck, 2015). The next section explores the external and internal factors that emerged from the data of the present study.

Supports and Hindrances to the Enactment of the Participants’ Beliefs

Tables 29 and 30 offer a summary of what the participants perceived to be the supports and hindrances, respectively, to the enactment of their beliefs about the topic. As shown in the charts, the participants’ belief-practice relationships were significantly affected by several factors at the school and classroom levels. At the school level, administrative support was consistently referenced as the essential variable. Andrea, Daniela, and Erika felt supported by their principals, who granted them flexibility in dual language instruction, allowing them to plan and conduct lessons in ways that corresponded with their beliefs. They also enjoyed the freedom to adjust the curriculum to meet the needs of their students. Such a flexibility was one possible explanation
for why the teachers were generally able to incorporate their beliefs about effective second language teaching into content instruction. Dual language researchers have shown that supportive leadership at the school site is paramount to the success of dual language programs (Freeman et al., 2005; Howard et al., 2018; Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Specifically, bilingual teachers appreciate the support, respect, and concern they receive from their leaders, especially when it comes to lesson planning and materials development (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008).

The next school-context factor cited by most participants was related to access to instructional materials and resources. The centrality of this factor was emphasized not only by the participants who appreciated its supportive roles but also by those who lamented its limitations. Bertha and Carmen felt seriously hindered by the lack of classroom materials and textbooks written in the Spanish language. In Andrea’s case, although some materials were available, she thought their visuals should have been improved to make them more accessible to students.

Daniela was the only participant who had no issue obtaining materials for teaching the second language. She mentioned three factors contributing to this situation. The first one was her vast experience teaching Spanish as a second language to English speakers. She had collected a lot of instructional materials and, upon working on them over and over, she knew what works well. Second, her school provides complete access to an online library, where students can read books, and generous funds for teachers to purchase classroom materials were available. Third, Daniela has many books of poetry to use with her dual language students. Thus, the teacher appeared to be fully supported by (1) her personal teaching experience, (2) school administration, and (3) access to abundant resources. Furthermore, since ready-to-use materials are available, the teacher could save some time developing and modifying them. This fact
explained why, unlike other participants having different situations, Daniela did not complain about lack of time. In other words, issues concerning instructional resources might impact the time that teachers had. This finding confirmed what Cammarata and Tedick (2012) observed in their study with dual language teachers. These researchers reported that the teachers had to spend a considerable amount of time and energy to find adequate materials.

Table 29

Summary of Supports to the Enactment of Participants Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Supporting factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Full access to digital resources, visuals, and other supplementary materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Available resources of updated info about DL education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration support for multimedia resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleague supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Colleague supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ positive attitudes and high motivation to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>Administration supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible lesson planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of materials for teaching English via poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum behavior problems and interruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students as language models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Administration supports and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 30**

Summary of Hindrances to the Enactment of Participants Beliefs About Effective Second Language Instruction in the DL Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hindering factors</th>
<th>District level</th>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Classroom level</th>
<th>Internal level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Inaccessible mandatory reading materials</td>
<td>Limited resources and materials in the Spanish language</td>
<td>Student’s reluctance to talk</td>
<td>Lack of teachers’ knowledge about teaching tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of time to create supplementary materials</td>
<td>Non-standard materials</td>
<td>Student’s lack of foundational skills in Spanish (reading and writing)</td>
<td>Lack of teachers’ knowledge about students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations to grouping management and comprehensible input due to the COVID-19 situation</td>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Lack of Spanish-speaking learners due to district’s control of incoming students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>District level</td>
<td>School level</td>
<td>Classroom level</td>
<td>Internal level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Limited time allotted to meet curriculum standard</td>
<td>Limited resources and materials in the Spanish language</td>
<td>Students’ lack of focus on the lessons</td>
<td>Lack of language models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The unequal number of face-to-face and learn-from-home students due to the COVID-19 situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>No opportunities for small grouping and hands-on activities due to the COVID-19 situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ reluctance to talk in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Lack of good materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A scarcity of standard instructional materials written in the Spanish language has been a recurring issue reported by many bilingual education researchers (Amrein & Peña, 2000; Bernstein et al., 2018; Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Freire & Valdez, 2017). For instance, although the teachers in Freire and Valdez’s (2017) study fully supported a culturally responsive pedagogical approach, the lack of materials and textbooks in the target language (i.e., Spanish) seriously hindered its implementation in their classrooms. (Spies et al., 2017) found that educators’ conviction about the importance of home language was not fully implemented due to the dearth of instructional materials. The same issue was also found.
to contribute to teachers’ belief-practice incongruity regarding bilingualism (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017). Cammarata and Tedick (2012) assert that the availability of balanced materials written in the two languages is one of the critical conditions that allow DL teachers to bring a language focus into content instruction.

Past researchers have revealed the ways teachers dealt with issues relating to inadequate materials and resources. One common strategy was to translate materials into the target language, although this could be time-consuming (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017). Most participants in the present study, however, suggested different approaches. Carmen would develop her materials or modify the ones she found. Andrea would create supplementary materials, albeit she was often burdened by the lack of time. Bertha would turn to an alternative resource. For instance, as noted in one of her lessons, she had her Spanish-speaking students work on a digital reading platform, where they can read or listen to materials in English related to the lesson topics. To Erika, lack of materials written in the Spanish language was a challenge that offered her the opportunity to select, create, and develop materials that best suited her learners. It appears that her vast experiences as an English teacher now became helpful in her dual language instruction. Many authors have underscored the instrumental roles of materials and resources in bilingual settings (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2012; Palmer & Lynch, 2008). The efforts all these participants made to resolve the issues speak volumes of the centrality of materials and resources written in the target language. It is therefore very clear that good materials and resources are crucial for the effectiveness of second language instruction in the DL classrooms.

At the classroom level, student factors appeared to be playing the most pivotal roles. Carmen attributed her successful L2 instruction to students’ positive attitudes and high
motivation to learn. Andrea cited the lack of students’ focus on the lessons as a barrier to implementing her second language instruction. Another challenge was students’ reluctance to talk in the target language. Unsurprisingly, this problem was predominantly expressed by the participants who believed in the importance of developing oral language proficiency, including Andrea, Bertha, and Daniela. The next classroom-context factor was associated with students' demographic composition, especially as far as the two-way dual language education was concerned. One study participant indicated that since she had a relatively balanced number of students from both linguistic backgrounds, she could pair up English-speaking students and their Spanish-speaking classmates, which she believed would promote language learning. Another teacher reported a contrasting situation, rendering her inability to apply the same strategy. To sum up, at the classroom level, the two most important factors are (1) students’ attitudes (2) the demographic composition of dual language students. While the former is probably a common issue in most language classrooms, the latter is unique to two-way dual-language contexts.

Time constraint was frequently referenced by the participants as a massive barrier to enacting their espoused beliefs about second language teaching. The same concern has been expressed by second language educators in the mainstream classrooms (Lucas et al., 2015) and the dual language environment (Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Spies et al., 2017). In a current study by Spies et al. (2017), the educators felt constrained by the lack of time to carry out practices that align with their beliefs about individualization as the best way to support young learners. Time constraint is arguably a common issue in various educational settings, but it appeared to be more challenging in the DL classrooms. One teacher indicated that “it takes more time to go through materials in a dual language because the kids, it's not their native language, you have to spend more time trying to get them to understand the text.” The
negative impact of this issue on second language instruction in the DL classrooms was not insignificant. Past research had suggested that when the time was limited for planning and teaching both content area and language, dual language teachers tended to focus on content over language instruction (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Gándara et al., 2005). Thus, practical concerns might have caused the teachers in the present study not to apply specific instructional strategies that they considered helpful for second language learning.

Finally, the COVID-19 crisis inevitably affected the teachers’ classroom practices, particularly concerning students’ interactions. It was a shared belief among the participants in this study that small grouping and pair work were highly influential for encouraging students’ interaction using the target language. Such grouping techniques also allow for the teachers to attend to their student's individual needs. However, following the COVID-19 protocols, classroom interactions were severely limited. Another effect of the crisis was on students’ composition in the classrooms. In response to the pandemic, schools have modified their instructional deliveries, offering students at least three modes of instruction: in person, remote learning, or a combination of both. In the several classes reported by the participants, the majority of students were learning remotely from home. In such cases, student-student interactions were even more reduced, especially when it came to oral communication. One teacher felt that these limitations would seriously impinge on language acquisition; therefore, there was a potential learning loss during the pandemic.

A similar concern has been noted in a current study by Hartshorn and McMurry (2020) on the impact of the COVID-19 on the teaching and learning of English as a second language in the U.S. The study analyzed, among others, data about the speaking and writing scores gained before and during the pandemic by a group of English learners attending a university’s intensive
English program. It was found that “students improved in both their speaking and writing skills, but the improvement was much smaller for speaking compared to writing” (Hartshorn & McMurry, 2020, p. 146). Thus, it seemed that a lack of interactions with classmates during virtual learning could hamper the development of students’ speaking skills. More studies are definitely needed to determine the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on learners’ language acquisition in the DL classrooms.

**Implications of the Findings**

The results of the study have the following implications. First, dual language teachers’ beliefs generally correspond to what is currently considered effective language instruction in the DL programs. These include a focus on oral competence and literacy skills, maximum exposure to and opportunities to use the target language, and the utilization of various verbal and nonverbal tools and strategies to facilitate acquisition (Howard et al., 2018). This finding is similar to the observations of other researchers (Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Johnson, 1992, 1994; Kissau et al., 2012), which revealed that second language teachers’ beliefs regarding various aspects of instruction tend to line up with popular approaches in the field of second language education at the time of the study. By holding general beliefs that align with current thinking about effective language teaching in the DL classrooms, DL teachers are likely to offer instruction that can foster higher levels of second language development.

Second, this study can inform those responsible for teacher preparation programs, especially as they pertain to instruction in the DL classrooms. Researchers have reported that DL teachers felt inadequately prepared for such a challenging environment. One of the areas they felt lacking is related to the skills and knowledge about classroom instruction that promotes second
language acquisition (Fortune et al., 2008; Oberg de la Garza et al., 2015). It has also been suggested that DL teachers have difficulties maintaining the right balance between content instruction and teaching language (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Gándara et al., 2005; Met, 2008). DL educators could benefit from teacher education and professional development opportunities that address these issues. Also, as the teachers might hold certain beliefs about effective instruction, such training should consider the roles of teachers’ beliefs in filtering the information they receive during the sessions, framing the issues they are facing, and guiding their classroom actions (Fives & Buehl, 2012).

An examination of DL teachers’ beliefs and factors that may hinder or support their execution in the classrooms must become an essential element in the design and curriculum of teacher training programs that aim to empower these educators. Such programs should equip teachers with the tools they need to implement their beliefs successfully even in the face of obstacles (e.g., lack of time, limited resources, and students’ reluctance to use the target language (Kang, 2008). Moreover, given the subjective nature of teachers’ beliefs (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996) and their possible link to a specific context (Fives & Buehl, 2012), professional development opportunities should consider taking a differentiated, ongoing approach that attends to teachers’ pedagogical perceptions (Spies et al., 2017).

Third, while the teachers in this study generally hold beliefs that align with evidence-based practices for promoting second language development, their belief about avoiding formal language instruction needs rectifying. This perspective reflects an incorrect assumption among dual language educators, that is, second language acquisition is the natural by-product of learning content area; as a result, they tended to heavily focus on fluency over accuracy (Howard et al., 2018). Empirical data (e.g., Harley, 1998; Tedick & Young, 2016) have suggested that
such an approach is likely to impede the acquisition of native-like fluency and grammar ability, especially by the minority language speakers. Several authors (e.g., Larsen-Freeman & Tedick, 2016; Lyster, 2011; Lyster & Mori, 2008) have strongly encouraged the use of more formal language teaching in the DL classrooms to facilitate the acquisition of forms that would be difficult to acquire without explicit instruction. It should be pointed out that the participants in the present study still consider the merits of attending to grammar. What they do not believe in is the traditional approached to teaching grammar, such as drills and repetitions. Therefore, dual language teachers need to be equipped with sophisticated skills and strategies for integrating formal language teaching in content instruction.

Finally, consistent with past studies (Bernstein et al., 2018; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Spies et al., 2017), school factors (e.g., administrative support, time, resources) profoundly influence DL teachers in acting upon their espoused beliefs. In the present study, principals’ support and trust have been invariably cited as instrumental to the enactment of DL teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction in the classrooms. As the participants indicate, integrating language teaching into content instruction requires modifications and adjustments of the standard curriculum, instruction, and materials. To do these optimally, they need strong administrative support not only in the form of maximum freedom to plan lessons and develop materials but also access and availability of resources they need to carry out the tasks. Schools need to become more aware of these issues and address them adequately.

Limitations

There were two main limitations to the study. The first one was associated with the source of data about the teachers’ classroom practices. Ideally, such data were obtained by
directly observing the teachers’ instructional behaviors. However, the current circumstances affected by the COVID-19 made it challenging to visit schools for in-person classroom observations. Given the constraint, the most viable option was to use the teachers’ journals to collect data about the participants’ instructional behaviors. A related limitation was that the researcher had no control over the number of lessons documented in the teaching journals. Although all participants had been notified about a specific number of lessons they were expected to document in their journals, only a few were able to meet the minimum requirement. Time constraints and the participants being inflexible in journaling their lessons, which was understandable given their substantial workload due to the COVID-19 crisis, accounted for the limitation.

Additionally, the researcher had no control over the type of lessons being reported in the teaching journals. Ideally, data about teachers’ practices in promoting speaking proficiency, for example, was obtained from speaking-focused lessons. However, several lessons that the participants documented had goals and focus areas that did not reflect their articulated beliefs. For instance, while holding that speaking should be the primary focus in the DL classrooms, one teacher shared all vocabulary lessons. In effect, it was hard to determine what strategies were being employed to address the speaking area. Despite the limitation, in such a case, it was still possible to salvage data about speaking within the vocabulary lessons since multiple language skills and areas were integrated into the lessons.

The second major limitation was concerned with time. The initial plan was that the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews fairly soon after receiving and analyzing the participants’ journals. The idea was to discuss classroom practices that the teachers had documented in the journals. However, owing to their demanding teaching responsibilities, which
were again affected by the pandemic, some participants had difficulty allocating time for the second interviews as planned. As a result, by the time the second interviews were carried out, many participants were having a hard time recalling and reflecting on specific details about the practices that they reported in their journals. Notwithstanding these limitations, the researcher was able to gain a relatively salvageable amount of data about classroom practices from the teachers’ journals and data about factors influencing the implementation of their beliefs about the topic under investigation.

**Recommendations for Future Studies**

Based on the findings and limitations of the study, the researcher offers several recommendations for future research.

1. A replication study could be conducted by addressing the limitations related to the source of data about teachers’ instructional practice. Direct classroom observations can be carried out to obtain tangible evidence about teachers’ classroom instruction, including – but not limited to – their language use, treatment of oral errors, and strategies to deal with students’ reluctance to speak in the target language.

2. The present study has shown that dual language teachers emphasize three language areas (i.e., speaking, reading, and vocabulary) in the DL classrooms. A further investigation could be conducted by focusing on one specific area in order to gain a better understanding of how dual language teachers specifically work on developing students’ proficiency in the area of interest while delivering content instruction. Of particular interest could be the extent to which dual language
teachers find it challenging to balance language and content teaching, what exactly makes it challenging, and what specific supports could be offered to help them overcome the challenges.

3. Dual language teachers’ perceptions and practice as they pertain to direct, formal language instruction is worthy of exploration. A critical finding of the present study was that despite the tendency not to focus on the accuracy aspect of students’ second language outputs, instruction that aims to correct errors is not entirely eschewed. In fact, addressing specific grammar issues is still considered necessary when the need arises. Future studies could examine teachers’ strategies to address language errors that they believe need correcting and the extent to which the strategies are effective.

4. A case study could be undertaken involving a DL program that is exemplary in providing supports for their dual language teachers to integrate language teaching and content instruction effectively. Such a research could explain how school-level and classroom-context factors play their facilitative roles in the DL classrooms.

Conclusions

Dual language education aims to generate bilingually proficient, culturally competent, and academically successful learners (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2008). It was understood that language proficiency is the key to achieving high academic performance (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). Since language acquisition is expected to occur while learning the content areas (Cloud et al., 2000), DL teachers must integrate language teaching and content instruction.
Nevertheless, little is known regarding: (1) what teachers believe to be effective ways of promoting learners’ second language proficiency; (2) how the beliefs are enacted in the DL classrooms; and (3) what factors affect DL teachers’ belief-practice relationships. An investigation of these issues is essential to understanding how dual language teachers navigate their language instruction within the challenging environment of dual language programs. The present study adds to our understanding of this specific area of teacher thoughts and practices in the context of dual language education.

Overall, the present study has shown that dual language teachers recognize oral proficiency and literacy skills as the primary goals of language teaching in the DL classrooms. They believe language instruction should focus on speaking and reading, although other language components, especially vocabulary, are also important to integrate into these areas. Direct grammar teaching is generally not regarded as the best approach, and accuracy issues are addressed only when necessary. Strategies for teaching language skills and vocabulary emphasize maximum exposure to the target language and opportunities for practice. A variety of supports (e.g., visuals, total physical responses, sentence frames, cognates) is believed effective as well. Students’ home culture and language are considered vital to second language learning.

That the teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction are generally compatible with some established principles of second language acquisition (SLA) and dual language education (DLE) are quite surprising given that past studies tend to indicate otherwise. An intriguing question is: What are the sources of these beliefs? Research has pointed out that teachers’ beliefs may be shaped by various internal and external factors, such as personal life and background, experiences, knowledge, education, and other existing beliefs (Levin, 2015). Available data from the present study suggest that education is an essential factor that might
have formed the teachers’ beliefs. All participants currently attended a graduate teacher certification program at a university in Florida. The program specifically aims to equip dual language teachers with knowledge and skills for developing their students’ second language proficiency. Thus, the participants might have gained insights into how to work with dual language students most effectively. Of course, that the teachers were able to embrace the new information and experiences presented during the program suggest that they were congruent with the teachers’ existing beliefs, for example, regarding the nature of knowledge, learning, and teaching (Fives & Buehl, 2012). At this point, the filtering function of the existing beliefs was at work. The next function of the beliefs was to frame imminent tasks or problems.

When it comes to second language instructional practices in the classroom, the teachers’ beliefs appear to be predominately influenced by contexts. Their prevalent beliefs about developing speaking and reading skills as primary goals of second language instruction in the DL classroom seem to stem from contextual demands. In dual language programs, students are expected to learn the second language via their engagement with the content area. At the same time, they must employ their second language abilities to engage with the academic content. Oral proficiency is seen as the key to participating in the lessons, and reading abilities are needed to comprehend texts about subject matters. By emphasizing speaking and reading areas, the teachers aspire to ‘killing two birds with one stone’: delivering instruction that concurrently (1) optimizes students’ second language learning and (2) promotes their knowledge of the content area. It appears that the content-language integration that is uniquely associated with DL education has framed the teachers’ conviction about what language areas to focus on and what types of instructional strategies effectively develop these areas. However, the implementation of these beliefs depends on whether other beliefs facilitate their activation.
Evidence from the teachers’ classroom practices accessed from their journals suggests a high degree of congruence between articulated beliefs and reported practices. The strongest belief-practice links occurred concerning the aspects of the teaching goals, areas of focus, and the integration of students’ home language and culture. Most of the beliefs about effective instructional strategies were also evident in their practices. In other words, their beliefs about the topics were generally acted out in the classrooms. What other beliefs had played their guiding function? Fives and Buehl (2012) mention teachers’ sense of self-efficacy and motivational abilities as the driving forces to enact pedagogical beliefs and the participants of this study presumably possess them. Thus, the teachers might feel confident with their pedagogical skills and knowledge acquired from various sources, most likely from the teacher certification program they attended. This internal factor, which derives from the teachers themselves, could be the key to their belief-practice congruence. What is also evident from the data is the influence of some external factors. The participants boldly attributed such a congruence to various external factors at the school and classroom levels. Administrative support and trust, access and availability of resources, school community support, and students’ positive attitudes towards the new language and high motivation to learn it are among the most significant variables. School and classroom factors (e.g., time constraint, limited materials, lack of resources) were also accounted for why a few specific beliefs were not always successfully enacted. In short, a confluence of internal and external factors profoundly influences the degree of (in)congruence between dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding effective second language instruction in the DL classrooms.

It is difficult to generalize the results from this study to other DL educators. Regardless, this initial investigation adds to the discussion about the filtering, framing, and action-guiding
roles of teachers’ beliefs, especially in the context of DL education. The study has identified factors that may shape DL teachers’ beliefs about effective second language instruction and their congruence with practices. The compatibility between DL teachers’ beliefs and current thinking about good practices in the field seems to be greatly facilitated by their knowledge and skills about second language pedagogy they acquired from professional development programs. Finally, the present study has pointed out that external supports at the school and classroom levels are the most crucial factors to the successful implementation of teachers’ beliefs regarding effective second language teaching in the dual language classrooms.
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The purpose of this study is to examine patterns of relationships between dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding effective second language instruction in the context of dual language programs in Central Florida. Specifically, the study aims at investigating (a) the beliefs dual language teachers’ have about effective second language teaching, (b) their instructional practices related to second language development, (c) the relationship between the teachers’ stated beliefs and their classroom practices, and (d) factors that support or hinder the enactment of teachers’ beliefs into classroom practices.

I will collect data by using semi-structured interviews, teachers’ journal/diary/log about dual language instructional practices, instructional documents (lesson plan, teaching materials, and other documents) that are used or have created for dual language instruction, and follow-up discussion. These are what I will expect you to do:

1. Participate in a semi-structured interview about your beliefs regarding effective second language instruction. The interview will be conducted using Skype for approximately 30 minutes, and it will be audio-recorded.
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3. Participate in a second semi-structured interview that will focus on your beliefs-practice connections and factors affecting them. It will be conducted after you have completed the 4-week teaching activities that you have documented in your journal/diary/log. The interview will be carried out on Skype for approximately 30 minutes and will be audio-recorded.

4. Participate in a follow-up discussion for approximately 30 minutes. The discussion will serve as a means of member checking and as an opportunity for you to reflect on your beliefs-practice connections. It will be conducted on Skype a week or two after the second semi-structured interview is done and will be audio-recorded as well.

If you agree to be interviewed, the recordings of your semi-structured interviews and follow-up discussion will be encrypted and stored on the OneDrive site associated with my UCF student account, to which only I have access. All recordings of semi-structured interviews and follow-up discussion will be erased from the storage site after the completion of the study. All electronic copies of your journal/log/diary and instructional documents (lesson plan, teaching materials, etc.) that you have shared with me will be stored on the OneDrive site associated with my UCF student account, and they will be erased from the storage site after the completion of the study. All the hard copies of journal/log/diary and documents, if any, will be secured in storage, to which only I have access. No copying will be made to the printed journal/log/diary and documents that you have shared with me. They will be returned to you if requested, or they will be destroyed after the completion of the study.

Identifiable private information that will be collected includes your name, years of your experience teaching dual language programs, the school where you are teaching, the grade where you are instructing dual language learners as well as the primary language of instruction, and the model of dual language program. Only I have access to this information, and I will not publish any of your identifiable data. All identifiable private information will be retained until the completion of the study, i.e., my successful dissertation defense.

To be eligible for the study, you must be a dual language teacher that instructs either English only, Spanish only, or both English and Spanish in dual language classrooms. You must have a minimum of 1-year experience teaching in dual language classrooms. You must also be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

**Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem:** If you have questions, concerns, or complaints: Deddy Anrand, Graduate Student, School of Teacher Education, College of Community Innovation and Education, at (407) 865-4063, or Dr. Joyce Nutta, Faculty Supervisor, School of Teacher Education, at (407) 319-0096 or by email at Joyce.Nutta@ucf.edu.

**IRB contact about your rights in this study or to report a complaint:** If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or have concerns about the conduct of this study, please contact Institutional
Review Board (IRB), University of Central Florida, Office of Research, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901, or email irb@ucf.edu.
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Key Information: The following is a short summary of this study to help you decide whether or not to be a part of this study. More detailed information is listed later on in this form.

Why am I being invited to take part in a research study?
I invite you to take part in a research study because you are a dual language (DL) teacher in a school that implements a two-way dual language program.

Why is this research being done?
Research has shown that teachers’ beliefs shape their assumption about teaching, learning, and their students, which in turn affect their instructions and students’ outcomes. Research also has indicated that bilingual educators often hold misconception about second language teaching and learning. This research study aims (1) to investigate dual language teachers’ beliefs and practices concerning effective second language instruction, and (2) to identify factors that affect the enactment of these beliefs into practices. Understanding of dual language teachers’ beliefs, practices, and factors that support or hinder their beliefs-practice connections can lend a leverage for enhancing the benefits of dual language programs.

How long will the research last and what will I need to do?
I expect that you will be in this research study for approximately 3 months. You will be asked to participate in three interviews, with each lasting about 30 minutes, to keep an informal journal/diary/log about your instructional practices in dual language classes across 4 weeks and share some instructional materials that you use or have created for dual language classes during this period.

More detailed information about the study procedures can be found under “What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?”

Will being in this study help me any way?
I cannot promise any benefits to you or others from your taking part in this research. However, possible benefits include an opportunity for you to become more aware of your implicit beliefs, which could help you to evaluate the extent to which these beliefs align with research-informed practices in dual language instruction. Another explicit reflect on your beliefs-practice connections. This kind of reflective activity can help to improve your teaching competence.

What happens if I do not want to be in this research?
Participation in research is completely voluntary. You can decide to participate or not to participate.
Permission to Take Part in a Human Research Study

**Detailed Information:** The following is more detailed information about this study in addition to the information listed above.

**What should I know about a research study?**
- Someone will explain this research study to you.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You can choose not to take part.
- You can agree to take part and later change your mind.
- Your decision will not be held against you.
- You can ask all the questions you want before you decide.

**Who can I talk to?**
If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team: Deddy Amrand, Graduate Student, School of Teacher Education, College of Community Innovation and Education, at (407) 865-4063 or by email at d.amrand@knights.ucf.edu, or Dr. Joyce Nutta, Faculty Supervisor, School of Teacher Education, at (407) 319-0096 or by email at Joyce.Nutta@ucf.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board (“IRB”). You may talk to them at 407-823-2901 or irb@ucf.edu if:
- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You have questions about your rights as a research subject.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

**How many people will be studied?**
I expect 6 people will be in this research study.

**What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?**

These are the things I would like you to do:

1. Participate in 2 online interviews and surveys via Zoom or Skype, each will last for approximately 30 minutes. The first interview and survey will focus on your beliefs about effective second language instruction in the context of dual language education. The second interview will focus on what you perceive as the factors that influence the enactment of your stated beliefs into practices. These interviews will be audio-recorded.
2. Keep a brief and informal journal, diary, or log about dual language instructional practices that you perform across 4 weeks. I would like your writing to be about two units that you select to focus on, and I also request that each unit address a different subject (i.e., one unit per subject, such as one math unit and one science unit). The length of the units you choose is flexible, just as long as each unit includes two lessons or more.
3. Share some of your lesson plans, instructional materials, and other documents that you use or have created for dual language instruction.
4. Participate in a follow-up discussion for approximately 30 minutes via Zoom or Skype. The discussion will serve as a means of member checking and as an opportunity for you to reflect on your beliefs-practice connections. This session will be audio-recorded.

You will be audio-recorded during this study. If you do not want to be recorded, you will not be able to be in the study. The recordings will be kept on OneDrive site that is associated with my UCF student
Permission to Take Part in a Human Research Study

account, to which only I have access. The recordings will be erased or destroyed after successful the completion of my study (i.e., successful dissertation defense).

What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?
You can leave the research at any time; it will not be held against you. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

What happens to the information collected for the research?
Your information or samples that are collected as part of this research will not be used or distributed for future research studies, even if all of your identifiers are removed.

Signature Block for Capable Adult
Your signature documents your permission to take part in this research.

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of subject             Date

______________________________
Printed name of subject

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of person obtaining consent  Date

______________________________
Printed name of person obtaining consent
APPENDIX F
FIRST SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
**First semi-structured interview protocol**

The purpose of this study is to examine dual language teachers’ beliefs about effective L2 teaching and learning, their connections with teachers’ classroom practices, and factors influencing the connection in the context of dual language programs in the state of Florida, U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompts &amp; elicitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To break the ice and provide some background information.</td>
<td>Tell me about yourself.</td>
<td>How long have you been a DL teacher? What grade and class do you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Beliefs about the effective second language teaching in the dual language program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think should be the main goal(s) of teaching a second language in the dual language class?</td>
<td>What do you want your students to learn in the dual language class? Why do you think these goals are important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus area(s)</td>
<td>Among the four language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing), what do you think should be the focus in your dual language class? How about vocabulary? grammar? accent? Why do you think these are important to focus on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>What strategies do you think effective for teaching language skills, vocabulary, etc.? Verbal/nonverbal supports Classroom activities Grouping Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The roles of students’ native language and culture</td>
<td>How important are they? If important, what should a dual language teacher do to optimize their roles? What kinds of instructional strategies do you think can help dual language learners achieve this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompts &amp; elicitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other strategies</strong></td>
<td>What other strategies do you think can increase the effectiveness of second language instruction in your class?</td>
<td>Anything else you would like to tell me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. The context of dual language instruction</strong></td>
<td>Can you tell me about the dual language program you are currently working with?</td>
<td>What model of DL is adopted and how is it implemented? What is the status of dual language program in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Member-checking</strong></td>
<td>Paraphrase what is heard about the main data: Ask for a response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The primary goal of second language teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Areas of focus in L2 learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The roles of students’ native language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions for writing journals about dual language instructional practices and sharing of teaching & learning materials

Journals

- Keep a brief and informal journal about dual language instructional practices that you teach during the same week period.
- Your journal can use narrative description, bulleted lists, and/or graphic information (such as seating charts, pictures of instructional posters/anchor charts, etc.) to respond to the 5 prompts below.
- Please write about two units that you select to focus on, with each unit addressing a different subject (i.e., one unit per subject, such as one math unit and one science unit). If you prefer, instead of writing, you could create an audio journal.
- The length of the units you choose is flexible, just as long as each unit includes two lessons or more.
- Please document after the lesson took place, ideally fairly soon after the lesson. After you have completed a journal, please email me an electronic copy of the written or audio journal.
- I would like you to document anything that you did and/or said to help your dual language students develop proficiency in their second language during the teaching of the units you have selected. Specifically, please feel free to use the following questions to guide your writing:

1. What were areas of focus in L2 learning (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, reading, speaking) in today’s lesson? What did you like your students to learn (Please respond in 3-5 sentences).
2. What were the instructional strategies you used to teach these areas of focus? How did they go? What made them successful or less/not successful? (3-5 sentences per strategy)
3. How did you manage student-teacher interactions and student-student interactions? How did they go? What made them successful or less/not successful? (3-5 sentences)
4. How did you manage the teaching/learning process (e.g., seating arrangement, visual aids, classroom management, technology & media, error treatments, etc.)? How did they go? What made them successful or less/not successful? (3-5 sentences per aspect)
5. What other information could you write about your teaching of dual language learners today, especially those related to their second language learning?

- Feel free to add anything else beyond these prompts that you think might provide useful information about your teaching practices.
Instructional Materials

- Please share some of your lesson plans, instructional materials, and other documents that you use for dual language instruction.
- The materials could be the ones that you used in the teaching & learning activities that you document in your journal/diary/log; Or, they could be the ones that you have created but did not use on these occasions.
- If possible, I would like you to email me an electronic copy of your materials. If you prefer, you could send me hard copies of these materials by mail, in which case I will send you a prepaid envelope.
APPENDIX H
SECOND SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Second semi-structured interview protocol

Conversation topics

1. Stated beliefs and instructional practices related to the goals of second language teaching in dual language classrooms
2. Stated beliefs and instructional practices related to the areas of focus in second language learning within dual language classrooms
3. Stated beliefs and instructional practices related to the roles of dual language learners’ native language and culture in their learning of a second language in dual language classrooms
4. Stated beliefs and instructional practices related to effective teaching/learning strategies for the development of dual language learners’ second language proficiency.

Questions:
1. To what extent do you think your beliefs about each of these areas of second language instruction have been implemented in the instructional practices that you performed across the 4-week period, as you have documented in your journal/diary/log?
2. From my analysis of your journal/diary/log, I saw that your espoused beliefs about [area(s) of second language instruction] was/were fully enacted in your classroom. What do you think were the factors that have enabled you to do so?
3. I also saw that your stated beliefs about [area(s) of second language instruction] was/were not successfully/only partially enacted in your classroom. What were the hindering factors?
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