Developing Teachers' Advocacy Skills for Multilingual Learners: An Examination of Advocacy in Simulated Environments and School Settings

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Education and Human Development

University of Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

William Michael Fox

May, 2022

Abstract

This dissertation is a researcher-practitioner response to questions related to the development of multilingual learner (ML) advocacy skills in teacher education settings, as well as questions related to the socially mediated discourse of ML advocacy that evolves over time and within situated learning settings. To advance the agenda of examining the discourse of ML advocacy, as well as how it unfolds in teaching settings, I conducted three studies. In manuscript #1, Dr. April Salerno and I described a simulator role-play assignment in which ML endorsement candidates (ECs) engaged in the work of an ML advocate in a conversation with a simulated general education teacher (in the form of an avatar) who expressed deficit views about an ML and his family. We then examined the discursive practices of three in-service ECs as they separately advocated for the ML. In manuscript #2, I conducted a follow-up study with 15 in-service educators who participated in UVa's ML programs and the ESL Advocacy Simulation, and I examined whether/how they engaged in advocacy in their current settings and what prepared them to do so. In manuscript #3, I described a second simulator role-play in which ECs analyzed a ML writing sample and engaged in a conversation with a writing teacher (in the form of an avatar) who was using deficit-oriented language to talk about the ML and her writing. I examined how 23 ECs advocated for the ML, and I illustrated three approaches to advocacy with three focal case-study ECs. These papers contribute to teacher education by presenting cutting-edge technology used to develop rehearsal spaces for ECs to engage in practice and reflection on advocacy skills and discursive choices. From a research perspective, instructional designs such as simulated interactions that focus on dialogic practices present a rich context for examining discourse. As a result, these papers offer novel approaches to teacher training and the analysis of advocacy discourse.

William Michael Fox

Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education

School of Education and Human Development

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, VA

APPROVAL OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation, ("Developing Teachers' Advocacy Skills for Multilingual Learners: An Examination of Advocacy in Simulated Environments and School Settings"), has been approved by the Graduate Faculty of the School of Education and Human Development in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Name of Co-Chair (Peter Youngs)

_____

Name of Co-Chair (April Salerno)

_____

Name of Committee Member (Chris Chang-Bacon)

_____

Name of Committee Member (Julie Cohen)

January 25th, 2022

Dedication

To my wife—my Doe.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to acknowledge my dissertation committee who have guided me through this process with insight, professionalism, patience, and wisdom. Thank you, Dr. Peter Youngs, for your unwavering guidance, your ability to differentiate and personalize my program path, and for your consistency. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to pursue this degree and for the research, writing, and instructional training I have received because of it. Thank you, Dr. April Salerno, for being my example of someone who "speaks up" against deficit-oriented language. Thank you for your forward-looking and growth-oriented feedback, and thank you for epitomizing foresight and integrity throughout the research process. Thank you, Dr. Chris Chang-Bacon, for pushing me to think more *critically* about language education, and for your willingness and ability to foster discourse that helped me to move my projects along. Thank you, Dr. Julie Cohen, for pushing me to improve my argument, and for the inspiration to pursue work in simulated learning. Thank you all for embodying the skills and dispositions of expert educators. You are true professionals and I have felt your full support and guidance throughout this process.

I would also like to thank my family for supporting me throughout the program. Thank you to my mom who allowed me to verbalize ideas and think through new concepts or readings outside of the walls of academia. Thank you to my kids who saw their dad sit in the bay windowsill day after day typing on his computer and still considered it "going to work." Most importantly, I'd like to thank my wife, Mickie. This life-long dream would not have been possible without your blessing. You endured my pontifications and my critiques of newspaper articles and assertions from social media that did not meet my standards of scientific rigor. Thank you for enduring four years of graduate assistant wages.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Overview of Manuscripts

Introduction

Teacher educators preparing individuals to serve multilingual learners (MLs) have the potential to inspire future teacher-advocates and change agents for MLs. “Speaking up” where MLs’ educational and life opportunities are challenged is one hallmark of an ML advocate in the teaching field. Despite the codification of advocacy into ML teacher education standards (e.g., Standard 5a, TESOL, 2019), relatively little is known about the development of ML advocacy skills in teacher education settings. The challenge facing the field of advocacy in ML teacher education is threefold: (1) Preparing ML endorsement candidates (ECs) with the necessary tools to engage in ML advocacy in their current or future teaching contexts, (2) Understanding the discursive features that ECs might utilize in advocacy-related interactions with colleagues, and (3) Following up with ML teacher education program graduates at yearly intervals to examine how they are engaging with advocacy in their current teaching contexts.

For the past two decades, researchers interested in ML advocacy have focused on describing advocacy actions among in-service ML teachers. This work has led to various binary categorizations of advocacy including: transformative/non-transformative (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007), within the classroom/beyond the classroom (Haneda & Alexander, 2015), and instructional/political advocacy (Linville, 2020). These studies all described ML advocacy as an interpersonal act that requires dispositional inclinations combined with specific content and soft skills. These studies focused on the various advocacy actions of in-service ML teachers. While this literature helped to illuminate the importance of these actions for ML teachers, the authors did not examine the potential role of teacher education coursework in developing ECs’ skills as ML advocates.

Researchers agree that ML advocacy that effects individual and institutional change, or transformative advocacy, requires certain interpersonal skills and characteristics (Athanases & Martin, 2006; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Linville, 2019; 2020; Staehr Fenner, 2014). These skills include being able to develop relationships, collaborate, and navigate interactions with potentially resistant educational stakeholders (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014). While many teachers might develop the skills for advocacy over time in the field, teacher educators such as Whiting (2019) and Linville (2019), have argued that teachers of MLs should be able to develop the skills of an ML advocate within teacher education settings. Some scholars have taken up this charge and have described teacher education programs, assignments, and course designs with advocacy as a focus (Athanases & Martin, 2006; Harrison, 2019; Huelsenbeck et al., 2019; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; 2013; Warren, 2020; Whiting, 2019). Other scholars have utilized in-person and digitally mediated role-playing interactions (i.e., simulations) as approximations of advocacy-related scenarios that teacher candidates might encounter in their teaching contexts (Caldas, 2017; Self & Stengel, 2020; Whiting, 2019).

In response to the potential problem of teacher candidates having to practice teaching on children and young adults in high-stakes environments, many teacher education programs have begun to utilize simulation technology as digitally mediated spaces for discrete pedagogical and interpersonal skills practice (Bautista & Boone, 2015; Cohen et al., 2020; Dalgarno et al., 2016; Dawson & Lignugaris, 2016; Ferry et al., 2005). These simulations offer rehearsal spaces for ECs to interact in a virtual classroom interface with avatars remotely controlled by a trained actor (Cohen et al., 2020). While many teacher educators have utilized simulation avatars of students and children in virtual classroom spaces, other researchers have focused on adult-to-adult simulations, such as parent-teacher conferences and teacher-to-teacher interactions (e.g.,

Chen, 2020; Coughlin & Dotger, 2016; Walker & Legg, 2018). In many of these adult-simulated scenarios, teacher candidates practiced navigating challenging interpersonal interactions.

For ML teachers, challenging interactions with general or content area teachers who might (un)consciously promote deficit-oriented views about MLs and their families is a relatively common occurrence (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; García & Kleifgen, 2018; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019). Recognizing and addressing deficit-oriented language, at times "speaking up" against inequities and language that negatively impact the lives and educational opportunities of MLs, is an integral part of ML advocacy (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; Linville, 2019). Teacher education research on ML advocacy development suggests that while ECs might demonstrate advocacy discourse in written discussion boards, more work is needed to bridge the space between advocacy-as-theory and advocacy-in-practice (Warren, 2020). Therefore, a major challenge for ML teacher educators is to provide rehearsal spaces in which ECs can begin to practice and reflect on discourses of ML advocacy—particularly in the context of interactions with colleagues.

While many teacher education programs have described various course assignments, activities, and orientations that align with ML advocacy, few studies have followed program graduates into their teaching contexts to examine how ML advocacy unfolds over time. Literature suggests a complex intersection of sociocultural histories, settings, and teachers' characteristics as salient factors in how teachers adopt and implement pedagogical tools first introduced in their teacher education programs (Grossman et al., 2000; Leko & Brownell, 2011; Thompson et al., 2013). However, these studies, which followed program graduates into their first years of teaching, focused on instructional strategies of science, English language arts, and

Special Education teachers. To date, few (if any) studies have examined whether ML advocacy tools first introduced in ML education programs unfold in similar ways.

This dissertation is a researcher-practitioner response (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) to questions related to the development of ML advocacy skills in teacher education settings, as well as questions related to the socially mediated discourse of ML advocacy that evolves over time and within situated learning settings (Peresinni et al., 2004; Thompson et al., 2013; Vygotsky, 1978). Among the manifold ways in which an ML teacher might serve as an advocate for MLs both within and beyond the classroom, including instructional, interpersonal, and political engagement, I focus this dissertation on interactions that ML teachers might have among colleagues. I ground this work on sociocultural and ecological frameworks (Bronfennbrenner, 1979; Darling, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978) as I view ML teachers as individuals who have the potential to engage in transformative advocacy actions within their particular school settings. While these settings might influence teachers' abilities to engage in ML advocacy, ML teachers might also inspire general education, content area teachers, and administrators to take up ML advocacy actions within their own contexts (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Thompson et al., 2013). In this way, discursive choices can play a significant role when attempting to persuade educational stakeholders to take up ML advocacy. To advance the agenda of examining the discourse of ML advocacy, as well as how it unfolds in teaching settings, I conducted three studies.

Overview of Manuscripts

In manuscript #1, "The Discourse of ESL Advocacy in a Simulated Environment," Dr. April Salerno and I described a simulator role-play assignment in which ML endorsement candidates (ECs) engaged in the work of an ML advocate in a conversation with a simulated

general education teacher (in the form of an avatar) who expressed deficit views about an ML and his family. We then examined the discursive practices of three in-service ECs as they separately advocated for the ML. We applied the theoretical framework of relational trust as a lens for examining how ECs attempted to (re)establish social trust between themselves and the general education teacher colleague. We also examined the discursive features that ECs utilized in their interactions with the simulator. We found that when ECs included most of the components of relational trust in their advocacy efforts, they used inclusive pronouns and future-oriented verb tenses. By contrast, the EC who did not include most of the components of relational trust but instead focused on competence (content expertise) used second person pronouns and the imperative verb tense in her advocacy efforts. This paper has been published in *Linguistics and Education*.

In manuscript #2, "Recontextualizing ESL Advocacy Tools," and as a solo author, I conducted a follow-up study of in-service educators who participated in UVa's ML programs and the ESL Advocacy Simulation. Rather than focusing exclusively on whether/how participants' current advocacy engagement was informed by their simulator interactions, I endeavored to examine broader sociocultural influences. I used situated learning theory (Peresinni et al., 2004) and an ecological framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) to investigate how teachers of MLs adopt and implement (i.e., appropriate) ML advocacy tools (first introduced to them in their teacher education settings) in their interactions with school-based colleagues. I interviewed 15 ML in-service educators to learn about their professional backgrounds and current roles, whether/how they advocate for MLs, challenges to advocacy within their teaching contexts, and courses and other professional experiences that prepared them for their role as ML advocates.

I found that all participants described engaging in various forms of *collaborative* and *instructional* advocacy, which were largely non-transformative (i.e., did not challenge institutions or norms) in nature. In collaboration with colleagues for instruction, participants' advocacy actions were constrained by their situated and ecological settings. Hindrances to transformative collaboration for instruction included state testing mandates, emphases on data/remediation, resources, and school cultures of teacher autonomy. Additionally, nearly all participants described engaging in advocacy as *conversations*, which embodied ML advocacy tools such as relationships, addressing deficit-oriented language, and maintaining assets-orientations. Advocacy as *conversations* were moments where participants described interactions that carried the potential for transformative change. For most participants, *conversations* were spaces in which they felt agency over individual-level challenges to advocacy. Most participants also discussed structural barriers that hindered their agency in advocacy—with the exception of a school principal, whose role and status facilitated broader, structural changes through various and on-going *conversations*. Participants discussed university coursework and previous experiences that prepared them for ML advocacy. Notably, participants discussed ESL, general education, and content-area ML advocacy mentors who were instrumental exemplars in participants' previous experiences—pointing to the potential inspirational role of *any* teacher of MLs engaging in advocacy work. I plan to submit this paper to *TESOL Journal*.

Manuscript #3 builds on the instructional design methods and advocacy emphasis from manuscripts #1 and #2. Manuscript #3 also builds on the finding from manuscript #2 that most teachers of MLs did not engage in transformative advocacy during collaboration for instruction. In manuscript #3, "Advocacy Discourse on Teaching Writing to Multilingual Learners," I developed an assignment for an online course in English Linguistics in which teachers analyzed

a writing sample from an ML and engaged in a simulated dialogue with an ELA teacher-colleague (Ms. Lee; in the form of an avatar) who was extremely focused on the grammar errors she was seeing in the student's writing. In this assignment, ECs applied notions of linguistic transfer, patterns of error, and critical examinations of a "standard" English as they considered how they might approach the collaborative conversation about ML writing through an advocacy lens. I examined 23 ECs' simulation interactions and I identified three approaches that ECs took in their conversations that were consistent across the dataset. I illustrated these three approaches through case-studies of the simulator interactions of Allison, Shane, and Linda (pseudonyms).

I found that ECs approached the collaboration by addressing Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented language—focusing on her *conceptual* orientation. Allison critiqued standardized language ideology and countered Ms. Lee's conceptual orientation by asserting assets-oriented perspectives toward the student and her writing. Focusing on the *conceptual* level, Allison worked to supplant Ms. Lee's deficit orientation, yet she did not provide supports to meet Ms. Lee's immediate and practical instructional needs. By contrast, Shawn approached the collaboration by focusing on providing *strategies*—suggesting instructional techniques, resources, and providing cross-linguistic explanations for the student's errors. Providing *strategies* in the moment, Shawn met the practical and instructional needs of Ms. Lee, yet he did not attempt to counter her deficit-oriented language, and he engaged in the same deficit language he was supposed to address. Finally, ECs approached the collaboration by incorporating a focus on both *conceptual* orientations *and* providing *strategies*. Linda critiqued Ms. Lee's deficit-orientation and worked to re-focus her perspective on the student's assets, yet she also provided practical instructional supports in the moment. Addressing Ms. Lee's *conceptual* orientation, Linda worked to supplant her deficit-oriented footing. However, by providing *strategies* in the

moment, Linda's efforts to maintain an assets-oriented perspective were potentially undermined by her acknowledgement and focus on the student's written errors. As a result, all three advocacy approaches demonstrated both affordances and hindrances. I plan to submit this paper to the *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

In summary, the three papers contribute to the field of ML research and teacher education. These papers address gaps in the literature on methods to develop ML advocacy skills in teacher education settings, as well as gaps that point to the need to follow-up with program participants in order to examine how these skills unfold over time. These papers contribute to teacher education by presenting cutting-edge technology used to develop rehearsal spaces for ECs to engage in practice and reflection on advocacy skills and discursive choices. From a research perspective, instructional designs such as simulated interactions that focus on dialogic practices, present a rich context for examining discourse. As a result, these papers offer novel approaches to teacher training and advocacy discourse.

References

Athanases, S.Z., & de Oliveira, L.C. (2007). Conviction, confrontation, and risk in new teachers' advocating for equity. *Teaching Education, 18*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476 21070 1325150.

Athanases, S.Z., & de Oliveira, L.C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers' challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record, 110*(1), 64–104.

Athanases, S.Z., & Martin, K.J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 627–646. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008.

Bacon, C.K. (2017). Dichotomies, dialects, and deficits: Confronting the "standard English" myth in literacy and teacher education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 66*, 341-357. https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917719255

Bailey, F., Burkett, B., & Freeman, D. (2010). The mediating role of language in teaching and learning: A classroom perspective. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 606–625). Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470694138.ch43

Ball, D., & Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479

Bautista, N.U., & Boone, W.J. (2015). Exploring the Impact of TeachME™ Lab Virtual Classroom Teaching Simulation on Early Childhood Education Majors' Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26*(3), 237-262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9418-8

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B.H. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Bunch, G.C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298–341. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Caldas, B. (2017). Shifting Discourses in teacher education: Performing the advocate bilingual teacher. *Arts Education Policy Review, 118* (4), 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2017.1287801.

Chen, G.A. (2020). "That's Obviously Really Insensitive:" Attuning to marginalization in a parent-teacher encounter. *Cognition and Instruction, 38*(2), 153-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2020.1722128

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance.* Teachers College Press.

Cohen, J., Wong, V., Krishnamachari, A., & Berlin, R. (2020). Teacher coaching in a simulated environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720906217

Coughlin, A.B., & Dotger, B.H. (2016). How can I help: Practicing familial support through simulation. Teacher Education Quarterly, 43(4), 77–96.

Dalgarno, B., Gregory, S., Knox, V., & Reiners, T. (2016). Practicing teaching using virtual classroom roleplays. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 126–154. https://doi.org/ 10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.8

Darling, N. (2007). Ecological systems theory: The person in the center of the circles. *Research in Human Development, 4*(33), 203–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427 60070 1663023

Dawson, M.R., & Lignugaris, B. (2016). Meaningful practice: Generalizing foundation teaching skills from TLE TeachLivE to the classroom. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 39*(3),1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406416664184

Dubetz, N.E., & de Jong, E. (2011). Teacher advocacy in bilingual education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 248-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623603

Ferry, B., Kervin, L.K., Cambourne, B.L., Turbill, J.B., & Hedberg. (2005). Incorporating real experience into the development of a classroom-based simulation. *Journal of Learning Design, 1*(1), 22–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.8

Fillmore, L.W., & Snow, C. (2018). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 8-51). Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9). http://www.tcrecord.org/content. asp?contentid=15018.

Grossman, P., Valencia, S., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. J*ournal of Literacy Research, 32*, 631–662.

Haneda, M., & Alexander, M. (2015). ESL teacher advocacy beyond the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49*, 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.009.

Harrison, J. (2019). Building Advocacy Capacity in a Teacher Training Program. In H.A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 44-52). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Harrison, J., & McIlwain, M.J. (2019). ESOL teachers' experiences in their role as advocate: Making the case for transitive advocacy. *TESOL Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.464

Huelsenbeck, C., Baecher, L., & Staehr Fenner, D. (2019). Action research for advocacy in a supervised teaching seminar. In H.A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 71-83). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Leko, M., Brownell, M. (2011). Special education preservice teachers' appropriation of pedagogical tools for teaching reading. *Exceptional Children, 77*(2), 229-251.

Linville, H. (2015). ESOL teachers as advocates: An important role? *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 98–131. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.193

Linville, H.A. (2019). Advocacy skills for teachers: "A real careful little dance". In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 3–17). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Linville, H.A. (2020). A closer look at ESOL teacher advocacy: What we do and why. *TESOL Journal, 11*(3) 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.508

Lucas, T. & Villegas, A.M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators.* Routledge.

Peressini, D., Borko, H., Romagnano, L., Knuth, E., & Willis, C. (2004). A conceptual framework for learning to teach secondary mathematics: A situative perspective. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 56(1), 67–96.

Self, E.A., & Stengel, B.S. (2020). *Toward anti-oppressive pedagogy: Designing and using simulated encounters.* Harvard Education Press.

Staehr Fenner, D. (2014). *Advocating for English learners: A guide for educators*. Corwin Press.

Stake, R.E. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. The Guilford Press.

TESOL International Association (TESOL). (2019). *Standards for Initial TESOL Pre-K-12 Teacher Preparation Programs*. Author.

Thompson, J., Windschitl, M., Braaten, M. (2013). Developing a theory of ambitious early-career teacher practice. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(3), 574-615.

Truscott, J. (1996). Review article: The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327–369.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes* (Ed. by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman). Harvard University Press.

Walker, J.J., & Legg, A.M. (2018). Parent-teacher conference communication: A guide to integrating family engagement through simulated conversations about student academic progress. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 44*(3), 366-380. doi:10.1080/02607476.2018.1465661

Warren, A.N. (2020): Toward an inclination to advocate: a discursive study of teachers' stance toward linguistically-responsive pedagogy in online language teacher education. *Language and Education, 35*(1), 60-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1801716

Whiting, J. (2016). Training ELL teacher advocates. *Fourth Estate, 32*(2), 9–10. http://textesoliv.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Complete-PDF.pdf

Whiting, J. (2019). Beyond the philosophy statement: Bringing advocacy center stage in TESOL teacher education. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 31–43). Routledge.

WIDA (2019). *K-12 Can Do Descriptors*. Retrieved from https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/can-do/descriptors

The Discourse of ESL Advocacy in a Simulated Environment

Will Fox and April Salerno

University of Virginia

Abstract

Research supports the notion that ESL teachers should not only be language teachers but also English Learner (EL) advocates. Despite evidence that suggests these skills are honed over time in the field, ESL teachers are often asked to exercise these skills immediately in their first year teaching. Thus, preparing individuals for EL advocacy before they become ESL teachers is a necessary component of ESL teacher education. In this paper, we examine a technology-driven simulation experience for ESL teaching candidates (TCs) as part of an online ESL teaching-methods course. We analyze the language of three TCs as they attempt to (re)establish social trust between themselves and the simulated colleague. We found TCs utilized linguistic indexicals to frame the context of the dialogue, and they used components of relational trust to advocate for an EL. We discuss the role of interpersonal skills, content knowledge, and relational trust in advocacy efforts.

Introduction

Research supports the notion that English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers should not only be language teachers but also advocates for English learners[1] (ELs; Athanases & de Oliveira, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). This work often includes advocating for ELs to have equitable access to curricula, resources, funding, or culturally relevant/sustaining pedagogy. To advocate effectively for ELs, ESL teachers must be able to cultivate relationships with educational stakeholders, yet few studies have closely examined the language used to foster this relational trust. Staehr Fenner (2014) elaborates on these interpersonal skills, including the ability to collaborate with different stakeholders, as well as the ability to persuade, empathize, and understand others' perspectives. However, she does not discuss the finer-grained discursive features of these interactions. She argues that ESL teachers need "soft skills" in advocacy efforts with content teachers, including being able to identify teachers who are open to working with ELs, not taking negative comments personally, and beginning advocacy efforts slowly (pp. 74–78). Despite evidence that suggests these skills are honed over time in the field, ESL teachers must often exercise these skills immediately in their first year teaching (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Linville, 2019; Whiting, 2016). Thus, preparing individuals for EL advocacy before they become ESL teachers is a necessary component of ESL teacher education (Athanases & Martin, 2006; Forhan & Scheraga, 2000; Whiting, 2016).

In teacher education settings, field placements are often the primary spaces in which teaching candidates engage with scaffolded teaching practice and socialization. These

[1] Although much important criticism has been leveraged against the term English Learner, including that it depicts students only in relation to English and constantly as learners (see, for example, García & Kleifgen, 2018), we use ELs and ESL (English as a Second Language) in discussing students who are identified for language support services in alignment with US federal policy.

placements are highly complex social environments which present significant challenges to mentor teachers and placement supervisors seeking to provide teaching candidates with safe, scaffolded practice in skills such as EL advocacy. Furthermore, power differentials between TCs and mentors further complicate opportunities for such engagement. In order to provide teaching candidates practice with discrete pedagogical and soft skills that are otherwise not easily practiced in preservice field placements, many teacher education programs have begun to utilize simulation technology (Bautista & Boone, 2015; Cohen et al., 2020; Dalgarno et al., 2016; Dawson & Lignugaris, 2016; Ferry et al., 2005). Fields such as medicine, aviation, and the military have widely utilized digitally mediated simulations for approximating practice, and research suggests simulations feel more realistic than role-plays or rehearsals (Cohen et al., 2020). Utilizing a virtual classroom interface with avatars (i.e., computer generated characters) remotely controlled by a trained actor, or "interactor," simulations offer opportunities for skills practice in standardized, less complex settings (Cohen et al., 2020). With the ability to repeat the same scripted scenario for multiple participants, this technology also allows researchers to systematically examine the language participants use in their reactions to the simulator.

For the current study, we have developed a video-based simulation experience for an online ESL teaching-methods course, which is part of an ESL endorsement course sequence at a state university. Many of the ESL teacher candidates (TCs) in the online course were already experienced or practicing teachers in other subject areas. Through the simulation, TCs each played the role of an ESL teacher, and the simulation avatar (see Figure 1) acted as a general education teacher unhappy with the classroom performance of a fictitious EL on the ESL teacher's caseload. In the scenario, the avatar behaved as a relatively hostile teacher who consistently used deficit-oriented language to discuss a "problematic" EL in her class. Such

deficit-oriented language runs counter to EL advocacy scholarship and the philosophy of the ESL teacher education program, both of which encourage EL teacher advocates to promote assets-oriented views of students (Linville, 2019; Paris & Alim, 2017). TCs participated in various reflective steps after the simulated experience. They watched recordings of classmates' simulations and talked through reflective questions with peers. In this process, they considered how their in-the-moment responses to the avatar may or may not have constituted effective EL advocacy and how they could plan for EL advocacy in future real-life interactions.

Staehr Fenner (2014), Linville (2019), and Harrison and McIlwain (2019) clearly assert that for ESL teachers to be effective EL advocates, they must be able to develop relationships, collaborate, and navigate interactions with resistant educational stakeholders. This study attempts to fill a gap in our understanding of how ESL teacher education programs might provide opportunities for TCs to practice advocacy skills in a semi-controlled environment. By implementing simulator technology with a script acted by a human actor, we are also able to examine how TCs react differently to dialogue that is generally the same. In this paper, we adopt Wortham and Reyes's (2015) three-phase model for discourse analysis alongside an analytical framework for examining social ties and relational trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) between teachers (i.e., at the school organizational level). Applying the components of relational trust at the dyadic discourse level, we examine TCs' attempts to (re)establish trust between themselves and a colleague. We analyze three TCs' discourse during recorded interactions with the simulator, and we attempt to answer the following research questions: (1) What components of relational trust do three TCs use to advocate for an EL in a simulator experience?; (2) What discursive features of relational trust do TCs utilize to advocate for the EL?

FIGURE 1. Screenshot of Example Avatar

Literature review

Defining advocacy for ELs

In the following section, we define both EL advocacy and relational trust, and we present a brief overview of the ecological context in which ESL teachers-as-advocates are situated. We then briefly introduce literature focused on in-service ESL teachers' experiences as advocates, as well as EL advocacy in teacher education programs. We highlight the fact that most studies have examined in-service ESL teachers' experiences, whereas relatively few studies have studied EL advocacy development in preservice settings.

Linville (2019) defines advocacy as "noticing ways ELs' educational success is challenged and then taking action with the goal of improving their educational experiences and outcomes, and life chances" (p. 4). Harrison and McIlwain (2019) add that ESL teachers engage in advocacy efforts beyond their classrooms, extending their efforts to colleagues, administrators,

community members, and families. Harrison and McIlwain focus on the notion of "transitive advocacy," or advocacy that inspires others to become change agents (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019, p. 14). They call for increased engagement with third-parties in which ESL teachers serve as key mediators of advocacy; however, they do not discuss how to develop skills for such social interactions.

Following Athanases and de Oliveira's (2007) notion of "speaking up" against inequities as an EL advocate, we focus on moment-to-moment interactions between ESL teachers and other educators. ESL teachers as advocates must not only possess interpersonal skills to be able to support those around them with ESL content knowledge, but ESL teachers must also possess the skills necessary to *defend* ELs against challenges to their educational successes. ESL teachers must also be able and willing to address deficit-oriented language toward ELs and their families (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007). We also follow Harrison and McIlwain's (2019) notion of transitive advocacy. We add that before ESL teachers can inspire others to become change agents for ELs, ESL teachers must be able to establish relational trust with others (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Without establishing and maintaining the interpersonal conditions necessary for teachers to work collectively toward a common purpose (i.e., relational trust), advocacy efforts become ineffective. For Bryk and Schneider (2002), relational trust involves the mutual presence and discernment of four key elements in moment-to-moment interactions. These four elements are: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity.

1) *Respect* is the recognition of the mutual dependencies of various roles in the school in advancing children's education. Thus, conversations must be endowed with genuine listening so that those with different perspectives feel equally valued.

2) *Competence* is the execution of individuals' formal responsibilities. Student outcomes, however controversial, are often the measure of competence within educational institutions.
3) *Personal regard for others* is a willingness to extend oneself beyond an individual role or set of expectations in acts that demonstrate care for others.
4) *Integrity* refers to consistency between words and actions. For education, this would entail solutions that are in the best interests of learners.

To navigate challenging moment-to-moment interactions and "speak up" against inequities while still maintaining relationships among educational stakeholders, ESL teachers must develop skills necessary to foster relational trust. We believe it is through relational trust that ESL teachers can help colleagues, administrators, community members, and families to develop a sense of shared responsibility in advocating for ELs. In this study, we describe the discourse features of relational trust within the context of a (simulated) challenging social interaction.

Studies of EL advocacy

The ecological contexts of federal, state, and district policies, as well as long-standing cultural assumptions concerning immigration and bilingualism exert enormous influence over ELs' experiences in US schools. When language policy decisions are influenced by popular misconceptions about language acquisition, ELs endure unrealistic expectations and pressure from educational institutions (Brown & Larson-Hall, 2012). At federal and state levels, "English only" movements based on a "sink or swim" language acquisition paradigm continue to influence schools and classrooms despite robust evidence of their ineffectiveness. This evidence suggests that developing an EL's first language (L1) literacy is positively associated with long-

term English proficiency and academic achievement (Hakuta et al., 2000; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Umansky & Reardon, 2014). Assimilation narratives (e.g., immigrant students should prioritize use of their L2 over their L1 in order to achieve academic success) negatively impact a classroom's ability to foster literacy in a student's L1, as well as hinder possibilities to sustain students' multifaceted cultural identities (Dubetz & de Jong, 2011; Paris & Alim, 2017). ELs might spend most of their daily instructional time with general-education teachers. Even among those willing to work with linguistically diverse students, many general-education teachers find themselves ill-equipped to meet ELs' needs (Bunch, 2013; Coady et al., 2011; Gándara et al., 2005). Amid these contexts, ESL teachers often find themselves on the frontlines of advocacy, defending and advocating for ELs with their ESL content expertise.

Although researchers and teacher educators continue to promote culturally and linguistically responsive teaching practices, recent research suggests that ESL teachers' efforts to defend and advocate for ELs are often met with resistance. Harrison and McIlwain (2019) conducted a mixed-methods study of 116 ESL teachers in four Southeastern US states regarding the role of advocacy in their teaching positions. They found that establishing and maintaining relationships among educational stakeholders is a fundamental role of an ESL teacher. They explained that much of the ESL teacher's role extends beyond the one-on-one student relationship to include work with administrators, colleagues, guidance counselors, media, policymakers, district personnel, parents, and community members. Harrison and McIlwain also reported that although 80 percent of respondents indicated a high degree of effectiveness in their advocacy, more than 70 percent mentioned experiencing a barrier of "implicit resistance" to their advocacy efforts from colleagues or administrators. They described this resistance as undermining ESL teachers' efforts to counter deficit-oriented beliefs about students, their

families, and immigration, as well as reluctance to implement suggested strategies from ESL teachers.

Other studies on EL advocacy among in-service teachers focused on describing the nature and extent of ESL teachers' advocacy actions. Haneda and Alexander (2015) interviewed elementary ESL teachers and discussed contextual and personal factors that promoted or hindered their abilities to enact forms of advocacy. They found limited instructional time with ELs hindered their abilities to enact advocacy within the classroom. Outside the classroom, elementary teachers focused on helping ELs navigate the school system, reaching out to EL families or assisting other colleagues in communicating with ELs' families, and offering their expertise to help general education teacher colleagues. Tricket et al. (2012) found that high school ESL teachers' acts of advocacy were negatively impacted by burdensome paperwork, language assessment responsibilities, and excessive meetings. Tricket et al. (2012) also indicated that the size and complexity of high schools increased the breadth of their social networks at the school. As a result, high school ESL teachers' advocacy efforts were dependent on relationships with a wide range of educators who worked with ELs.

Together, these studies on in-service ESL teachers' experiences indicate the importance of relationships among colleagues. However, relatively few studies have examined how to develop these interpersonal skills in preservice settings. Linville (2019) asked in-service teachers where they acquired EL advocacy skills. Most ESL teacher participants indicated that their preservice teaching programs encouraged a disposition of advocacy, whereas the primary setting in which they reported developing their advocacy skills was on the job. Whiting (2019) argued for including more opportunities to develop advocacy skills in preservice settings, explaining that ESL teachers need to be able to "hit the ground running" with advocacy efforts, even within

the first weeks of teaching (Whiting, 2019, p. 30). He described role-play scenarios that provided opportunities for TCs to engage in advocacy skills practice.

Warren (2020) investigated online discussion board responses of TCs enrolled in a four-course online sequence with a focus on preparing teachers of multilingual students. She examined how TCs engaged with advocacy-related discussion topics and found that many TCs demonstrated "inclinations to advocate" through their discursive stances, but that it was unclear how or if TCs could apply these skills in live discourse practice. Linville (2015) investigated preservice teachers' beliefs about the role of advocacy. She administered surveys to 50 master's-level TESOL students, nearly half of whom were part-time or full-time teachers. She found that (1) number of courses taken in their master's program, and (2) overall teaching experience were significant predictors of TCs beliefs in the importance of advocacy.

While teacher educators and researchers call for increased practice of advocacy skills embedded within teacher education programs, few studies have examined the development of these skills. While Linville (2019) indicated that the majority of ESL teachers developed the skills of EL advocacy on the job, it is unclear whether these skills are learnable in preservice settings. Furthermore, while studies on EL advocacy have largely focused on describing the interpersonal "soft" skills of an EL advocate, less is known about the finer-grained discursive features of these interactions. For the current study, we examine the discursive features that TCs utilized in their advocacy efforts in a simulated environment while also analyzing TCs' responses through the lens of relational trust.

Theoretical framework

We argue that ESL teachers must be able to establish trust among educational stakeholders to enact advocacy beyond the confines of their classrooms and foster transitive

advocacy (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019). That is, in order for ESL teachers' advocacy efforts to be received, adopted, or enacted, educational stakeholders must be willing to receive new information, strategies, or perspectives from ESL teachers. Establishing and discerning this trust might require that one party work to remedy areas where relational trust has been weakened.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) developed relational trust as a theoretical framework to explain schools' organizational effectiveness. The researchers asserted that for a school to effectively implement policy, curriculum, or educational reforms, relational trust must be present. Bryk and Schneider drew on Putnam's work, using social capital theory to analyze the functionality of democratic institutions. Putnam (1993) explained that for a democratic institution to run effectively, individuals must be willing to associate with one another for common purposes. For Putnam, social ties reflect levels of relational trust and thus influence effectiveness of democratic organizations (Putnam, 1993). Bryk and Schneider (2002) applied this theory to schools, where relational trust and social ties impact student and community outcomes.

In teacher-teacher relations, individuals must make in-the-moment judgments about competence, respect, personal regard, and integrity of others. Thus, it is important to examine how study participants respond to the hostile teacher avatar by acting in ways that promote trust—demonstrating competence, respect, personal regard, and integrity. In this study's simulated scenario, the general-education teacher (avatar) consistently used language that represents infractions of relational trust. Thus, the knowledge and skills that the TCs accessed for this simulation can be viewed as resources to mediate or mitigate breaches of relational trusts.

Methods

Researchers' positionalities

We approach this study as practitioner-researchers in which we seek both to improve our own practice and generate new knowledge for others through our work (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). We view this project as a multiple-case study (Stake, 2006) in which we utilize discourse analytical methods to closely examine the language used by case-study TCs in the simulation (Wortham & Reyes, 2015). As practitioner-researchers, we both played key roles in the research setting. April was the primary instructor of the course from which data was taken, while Will assisted her. Together, we developed, piloted, and implemented the simulation assignment in which TCs participated. Further, we built this assignment based largely on our own experiences as ESL teachers and language teacher educators, particularly experiences in which we ourselves had to navigate tricky interpersonal encounters with colleagues about ELs we taught.

Participants

Participants included the 13 TCs enrolled in one section of an online ESL teaching-methods course at a large, public Southern university. Ten of the 13 TCs were female, and all but one were practicing teachers. Years of teaching experience ranged from 2 to 28. Five TCs reported having previous or current experience in private schools, while the other eight reported public school experience. Four TCs reported having experience at the elementary level, while the other nine either reported upper-grade-level experience or did not indicate the context of their experience. Five TCs reported already possessing master's degrees. Because of the course's online modality, students' residencies varied greatly. Three TCs were teaching abroad (Middle-East and Asia), while the remaining 10 lived on the U.S. East Coast.

We chose three TCs as cases to highlight three EL advocacy approaches. For our analysis, we focused on the simulator interactions of Stanley, Mandy, and Benny (pseudonyms). We chose these three TCs because after watching all 13 participants' interactions, these three

represented the clearest examples of TCs who took very different approaches, each doing one of the following: (1) including most of the components of relational trust, (2) focusing on only one or two components of relational trust, and (3) including elements of relational trust but struggling to articulate ESL content. These TCs, similar to the make-up of the overall course, were White and L1 English-speakers. We recognize the need for future research with more ethnically and linguistically diverse participants.

Stanley was an ESL/English 10 (ages 15 to 16 years old) teacher in East Asia; he was also serving as a resident advisor in the school dormitory. We chose Stanley as a representative based on his calm demeanor and clear attempts to address deficit-oriented language in the simulator. For our study, Stanley represents a TC who utilizes many components of relational trust while still directly addressing deficit-oriented language.

Mandy held a master's degree in education and was living and teaching in the Middle East as a first-grade teacher at a bilingual private school. For our study, Mandy represents a TC whose interactions focus mainly on the relational trust category of *competence*, as evidenced by her consistent use of direct suggestions and ESL strategies to address the general education teacher.

Benny was in his second year as an English teacher at a boys' private boarding school in the US; he was also serving as a coach and resident advisor. Reflecting on his first year teaching in his online discussion-board introduction, Benny commented on his desire to learn more about ESL methods:

> I had a lot of trouble getting my ESL [students] up to speed with the rest of the class. I felt as though they were often ill-prepared for assessments and essays because of my inexperience as a teacher, and I hope to be able to improve on that this year!

For our study, Benny represents a TC who utilizes many relational trust components but whose still-developing ESL content knowledge and teaching inexperience might diminish one's perception of his competence.

Simulator background and script

TCs completed the simulation as a required assignment for their methods course. Before engaging with the video-based simulation, all TCs were provided with background information on the fictitious general-education teacher (Ms. Laing), the fictitious EL (Fernando) and his family, as well as relevant school context. In the simulation script, Ms. Laing is a general-education teacher (avatar) with 10 years teaching experience at her school. For the simulation, TCs assumed this was their first year working at the hypothetical school; they had an overall positive professional relationship with Ms. Laing but had not had much opportunity to visit her classroom because they taught another class when she taught Fernando. TCs also knew that Ms. Laing had been vocal about her negative experiences and feelings toward ELs.

In the simulator, Ms. Laing complains about Fernando, a 12-year-old, 6th-grade EL. Fernando has been in the US in the TCs' school district since kindergarten, except for three months in 2nd grade when he moved temporarily to stay with another relative in the US. Fernando's L1 is Spanish; he was born in Honduras, and his family immigrated to the US when he was 4. His standardized language proficiency test scores have not changed in the past two years, which are advanced in speaking and listening, and intermediate in reading and writing. Fernando's father works two jobs to provide for their family, and Fernando's mom babysits and volunteers at their church.

The simulator script provided to the simulator interactor (who played the Ms. Laing avatar) consisted of learning challenges and objectives. We used two learning challenges for the

TCs: (1) recognize and address deficit-oriented language that Ms. Laing is using about an EL's family/culture, and (2) recognize and address deficit-oriented language that she is using about an EL's behavior and academic performance. TCs were also provided with these two advocacy objectives prior to their engagement with the simulator, but they were unaware of what Ms. Laing would say in the interaction. We wrote responses for the interactor to be based on how TCs responded to these challenges (see Table 1). For example, in cases where TCs did not meet the expectations for the simulation objectives (termed "misses"), Ms. Laing became even more hostile and reiterated the deficit-oriented language in the hopes of generating a desired response. In cases where TCs met the objectives (termed "hits"), Ms. Laing would nod her head in agreement and be amenable to TCs' suggestions.

For the family/culture learning objective, Ms. Laing complains that she is unable to reach Fernando's family by phone and that they do not care about his education. For the academic/behavioral learning objective, Ms. Laing explains that she "has tried to put him next to the brightest kids in the class" and that "he doesn't turn anything in and just whispers in Spanish to others in the class" despite her knowledge that "he knows English." Later, in an exasperated tone, Ms. Laing exclaims, "he just isn't motivated." For the assignment, we expected TCs to address or respond to this deficit-oriented language. As part of ensuring the script's validity, we piloted the simulation with three graduate students who were not part of the course but who had experience taking ESL teaching-methods courses.

Table 1 Simulator Objectives: Hits and Misses

When learners….	Avatar might...

	NOTE: *Avatar can choose from among these actions to respond to any of the learner hits or misses in the left column.*
HIT	HIT
Performance Objective #1: Academic/class Question the student's motivation Ask questions regarding Spanish usage (e.g. "What exactly was Fernando saying in Spanish?") Ask questions related to the difficulty/language/expectations of the assignment Question the seating arrangement of the students Make suggestions related to solving the issue as something other than Fernando's lack of motivation (e.g. "how can we make the assignment or class more accessible for Fernando?" or "How can the class be more culturally relevant/responsive for Fernando?" of "Is there a way that Fernando could use Spanish to learn the class content?") Ask clarifying questions, open-ended questions Talks about differences between social language and academic language **Performance Objective #2:Family** Push back on family assumptions (e.g. "let's be careful not to assume") Make suggestions related to solving the issue together (e.g. "let's meet again to discuss how we can reach his parents together") Suggest a scenario that paints Fernando's family in a more realistic way (e.g., "I talked with his parents at a community event and they were very encouraging and supportive of Fernando" or "both his parents work two jobs to provide for their family")	Nod head Look engaged Say "good point, I didn't consider that" Say "oh, okay"; "That's a good idea"; "Let's do that" (If asked to elaborate on classroom context beyond what the script allows, say: "I'll have to think about that" or "That makes me think, I'll have to get back to you on that"). Respond with "Oh okay, I agree, he doesn't have enough academic English to be in my class. Maybe he should just be in your ESL class instead of my class." Seem amenable to possibility of collaborating on solutions.
MISS	MISS
Performance Objective #1:Academic/class	

Doesn't address anything about class or academic performance Gets angry or uses negative language towards teacher or student Tells teacher to provide all work in Spanish for Fernando	Respond with "Well, what should I do about him not being able to do any of the work in my class? And how much he speaks Spanish with his friends!"
Performance Objective #2:Family Talks about different cultures not emphasizing education, talks negatively about other cultures or family Gets angry or uses negative language towards teacher or student	Seem pleased to hear it, respond with "I don't know what we're supposed to do if they can't help themselves at home."
Doesn't address anything about calling home/family Claims it a problem for all ESL kids	Respond with "Well, what should I do about the family situation? How can I get him to work in class if I can't get his parents on board, or even be able to communicate with them in English!"

Procedure

Prior to the simulation experience, TCs read and engaged in discussions of EL advocacy, family relationships, and collaboration among teachers. These discussions asked students to synthesize readings in explaining what productive relationships between ESL teachers and other educators might look like and in considering their own assets and growth areas in terms of working as EL advocates (see appendix for list of course readings). TCs signed up for 15-minute windows in which to participate in the simulation. We then placed TCs into small groups and assigned them to online discussion boards in which individual group members had access to recordings of each other's simulations.

In addition to the avatar responding to the learner's hits or misses as indicated in Table 1, we also planned that each learner would complete two consecutive, five-minute versions of the simulation with Ms. Laing exhibiting different conflict levels. In the first scenario, Ms. Laing was cooperative and willing to receive suggestions from the TCs despite using deficit-oriented language about Fernando. In the second scenario, Ms. Laing was less cooperative. Because research suggests that ESL teachers' advocacy efforts are often met with resistance from colleagues (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019), we focused our analysis on the second scenario. After completing the two five-minute simulations, TCs completed reflection questions that addressed:

1) their overall experience with the technology,

2) ways they could improve their advocacy efforts,

3) the nature of the skills/knowledge they accessed while in the simulator

4) two questions they wanted to ask their group for feedback, and

5) the realism of the experience.

After completing the simulation and reflection questions, TCs met with their groups to watch each other's recorded simulations, discuss the videos, and offer each other feedback. These meetings were recorded on Zoom and stored in Canvas Studio, a cloud-based platform, where group members could access them. Group discussions were based on the two questions for which each student requested feedback, as well as questions that addressed: (a) similarities/differences between each other's experiences, (b) ways to improve, (c) lessons learned regarding their readiness for advocacy, (d) how the technology helped/hindered the experience, and (e) potential future applications for simulation experiences. Following these interactive group meetings, TCs submitted their written responses to reflection questions.

Analytic strategies

Following data collection, I watched all 13 TCs' recorded simulation interactions and read their pre-simulation discussions and post-simulation reflections. I used closed captioning software to auto-generate initial transcriptions of the recorded interactions and cleaned transcriptions for accuracy and readability. To guide analysis, I adopted Wortham and Reyes's (2015) three-phase discourse analysis approach. Since the current study is an examination of how TCs might advocate for an EL in collaboration with a colleague, I found Wortham and Reyes's (2015) focus on social action and relationships in discrete discursive events to be an appropriate method for examining TCs' language in the simulator experience. The three phases in Wortham and Reyes's (2015) iterative discourse analysis framework are: (1) mapping the narrated event, (2) identifying/construing indexicals, and (3) interpreting social action.

In the first phase—mapping the narrated event—I examined contents of the discursive interactions. According to Wortham and Reyes (2015), mapping narrated events involves using "knowledge of semantic, pragmatic, and grammatical regularities" (p. 41). Because of the simulation experience's systematic design, key discursive events were recurring and intentionally predictable (i.e., regularities). These events followed the script's learning objectives (mentioned above and in Table 1). In the second phase—identifying/construing indexicals—I identified five salient pragmatic indexical signals based on the 13 TCs' responses and interactions with the simulator. These pragmatic signals were (1) TCs' use of ESL content knowledge to clarify, correct, or provide instructional strategies to Ms. Laing, (2) TCs' use of clarifying questions to elicit further explanation of Ms. Laing's concerns (3) TCs' attempts to collaborate with Ms. Laing by discussing future partnerships with her (e.g., planning future meetings) , (4) TCs' attempts to demonstrate empathy/solidarity with Ms. Laing and her concerns, and (5) TCs' attempts at addressing deficit language from Ms. Laing. At the same

time, I also identified TCs' usage of deictics, such as, "we," "us," "you," and future verb tenses which helped to define the spatiotemporal context of the discursive event.

I then reflected on the interpersonal nature of the indexicals in situations such as the simulator interactions where relationship-building is foundational to being able to share new information with another person. Based on these considerations, I identified relational trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) as an appropriate theoretical framework for reconfiguring the salient indexicals. Reflecting the "iterative cycle of configuring, construing, and interpreting indexicals" (Wortham & Reyes, 2015, p. 43), I used the relational trust framework to reconfigure TC responses by (1) respect, (2) competence, (3) personal regard for others, and (4) integrity. To increase validity, I sought feedback from peer researchers, including April.

Again, reflecting an iterative cycle, I then re-evaluated the discursive events for salient indexical features within the relational trust framework. According to Wortham and Reyes, deictics are examples of indexicals that establish reference in a discursive event; they include: (1) personal deictics, such as the use of *I*, *you*, or *we*, and (2) spatiotemporal deictics, such as *here*, *there*, *now*, or *then*, as well as (3) verb tenses, which presuppose and create the context of discursive events (Wortham & Reyes, 2015, p. 47). Thus, deictics serve as indexicals of how interlocutors both interpret and create discourse space, time, and relationships. Therefore, to answer research question two, I focused on how TCs used deictics to attempt to establish relational trust between themselves and Ms. Laing.

Findings

In the following section, we present excerpts of the three aforementioned focal TCs' responses to the simulation: Stanley, Mandy, and Benny. We introduce each excerpt with relevant context and key features that we then examine in more detail. In our analysis, we discuss

how the three TCs' interactions and responses align with the categories of relational trust (research question one; see Table 2 for examples), as well as how personal and spatiotemporal deictics as indexicals serve to define the contextual boundaries of relational trust between interlocutors (research question two).

In all excerpts, deictics that are part of our main analysis are bolded. Line numbers are based on breath units, with new lines started where speakers paused to take breaths. Ellipses in parentheses indicate pauses and hesitations, up-arrows denote rising intonation, use of (XX) indicate unclear speech, and underlining indicates emphasis.

Table 2 Relational Trust Framework with Examples from TCs

Category	**Definition**	**Examples from TCs**
Respect	Recognition of the mutual dependencies of various roles in the school in advancing children's education	Using inclusive "we," "us," or "our" in reference to mutual responsibility for EL students
	Conversations must be endowed with genuine listening so that different perspectives feel equally valued.	Recasting main ideas of other speaker Asking clarifying questions
Competence	Execution of individuals' formal responsibilities	Addressing misunderstandings about second language acquisition, ESL methods, or cultures
	Student outcomes, however controversial, are often the measure of competence within educational institutions.	Addressing inadequate institutional supports for ELs
Personal Regard for Others	Willingness to extend oneself beyond an individual role or set of expectations in acts that demonstrate to others that they care for them	Offering to help teacher with a student or issue after school hours

	Reducing others' sense of vulnerability. Going the extra mile for others	Suggesting further collaborative efforts; showing empathy
Integrity	Consistency between words and actions. Despite personal interests or needs, a focus on solutions grounded in the primary principles of the institution For education, this would entail solutions that are in the best interests of the children. Calling on or using moral-ethical presuppositions as injunctions	Referencing institutional or moral expectations for education Direct addresses against deficit-oriented language toward ELs and their families.

Adapted from Bryk & Schneider (2002)

Stanley

In the excerpt below, Stanley responds to Ms. Laing's frustrations about Fernando's language proficiency, use of Spanish in the classroom, and in-class behavior. Stanley briefly but directly addresses Ms. Laing's concerns about Fernando's English proficiency and behavior. He then utilizes an inclusive indexical to establish a sense of mutual dependency.

Excerpt 1a.

1 but I do want to caution on (..) assuming the uh

2 oral capabilities are as good as his uh writing skills or reading skills ↑

3 and so I think that's something to take a look at, is he

4 potentially acting out because he's frustrated because he can't access the material?

5 um (..) and that's something that **we** can look at if you're interested in

Stanley voices a disjunctive, (line 1) "but," that leads to a direct address to Ms. Laing about

language proficiency domains, (lines 1-2). This direct statement involves Stanley, as the ESL teacher, positioning himself as competent or as someone who can offer suggestions. Stanley then recasts a potential explanation for Fernando's academic language difficulties with a question, (lines 3-4) "is he potentially acting out because he's frustrated because he can't access the material?" Finally, Stanley's use of "that's something that **we** can look at" as a linguistic indexical of inclusion positions the two teachers as mutually dependent, engaging in the work together as an act of respect (Bryk & Schneider, 2002, p. 23).

Ms. Laing responds to Stanley's suggestion that they consider the situation more closely together by stating that Stanley should be the one who is responsive to her needs because he is the ESL teacher. In the next example, we see Stanley attempt to establish relational trust by demonstrating personal regard and respect for Ms. Laing and we see Stanley use future tense and personal deictics to broaden the potential temporal context of the interaction.

Excerpt 1b.

6 Yeah I definitely understand your frustration but I think that it's, it's, it's always a challenge to

7 to be able to reach every single student

8 and with a number of students in the class it's when one student is falling behind

9 it can be <u>frustrating</u> and difficult but

10 I think it's important, maybe **we** can try to work on something together

11 I don't see Fernando as needing to be moved strictly into our, like, bridging, our ESL course alone

12 I think he's, he's quite competent in English at his current level to be able to access the

13 you know access your, your class material

14 I think maybe **we** could do some modifications

15 um about that (XX)

Stanley reacts by showing empathy toward Ms. Laing, and he offers conciliatory remarks, sympathizing with teachers who must reach all the students in a class. This show of empathy can be seen as an act of respect or personal regard for Ms. Laing. He then uses an inclusive "**we**" to refer to future actions that would address Ms. Laing's concerns. This use of "…**we** can try to work on something together" (line 10) in future collaboration extends the role of ESL teacher and personal regard for Ms. Laing. This discursive and relational move unifies respect (mutual dependencies), competence (formal role), and personal regard for others (reducing vulnerabilities). In this excerpt, Stanley also responds to a suggestion posed by Ms. Laing that Stanley should remove Fernando from her class. Here, Stanley directly negates this as a solution and asserts Fernando's competence in English to be able to access her course content (line 12), while again proffering a future, inclusive act of personal regard (line 14), using the personal deictic "**we**" to do so.

Ms. Laing then brings up her difficulties in reaching Fernando's parents by phone. She declares, as scripted, that "his parents don't care about his education," and Stanley responds to Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language about Fernando's family. Stanley asserts his competence and extends his personal regard for Ms. Laing, We can also see Stanley appealing to a moral-ethical responsibility (integrity) when he asserts the collective role of teachers to look after students.

Excerpt 1c.

16 Well I definitely, I can, I can help you, I will you know I've,

17 I've had Fernando in my class before and he's been within our school for quite a long time

18 so I mean I can definitely help you in

19 in getting contact with the office and trying to find a contact for him

20 or seeing when his last home visit was (..) anything like that (XX)

21 you know I also want to remind you that it's (..) you know it's also **our** job not just my own that we look after **our** students and take care of them

22 so it's something to consider moving forward and

23 how you can help him and (..) then try to ease that frustration that you have right now

Stanley's reply includes the type of support that his formal role (competence) might entail, and he includes some information regarding Fernando's school history, though adding the detail that Fernando had been in his class before, which was not information provided to TCs (lines 17-20). Stanley also extends his personal regard for Ms. Laing by demonstrating a willingness to contact the school or district office for her (line 19). Then, Stanley makes a critical pivot in his response (lines 21-22) "You know I also want to remind you that it's, it's also **our** job and not just my own that we look after **our** students…" This linguistic turn is a direct address to language that Ms. Laing has been using. At first glance, it might appear that this move is simply the use of the inclusive "we" and "our" to establish a sense of mutual dependency or respect. However, this statement also encapsulates a reminder of Ms. Laing's formal role (i.e., competence) in providing for her students' needs as well as a seeming appeal to moral-ethical and institutional expectations (i.e., integrity).

Reacting to Stanley's injunction, Ms. Laing acknowledges her personal difficulties but returns the focus to the ESL department, explaining that she had expected a lot more support from them and that she feels frustrated not knowing what to do and with little control over her class roster. Stanley responds with personal language, reiterating the collective responsibility of teachers in supporting their students' needs. The dialogue continues:

Excerpt 1d.

24 Ok well yeah

25 I mean **I'll** definitely see what I can do personally in helping out with this um

26 you know so we're here to help the students who need our support

27 but it's definitely a collaborative effort

28 um and as long as you think **we** can move forward working together

29 and try something

30 and I think it will work out soon (..) you know (..) take a breather

Here, Stanley replies with a future tense promise, "I'll definitely see what I can do personally" (line 25). This discursive move positions the relationship between the two interlocutors beyond the immediate context's spatiotemporal boundaries. The word "personally" literally adds an element of personal regard, yet it is unclear how or if this promise for future support will yield the fruits of action. Finally, we see Stanley reiterate his offer to extend their relationship's boundaries by suggesting "it's definitely a collaborative effort…as long as you think we can move forward working together…I think it will work out soon" (line 27-30). In a way, this conclusion epitomizes the co-dependence of respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity in establishing relational trust.

Stanley's simulator interaction contained all four categories of relational trust. He directly addressed Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language while still initiating each response with respect and personal regard for her. In his direct counters to Ms. Laing's language choices, Stanley asserted his competence by infusing his responses with his background knowledge about Fernando, as well as ESL content-specific knowledge (e.g. differentiating between proficiencies among language domains). Finally, by appealing to integrity and the notion of mutual dependency, he reaffirmed the collaborative nature of teachers' work with ELs. Having exemplified many aspects of relational trust, he thus positioned his relationship with Ms. Laing as future-oriented. Stanley's view that successful advocacy for Fernando hinged on a relationship with Fernando's content teacher is exemplified in Stanley's post-simulation written reflection:

> I did try to use logic to help Fernando, but it was most important to reach Ms. Laing so as to influence her, and almost make it about her so that she would cooperate. Without her help, I don't see Fernando being able to improve, and her attitude in both scenarios was poor.

Stanley's approach to "make it about her" was in part borne out by his usage of personal and temporal deictics, as well as the components of relational trust. Stanley's use of all four relational trust components seems well-aligned with his conscious choice to help Fernando by attending to his relationship with Ms. Laing. For teacher educators, Stanley's case might serve as an example of how TCs can take balanced approaches to advocacy through utilizing both content knowledge and interpersonal skills.

Mandy

Unlike Stanley, who demonstrated competence alongside other aspects of relational trust (personal regard, respect, and integrity), Mandy's responses to Ms. Laing's language and

concerns center almost exclusively around the relational trust category of competence. In Mandy's response to Ms. Laing's initial complaints about Fernando, Mandy emphasizes research on the benefits of utilizing a student's L1 as an asset for content comprehension by suggesting peer supports who speak the same L1 as Fernando, thus imploring Ms. Laing to "honor the home language." She also uses ESL knowledge on a standardized proficiency test and second language acquisition theory to explain why Ms. Laing might have confused Fernando's conversations in English with friends in the hallways with his academic performance in class. In an act of personal regard, Mandy compliments Ms. Laing on how she has seated him near native English-speaking peers. Mandy continues to inform Ms. Laing with her background knowledge of Fernando, explaining that he has been in the States for "quite some time" and that "he's been going to elementary all the way through here."

In the following excerpt, we see Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language toward Fernando and Mandy's response. Following this exchange, Mandy does not continue to address Ms. Laing's assertion that Fernando lacks motivation, but instead provides further instructional suggestions.

Excerpt 2a.

1 *Ms. Laing*: I mean he rarely turns anything in

2 I think he's just not <u>motivated</u> at all and I don't know why—

3 *Mandy*: — I don't know if it's a lack of—

4 *Ms. Laing*: —I really would like you to take this kid off my hands and put him in your class and you know, <u>done</u>!

5 *Mandy*: You know I am teaching another class during this period

6	but I can give you strategies and help in ways to help scaffold the written language for him
7	so maybe have one of the peers (..) English friends sitting next to him read the language
8	or read the passage
9	out loud as he's reading it normally so (XX)
10	it's not taking him another time to read it
11	you know you read it separately

In Ms. Laing's reply, she expresses concern that Fernando is (line 2) "just not motivated." Mandy's interjection of (line 3) "I don't know if it's a lack of—" appears at first to engage deficit-oriented language with Ms. Laing by overlapping Ms. Laing's suggestions that Fernando lacked motivation. This reaction to the deficit-oriented language did not appear to impact the ensuing discourse, and Mandy made no further attempt to address this issue directly. A "hit" for the simulation could have entailed Mandy returning to Ms. Laing's assertions about Fernando's motivation, perhaps in a similar fashion as Stanley, who utilized personal regard and respect as precursors to directly addressing and refuting deficit-oriented language. This might have therefore been a missed opportunity for Mandy to address deficit-oriented language.

Afterwards, and in response to Mandy's instructional strategies involving student collaboration, Ms. Laing retorts that she does not want to burden another student with having to help Fernando. Here again, Mandy continues to provide instructional strategies in the moment, using second-person deictics in the imperative form to convey her content expertise, or

competence, which contrasts with Stanley's use of inclusive indexicals alongside his exercise of competence.

Excerpt 2b.

12 But like maybe, okay, instead of having it all as a class **you** can have it, **you** could read it aloud to the whole class

13 or have groups and talk about it so incorporating more oral language into the lesson

14 or (..) find a text maybe that has a little bit less of the vocabulary

15 and more simplified, **you** know **you** go to, um (XX)

16 go to like Reading A to Z and find what **you're** learning about

17 what **you're** studying about and see if there's a social studies passage

18 that's at a, at a, at his reading level that's a little bit lower

19 or.. **you** can (XX)

20 and for writing **you** can have him dictate little bit lower, or **you** can look for writing maybe have him dictate to

21 or give him some words to choose from in like sentence frames—

(End of simulation session due to timeout)

Of note in terms of deictic indexicals, Mandy uses the "**you**" singular/imperative form frequently in this section. Perhaps in connection to the notion that Ms. Laing needs immediate suggestions, Mandy replies with additional instructional methods at the second-person level. She does not utilize inclusive personal indexicals, nor does she utilize future tenses that might indicate a (possibly hypothetical) future collaboration or relationship. The simulation time expired before Mandy could finish explaining an instructional strategy using sentence frames.

On one hand, Mandy's efforts could have been an attempt to establish herself as an expert in ESL content. This formal role of "ESL teacher as expert" could have had an impact on how Mandy approached her advocacy efforts. On the other hand, Mandy might have felt that the interaction was her only chance to provide support to Ms. Laing, given both the constraints of the simulation time and the context of her own teaching schedule at the simulated school. Additionally, it is possible that some TCs (including Mandy) viewed the experience as an opportunity to demonstrate as much ESL knowledge as possible not in their fictitious role as ESL instructor but in their actual role as a student completing a course assignment. In her reflection when discussing differences between her simulation experience and her peers' simulations, Mandy wrote,

> One big difference that I noticed from my video compared to my partners was that I gave out direct suggestions and strategies for Ms. Laing… For me, I came from a primary classroom teacher's perspective, and I would want something I could try right away (Reflection question 2).

Perhaps for Mandy, the teacher was in desperate need of her ESL expertise and she complied with that implicit request through direct suggestions. Mandy's ESL content expertise served to address perceived issues related to a colleague's competence. However, without more context on the assignment or classroom text, the panoply of suggestions could be viewed as superficial or burdensome rather than legitimate suggestions for implementation. Time did not allow for elaboration on her specific suggestions, and Mandy did not make efforts to discuss collaboration with Ms. Laing in the future. Thus, it is unclear how Mandy made efforts to establish respect or personal regard for Ms. Laing in her advocacy.

In her approach, Mandy viewed the interaction as bounded by the encounter's immediate physical and temporal limitations. Applying the relational trust framework, many of Mandy's discursive choices did not reflect aspects of respect, personal regard for others, or integrity. Her interaction epitomizes the competence category, and in many ways her responses provide ESL methodological details that Stanley does not include. However, it is unclear whether or how Ms. Laing would have applied Mandy's suggested strategies. Unlike Stanley, Mandy does not utilize the deictics of future tense or inclusive personal pronouns, nor does she address deficit-oriented language in a direct or clear way. If these approaches are necessary for building relational trust with Ms. Laing, then Mandy might have missed that opportunity. For teacher educators, Mandy's case might suggest the importance of teaching interpersonal skills alongside content knowledge, particularly in interactions like those with Ms. Laing where a teacher resists working with ELs or receiving advice.

Benny

Benny utilizes many relational trust components in his simulation experience. However, a potential unfamiliarity with ESL content and missed opportunities to address deficit-oriented language might contribute to weakened discernible trust in the moment-to-moment interaction. After Benny asks clarification questions, Ms. Laing responds that Fernando is not doing well in class, including statements about his in-class use of Spanish, his seat next to the highest performing students in the class, and hearing him speak English in the hallways with friends. In this excerpt, we can see a number of pauses in the middle of Benny's responses.

Excerpt 3a.

1 Yeah, um, so I think, um, an important thing for Fernando is (..)

2 he's not (XX) he’s not quite at the level of, of written and oral language (…) acquisition

3 that I would call (…) comprehensive ↑

4 um he still struggles (…) as much as he can converse in English right ↑

5 um I hear him do it all the time also

6 he definitely has a lot of issues with

7 sort of the finer points of (…)

8 the, the, the, the most elite points the

9 most skilled points of speaking English

10 sort of the comparing contrasting um

11 because he doesn’t quite have the language for it

12 um I think (…) did you try sitting him with the other Spanish speakers in the class at the beginning of the year maybe?

Benny attempts to inform Ms. Laing about written and oral language differences, but he hesitates often and describes Fernando’s language acquisition as not “comprehensive.” He continues describing Fernando’s difficulties with what he calls the “finer points,” the “most elite,” and “high skilled points” of speaking English, where he continues to describe an example of these points, such as compare and contrast. It is unclear how Benny connects or distinguishes oral and written language in his response, and it is unclear how firm a grasp Benny has on ESL terminology. Rather than establishing himself as a resource with expertise to share (Mandy’s example), Benny’s hesitations and ambiguity in explaining the relationship between language domains and proficiency levels seem to undermine his argument. Additionally, by focusing nearly entirely on what Fernando is unable to do linguistically, Benny is engaging in some of the

same deficit-oriented language he is supposed to address. Benny's post-simulation reflection supports the notion that potentially insufficient background or knowledge in ESL made the simulation conversation difficult for him:

> I think at this point I definitely don't have enough of a background in teaching ESL to rely on that much at all…it was my ability to slow down someone who was clearly unhappy and consider their perspective before rebutting, much more than it was my ability to explain how Fernando could best be aided in the classroom as language learner (Reflection question 2).

Ms. Laing responds to Benny's question about seating arrangements and then exclaims that Benny is suggesting that Fernando does not have enough academic English to be in her class. She also suggests that Benny take Fernando "off her hands" and make her "problem" go away. In this excerpt, we see Benny respond to this language directly and we see his use of inclusive personal and temporal deictics to support relational trust between himself and Ms. Laing.

Excerpt 3b.

13 Well unfortunately that's not really quite how it works

14 as I said it's (..) it's **my** job to support everyone in this process ↑

15 I'm definitely, <u>definitely</u> willing to work with both you and Fernando to find a way that I

16 can help sort of bridge the gap between his (..) understanding of academic English

17 and the academic English he needs for your class

18 um (..) I would love to be a go between for that

19 that is <u>quite literally</u> my job

20 so I think it might make sense for the **three of us** to sit down and sort of (..)

21 think about the best way **we** can do this and from there

22 and maybe you can **you and I could** (..) could get together on a (..) on a somewhat regular basis and go over the things that Fernando is struggling with

23 the academic language that he really needs to work through

We see here Benny's response to Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language, as he addresses her statement that Fernando should be removed from her class, (line 13). This statement bolsters Benny's perceived competence as he asserts his (and the institution's) formal role is in serving ELs. This statement also addresses Ms. Laing's deficit language. Benny then continues to describe his role with his use of the personal possessive "**my** job" (lines 14-19), but suggests "**the three of us** sit down and sort of think about the best way **we** can do this…" and to "get together on a, on a somewhat regular basis and go over the things Fernando is struggling with…" (lines 20-22). With these added suggestions and shift to the personal pronoun "**we**", Benny extends his collaborative efforts, which sets their collective sights on future plans for supports. Rather than providing in-the-moment concrete strategies (i.e., Mandy), Benny demonstrates personal regard for Ms. Laing, like Stanley, by his willingness to continue working with her.

After addressing academic issues, Ms. Laing raises her concerns about being unable to reach Fernando's parents. As in her previous deficit-oriented language, Ms. Laing says, "his parents don't seem to care too much about his education." Benny replies that Fernando's family life is complicated and that they are very busy. He adds that Fernando's dad works two jobs and his mom also works with younger children. Ms. Laing responds that many families have busy lives and that she does not know "what we're supposed to do if they can't help themselves at home." Ms. Laing's statement about Fernando's parents is another opportunity for an ESL

teacher to address deficit-oriented language regarding family/cultural contexts or norms. In this excerpt, we see Benny respond to Ms. Laing without addressing her language directly, and we see his reliance on formal/institutional responsibilities as a foundation for his reply.

Excerpt 3c.

24 Absolutely um (…) you know I've I've made an effort to reach out to them with

25 with not so much um help as well but

26 I think regardless of (..) whether or not (..) they're um going to be there

27 **we** have Fernando and (..) I think it's still our job t- to do what we have to do um whether—

It appears that Benny agrees with Ms. Laing's statement, "I don't know what we're supposed to do if they can't help themselves at home" when he responds with "Absolutely." Benny's response is not a rebuttal or an indication that Ms. Laing's language choices were perhaps problematic. Instead, Benny responds that he also could not reach Fernando's parents (lines 24-25). This response was not part of the information we provided to participants. Later, Benny's statement that "regardless of whether or not they're [Fernando's parents] going to be there, we have Fernando, and I think it's still our job to do what we have to do…" (lines 26-27) is an example where Benny has defined his formal ESL teacher role. Without explicitly addressing the teacher's deficit-oriented language, Benny misses an opportunity to advocate for Fernando. A "hit" for this simulation could have been questioning Ms. Laing's broad assertions that Fernando's parents "don't care about his education." Another "hit" could have been Benny's offering to help Ms. Laing reach out to Fernando's parents.

From Benny's simulation experience, it is clear that he was not very comfortable with ESL content or strategies. He thus relied more heavily on his interpersonal skills. His efforts

contrast with Mandy's in his usage of more components of relational trust, such as respect and personal regard for others. However, competence (in this case the inability to articulate clearly ESL-related terminology or knowledge) could be a mitigating factor in discerning relational trust. Furthermore, Benny missed an opportunity to address or recognize deficit-oriented language, as demonstrated by his acquiescence to assumptions that Fernando's family is unsupportive. Indeed, by not recognizing or addressing such deficit-oriented language about Fernando, Benny might have enjoined solidarity between himself and Ms. Laing at Fernando's expense.

Discussion

We have now examined how three TCs in an online ESL methods course engaged in advocacy for ELs in a simulated environment. We examined TCs' use of temporal and personal deictics through a relational trust framework as a lens to examine these three participants' simulator interactions. The ESL teacher's role as advocate entails a responsibility to meet individual students' linguistic and socioemotional needs. Yet research clearly indicates that effective advocacy for ELs, or simply the formal ESL teacher role, extends beyond classrooms to include work with colleagues, administrators, parents, and community members (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Linville, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014). Charged with the responsibility to provide professional development to teachers who might still be learning about ESL methods, ESL teachers must earn the right to be heard by establishing trust between themselves and their colleagues or community members while also challenging deficit-oriented views that colleagues might hold against ELs. Sometimes these efforts to advocate for ELs' educational success are met with resistance from colleagues, administrators, or community members (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019).

From our three examples, it is clearly possible for TCs to engage in advocacy efforts without demonstrating all the components of relational trust. Yet strong advocacy efforts might entail the presence of most of the components. Stanley offered the most balanced approach to advocacy, as he utilized the full spectrum of relational trust categories in the simulation. In his interaction with a teacher who was resisting his advocacy efforts, Stanley focused on establishing a sense of mutual dependency in meeting ELs' needs through use of inclusive personal and future-oriented deictics. He also attempted to reduce Ms. Laing's vulnerability by empathizing with her concerns, while still directly confronting her deficit-oriented language. In responding to her deficit-oriented language, Stanley drew on his ESL content knowledge without enjoining himself to Ms. Laing's language. This key element distinguished his responses from efforts that established solidarity between colleagues at the expense of students.

Mandy focused mainly on the category of competence without demonstrating as much respect, personal regard, or integrity as Stanley. By focusing almost exclusively on providing in-the-moment instructional strategies and utilizing second-person imperative deictics, Mandy did not make attempts to establish a discourse space of mutual dependency, nor did she make many efforts to reduce Ms. Laing's vulnerabilities. After Mandy's incomplete attempt to address Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language, she did not revisit the issue, which could be interpreted as engaging in the same deficit-oriented language she intended to address. Therefore, Mandy could have focused more on developing trust with Ms. Laing for future collaborative supports by utilizing inclusive personal and future-oriented deictics. This would align with research that indicates ESL teachers should seek to establish relationships (for advocacy) with colleagues slowly (Linville, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014).

Benny focused on establishing a sense of mutual dependency and reducing Ms. Laing's vulnerabilities. Benny explicitly defined his ESL teacher role in displaying his competence, yet he struggled in the moment to articulate ESL terminology and content knowledge. In some instances, Benny clearly addressed Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language, while in others he enjoined himself in the deficit-orientation. It appeared as though he agreed with Ms. Laing's statement, "I don't know what we're supposed to do if they can't help themselves at home" when he responded with "Absolutely." While this might be an attempt at establishing solidarity, it is also a missed opportunity to question Ms. Laing's broad assumption about Fernando. Harrison and McIlwain (2019) argue that an important ESL teacher role is to intervene when school personnel make misinformed decisions that impact ELs. For ESL teachers to effectively advocate in such contexts, they might need more fully developed competence in ESL content.

An ESL teacher who advocates for ELs must be able to successfully address deficit-oriented language concerning content areas such as language acquisition, best language instruction practices, or family and cultural norms. Yet ESL content expertise alone, without relational trust between educational stakeholders, might not lead to successful, or "transitive" advocacy (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019). Therefore, ESL teachers must have both (1) interpersonal skills or training to help them understand *how* to be effective advocates for ELs and (2) content knowledge that allows them to know *what* to advocate for. Rather than simply offering coursework to increase TCs' recognition of ESL teachers' advocacy role (Linville, 2015), ESL teacher education programs should provide opportunities for TCs to practice skills necessary for effective advocacy (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Linville, 2019). In our study, we sought to address the gap between TCs' knowledge and beliefs shaped by coursework and opportunities to practice interpersonal skills as an EL advocate. An important

point for teacher educators is that TCs' participation in the simulation was a formative, rather than summative assessment, for instruction purposes. After participating in the simulator, TCs had opportunities to view recordings of their own simulator experiences, as well as those of peers and to engage in discussions about those simulations. This research helps us recognize the importance of including post-simulation activities where TCs reflect directly on how they engaged (or not) in all four aspects of relational trust and how they might improve that in future simulated and actual interactions.

Conclusion

An advocate seeking to foster change in society might encounter resistance. Resistance in our simulation appeared, for example, in Ms. Laing's deficit-oriented language about Fernando and his family. Transitive advocacy, or advocacy that inspires others to become change agents, might entail the ability to influence others' language or beliefs. In this way, addressing the views and opinions of those with differing perspectives becomes a paramount component of advocacy. But to change an individual or society in the direction that an advocate might seek, a successful advocate would not only address perspectives that differ from their own, but they would actually serve as a mediator to a change in the perspectives of others. When fully realized, transitive advocacy could eventually lead to a broader shift in the systems and ideologies of society. Because of this potential power, self-reflection is equally important for advocates as for those they seek to change.

While this simulation was designed for TCs to engage in recognizing and addressing deficit-oriented language and misinformed instructional decisions for ELs through advocacy, solutions that best meet ELs' needs are oftentimes context-dependent. Deficit-oriented language is not always as obvious as our script denoted, and neither are ideologically opposed sides so

clearly defined. In the simulation, it might be easy to assume that Ms. Laing is on the “wrong” side of the scenario, thus advocacy for ELs can mistakenly be framed as being on the “right” side of social issues. As a result, those who view themselves as advocates in society should reflect on how they approach their work. Without the ability and willingness of individuals in society to work collectively toward a common purpose (Putnam, 1993), advocacy efforts can become ineffective. Therefore, relational trust is a key mediator to lasting and meaningful change.

References

Athanases, S. Z., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2007). Conviction, Confrontation, and Risk in New Teachers' Advocating for Equity. *Teaching Education*, *18*(2),123-136. http://doi.org/10.1080/10476210701325150

Athanases, S. Z., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers' challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(1), 64–104.

Athanases, S. Z., & Martin, K. J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 627–646. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008

Ball, D., & Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479

Bautista, N. U., & Boone, W. J. (2015). Exploring the Impact of TeachME™ Lab Virtual Classroom Teaching Simulation on Early Childhood Education Majors' Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26*(3), 237-262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9418-8

Brown, S., & Larson-Hall, J. (2012). *Second language acquisition myths: Applying second language acquisition research to classroom teaching.* University of Michigan Press.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. H. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298–341. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Coady, M. R., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2011). From preservice to practice: Mainstream elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English language learners in the state of Florida. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*(2), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.597823

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance.* Teachers College Press.

Cohen, J., Wong, V., Krishnamachari, A., & Berlin, R. (2020). Teacher coaching in a simulated environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720906217

Dalgarno, B., Gregory, S., Knox, V., & Reiners, T. (2016). Practicing teaching using virtual classroom roleplays. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 126–154. https://doi.org/ 10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.8

Dawson, M.R., & Lignugaris, B. (2016). Meaningful practice: Generalizing foundation teaching skills from TLE TeachLivE to the classroom. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 39*(3),1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406416664184

Dubetz, N. E., & de Jong, E. (2011). Teacher advocacy in bilingual education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 248-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623603

Ferry, B., Kervin, L.K., Cambourne, B.L., Turbill, J.B., & Hedberg. (2005). Incorporating real experience into the development of a classroom-based simulation. *Journal of Learning Design, 1*(1), 22–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.8

Forhan, L. E. & Scheraga, M. (2000). *Becoming sociopolitically active.* In J.K. Hall & W.G. Eggington (Eds.), The sociopolitics of English language teaching. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

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

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9). http://www.tcrecord.org/content. asp?contentid=15018.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Haneda, M., & Alexander, M. (2015). ESL teacher advocacy beyond the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49*, 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.009.

Harrison, J., McIlwain, M. J. (2019). ESOL teachers' experiences in their role as advocate: Making the case for transitive advocacy. *TESOL Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.464

Linville, H. (2015). ESOL teachers as advocates: An important role? *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 98–131. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.193

Linville, H. A. (2019). Advocacy skills for teachers: "A real careful little dance". In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 3–17). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Lucas, T. & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators.* Routledge.

Paris, D., & Alim, S. (Eds.) (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* Teachers College Press.

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.

Staehr Fenner, D. (2014). *Advocating for English learners: A guide for educators*. Corwin Press.

Stake, R.E. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. The Guilford Press.

Thomas, W.P., and V. Collier. 2002. *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement* (Final report). Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1pdfs/1.1complete.pdf

Trickett, E. J., Rokhostkiy, E., Jeong, A., Genkova, A., Oberoi, A., Weinstein, T., & Delgado, Y. (2012). "The kids are terrific: It's the job that's tough": The ELL teacher role in an urban context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*, 283–292.

Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*, 879–912. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214545110

Warren, A. N. (2020): Toward an inclination to advocate: a discursive study of teachers' stance toward linguistically-responsive pedagogy in online language teacher education. *Language and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1801716

Whiting, J. (2016). Training ELL teacher advocates. *Fourth Estate, 32*(2), 9–10. http://textesoliv.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Complete-PDF.pdf

Whiting, J. (2019). Beyond the philosophy statement: Bringing advocacy center stage in TESOL teacher education. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 31–43). Routledge.

Wortham, S., & Reyes, A. (2015). *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event*. Routledge.

Appendix

List of Readings within the Advocacy Simulator Module

Dove, M. G., & Honigsfield, A. (2018). Chapter 1: "Teacher collaboration is not an option: It is a must", in *Co-Teaching for English Learners.* Corwin.

Freeman, Y.S., Freeman, D.E., Soto, M., & Ebe, A. (2016). *ESL Teaching: Principles for success*. Heinemann.

Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (2016). *Mastering ESL/EFL methods: Differentiated instruction for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students.* Pearson.

Linville, H. A. (2019). *Advocacy in English Language Teaching and Learning.* Routledge.

WIDA. (2016). *ABCs of Family Engagement*. University of Wisconsin.

Recontextualizing ESL Advocacy Tools

Will Fox

University of Virginia

Abstract

Despite the codification of advocacy into English as a second language teacher education standards, relatively little is known about the development of English learner (EL) advocacy skills in teacher education settings. While many ESL teacher education programs have described various course assignments, activities, and orientations that align with EL advocacy, few studies have followed program graduates into their teaching contexts to examine how EL advocacy unfolds over time. In this study, I conducted follow-up interviews with in-service teachers who participated in a university ESL teacher education program—in which all participants engaged in a variety of coursework with EL advocacy as a focus. I used situated and ecological theories as a framework to examine whether/how participants engage in EL advocacy in their school settings, as well as what prepared them for this work. I found that participants engaged in advocacy in two main ways: advocacy as *instruction* and as *conversations*. I also found that participants encountered barriers to advocacy at *individual* and *structural* ecological levels. I explore the role of participants' sociocultural histories, including EL advocacy tools introduced in participants' university teacher education programs, as mitigators of such barriers. I discuss implications for ESL teacher educators.

Introduction

Research indicates that for English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers, advocacy is a primary job responsibility (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2008; Linville, 2015; 2019; 2020). This work often includes advocating for English learners (ELs) to have equitable access to curricula, resources, funding, and/or linguistically and culturally relevant/sustaining pedagogy. Although advocacy for ELs can be viewed as the exclusive purview of ESL teachers, most ELs spend the majority of their daily instructional time with mainstream teachers. Consequently, all teachers of ELs potentially have opportunities to serve as EL advocates (Bunch, 2013; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Researchers have drawn distinctions between advocacy efforts at the instructional level and those aimed at broader institutional and policy change (Athanases & Martin, 2006; Dubetz & de Jong, 2011; Haneda & Alexander, 2015; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Linville, 2019; 2020). The nature and extent of advocacy efforts among teachers of ELs depend on various factors, including grade level (Haneda & Alexander, 2015), teaching experience (Linville, 2020), teacher education coursework (Athanases & Martin, 2006), and teaching contexts (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019).

Researchers agree that EL advocacy that effects individual or institutional change requires certain interpersonal skills and characteristics (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Linville, 2019; 2020; Staehr Fenner, 2014). These skills include being able to develop relationships, collaborate, and navigate interactions with potentially resistant educational stakeholders (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014). Yet few studies have examined methods to develop these skills in teacher education (for exceptions, see Fox & Salerno, 2021; Whiting, 2019). Additionally, the question of whether teachers are able to adopt and implement EL advocacy skills first introduced in their teacher education programs remains largely unexamined

(for exceptions, see Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007; de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007). Among EL advocacy studies in teacher education programs, some have examined teacher candidates' beliefs about advocacy (Linville, 2016; 2019); some have outlined general-education curricular emphases on advocacy for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Athanases & Martin, 2006; Lucas & Villegas, 2011); another focused on developing an "advocacy stance" through online discussion boards (Warren, 2020); and others have explored role-play scenarios and simulations for practicing EL advocacy skills (Caldas, 2017; Fox & Salerno, 2021; Whiting, 2016; 2019).

Researchers outside ESL have used qualitative methods to follow teacher education graduates into their first years of teaching (e.g., Grossman et al., 2000; Leko & Brownell, 2011; Thompson et al., 2013). These researchers reported that the ways in which teachers appropriate (i.e., adopt and implement) learning from teacher education programs seem influenced by the intersection of sociocultural histories, settings, and teachers' characteristics. These studies suggested that contexts affect learners' development, but that learners' characteristics (e.g., knowledge, beliefs, and actions) also affect the context (Leko & Brownell, 2011; Peressini et al., 2004). While many factors can affect teachers' appropriation of instructional strategies, understanding whether EL advocacy skills are learnable in teacher education settings is imperative for ESL teacher educators. Thus, examining how teachers of ELs might appropriate pedagogical tools of EL advocacy (e.g., collaboration, relationship-building, assets-oriented perspectives, addressing deficit-oriented language) introduced in their ESL teacher education programs is an important first step.

For this study, I conducted structured interviews with in-service teachers to examine the ways they discuss their engagement in EL advocacy up to a year after taking ESL methods

coursework, and I examine how participants utilize (or not) EL advocacy tools introduced to them during coursework. Since most advocacy situations occur unpredictably or in one-on-one situations, directly studying teacher advocacy in the field presents a major challenge for researchers (Staehr Fenner, 2014). As a result, I focus on discerning EL advocacy development through the ways participants discuss their EL advocacy engagement, as well as factors that lead to their engagement in this work. This study is guided by the following research questions: (1) How do teachers discuss their engagement in EL advocacy practices up to a year after taking coursework in ESL methods? (2) How do they describe factors that mediate their EL advocacy engagement?

Literature Review

Defining Advocacy

Fundamentally, *all* educators are naturally positioned as potential advocates of student growth as they work to provide students with access to the resources and skills to meet the expectations of educational systems. Teacher-advocates within general education engage in a variety of advocacy actions across a broad range of contexts. The field of ESL builds on this work in ways that are specific to the particular challenges faced by linguistically minoritized students and families as they engage with school systems. Researchers in the field of ESL have devoted considerable energy to categorizing EL teachers' advocacy efforts. Emphasizing that advocacy entails both noticing inequities and taking action to mitigate them, de Oliveira and Athanases (2007) distinguished between non-transformative acts of advocacy that do not challenge institutional norms (e.g., translating materials; helping ELs navigate schools), and acts of advocacy that do challenge systems of inequity (e.g., re-designing assessments allowing ELs to demonstrate linguistic *and* cognitive development; promoting balanced bilingual students as

linguistic exemplars). Dubetz and de Jong (2011) divided acts of advocacy by within-the-classroom advocacy and beyond-the-classroom advocacy. Haneda and Alexander (2015) added to Dubetz and de Jong's findings and categorized advocacy by combinations of transformative/non-transformative advocacy and within-the-classroom/outside-the-classroom advocacy.

Harrison and McIlwain (2019) focused on the notion of "transitive advocacy," or advocacy that inspires others to become change agents, suggesting that a shared responsibility for ELs can be developed through engagement with colleagues, administrators, community members, and families (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019, p. 14). Following researchers that emphasized the importance of collaboration skills among teacher of ELs (e.g., Bailey et al., 2010; Staehr Fenner, 2014), Fox and Salerno (2021) added that in order to foster transitive advocacy, ESL teachers must be able to defend their ELs against deficit-oriented language and establish relational trust with others (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). We argued that establishing and maintaining the interpersonal conditions necessary for teachers to work collectively toward a common purpose (i.e., relational trust) is an important part of EL advocacy. Recently, Linville (2020) proposed distinguishing between instructional and political advocacy actions. For Linville, instructional advocacy included collaborating with content teachers, providing professional development, and speaking up against deficit-oriented language toward ELs among colleagues. Political advocacy was comprised of encouraging students to become aware of sociopolitical issues regarding language use in society, working with EL families and taking a leadership role in the community, and writing/engaging with public figures.

For the purposes of this study, I conceptualize EL advocacy as (a) the willingness and the ability to speak up on behalf of ELs in moments where individuals are utilizing language to talk

about ELs in deficit-oriented ways, and (b) noticing and taking actions to address perceived challenges to ELs' educational and life opportunities.

In-service Advocacy for ELs

Haneda and Alexander (2015) conducted a qualitative study of 34 elementary teachers' advocacy actions across five urban school districts. They found that multilingualism and intercultural experience (many participants reported extensive experience living abroad) were significant factors in whether ESL teachers proactively and routinely advocated for ELs. The researchers also found that teachers reported more advocacy actions beyond the classroom than within the classroom, which they attributed to limitations on their instructional time with ELs. For example, ESL teachers typically spent 30-45 minutes per day with their ELs, and oftentimes this work included remedial/modified instruction in pull-out or push-in settings, or the use of district-adopted ESL textbook series. The authors noted the teachers' outside-the-classroom acts of advocacy were non-transformative in nature. This work included helping ELs to navigate the school system, reaching out to EL families or assisting other colleagues in communicating with EL families, and offering their expertise to help general education teacher colleagues.

In another qualitative study, Tricket et al. (2012) found that high school ESL teachers' acts of advocacy were also highly contextualized and influenced by broader ecological factors, including federal policies. Tricket and colleagues also emphasized the importance of social networks and institutional climate on the experiences of ESL teachers. According to the authors, high school ecologies provided some contrasts to ESL teacher roles in elementary contexts. Specifically, they noted that the size and complexity of high schools required that advocacy efforts and interactions include a wider set of school negotiations and relationships. Harrison and McIlwain (2019) found that establishing and maintaining relationships among educational

stakeholders is a fundamental ESL teacher role. They reported that school climate was an important factor in teachers' advocacy for ELs, explaining that more than 70 percent of participants mentioned experiencing an advocacy barrier of "implicit resistance" from colleagues or administrators. This resistance often involved undermining ESL teachers' efforts to counter deficit-oriented beliefs about students, their families, and immigration, as well as reluctance to implement suggested strategies from ESL teachers.

In a rare follow-up study with graduates of a teacher education program designed for general education/content area teachers with a focus on equity for culturally and linguistically diverse students, Athanases and de Oliveira (2007) conducted focused interviews with 38 graduates who had taught between one and three years after graduation. The authors focused on the notion of "speaking up" against inequity as part of the advocate role, and they found that graduates encountered interpersonal difficulties when consistently engaging in such practices (i.e., when speaking up). Athanases and de Oliveira explained that as novice teachers, many graduates felt underprepared to navigate the risks and confrontations incurred from their advocacy efforts among colleagues and parents. They concluded that teacher education programs should provide role-play experiences and have students practice managing confrontations with educational stakeholders before encountering them in the field.

Based on the aggregate reported experiences of in-service teachers from the above studies, it seems that ESL teachers and teachers of ELs should be prepared to enter teaching contexts ready to engage in EL advocacy with varying degrees of support from administrators, colleagues, and institutions. To navigate these relationships and contexts, teachers of ELs must possess the content knowledge to know what to advocate for and the interpersonal skills to

persist in these efforts. Thus, a growing priority in ESL education programs is providing opportunities to practice EL advocacy skills (e.g., Standard 5a, TESOL, 2019).

Advocacy for ELs in Teacher Education

Whiting (2019) elaborated on the often-neglected role of advocacy in teacher education programs or textbooks, despite clear mandates for advocacy in the TESOL Standards (e.g., Standard 4; 5a; 5b, TESOL, 2019). He argued that ESL teachers "should be as well-trained in advocacy as they are in other skills of the EL teaching profession" (Whiting, 2019, p. 31). He also argued that teachers should not wait and develop the skills of an "advocacy stance," such as emotional maturity and interpersonal skills, on the job. Instead, ESL teachers "need to be able to hit the ground running so that even in their first week on the job, if need be, they know how to advocate effectively" (Whiting, 2019, p. 30). To prepare ESL graduates, he outlined various in-person role-plays and practice scenarios that he uses in his teacher education program.

In the same volume as Whiting (2019), Harrison (2019) and Huelsenbeck et al. (2019) described assignments and course designs in ESL teacher education programs focused on the EL advocate role. The authors focused on how students in their programs engaged with areas of EL need in specific teaching contexts. Harrison wrote about an elective course in an ESL graduate program entitled "Advocacy for ELs," and Huelsenbeck and colleagues described action research projects during ESL candidates' supervised teaching internships. Students in both programs utilized needs-assessments and conducted literature reviews based on these assessments; they collaborated with administrators, developed action-oriented projects, implemented them, and reported findings to their peers. The authors recognized the need to follow up with graduates at yearly intervals to examine effects of the projects and courses on their work as EL advocates.

In a recent qualitative study, Warren (2020) examined discursive features of advocacy among students participating in course assignments. She examined discussion board posts from students enrolled in an online four-course series on emergent/bilingual and multilingual instruction. She focused on how students' responses to writing prompts demonstrated how "advocacy stances" were interactionally constructed (Warren, 2020, p. 2). She also showed how students "worked up" their advocacy stances in their discussion posts by challenging political or institutional status quo practices, such as convincing stakeholders of the importance of dual-language programs for bilingual/multilingual students (Warren, 2020, p. 13). She explained, however, that students' relative inexperience in ESL content and teaching were exemplified in their incomplete understanding of potential difficulties and structural barriers inherent in implementing their ideas.

Together, the literature on advocacy skills and development in ESL teacher education programs points to the need for following up with teacher education students. Understanding factors that lead to EL advocacy skills development is especially important if ESL teacher education programs are to prepare teaching candidates to establish relationships with educational stakeholders, defend ELs against deficit-oriented language, "speak up" against inequities, and inspire change agents for ELs (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014). Additionally, it is important to understand how teaching contexts interact with teachers' engagement in EL advocacy. Not knowing how teachers practice EL advocacy over time can lead ESL teacher educators to make programmatic and instructional design decisions with limited empirical support. In this study, I address this gap in the literature by examining how EL teachers who have recently taken ESL coursework engage with EL advocacy in their current teaching contexts.

Conceptual Framework

Teachers work in complex and interconnected settings where influences both inside and outside the classroom can impact advocacy engagement. Responding to these complexities inherent in teacher learning and development, I use ecological and situated learning theories (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Peressini et al., 2004) as general frameworks for examining teachers' engagement in EL advocacy after taking ESL coursework. From an ecological perspective, historical and social contexts provide environmental affordances that either facilitate or hinder teachers' pedagogical practices—such as the enactment of EL advocacy. Similarly, a situated lens attends to individual and sociocultural contexts that might facilitate or hinder teachers' abilities to implement or develop their professional expertise over time (Peresinni et al., 2004); a situated lens focuses on "the process of recontextualizing resources and discourses in new situations" (p. 70). For Peressini and colleagues (2004), recontextualization is "the transformation of resources and discourses as they are disembedded from one social context and embedded into another" (p. 70).

A situated lens suggests that learning is socially mediated and it is aided by conceptual and practical (material) tools. Such tools are the "resources and discourses" that are recontextualized in teachers' own settings. For the purposes of this paper, I focus on conceptual tools of EL advocacy introduced in an ESL teacher education program – tools that I identified as central to the program after three years of observation and participation as a practitioner-researcher who was involved with the students and curricula of the teacher education program. In particular, I focus on the tools of collaboration (Linville, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014), developing and maintaining relationships (Linville, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014), assets-oriented perspectives toward ELs (MacSwan, 2020; Moll et al., 1992), and addressing deficit-oriented perspectives

about ELs and their families (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007; Fox & Salerno, 2021). The extent to which teachers are able to take up these tools is contingent on a host of factors. These factors can include teachers' identification with different communities of practice (e.g., university, school district, school), their beliefs about teaching and learning, their situated settings, and their motivations for integrating the tools into their practice (Leko & Brownell, 2011; Lortie, 1975; Thompson et al., 2013).

Accordingly, I view the learning and development of EL advocacy as not solely a discrete and independent unit of cognition, but as inextricably bound by the contexts in which individuals interact. Thus, as participants recontextualize EL advocacy resources and discourses, they are influenced by individual sociocultural histories, as well as their ecological and situated settings. Understanding how teachers discuss their engagement in EL advocacy in a variety of contexts and roles—and how they discuss their preparation to do so—provides insight into how ESL teacher education programs might leverage individuals' unique characteristics and teaching contexts to promote more effective advocacy for ELs across the U.S.

Methods

Researcher Role

I approach this study as a practitioner-researcher in which I seek both to improve my own practice and generate new knowledge for others through my work (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). As a practitioner-researcher, I was deeply embedded in the university setting for this study. For three years, I observed, interviewed, and collaborated with teacher education professors and administrators. During this time, I reviewed and developed ESL endorsement course syllabi, and I assisted in the redevelopment of several ESL course assignments and designs, including an ESL advocacy simulator experience that all participants in this study

engaged with. However, I was not the instructor for the courses in which participants engaged in the EL advocacy simulator. I was the primary instructor of a supervised teaching seminar course for three participants, and I was an instructor in a different course (an education-based course on linguistics) in which two of the participants in this study had been students. Having such deep involvement in the setting allowed me to develop an emic perspective (Creswell & Poth, 2018) of the university's ESL program. At the same time, I acknowledge the limitation that this study did not allow me the luxury of having as deep of an understanding of participants' current teaching settings.

University Coursework

Participants in this study participated in one of two ESL coursework pathways at a state university ESL teacher education program in the South. Many participants were enrolled in online programs and were seeking ESL add-on endorsements to existing teaching licenses. Other participants were enrolled in an in-person teacher education program and were seeking initial teaching licenses with endorsements in ESL. The ESL programs included coursework in second language acquisition, cross cultural education, ESL methods, ESL assessment, curriculum design, linguistics for education, literacy, and reading instruction. While some participants in this study had fully graduated and received ESL endorsements (and were now practicing teachers), others were already full-time teachers in other grade/content areas and were still completing their endorsement coursework, but were licensed, practicing teachers.

In their ESL coursework, participants engaged with resources and discourses that provided opportunities for participants to engage with conceptual tools for EL advocacy. For example, students engaged with EL oral and written samples and applied a language proficiency framework to describe what ELs were able to do linguistically rather than what they were not

able to do. Students also engaged in an advocacy-related role-play assignment in which they practiced advocating for an EL with a colleague who was utilizing deficit-oriented language to talk about the EL. Participants reflected on this experience in small groups as they considered ways to improve their collaboration, their relationships with other teachers, and whether their discourse did or did not constitute effective advocacy (see Fox & Salerno, 2021). Students engaged with other course readings, assignments, videos, and discussions that focused on the importance of collaboration, relationships (with students and with colleagues), and the development and maintenance of an assets-oriented perspective toward ELs and their families.

Participants

Criteria for participation/selection in the study include two parameters: (a) participants took ESL methods courses at the university within a two-year period in either in-person or online ESL programs, and (b) participants were educators in PreK-12 settings at the time of the study. I chose these courses because of the instructors' emphasis on ESL advocacy as well as their desires to examine the phenomenon. Based on these criteria and through a multiple-contact approach to recruiting participants, I conducted 15 interviews with practicing teachers who had participated in, or were currently participating in, the focal ESL coursework. I focused on 15 participants who had taken at least one ESL methods course, participated in the advocacy simulator, and were serving as PreK-12 educators serving ELs in some capacity at the time of the study. Among the 15 participants, six were content-area teachers, five were ESL teachers, three were reading specialists (one was a reading specialist teaching assistant), and one was a K-8 principal. Three of the 15 participants were male, and four of the 15 were first-year teachers. Locations varied greatly, as participants' teaching contexts were distributed among four U.S. states, and three participants were teaching in either the Middle East or Asia. This variety of

geographical distribution allowed me to identify themes that were both common and unique across a wide range of teaching contexts (see Table 1).

Data Collection

Data for this study are based on coursework assignments and artifacts of a university ESL teacher education program – particularly coursework with ESL advocacy as a focus. This university data, though not primary data for the analysis of this study, included written discussion boards, assignment reflections, videos, recordings of advocacy simulator interactions, and recorded group interactions/debriefs. Primary data for this study is comprised of interviews with participants about their current teaching practices and contexts. I conducted one-and-a-half-hour structured interviews via Zoom with each participant and the interviews were recorded. I based interview questions on participants' characteristics and sociocultural histories, settings, and conceptual tools. In the interviews, I asked participants to reconstruct their paths to their current teaching contexts. I then asked them to describe their current roles, whether/how they advocate for ELs, how they define advocacy for ELs, challenges to advocacy in their teaching contexts, as well as experiences or coursework that prepared them for their role as EL advocate. Last, I asked participants to complete a task in which they imagined that their goal was to foster transitive advocacy among the educational stakeholders in their teaching contexts, and they described their approaches and strategies for doing so (see Appendix A for full interview protocol).

Analytic Methods

For analysis, I examined interview responses and I focused on (a) whether/how participants currently advocate for ELs, (b) how they define advocacy, (c) what experiences prepared them to be advocates for ELs, and (d) what challenges they face when advocating for

ELs in their current contexts. I wrote detailed analytic memos following each interview that described the tone and meaning discerned during the interview. I uploaded recorded interviews into closed-captioning software for transcription and I cleaned transcripts for readability. I uploaded interview transcriptions into Dedoose Qualitative Analysis software for coding. For coding, I followed a deductive analytical process (Miles et al., 2014). In the first cycle of coding, I identified initial themes of how each participant discussed their current engagement in EL advocacy (RQ1). These themes included "advocacy as…" framing, in which I identified in one or two words indicating how the participants seemed to conceptualize advocacy. Examples of this included advocacy as: community building, coordinating, equity, family engagement, instruction, persuasion, conversations with peers, difficult conversations, and sharing ESL knowledge. For factors that mediated EL advocacy engagement (RQ2), I focused on how participants discussed their preparation for EL advocacy, for which I also identified generalized themes for each participant. Example themes for preparation for advocacy included: EL family/heritage, study/living abroad, coursework, mentors, previous teaching/work experiences, and self-critique/growth. For contextual factors that mediated advocacy engagement (RQ2), I identified two initial categories: individual barriers, and structural barriers.

After categorizing each participant's responses to interview questions, and using the constant comparative method (Creswell & Poth, 2018), I then evaluated the salience of each category across the dataset highlighting specific quotations that aligned with initial themes. Through the process of identifying frequencies of category counts, I was able to reduce the initial categories into higher levels of abstraction and I organized themes by research questions: RQ1 (a) advocacy as instruction, and (b) advocacy as conversations, and RQ2 (a) preparation for advocacy, (b) individual barriers to advocacy, and (c) structural barriers to advocacy. After

establishing salient themes and remaining attentive to disconfirming evidence (Miles et al., 2014), I examined interview responses through the framework of: collaboration, relationship-building, assets-oriented perspectives, and addressing deficit-oriented perspectives. To establish the validity of the interview data, I employed member checks (based on emergent themes), the use of multiple data collection methods (including university coursework data), as well as peer review and debriefing from faculty at the university (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Findings

Below, I present emergent themes that occurred across the dataset regarding how participants discussed their engagement in EL advocacy in their current educational contexts (RQ1). Participants described their advocacy engagement as *instruction* and as *conversations*. I focus on ways in which participants' advocacy actions did or did not challenge existing institutional norms (i.e., transformative/non-transformative), and I examine participants' descriptions of their advocacy engagement through the lens of the conceptual tools of EL advocacy introduced in their teacher education programs. Then, I present how participants discussed personal and contextual characteristics that mediated their engagement in EL advocacy (RQ2). Participants described a variety of factors that prepared them for EL advocacy, including teacher education coursework and previous experiences. They also discussed *challenges* to their advocacy engagement as *individual* and *structural* barriers. I explore the affordances and hindrances of EL advocacy tools at mitigating such challenges.

Advocacy Engagement

Advocacy as Instruction

Participants described (a) their current teaching role and job responsibilities, (b) whether/how they advocate for ELs in their current role, and (c) how they define advocacy. All

participants discussed EL advocacy as variations of *instruction* and *conversations*. While all participants claimed that they had advocated for ELs in their teaching contexts, the nature and extent of their descriptions and engagement in these forms of advocacy varied across the dataset. For advocacy as *instruction*, participants paid significant attention to students' academic needs, ensuring that ELs have equitable access to the curriculum through resources, accommodations, and scaffolds. With few exceptions, participants' discussions of instructional advocacy focused mainly on the advocacy tool of collaboration in instructional planning. In staff meetings, planning sessions, and co-teaching roles, participants created adaptations to lesson plans, assessments, and provided procedural scaffolding for ELs in order to facilitate access to academic content. During these collaborations with other teachers or administrators, participants rarely challenged the status quo or engaged in political advocacy (Haneda & Alexander, 2015; Linville, 2020; Warren, 2020).

Many participants described their engagement in advocacy as ensuring instructional "equity" and "fairness." Brett, an elementary ESL teacher, described his instructional role as "ensuring all students have accommodations and scaffolds for everything that they do so that curriculum is always available and accessible to them to do their best." Sharon, a high school math teacher, shared how she worked to ensure ELs received appropriate accommodations on in-class assessments. Brittney, also an elementary ESL teacher, and David, a middle school civics teacher, both emphasized ensuring newcomer ELs are provided with adequate instructional supports (e.g., scaffolding) while at the same time advocating that ELs with higher proficiency continue to receive differentiated supports so that they could demonstrate what they knew about academic content. David, also a lead civics teacher and mentor for new teachers, emphasized his leadership role by ensuring that discussions about scaffolds for ELs become a normalized part of

department planning meetings. Similarly, Amber, a literacy instructional coach, ensured teachers were thinking about "how they were going to reach ESL students" during lesson planning sessions.

In addition to instructional advocacy actions, some participants emphasized the cyclical use of instructional data, such as formative and summative assessments on ELs' academic performance, as foundations to their advocacy efforts. These participants viewed data as a tool to identify instructional needs or "gaps" in learning, which provided a justification to "speak up" or act on ELs' behalf. Heather, a K-8 private school principal, described her use of reading scores as supporting evidence to persuade teachers at her school of the need to develop an EL program. Katherine, an elementary reading specialist, discussed her role in advocating for special education assessments for ELs who, after five years of U.S. schooling, had remained at kindergarten reading levels. At the same time, Katherine also discussed advocating for a fourth-grade EL to receive gifted services.

Because the context of the interviews for this study was amid the global Covid-19 pandemic, many participants described their instructional advocacy role as involving emotional and technical support in virtual learning environments. For those who experienced remote/virtual teaching environments, time with students was often relegated to non-direct-instructional roles. Additionally for these participants, instructional advocacy entailed ensuring that ELs received adequate attention from general-education teachers. Stephany and Brett, both elementary ESL teachers, talked about the challenges of supporting students who might "go unnoticed" because they were not visible to teachers or were too shy to speak up during virtual meetings. Stephany told a story about how she encouraged one second-grader to advocate for herself after not understanding that her teacher had opened a virtual game for her class during lunch. By

encouraging her and modeling the language to ask the teacher about the game, Stephany supported the student by providing her with the language for self-advocacy:

> I said, okay, I could email your teacher, but let me help you, we'll talk through it and how you can ask her because I said, 'I'm not there all the time,' and so I showed her, I told her how to ask, what to say in the chat or how to write her an email.

Brett and Stephany both expressed communicating with teachers, students, and parents to assess technology difficulties, attendance issues, as well as class participation. Not all participants, however, were fully remote/virtual at the time of the interviews. Some participants reported ever-changing environments of in-person, hybrid (e.g., two days in-person, two days virtual), to fully virtual, while others reported that they had been fully in-person throughout the year.

Several participants described current work and future plans to establish or serve in instructional programs beyond their regular teaching assignments, including guided reading programs, the creation of an EL services program at a private school, and after-school tutoring. Some participants described reaching out to translation services or bilingual tutors for additional supports. Sharon, an algebra teacher, focused on future plans to develop an ESL algebra class incorporating computer programming at her school. Other participants highlighted smaller-scale instructional changes, such as the incorporation of multicultural literature in an English class (Megan).

Overall, participants' engagement in instructional advocacy varied across the dataset and was influenced by specific teaching roles and contexts. With the exception of one English teacher, Megan, who included multicultural literature in her own classroom, participants' descriptions of instructional advocacy rarely advanced beyond what seemed to be non-transformative forms of advocacy. Noticing opportunities to act or speak up on behalf of ELs seemed to be based on ecological factors, such as disparities highlighted from state/federal

standardized assessments, ELs' access to resources, and the need to bring to teachers' attention the importance of differentiated instruction for ELs. "Needs" for advocacy were thus associated with environmental factors that led to ELs' marginalization. Across the dataset, participants collaborated for instruction by ensuring both ELs and teachers could conform to institutional regulations, norms, and expectations rather than challenging them.

Advocacy as Conversations

While all participants discussed their engagement in advocacy as instruction, many also discussed EL advocacy as engaging in *conversations*. Fourteen out of 15 participants discussed variations of advocacy as conversations. For the one participant, a reading specialist, that did not discuss her own engagement in this practice, she did recount a story about the advocacy discourse efforts of the ESL teacher at her school. Overall, the types of conversations participants engaged in varied, including (a) informal discussions with colleagues about language learning; and (b) difficult conversations (i.e., addressing deficit-oriented language, practices, or misconceptions about EL education) with peers, administrators, or community members. Participants who discussed advocacy as conversations tended to view themselves as specialists with content knowledge that, when shared, had the potential to re-shape how other educators thought about ELs. While many participants elaborated on their interactions with others in moments that carried potential for risk, some participants discussed establishing relationships as a social condition for their advocacy—conditions that "made advocacy seem less scary" (Stephany). Heather, a K-8 private school principal, focused on developing "teacher buy-in" over long periods of time by "dropping hints" or first demonstrating desired changes in her own practice. For others, like Megan who addressed deficit-oriented perspectives while at a community grocery store, "speaking up" on behalf of ELs beyond the school setting by sharing

ESL-related knowledge might have been a first step toward fostering a more equitable community perspective. Advocacy as conversations thus incorporated the EL advocacy tools of relationship-building over time, assets-oriented perspectives, and addressing deficit-oriented language.

Many participants viewed "discussions" and "conversations" as key opportunities to address what they viewed as deficit-oriented language or perspectives, as they worked to re-frame teachers' language in more assets-oriented ways or pose alternative language choices and perspectives on EL performance or behavior. Recalling a situation in which a colleague was expressing doubts about an EL's participation and academic performance in class, Stephany describes how she engaged in advocacy by ensuring teachers are also seeing the positive aspects of ELs:

> I've kind of really gone in there, and you know tried to really work with the kid and you know, really kind of helped change the verbiage teachers use and their thinking about, just really focusing on what ELs can do [rather than what they can't do] (Stephany, ESL teacher).

Mark, an elementary teacher at an international school in East Asia, also discussed his role in helping to re-cast teachers' language in more assets-oriented ways. He then focused on the importance of the interpersonal skills involved when sharing ESL content knowledge with other teachers:

> You don't want to jump down the teacher's throat and be like, 'you're making the lesson too hard for them, you're using language and, all these idioms and things, these kids have no idea what you're talking about, or only five of them do!' So, it's that gentle reminder that language is a massive barrier at our school and we have to be really mindful of that.

Many ESL teacher-participants seemed to view advocacy-as-conversations through the lens of relationships. Stephany viewed relationships with teachers as a key mediating factor in being able to advocate for her ELs. In her school, she found that teachers were more receptive to

her advocacy efforts after establishing relationships with them, “I’ve built so many great relationships with the teachers that advocacy isn’t as terrifying as I thought.” Stephany continues to explain how in her school she views teachers’ misunderstandings about ELs as an opportunity to serve as a resource for her colleagues:

> I realized how important it is, especially to speak up for my students’ needs and because it might it might not be like other teachers or staff or administrators, it might not be them being negative or not paying attention to something. It’s just that they need more time to learn about our ELs and understand, and so I’m always happy to be that person.

Similarly, Brett expressed a desire to remain sensitive to his position or status in relation to other teachers in his school with whom he sought to share ESL-related advice: “I think in any of the conversations I try to have in terms of advocacy I never tried to do it in a way of talking down to or feeling judgmental on classroom teachers.”

Participants discussed advocacy by their sharing of newly acquired resources or ideas on language acquisition with others. Participants often framed these discussions as opportunities to assess and/or challenge colleagues’ “stereotypes” or “assumptions about language” that even they themselves had held before. Conversations where participants shared ESL content knowledge with others also extended beyond individual schools. Megan, an 8th-grade English teacher, discussed how she engaged with community members who voiced frustrations about having an influx of immigrants in their community. In these interactions, she described “defending and advocating for ELs” in her community by addressing negative statements about EL families’ use of Spanish in public places such as local grocery stores (i.e., community members who exclaimed that EL families should only speak English), or assumptions that all ELs are recent immigrants (as opposed to the majority being born in the U.S.).

Overall, participants' engagement in conversations carried potential for transformative or transitive advocacy (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019). In such interactions, participants utilized more advocacy tools than when engaging in instructional advocacy. Conversations among participants also extended beyond individual classrooms or schools and into larger community spaces. In their discussions of advocacy conversations, the role of interpersonal skills such as relationship-building and patience became salient features. Additionally, ecological and situated factors influenced the nature of participants' advocacy engagement, which I explore further in the next section.

Factors Mediating EL Advocacy

In order to examine how participants discussed factors that mediated their EL advocacy engagement (RQ2), I asked participants to describe what prepared them to advocate for ELs, as well as what challenges they perceived to their advocacy. Participants described different factors that prepared them for their engagement in EL advocacy. These factors included both previous experiences and personal characteristics. Personal characteristics that participants described included family heritage (e.g., family or participant was an EL), and dispositions to "stand up" for others. Previous experiences that participants described included: university coursework, mentors/examples of advocacy, study/travel abroad, and previous teaching experiences in different contexts.

For university coursework, participants described numerous resources and discourses that facilitated their current advocacy practices. Participants discussed the importance of learning the background and theories behind best practices for EL instruction, which gave them "evidence" and a foundation on which to promote best practices and to challenge misconceptions about EL learning. Participants discussed readings that challenged their assumptions about how languages

are learned, and in particular, their assumptions that immersion is the only way to learn a language. Several participants mentioned the ESL-methods simulator as an instrumental tool that allowed them to practice advocating through a conversation:

> Where we talked to a fake computer person, which was probably one of the most nerve-wracking things I've done because it felt very awkward but now, I really appreciate it because it forced me to try to verbalize how I would talk to somebody about dismantling those stereotypes and giving more education or research-based ideas about language (Grace).

Participants also described university coursework in which they engaged in conversations with peers in collaborative reflection, teaching inquiries, and practice for professional learning communities. Many participants also mentioned course videos that provided visual examples of specific instructional strategies. Others mentioned a case-studies assignment in which they interviewed, assessed, and "tracked" an individual EL's academic progress over the course of a semester.

At the same time, participants expressed how coursework had not prepared them for their specific contexts. Most of these participants expressed the desire for more practical applications and instructional strategies in their work with ELs rather than a focus on theory. Katherine, an elementary reading specialist, discussed how her ESL coursework did not help her meet the instructional needs of her ELs—specifically ELs with "no language." Stephany also described limitations of university coursework as more narrowly focused on theory, especially compared to the practical professional development sessions she attended at her teaching context.

A significant resource that participants seemed to rely on in their recontextualization of EL advocacy was socially mediated by mentor advocates in their teaching and learning contexts. Participants mentioned the role of mentors that served as exemplars of EL advocacy. For some, assigned mentor roles were part of their supervised teaching experiences, while for others,

mentors were influential model EL educators in participants' past or current teaching contexts. Several participants told narratives of how mentors "spoke up" on behalf of ELs in meetings or discussions, and other participants shared how mentors modeled home visits and family engagement. Katharine, an elementary reading specialist, described a recent interaction in which she used deficit-oriented language but felt the need to self-correct upon her awareness of the ESL teacher in the meeting:

> Our ESL teacher, she's a huge advocate for our students. She actually just fussed at me because we were in a meeting and I just wasn't paying attention. We were looking at data, and I saw these girls, 'why haven't they made progress?' then I said 'because they don't speak English,' and then I corrected myself, and I said 'they have limited English.' Well, she was not very happy with me. So, she is a huge advocate for them.

Katherine's example illustrates how specific conceptual frameworks introduced in ESL education programs, such as assets-oriented perspectives toward ELs, might require time and accountability to be fully integrated.

Previous teaching experience was another significant factor in participants' discussions of what prepared them for EL advocacy. In some instances, teaching experiences involved mentorship and modeling of advocacy, while in others, salient factors were a sense of being "thrown in the fire" (Amber). For these participants, experience working in schools with high populations of ELs had forced them to "learn on the job" even without prior ESL teacher education coursework. Other teachers reported experiences and training in special education as factors that prepared them for EL advocacy. Mark discussed how "coming from a special needs background, [advocacy] is a word you hear all the time." Melissa, an elementary teacher at an international school in the Middle East, also described how ESL coursework brought the word "advocacy" back into her mind and she realized the "crossover" between special education advocacy and work with ELs.

Participants' recontextualization of resources and discourses into their current teaching settings seemed to involve more than simply implementing what they learned in their teacher education program. Participants' own experiences as learners and as professionals in a variety of settings all worked together to facilitate their advocacy engagement. In the next section, I explore some of the ways in which participants described contextual hindrances to their advocacy efforts.

Challenges to Advocacy

Several studies have focused on various challenges, or barriers, that teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students might encounter when engaging in EL advocacy (Athanases & Martin, 2007; Fox & Salerno, 2021; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Linville, 2019). Broadly speaking, these studies emphasized the need to navigate interpersonal challenges that authors defined as "resistance" (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019), or "confrontations" and "risks" (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007). In order to continue examining factors that mediated participants' engagement in EL advocacy (RQ2), I focused on challenges to advocacy. I asked participants to describe (a) challenges to EL advocacy in general, and (b) challenges to EL advocacy at their particular school/setting. Based on interview responses, participants in the current study viewed challenges to EL advocacy as encompassing both individual and structural levels. I define challenges at individual levels as personal beliefs, conceptualizations, or knowledge (whether correct or incorrect) of individuals or groups of individuals about ELs, their families, and EL education. I define challenges at structural levels as institutional practices (history, norms, laws), community beliefs, and resources. These two ecological levels represent the two main ways participants viewed external pressures on their abilities to enact advocacy and which also impacted how participants recontextualized advocacy.

Challenges at the Individual Level

Participants often discussed challenges to EL advocacy as individuals (or groups of individuals) who maintained misunderstandings about EL education, language learning, or culture. Many participants saw these challenges manifested in colleagues who expressed opinions or harbored inappropriate assumptions about EL education, including educators who were making decisions about ELs' educational opportunities with limited knowledge of EL education. Others discussed how teachers in their school often testify to having seen ELs acquire English within two or three years and exit ESL services early in 2nd or 3rd grade. Thus, many teachers maintained unrealistic expectations for all ELs to acquire English at the same speed – despite the vast diversity of students who all share the EL label – while other teachers expected ELs (at all proficiencies) to access the same materials as native English speakers. As a lead teacher for content-area teachers who serve ELs in their classes, David discussed the challenge of "addressing misunderstandings from people who assume [ESL methods] is all about watering down the content and making it easier." While framing such misunderstandings among colleagues as potential deficits, participants rarely expressed these challenges as insurmountable obstacles. Instead, many discussed individual challenges to advocacy as within the participants' agency to change.

While describing challenges to advocacy, participants focused on changes they wished to see among colleagues, and many offered examples of how they planned to address them. The interpersonal work of convincing multiple stakeholders of the need for change was exemplified by Heather, a principal of a private school who was working on developing an EL program and who had taken just one ESL-methods course. She discussed the challenge of "getting teachers to believe that an EL program is needed." She continued: "it's our ethical responsibility to provide services if we are going to admit them [to the school]." She described the work of using her

emerging Spanish proficiency in staff meetings or communication with ELs' parents and "dropping hints over time" with teachers. She discussed her collaboration with the nearby public school district who encouraged her to utilize translation services to send communication home to parents of ELs. She also described her goals as "showing teachers first that I am making equitable changes in my own practices before giving mandates." Heather addressed changes she wished to see by focusing first on her own practices and then using the tools of collaboration, developing relationships, and assets-orientations. As a principal with previous teaching and administrative experience, including additional coursework in administration and supervision, Heather exemplified the importance of time and experience in the development of advocacy skills.

Some participants emphasized the need to foster a deeper understanding among teachers about what it means to be a language learner—focusing on the notion of developing empathy for ELs' experiences. David discussed a desire to see teachers at his school develop a sense of the experiences of language learners. To address this, he described working with administrators to develop opportunities for teachers to shadow individual ELs throughout a school day. Other participants focused on addressing a ubiquitous "your students versus our students mentality"—where content area teachers view ELs as the exclusive responsibility of ESL teachers.

Participants described barriers at individual ecological levels as potential gaps in colleagues' understandings of EL education, and which could be mitigated through the sharing of information and resources. Advocacy tools of collaboration, assets-orientations, addressing deficit-oriented language, and relationships could be recontextualized through various advocacy-related discourses with colleagues, ultimately providing participants a sense of agency. However, at broader structural levels, participants described frustrations and challenges to their advocacy

that seemed to hinder their confidence or limit their opportunities to engage in such conversations—which I explore in the next section.

Challenges at Structural Levels

Participants discussed challenges to EL advocacy at structural ecological levels. At this level, participants framed challenges in terms of systems or norms that significantly hindered their perceived effectiveness as EL advocates. Participants often viewed these barriers as school "cultures" or policies that would not change with one conversation alone. For some participants, structural barriers might have influenced their decisions to focus their advocacy efforts within their own classroom spaces or limit advocacy-related conversations to informal discussions with colleagues rather than as collaborative instructional planning. For those that expressed frustrations with structural barriers, time was also an important factor.

Grace, a history teacher at a private school in the U.S. that had ELs but did not have an EL program, advocated for bilingual supports for several students that she noticed were struggling with classwork. Yet her school approached language learning as "sink or swim" immersion:

> I brought this concern up to those around me, the academic Dean, and was very frustrated with the reply that I got. That, 'Oh well, you know it'll just take time, immersion will work, being around people who speak English will help.' And I'm like, 'Yes, he will eventually learn, but there are structured skills and techniques that can be taught that could help.

Grace also discussed how she left the school for another position after that year—in part due to her frustrations with institutional norms and the difficulty that "change is slow and institutions don't change overnight." At an international school in East Asia, Stanley described the challenge of a school culture of teacher autonomy. According to him, this program model simultaneously provided the freedom to create one's own lessons and activities, but also the difficulty in

persuading colleagues to adopt new methods or ideas. For Stanley, collaboration with teachers was hindered by the school structure. As a result, he believed in his context that the changes he wished to see other teachers take up (e.g., activities, curriculum, concepts from ESL methods coursework) should start in his own classroom.

Many participants discussed the need for ESL strategies through professional development for their colleagues; however, structural limitations of teachers' time and workloads were viewed as hindrances. Both Stanley and David discussed the issue of already-burdened and over-worked teachers and their potential lack of bandwidth for additional training. David, who had been co-teaching with ESL teachers in his middle school civics classes for the past four years, explained that he began taking ESL courses because of "the revolving door of ESL teachers" at his school. Frustrated with the challenges of constantly adapting to multiple ESL teachers, many of whom were not certified because of a general shortage of ESL teachers in his district, David wanted to serve ELs in his civics class without relying on an ESL teacher, so he enrolled in an ESL endorsement program. In many other cases, participants described settings where there was a structural need for teachers with ESL expertise, and so they enrolled in ESL coursework themselves. Thus, for many participants, participants seemed to respond to the hindrances of structural barriers by taking on additional training for themselves or focusing on their own teaching practices to address changes they wished to see.

Participants also discussed variations in teaching/learning contexts as challenges to EL advocacy. For many participants, the overall number of ELs and ESL teachers at their schools significantly shaped how they viewed EL advocacy. In schools with fewer ELs, participants described their role of advocate as encompassing a greater responsibility to reach more teachers; whereas in schools with larger EL populations with more ESL teachers, participants felt that the

breadth of their advocacy was limited to colleagues in their specific grade level or content area. Brittney, an elementary teacher in New England, described a lack of coherent guidance and consistency between and among the schools' ESL services in her district. Without clear guidance and consistency among EL programs at the district level, Brittney described her advocacy as a "public relations" speaker who was constantly trying to explain to teachers what ESL teachers and ESL programs do. Brittney also described her district's lack of understanding of the intersections of special education and ESL services and how in her district "special education trumps ESL services," also asking "why can't they be mutually beneficial?

In all, participants framed structural challenges as hindrances to their advocacy among broader social and ecological networks. Institutional and cultural norms and regulations negatively impacted participants' sense of agency—particularly in their abilities to instantiate or inspire change in their settings. As a result, participants often responded to such environmental factors by focusing more narrowly on their own practices and classrooms—often taking responsibility for their own professional development rather than challenging structural barriers that negatively impacted ELs' educational opportunities. One notable exception was Heather, the private school principal. In her interactions with staff, faculty, and parents at individual levels, she exemplified many of the EL advocacy tools. Yet, because of her role and capital as the school leader, her individual interactions over time had broader—structural—consequences.

Discussion

Participants discussed their engagement in EL advocacy in a variety of ways. In particular, they discussed advocating for ELs through instruction and conversations, and these EL advocacy practices aligned with the resources and discourses (Peresinni et al., 2004) of (a) collaboration, (b) relationship-building, (c) assets-oriented perspectives toward ELs and their

families, and (d) willingness and ability to address deficit-oriented language about ELs and their families. Participants also discussed ecological, institutional, sociocultural, and situated (Borg, 2004; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Peresinni et al., 2004) factors that mediated their EL advocacy engagement, which included previous experiences and characteristics, as well as variations in teaching settings.

Instructional advocacy—particularly collaboration—encompassed mainly non-transformative acts (i.e., did not challenge institutional norms/status quo; Dubetz & de Jong, 2011), as participants engaged in providing supports to meet institutional and legal requirements. Participants' collaboration with colleagues about EL instruction were contextualized by broader institutional, sociopolitical, and ecological influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Peresinni et al., 2004) as they worked within existing systems. For many participants, instructional advocacy was framed as enabling ELs to have equitable access to resources and instructional supports—based largely on perceived deficits related to institutional and standardized pressures such as test scores. On one hand, concerns for data-driven instruction based on standardized test performance harkens to conservative instructional practices with a focus on standardized testing and remediation (Thompson et al., 2013). With such a focus, a seemingly unavoidable byproduct is a tendency to view students through ways in which they do or do not "measure up" against standards. Yet, it is difficult to imagine a teacher in the field who, in the midst of immediate and pressing instructional needs, might focus instead on challenging the institutional constructs that *create* the conditions for the very deficits they are attempting to address. Thus, for many participants, instructional advocacy was seen as a triage of student needs, as they sought to treat the symptoms (rather than the causes) of students' marginalization. While such work can be labeled as "non-transformative" because it does not challenge existing systems, responding to

and addressing immediate needs at the school or classroom level might still have "ripple effects" on individuals' lives and opportunities over time (Linville, 2020).

By contrast, the potential for transitive advocacy, or advocacy that inspires others to become change agents for ELs, seemed to manifest the most in participants' framing of advocacy as conversations. Through these conversations, participants described addressing deficit-oriented language, the maintenance of assets-orientations, and an emphasis on relationships among colleagues. In such interactions, participants described burgeoning confidence and agency in their role as advocates. These conversations also tended to occur outside of the classroom. Contrasted with instructional advocacy, conversations seemed to occur at the periphery of "part of the job" of ESL job requirements (Linville, 2016)—in informal settings such as lunch, after-school settings, between classes, or while out in the community. As a result, exploration of ways in which EL advocates might (or why they might not) engage in transformative and transitive advocacy in collaboration for instruction is also warranted.

Researchers have found that EL advocates engage in broad social networks while often encountering "resistance," "confrontations," and "risk" (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019). Many participants in this study discussed such encounters as *individual challenges* when they interacted with colleagues, administrators, and community members. In these discourse spaces, participants in the current study navigated challenging interactions (i.e., risks) with others as they "spoke up" on behalf of ELs in specific moments. However, participants did not discuss or label all of these interactions as contested spaces. Rather, participants often framed these discourses as key opportunities to advocate for ELs by discussing ESL-related content, methods, resources, and supports.

Implications

Thus, while participants viewed such interactions as opportunities to share new knowledge or to persuade others, many framed these discursive moments as conversations rather than as confrontations. This finding marks a contrast to previous work on advocacy (e.g., de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007) as participants in this study moved from the expectation of resistance to viewing interactions with colleagues as *opportunities* to share new knowledge and/or perspectives with others. Thus, this study highlights the potential for EL advocacy conversations—and the preparation to do so in teacher education settings—as integral to addressing individual level barriers. When armed with EL advocacy skills such as recognizing and addressing deficit-oriented language, "dismantling language stereotypes" (e.g., Grace), sharing content-related knowledge with a colleague, collaborating with colleagues, maintaining assets-oriented perspectives, and forming relationships over time, EL advocates have the potential to transform individual teachers' perspectives and instructional practices.

Harrison and McIlwain (2019) argued for intervention from school administrators to mitigate resistance from colleagues who exhibited deficit-oriented language or who undermined ESL teachers' instructional advice, and de Oliveira and Athanases (2007) suggested the incorporation of more practice spaces in teacher education to prepare advocates for confrontations. A key finding from the current study is that for many participants, relationship-building was a key mediator to reducing risks and confrontations in advocacy-related conversations. For some, relationships were built over longer periods of time, and for others relationships included ensuring advocacy efforts took into consideration colleagues' backgrounds and beliefs before advising change. As a result, ESL teacher education programs

might benefit from focusing more on the conceptual tool of relationship-building among colleagues—with attention to longer-term perspectives on institutional change.

An additional finding from this study is the role of mentor EL advocates in participants' sociocultural histories. Participants witnessed teachers *doing* advocacy both in supervised teaching experiences, as well as teachers' own experiences in different contexts. Participants described these experiences as significant contributors to their engagement in advocacy. Many participants' accounts of mentor advocates included moments where they spoke up on behalf of ELs at meetings where colleagues were using deficit-oriented language. Such individual acts of advocacy, even when viewed as menial, mundane, or which lack the luster of challenging oppressive systems, might still have transformative and transitive effects on future EL advocates. As this study highlights through a diversity of educators with coursework in ESL methods, supervised teaching experiences and placements might benefit from identifying both content-specific *and* EL advocacy mentors. Thus, preparation for work as EL advocates could benefit from more attention to identifying *any* teacher of ELs who actively engages in EL advocacy work with provisions for shadowing, collaborating, and reflecting on observed advocacy practices.

While many participants described advocacy conversations with colleagues, many others voiced difficulties with larger-scale and more endemic barriers. Barriers to advocacy were often context-dependent, as many participants discussed teaching settings with varying degrees of resources and support for ELs. As a result, advocacy practices likewise varied by contextual factors. Reflecting the context-dependence of EL advocacy, teacher educators could emphasize the importance of preparing teachers to assess the needs, knowledge, resources, beliefs, and goals of their teaching contexts as they develop long-term perspectives on future institutional

change for ELs (see Huelsenbeck, 2019). At the same time, the notable exception of Heather, the private school principal, highlights the importance of the various spheres of influence in which each individual might be situated. In many ways, Heather was positioned in a role such that individual interactions—conversations—carried the potential to instantiate change at structural levels. As she discussed her advocacy engagement with teachers, parents, students, community members, and other educational systems, the roles of EL advocacy tools were ever-present. There is a need for further studies that examine the development of and practice of advocacy skills among educational stakeholders in various ecological levels, such as principals, district leaders, or policymakers.

Limitations and Conclusion

Situated literature indicates that various settings might influence teachers' enactment of learning, and that teachers might also influence their settings (e.g., Thompson et al., 2013). In other follow-up studies of teacher learning, researchers conducted interviews and observations over the course of several years. A strength of the current study is the richness of data and insight of the university setting. This allowed me to formulate a framework for how the ESL program promoted EL advocacy skills across the curricula. However, I did not have access to the same depth of data and understanding of participants' current settings. Based on the results of this study, further *in situ* interviews and observations are warranted to examine how advocacy unfolds for participants over longer periods of time.

It is important to consider the limited roles and influence of teachers within individual school settings. Addressing structural barriers to EL advocacy might not only require time, but the coalition of other EL advocates giving stronger and more emphatic voice for institutional change. At the same time, administrators, district leaders, and teacher educators are positioned in

unique vantages such that their “spheres of influence” might naturally lead to agency over structural issues. Thus, the burden of structural change need not rest solely on the shoulders of EL teacher-advocates, but the collective efforts of advocates in various roles and contexts.

References

Athanases, S. Z., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2007). Conviction, confrontation, and risk in new teachers' advocating for equity. *Teaching Education, 18*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476 21070 1325150.

Athanases, S. Z., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers' challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record, 110*(1), 64–104.

Athanases, S. Z., & Martin, K. J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 627–646. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. H. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298–341. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Caldas, B. 2017. "Shifting Discourses in teacher education: Performing the advocate bilingual teacher. *Arts Education Policy Review, 118* (4), 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2017.1287801.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance.* Teachers College Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Creswell, J., & Poth, C. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (Fourth ed.). Sage Publications.

Dove, M. G., & Honigsfield, A. (2018). Chapter 1: "Teacher collaboration is not an option: It is a must", in *Co-Teaching for English Learners.* Corwin.

Dubetz, N. E., & de Jong, E. (2011). Teacher advocacy in bilingual education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 248-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623603

Freeman, Y. S., Freeman, D. E., Soto, M., & Ebe, A. (2016). *ESL Teaching: Principles for success*. Heinemann.

Gottlieb, M. (2013). *Essential Actions: A Handbook for Implementing WIDA's Framework for English Language Development Standards*. WIDA.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9). http://www.tcrecord.org/content. asp?contentid=15018.

Grossman, P., Valencia, S., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. J*ournal of Literacy Research, 32*, 631–662.

Haneda, M., & Alexander, M. (2015). ESL teacher advocacy beyond the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49*, 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.009.

Harrison, J. (2019). Building advocacy capacity in a teacher training program. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 44-52). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Harrison, J., McIlwain, M. J. (2019). ESOL teachers' experiences in their role as advocate: Making the case for transitive advocacy. *TESOL Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.464

Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (2016). *Mastering ESL/EFL methods: Differentiated instruction for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students.* Pearson.

Huelsenbeck, C., Baecher, L., & Staehr Fenner, D. (2019). Action research for advocacy in a supervised teaching seminar. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 71-83). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Master, B., Loeb, S., Whitney, C., & Wyckoff, J. (2016). Different skills? Identifying differentially effective teachers of English language learners. *The Elementary School Journal*, *117*(2), 261–284.

Leko, M., & Brownell, M. (2011). Special education preservice teachers' appropriation of pedagogical tools for teaching reading. *Exceptional Children, 77*(2), 229-251.

Linville, H. (2015). ESOL teachers as advocates: An important role? *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 98–131. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.193

Linville, H. A. (2019). Advocacy skills for teachers: "A real careful little dance". In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 3–17). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Linville, H. A. (2020). A closer look at ESOL teacher advocacy: What we do and why. *TESOL Journal*, *11*(3) 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.508

Loeb, S., Soland, J., & Fox, L. (2014). Is a good teacher a good teacher for all? Comparing value-added of teachers with their English learners and non-English learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *36*(4), 399–416.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed, pp. 606-636). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators.* Routledge.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. Jossey Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook. 3rd. ed: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paris, D., & Alim, S. (Eds.) (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* Teachers College Press.

Peressini, D., Borko, H., Romagnano, L., Knuth, E., & Willis, C. (2004). A conceptual framework for learning to teach secondary mathematics: A situative perspective. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 56(1), 67–96.

Staehr Fenner, D. (2014). *Advocating for English learners: A guide for educators*. Corwin Press.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. The Guilford Press.

TESOL International Association (TESOL). (2019). *Standards for Initial TESOL Pre-K-12 Teacher Preparation Programs*. TESOL Press.

Thompson, J., Windschitl, M., & Braaten, M. (2013). Developing a theory of ambitious early-career teacher practice. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(3), 574-615.

Trickett, E. J., Rokhostkiy, E., Jeong, A., Genkova, A., Oberoi, A., Weinstein, T., & Delgado, Y. (2012). “The kids are terrific: It’s the job that’s tough”: The ELL teacher role in an urban context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*, 283–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.10.005

Warren, A. N. (2020): Toward an inclination to advocate: a discursive study of teachers’ stance toward linguistically-responsive pedagogy in online language teacher education. *Language and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1801716

Whiting, J. (2016). Training ELL teacher advocates. *Fourth Estate, 32*(2), 9–10. http://textesoliv.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Complete-PDF.pdf

Whiting, J. (2019). Beyond the philosophy statement: Bringing advocacy center stage in TESOL teacher education. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 31–43). Routledge.

WIDA (2019). *K-12 Can Do Descriptors*. Retrieved from https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/can-do/descriptors

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Name	**Background**	**Teaching Context**
Amber	Worked at prior school with majority EL population and was "thrown into the fire" by being forced to learn how to teach ELs; started taking classes toward endorsement over long period of time.	Elementary reading specialist and ESOL teacher in the South; school used to be mainly White but recently experiencing increased growth in diversity and is now Title 1 school; teachers at school did not know how to work with ELs
Katherine	"Nothing prepared me to work with ESOL students." "No, NO prior knowledge on how to work with ELs." "Feel like I am translating instead of helping." Enrolled in post-master's degree in reading, including several ESL-related courses	Elementary reading specialist 2nd and 3rd grade Title 1 school in the South. ESOL population increased recently; used to have one ESL teacher part-time, now there are two ESL teachers.
Grace	Taught for two years in different private boarding school previously; noticed several ELs struggling but school did not have support system; enrolled in master's degree for ESL.	Private boarding school in the South; not sure about overall EL population in current school, but has a few ELs in her class.
Stanley	8 years of experience in private international schools across Asia including elementary, middle, and high school teaching. Enrolled in master's degree in ESL; undergraduate degree in literature; "everything about teaching came from on-the-job experiences."	Middle school English language and literature teacher at international school in East Asia. Dual language instructional format with half English, half other language. English teachers from diverse English-speaking countries, including the U.S., Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, Scotland. Focus on teacher autonomy rather than collaboration.
Mark	Working on master's degree in ESL; undergraduate degree and initial licensure in Special Education; views advocacy through that lens; shifted perspectives with ESL coursework; taught special education in two different countries in East Asia before current school and position.	4th grade ESL teacher in private school in East Asia; push-in teacher for 3 different classes with 22 students in each class.
Brett	Completed in-person master's degree for ESL initial endorsement; tutored newcomer ELs before starting graduate work; studied abroad in Mexico "broadened and opened perspectives"	4th grade ESL teacher at school in South with more than 50 percent EL population; 60 percent Hispanic; one among many ESL teachers; experienced rotations of in-person, hybrid, and fully online instruction within last year.
Heather	6th year at school; experience as dean of instruction before principal role; taught English in public school for 10 years;	Principal K-6 private school in the South; mostly black and Hispanic; small class sizes;

	administration and supervision degree program.	identified large numbers of ELs but few teachers knowledgeable about ESL methods.
Stephany	Parents were immigrants and spoke Spanish in the home; experienced limited ESL support as a child; completed in-person master's degree in ESL	Elementary 3rd grade ESL teacher in urban school in the South. Majority of students ELs with L1 Spanish; one of many ESL teachers—at least one for every grade level; lots of professional development and support for ESL
Brittney	Did not do undergraduate degree in education; assisted kindergarten teacher, including summer program where encountered ELs and decided to get license in ESL; enrolled and completed ESL certificate program online. Studied abroad in Spain; traveled to Germany and Italy.	ESL teacher 3rd through 5th grade in New England area. Academic support in math and science for newcomer ELs to fully exited ELs.
David	Began co-teaching with ESL teachers and saw "revolving door" of certified/uncertified teachers; difficulties getting along and working well; didn't want to rely on others which led to enrolling in master's in ESL.	8th grade civics teacher in urban school in the South; department chair of social studies, lead mentor; 40 percent free and reduced lunch; large Hispanic population
Megan	Grew up with "98 percent White community and little to no diversity." Initial teaching credential did not require ESL coursework; community experienced rapid influx of immigrants and "teachers didn't know what to do." Led to her desire to enroll in online master's degree ESL endorsement program.	8th grade English language arts teacher at very small rural school district in the South; 8th grade chair for county, works with principals and superintendent; "community is racist" "a lot of ignorance, misunderstandings, and people saying ELs must not value being in America if they speak Spanish"
Mandy	Initial licensure in elementary special education; similar strategies but additional focus on communication and language; 5th year teaching at current school; grew up with IEP, had to learn to advocate for herself.	1st grade teacher at bilingual school in Middle East; "elite private school where kids have drivers, parents don't cook, family from ruling class." Students are better communicating in English than Arabic.
Sharon	Father was EL, supported him with reading/writing; traveled and lived in Asia; moved to many places. Completed in-person master's degree in ESL.	Algebra 1 teacher in rural school in the South; all virtual learning; Title 1 school
Tiffany	Previous work as K-2 music teacher but shifted to family outreach during Covid; took one graduate class in ESL methods	K-2 music teacher at large urban charter school in New England; diverse large city school (e.g., Hispanic, Bangladesh, Egyptian, Tibetan); no programs or support for ELs.
Lisa	Moved to U.S. from small town in India when 22 years old and understands what it's like to be in ELs' shoes; motivated her to work in ESL field.	Elementary reading specialist assistant, grades 1-3 at urban school in the South; reading intervention program focused on promoting grade level reading proficiency among ELs and non-ELs

Appendix

ESL Teachers' Appropriation of Pedagogical Tools of EL Advocacy

Interview Protocol

This interview is part of a research study that I am conducting on how current students and graduates of UVa's ESL programs are engaging with the notion of EL advocacy at their teaching contexts or in their continued professional development.

1. **Please describe your current teaching position and any other required responsibilities you have at your school.** (Probe for grade level, subjects, other work responsibilities such as committees.)

- **What experiences have prepared you to work with ELs?** (Probe for teacher preparation, colleagues, professional development, experiences outside of U.S.)

- **As part of your current position, do you advocate for ELs in your school? If so, please describe how you do this.** (Probe for specific example and for how they define advocacy for ELs)

- **What are some challenges in advocating for ELs in general and at this school?** (Probe for technology, virtual learning, resources, school climate, deficit-orientations)

- **What experiences/factors have prepared or enabled you to advocate for ELs?** (Probe for UVA coursework, UVA field placements, ESL content knowledge, interpersonal skills, co-workers)

- **How confident do you feel in your ability to advocate for your English Learners when talking to other teachers at your school?** (1-5):
  1) not at all confident
  2) somewhat confident
  3) neutral
  4) somewhat confident
  5) very confident

- **What are some things you would like to see colleagues at your school begin to advocate for or change?**

- **Imagine that you that you will be teaching at your school for at least the next three years. Your goal is to serve as a change agent for ELs yourself and to inspire several of your colleagues (teachers, administrators, etc.) to also advocate for and become change agents for ELs. What strategies and approaches would you take to make this happen in your own teaching and in your interactions with other teachers and**

administrators? (Probe for collaboration, developing relationships, deficit-oriented language)

- **Is there anything that we didn't talk about that you would like to share?**

Advocacy Discourse on Teaching Writing to Multilingual Learners

Will Fox

University of Virginia

Abstract

Teachers of multilingual learners (MLs) are often called upon as advocates to address language and perspectives that promote deficit-oriented views about MLs. Deficit-views about MLs' language development that focus on what MLs are not able to do are widespread in writing pedagogies. Preparing ML teachers to engage in conversations about ML writing through an advocacy lens is an educational imperative. To do so, I developed an assignment for an online course in English Linguistics in which teachers analyzed a writing sample from an ML and engaged in a simulated dialogue with an ELA teacher-colleague (Ms. Lee; in the form of an avatar) who was extremely focused on the grammar errors she was seeing in the student's writing. I examined 23 ECs' simulation interactions and I identified three approaches that ECs took in their conversations that were consistent across the dataset. I found that five ECs approached the collaboration by addressing Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented language—focusing on her overall *conceptual* orientation. By contrast, seven ECs approached the collaboration by focusing on providing *strategies*—suggesting instructional techniques, resources, and providing cross-linguistic explanations for the student's errors. The most common group (11 out of 23 ECs) approached the collaboration by incorporating a focus on both *conceptual* orientations *and* providing *strategies*. I illustrate these three approaches through three case-study simulator interactions. I discuss the affordances and hindrances of all three approaches, and I discuss the implications for research and teacher education.

Introduction

For teachers of multilingual learners (e.g., ESL teachers), where issues of equity, power, race, and social capital intersect with the lives of students on a daily basis, the potential for advocacy is imbued into every instructional decision and interaction (Dubetz & de Jong, 2011; Flora & Rosa, 2015; Linville, 2016). Particularly important for multilingual learner (ML) advocates is the ability to challenge approaches to ML instruction that might promote deficit-oriented views about MLs' language and literacy practices (Fox & Salerno, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2017; Self & Stengel, 2020). Such deficit-oriented perspectives often couple English language development with assumptions about student intelligence, their capacity to learn (Athanases & Wong, 2018), or such perspectives promote illusory and arbitrary notions of "native-like" grammatical accuracy (Lippi-Green, 2012; McKinley & Rose, 2018). One important, but understudied, aspect of ML advocacy is advocating for ML writers. From an ML advocacy perspective, how ML teachers approach conversations with colleagues about ML writing, or how they "frame" (Gordon, 2015, p.325) such discussions, can have important implications for the educational opportunities of MLs. Therefore, a major challenge for ML teacher educators is to provide rehearsal spaces (e.g., simulations, role-plays) in which ML endorsement candidates (ECs) can begin to critically examine approaches to language education in society that tend to frame MLs from deficit perspectives. Thus, this paper is situated at the intersections between teacher education promoting advocacy among teachers working with MLs, and teachers of writing.

To advance this agenda, I developed an advocacy-related and video-based simulation assignment for an online education-based English linguistics course at a Southern U.S. research university in a series of courses leading to a state ML teacher endorsement[i]. As the instructor for

the course and as a researcher interested in ML advocacy discourse and its development among ECs, I designed the simulation experience as an interaction between a middle grades (student ages 12-15) ML teacher and a middle grades English teacher. In the simulation experience, ECs navigated a planned meeting with the English teacher (an avatar named Ms. Lee) who was very concerned with the grammar errors she was seeing in the written work of an intermediate-level English proficient ML (Gabriela) in her class. In the scenario, Ms. Lee ignored the substance of Gabriela's writing, focusing exclusively on what Ms. Lee described as her failures to write with standard conventions. Throughout the scenario, Ms. Lee approached Gabriela's written work from a deficit-oriented linguistic perspective, often repeating her concerns of maintaining a "standard English," expressing her fears that graders on the end-of-year state writing test would easily recognize that Gabriela was an ML.

For the assignment, ECs were supposed to recognize and address the deficit-oriented language of Ms. Lee while advocating for Gabriela with assets-based instructional advice (MacSwan, 2020). ECs were provided in advance with a list of assets-based strategies for teaching writing to MLs that ECs could implement during their interactions with the simulator. Following the simulation experience, ECs participated in various reflective steps. They watched recordings of classmates' simulations and talked through reflective questions with peers. In this process, ECs reflected on the nature of the avatar's approach to writing instruction in general, and they considered how the instructional advice they provided to the avatar might or might not have exemplified ML advocacy.

The design of the simulator assignment allowed for the ability to repeat the same scripted scenario for multiple participants. Thus, I was able to systematically examine the language participants used in their reactions to the simulated colleague who might have (un)consciously

promoted a deficit-oriented perspective about an ML. For this paper, I apply a multiple case-study thematic analysis framework (Gordon, 2015; Miles et al., 2014; Stake, 2006) to examine ECs' interactions with the simulation avatar, and I address the following research questions: (1) How do ECs advocate (or not) for an ML during a simulated meeting with a colleague about the ML's writing? (2) How do three ECs approach, or frame, their advocacy for the ML?

Literature Review

ML Advocacy Defined

Children and adolescents in PreK-12 schools are bounded by challenges inherent in a system that foists learning and developmental expectations upon them. Therefore, *all* educators are naturally positioned as potential voices and facilitators – advocates – of student growth as they work to provide students with access to the resources and skills to meet the expectations of this system. Yet, it is widely established that not all students succeed in conforming to the expectations of standardized curricula and language in equal ways. While general differentiation strategies can "close the achievement gaps" among a specific range of diverse student needs, research shows that MLs benefit from teachers who are trained in ML-specific instructional strategies, content knowledge, and skills beyond those offered to non-MLs (Loeb et al. 2014; Master et al. 2014). ML advocacy can therefore be framed as providing teachers and students with access to knowledge, skills, and resources to enable MLs to meet institutional (societal) expectations, regulations, and norms (i.e., non-transformative advocacy; de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007).

At the same time, educators might also focus on transformative advocacy (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007) by challenging the systems themselves that undermine students' educational and life opportunities. Such work often includes community engagement or political activism

that seeks to redress inequities, challenge the status quo, and inspire change. For example, ML advocates might focus on addressing "English-only" policies that undermine MLs' abilities to develop and utilize their home languages as valued resources for learning. Other ML advocates that seek to instantiate change at structural levels might focus on promoting equitable access to multilingual resources, teacher training, or family engagement and communication. Such acts of advocacy might occur outside of the school or classroom environment.

While ML advocacy is often framed as being a voice or giving voice to students and families to improve their educational experiences across a broad range of settings, ML advocates might also "give voice" to their school colleagues—adding perspectives, instructional tools, challenging deficit-oriented language, and inspiring others to take up advocacy in their own practices and contexts. Researchers have found that in school settings, ESL teachers engage in advocacy in two main ways: (a) taking actions directly with MLs in their own classroom spaces by providing equitable and culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy, and (b) collaborating with colleagues outside their own classrooms by providing professional development, planning for instruction, speaking up against deficit-oriented language about MLs and/or their families, or engaging in informal conversations about MLs and instructional supports (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007; Dubetz & de Jong, 2011; Haneda & Alexander, 2015). For this paper, I focus on this second aspect and definition of ESL advocacy: collaborative dialogues with colleagues for ML instruction.

ML Advocacy Discourse Practice

Affirming the collaborative nature of this work, scholars have identified several interpersonal skills that are essential for ML advocacy, including the abilities to establish relationships with educational stakeholders, defend MLs against deficit-oriented language,

"speak up" against inequities, and inspire change agents for MLs (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2007; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Staehr Fenner, 2014). While many teachers might develop skills for advocacy over time in the field, teacher educators such as Whiting (2019) and Linville (2019) have argued that teacher education programs should prepare ML teachers for their roles as ML advocates. Some scholars have taken up this charge and have described teacher education programs, assignments, and course designs with advocacy as a focus (Athanases & Martin, 2006; Harrison, 2019; Huelsenbeck et al., 2019; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; 2013; Warren, 2020; Whiting, 2019). Other scholars have utilized in-person and digitally mediated role-playing interactions (i.e., simulations) as approximations of advocacy-related scenarios that teacher candidates might encounter in their teaching contexts (Caldas, 2017; Fox & Salerno, 2021; Self & Stengel, 2020; Whiting, 2019).

While many teacher educators have utilized simulation avatars of students and children in virtual classroom spaces (e.g., Cohen et al., 2020), other researchers have focused on adult-to-adult simulations, such as parent-teacher conferences and teacher-to-teacher interactions (e.g., Chen, 2020; Coughlin & Dotger, 2016; Walker & Legg, 2018). In many of these adult-simulated scenarios, teacher candidates practiced navigating challenging interpersonal interactions. For teachers who specialize in working with MLs, difficult interactions with content-area teachers who might (un)consciously promote deficit-oriented views about MLs and their families is a relatively common occurrence (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; García & Kleifgen, 2018; Harrison & McIlwain, 2019). In order for ECs to respond to this reality and serve as effective ML advocates, they must be able to recognize and address deficit-oriented perspectives, at times "speaking up" against inequities that negatively impact the lives and educational opportunities of MLs (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; Linville, 2019). However, deficit-oriented perspectives

about language learning are not always manifested in explicit ways (Harrison & McIlwain, 2019; Paris & Alim, 2017). Instead, they are often expressed in implicit assumptions that view "the languages, literacies, and cultural ways of being of many students and communities of color as deficiencies to be overcome" (Paris & Alim, 2017, p. 4). Such assumptions are often couched in the language choices of individuals as they engage in various discourses about ML education.

In order to be prepared for discourses in which they might encounter deficit-oriented perspectives, ECs need more opportunities to practice the skills of an ML advocate. Crucial to this role are rehearsal spaces (e.g., role-plays, simulations) in which ECs can engage with coursework that promotes (1) inclinations toward justice and equity, (2) opportunities to engage in approximations (i.e., practice) of ML advocacy, and (3) peer-mediated reflections on the role of their discursive choices in advocacy-related interactions. While some work has been done to advance the emphasis of advocacy in ML teacher education, less is known about the discourse features that comprise advocacy-related interactions (see Fox & Salerno, 2021; Warren, 2020 for exceptions). Besides general interpersonal skills such as abilities to empathize, persuade, or foster relational trust, the question of how an ML teacher might advocate for an ML—particularly in writing instruction—while using concepts and tools introduced in ML teacher education remains largely unexamined.

Deficit-orientations and Writing

Recognizing, or "noticing," deficit-oriented perspectives about MLs and/or their families is a fundamental first step toward ML advocacy (Linville, 2020). Scholars focused on advocacy for MLs have begun addressing what they view as pervasive deficit-oriented perspectives on how second/additional languages are acquired (e.g., Lantolf, 2006; Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; McKinley & Rose, 2018; Paris & Alim, 2017; Valdés et al., 2011)—which in turn, influence

broader cultural and institutional approaches to language teaching. According to these researchers, historically mainstream second language acquisition perspectives have maintained a deficit-oriented view of language learning focused on MLs' limitations and failures to achieve "native-like" competence in the target language (McKinley & Rose, 2018). As a counter to this dominant language ideology, researchers have argued for a focus on how language users might demonstrate linguistic competence in a variety of contexts and purposes even while producing grammatically "inaccurate" language (Lantolf, 2006; Valdés et al., 2011). Despite this ongoing work, as well as foundational sociolinguistic literature (e.g., Labov, 1969) explaining the socially constructed nature of linguistic conventions and the resulting arbitrariness of a "standard" language, educators seem to have made little progress in dismantling deficit-oriented worldviews on language learning (Bacon, 2017).

In addition to challenging paradigms of objective "correctness" in language conventions, researchers have also criticized "monoglossic" language education paradigms (i.e., one variety of a language is superior) because they fail to be critical of how standardized varieties of a language can be used to perpetuate racial discrimination (Bacon, 2017; Flores & Rosa, 2015; MacSwan, 2020). For educators in the U.S., the standard variety of English used to "gain access to upward mobility" has been associated with White, affluent, monolingual English speakers (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 165). Flores and Rosa (2015) explained that monoglossic language ideologies, such as "English-only" movements and the perpetuation of standardized English, favor only one dialect/variation of English as the "appropriate" variety for access to social capital and rely on the concept of an idealized grammatical system as the primary vehicle of effective communication. According to many language researchers, a monoglossic view presupposes an objective, or "standard," language variety that serves as a linguistic reference point, despite a

lack of evidence that accurately defines the features of this variety or which connect linguistic conventions with an objective reality (García & Wei, 2014; Valdés, 2011).

MacSwan (2020) argued that attempts to reframe standardized language discourses as "academic English" still perpetuate deficit and racialized hegemony. Again, emphasizing the historical association between "standard" English and affluent, White speakers of English, MacSwan challenged notions that some linguistic varieties are inherently more "complex" than others. Instead, MacSwan (2020) argued that non-standard varieties of English (e.g., African American English) and hybrid language practices (e.g., multilingual codeswitching) were "just as rich and complex as the language of the educated classes" and that they "reflect rule-governed and systematic linguistic knowledge" (p. 33). He thus challenged the idea that "academic language" is the only language variety capable of conveying complex ideas or which uses complex grammar. MacSwan then advocated for a return to asset-oriented perspectives in order to "discover how children use language in non-school contexts and for non-school tasks, with the aim of informing strategies for connecting school experiences with home experiences" (p. 34).

Despite these revealing insights, some researchers remain uncertain about the pedagogical implications of such theoretical orientations in practice—particularly for writing instruction with MLs. In a response to Flores and Rosa (2015), Cummins (2017) asked whether teachers who provide conceptual and linguistic feedback on MLs' writing are complicit with "discourses of appropriateness" (p. 419), thus raising the question whether addressing grammatical errors in writing is a deficit-oriented practice and is to be avoided. Gevers (2018) questioned the implications of adopting "code-meshing" pedagogies that encourage MLs to intentionally mix non-standard language in written expression for rhetorical effect. He argued for a distinction between non-standard oral and written registers, and for the pragmatic concern that

standard (i.e., written) registers are often still expected in many workplace environments. He also argued that MLs at early stages of proficiency might benefit from developing proficiency in "dominant discourses before trying their hand at [code-meshing strategies]" (p. 81). Gevers (2018) and Cummins (2017) both explained that the field of education would benefit from further studies that examined writing pedagogy incorporating the integration of students' home language varieties in literacy practices such as writing. Only then could teachers of ML writers employ such pedagogies with confidence.

Conceptual Framework

As emergent ML advocates, it is important for ECs to consider how an ML advocacy lens might interact with language ideologies and to practice and to reflect on approaches to ML writing instruction. ML advocates are often called upon to challenge deficit-oriented ideologies that frame MLs' cultural and linguistic resources as deficiencies to be overcome (Paris & Alim, 2017). From a critical perspective to language education, focusing on notions of "native-like" grammatical "correctness" in writing while emphasizing the role of standardized language forms that are "appropriate" for academic contexts can often lead to deficit-oriented writing pedagogies (Flores & Rosa, 2015; MacSwan, 2020). Recognizing deficit orientations as they exist in practice and being able to address them are important skills for ML advocates as they both teach MLs and engage with teachers who are working with emerging-proficient ML writers.

Literature on assets-oriented pedagogies emphasize the importance of viewing MLs' cultural, cognitive, and linguistic resources as valuable capital to their own and others' learning in school settings (Moll et al., 1992). As a result, ML teachers who are collaborating with writing teachers might employ several approaches as ML advocates. By encouraging teachers to learn about a student's first language, grammar "errors" can be examined through first language

influences—as expected developmental processes—rather than as learning "problems" to be solved (Echevarría & Bear, n.d.; Shatz & Wilkinson, 2013). They might also incorporate strategies for grammar instruction that are systematic and pattern-oriented rather than focused on all errors (Christensen, 2017; Lee, 2020). ML advocates can encourage teachers to focus on what the ML "can do" rather than what they are not doing correctly (WIDA, 2019). ML advocates can encourage teachers to learn to distinguish between language that people use on a regular basis (i.e., descriptive use) and idealized language forms that are prescribed within education as "standard" forms (Christensen, 2017; Curzan & Adams, 2011). Teachers can be encouraged to ask "Whose standard?" and to challenge the notion of "idealized monolingualism in a standardized national language as the norm to which all national subjects should aspire" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 151). Finally, ML advocates might encourage teachers to consider the derivations of raciolinguistic ideologies as nested in historical power differentials with "White listeners" as the gatekeepers of "appropriate" language use.

At the same time, ECs might also draw on approaches to ML writing that maintain deficit-oriented perspectives. It is unclear how ECs might interact with such concepts and their own sociocultural histories and beliefs in a situation that would cause them to draw on these resources under pressure. In this study, the simulator assignment provided a space in which ECs practiced and reflected on ways in which they might approach writing instruction through an advocacy lens in the context of collaboration with a colleague.

Method

Researcher Positionality

As a White, monolingual L1 English language user with a degree in linguistics having spent two years at a university in Asia as an English teacher and a Christian missionary, I entered

ML teaching in the U.S. with a provisional teaching license expecting to focus exclusively on English language development. When I began my work as an ML teacher in the U.S. at a high school that had seen a recent influx in immigrant youth from Central America, I was surprised by the complexity of the role (i.e., case management, high stakes assessments, professional development for colleagues, and other facets beyond English language instruction). Students' home languages were rarely viewed as assets, and I was largely unprepared for daily interactions in which experienced teachers expressed their disdain for MLs and their culture, their fears of a loss of classroom management when these students would speak Spanish in their classes. I also felt pressure from standardized writing assessments required for graduation that were norm-referenced for L1 English-speaking students, and I saw many teachers of writing struggle with balancing developmental and process-oriented writing perspectives with concerns for grammatical accuracy. As a teacher educator preparing future ML advocates, my goal has been to provide teaching candidates with spaces to begin examining their instructional practices and interactions with colleagues through an advocacy lens. Additionally, as the designer of the simulator assignment and the instructor for the course, I approach this study as a practitioner-researcher in which I seek both to improve my own practice and generate new knowledge for others through my work (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009).

Participants

Participants in this study include 23 students enrolled in an online graduate course, English Linguistics. Among the 23 participants, 18 were female and 5 were male; 13 self-identified as being bi/multilingual, with the remaining 10 identifying either as possessing some knowledge (but not full proficiency) in one or more languages. Nine of the participants indicated they had teaching experience (range, 1-10 years), and the remaining 14 were pre-service

teachers. Among those with teaching experience, five were experienced teachers in early elementary (e.g., PreK/Kindergarten), with the remainder possessing teaching experience in secondary or adult settings. Five of nine experienced teachers worked in public schools, while the remaining four worked in private schools. Finally, 13 of the 23 participants reported experience living abroad (see Table 1).

I chose three ECs as cases to highlight three approaches that I saw across the dataset in the conversation with Ms. Lee. I focus on the simulator interactions of Allison, Shane, and Linda (pseudonyms). I focus on these three as example interactions because in examining ECs' interactions with the simulator, they each represent how ECs oriented themselves toward Ms. Lee in the simulation. ECs' interactions focused mainly on one of the following: conceptual orientations, providing strategies, and combining conceptual with strategies. Responding to Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented approach to Gabriela's writing, some ECs chose to focus on addressing Ms. Lee's overall *conceptual* orientation and they emphasized viewing Gabriela and her writing through an assets lens. By contrast, other ECs chose to address Ms. Lee's concerns by providing suggestions, or *strategies*, in order to support Gabriela's development of grammatical accuracy in writing. Last, some ECs attempted to advise Ms. Lee by addressing her *conceptual* orientation toward writing and by providing *strategies* to meet her pressing demands for instructional support. After establishing these three approaches, I reviewed all participants' simulation interactions and found the discourses of Allison, Shane, and Linda exemplified key aspects of each category.

Advocacy in Writing Simulator

I designed the simulator experience as a 10-minute conversation in which ECs navigated a meeting with an English teacher on language-related content. Before engaging with the

simulator, ECs read articles and participated in discussion boards focused on the topic of written error correction, prescriptive versus descriptive language approaches, "standard English," raciolinguistics, and linguistic transfer. Overall, these readings focused on approaching grammar and written correction from a critical literacy and social-justice framework, which called attention to the ways in which monolingual language ideologies perpetuate an imagined "standard" language. This ideology, the authors argued, has served to marginalize students who use non-standard language varieties.

I provided all ECs with background information on the fictitious English teacher (Ms. Lee), the fictitious ML (Gabriela), relevant school context, and a supplemental artifact—a writing sample from Gabriela. In the simulation script, ECs were made aware that Ms. Lee is a middle grades (8th grade) English teacher with 10 years teaching experience at her school. For the simulation, ECs assumed this was their first year working at the hypothetical school; they had an overall positive professional relationship with Ms. Lee but had not had much opportunity to visit her classroom because they taught another class when she taught Gabriela. ECs also knew that Ms. Lee had been struggling to provide effective writing instruction for MLs, following a recent influx of MLs to their school, but that she had been working hard to provide for their needs.

In the simulator, Ms. Lee is concerned about Gabriela, a 14-year-old, 8th-grade ML. Gabriela has been in the U.S. in the EC's school district since 4th grade, and she attended school until the 4th grade in Honduras. Gabriela's L1 is Spanish; she was born in Honduras, and her family immigrated to the U.S. when she was in 4th grade. Her standardized language proficiency test scores have not changed in the past two years, which are intermediate in speaking and listening, and intermediate in reading and writing.

Before the meeting, I provided ECs with a writing sample of Gabriela's written work (an actual ML writing sample) with "errors" highlighted in red by Ms. Lee (see Appendix A). Based on this writing sample, I asked ECs to plan and develop assets-based instructional advice as ML advocates. The simulator script provided to the simulator actor who was playing Ms. Lee consisted of learning challenges and objectives. I wrote scripted responses for the actor to be based on how ECs responded to these challenges and objectives. I used two learning objectives for the ECs: (1) recognize and address deficit-oriented language that Ms. Lee is using about an ML and her written work, and (2) convey assets-based instructional advice to Ms. Lee.

Simulator Script

In order to portray Ms. Lee as a teacher who is concerned with the societal implications of students not adhering to standardized linguistic conventions, I wrote in the script for Ms. Lee to make statements such as, "If we let everyone write the way they wanted, we'd never understand each other as a country, would we?" I also designed Ms. Lee's responses to focus exclusively on the grammar errors in Gabriela's writing, and I had her express other statements such as, "I'm having a hard time understanding what she's trying to say, since I'm having to read so slowly," or "…it makes it so obvious that she's an English learner—that can't be good for her passing the standardized test." In order to establish "hits" for this simulation, I expected ECs to respond to these statements in ways that promoted an assets-oriented perspective (following the assets-based linguistic framework suggestions). As part of ensuring the script's validity, I piloted the simulation with three graduate students who were not part of the course but who had experience taking ML teaching-methods courses.

After completing the simulation, ECs completed reflection questions on their experiences, including questions for which they wanted partner feedback. I placed ECs into

small groups and assigned them to online discussion boards in which individual group members had access to recordings of each other's simulations. After completing the simulation and reflection questions, ECs met with their groups to watch each other's recorded simulations, discuss the videos, and offer each other feedback. These meetings were recorded on Zoom and stored on a cloud-based platform, where group members could access them. Group discussions were based on the two questions for which each student requested feedback, as well as questions that addressed lessons learned on (1) advocacy in writing instruction, (2) the role of "standard" English in education, (3) collaboration with a colleague, and (4) the application of the assignment in future/current teaching contexts. Following these interactive group meetings, ECs submitted their written responses to reflection questions.

Analytic Methods

I used a multiple case study approach (Stake, 2006) to gather a wide range of data to provide insight into individual as well as collective characteristics. Data for this study included simulation recordings, recordings of group discussions, discussion boards, and reflection questions. Primary data for this study were simulation interactions. Following data collection, I watched all 23 ECs' recorded simulation interactions and read their pre-simulation discussions and post-simulation reflections. I used closed captioning software to auto-generate initial transcriptions of the recorded interactions and cleaned the transcriptions for readability. I uploaded transcriptions and written reflections into Dedoose Qualitative Analysis software for coding. For coding, I followed a deductive analytical process (Miles et al., 2014) as I examined ECs' simulation interactions. I focused my analysis on how ECs used language to "frame" the contents of their collaborative dialogue (Gordon, 2015; Miles, et al., 2014; Tannen et al., 2015). Frames refer to how interlocutors "define the social situation" by creating "footings" that make

"alignments between each other as well as what is said" (Gordon, 2015, p. 325). In the case of the simulation interaction, footings were based in part on the context of the simulation design. In their conversation with the avatar, I found that ECs established footings consisting of conceptual orientations toward (1) language conventions, (2) written feedback, and (3) the role of standardized language in society. At various times, ECs aligned themselves with Ms. Lee's orientations, while at other times ECs challenged Ms. Lee's pedagogical approaches within the simulation.

Because of the simulation experience's systematic design, key discursive events in the simulation interactions were recurring and intentionally predictable (i.e., regularities). These events followed the script's learning objectives. I designed the script for the simulation avatar to make specific deficit-oriented comments at designated time intervals, and I generated initial codes based on how ECs reacted to the avatar's use of deficit-oriented language. I then identified advocacy approaches based on ECs' instructional advice to the avatar. Based on ECs' interactions, or how they advocated for Gabriela in the simulator, 11 initial codes emerged from the data. These initial codes included: (1) deficits acknowledgement, (2) advice to be sensitive, (3) assets framing, (4) critique of standard English, (5) defense of language diversity, (6) deficit-oriented reinforcement, (7) distinguishing between oral and written language, (8) identifying specific strengths in writing, (9) focusing on patterns of errors, (10) instructional strategies/practical advice, and (11) theory/conceptual advice. After re-reading transcriptions and examining codes for salience, I was able to re-group the findings into three themes, or approaches to advocacy in the simulation: (1) Conceptual, (2) Strategies, and (3) Conceptual and Strategies (see Table 2). To answer research question two, I examined how three case-study ECs

"framed" Gabriela as an ML and her writing, and how they constructed or challenged footings in their advocacy approaches.

Findings

ECs responded to the avatar in a variety of ways as they utilized conceptual tools and strategies in order to advocate for an ML in the context of a collaborative dialogue about the ML's writing. I found three approaches were consistent across the dataset, as participants' advocacy focused on themes of: (1) Conceptual, (2) Strategies, and (3) Conceptual and Strategies. In the following section, I present the three approaches to the collaborative dialogue about ML writing (RQ1), illustrating each approach with quotes from ECs' simulation discourses. Then, I examine three case studies that exemplify the three approaches as I focus on the discursive features that ECs used in their advocacy within each approach (RQ2).

Conceptual

Overall, five out of the 23 ECs focused on addressing Ms. Lee's concerns about Gabriela's writing at the conceptual level. *Conceptual* approaches focused on addressing mainly theoretical orientations (e.g., critique of standardized language ideology) toward writing in general rather than providing specific and actionable instructional strategies. Specifically, these ECs centered their advocacy efforts on maintaining assets-orientations during the dialogue. They consistently conveyed positive attributes of Gabriela and her writing—particularly emphasizing the strength of her content and meaning. They also highlighted other positive aspects, such as her organization, word choice, voice, and punctuation. These ECs worked to re-frame Ms. Lee's deficit-orientation by providing a contrast—as a counter-perspective—to her focus on grammatical correctness.

ECs in this category did not discuss grammar correction and offered little practicable instructional advice in the moment. For example, ECs emphasized the importance of patience and exposure to language: "She'll figure out how to express herself a little bit more clearly in time…she just needs a little bit more time and more exposure and more practice on her own" (Caren). ECs also focused on developing student identity in writing rather than focusing on passing an assessment. For example, Brittney suggested, "Maybe we could just focus on how we can empower her in her voice, in her writing, instead of just worrying about the standardized test." ECs also celebrated the home language of students while de-emphasizing the role of standardized language in school settings. For example, Sharon suggested, "The important thing is as teachers we celebrate the language that students do speak instead of teaching so-called 'standard English.'" Thus, ECs in this category tended to focus their advocacy on addressing Ms. Lee's conceptual orientations toward ML writing instruction—potentially attempting to persuade Ms. Lee to change her perspective rather than providing specific instructional strategies.

Allison

Allison, who majored in Spanish and studied in Spain during college, was a middle school English teacher with 5 years of teaching experience. During her collaborative dialogue with Ms. Lee, she identified several positive aspects of Gabriela's essay. Allison acknowledged that additional supports, such as ML pull-out groups, might be justified for Gabriela, but she also challenged the role of standardized language practices. In addition to challenging Ms. Lee's monoglossic footings by contrasting everyday language with written content-specific registers, Allison spent the majority of her time discussing, framing, and identifying specific areas where Gabriela's written work demonstrated strengths. Thus, she worked to supplant Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented focus on Gabriela's deficiencies and grammatical errors in her writing.

In her simulation interaction, Allison acknowledges the need for additional support for Gabriela in her writing, and then she responds to Ms. Lee's quip, "if we let everyone write the way they want to, we'd never understand each other as a country, would we?" Allison seems to deflect Ms. Lee's question and turns to an assets-oriented perspective as a response:

> That's certainly a good question, and one that a lot of scholars and teachers ask but I think there's an argument to make that even if she's not using the kind of academic English some of her peers might be using, her meaning is still being conveyed and, in that way, she is having some success that I think is worth celebrating.

Rather than addressing Ms. Lee's question by confronting her use of standardized language ideology with discourse about race, Allison seems to define standard English as "academic English," referencing the language of her "peers" in contrast to Gabriela's usage. This discursive move might be an attempt to re-frame the standardized language discourse by relativizing linguistic registers as being "appropriate" for specific contexts—a move MacSwan (2020) critiqued. Rather than focusing on providing strategies to help Gabriela access academic English, she initiates discourse on the content of Gabriela's essay. Later in the dialogue, Allison expounds on the aspects of Gabriela's essay that were "worth celebrating," including her usage of three paragraphs and sentence organization, her usage of the second person as a rhetorical strategy, as well as her passion, conviction and her voice in her written expression.

In addition to her discourse on Gabriela's strengths as a writer, Allison also questioned the concept of standardized language in educational systems. In the next excerpt, Allison responds to Ms. Lee's reflection that "standard English might not be how people actually use language:"

> I think you're right. I think maybe the English we expect from students in the class is not, it's not reflective of their reality. And I hope that over time we can shift our classrooms so that they'll be a little more authentic to the skills students need

Allison seems to challenge the footings of both the weight of and the role of standardized language in school settings. She emphasizes the dichotomy between the everyday language and experiences of students outside of academic settings and what is required of them for success in school. In her "I hope that over time…" statement, she utilizes future-oriented indexicals (Wortham & Reyes, 2015) to shape her framing of ML writing instruction and ML education more broadly. By positing the notion that classrooms in the future should be more "authentic to the skills students need," she also seems to assert the practical value of the language varieties of MLs outside of school. This evaluative statement also reflects an assets-oriented approach toward MLs' home language use.

When Ms. Lee presses Allison for more information about the source of Gabriela's written errors, Allison responds with generalized notions about structural differences between her first and second language, as well as suggestions that Gabriela's first language might be exerting influence over her sentence construction. Here Allison elaborates on this idea:

> It's possible that when she, you know, she's having to do so much translating in her head as she writes, which is really difficult. So, an assignment is probably taking triple the time it takes other students when she's reading aloud in her head, it might make perfect sense in her own language and might not realize that the English structures are different.

Allison seems to appeal to empathy by suggesting Gabriela is having to take "triple the time" to complete her work. She also shares with Ms. Lee the general notion that Gabriela "might be translating from Spanish in her head." However, throughout her simulator interaction she did not discuss specific written errors to illustrate this concept nor did she discuss strategies to address them. As a result, Allison seemed to approach the collaboration from a conceptual standpoint—choosing to address Ms. Lee's concerns over grammar by focusing on highlighting the strengths of the essay instead of providing practical instructional strategies to address errors.

Throughout the data set, Allison referred to “academic English” as the linguistic register of education settings, and she discussed the tension between teachers wanting to provide students with “communication skills needed for everyday life” and burdensome tests that “students *need* to have academic success.” By illuminating the difference between the linguistic registers of “everyday life” and those required for “academic success,” Allison introduced potential sociopolitical aspects of language use in society. These approaches seemed to address the footing of standardized language discourse and challenged the practical application of an “academic English” across broader social contexts. While she did address sociopolitical implications of linguistic diversity broadly, Allison did not invoke critical discourse on how a focus on “academic English” often serves as a proxy for racialized monoglossic perspectives (Rosa & Flores, 2015; MacSwan, 2020).

In her advocacy approach, Allison did not seem to engage directly in confrontational discourse regarding Ms. Lee’s deficit-oriented statements. Instead, she seemed to redirect the issue by re-framing the discussion by focusing on assets-orientations. Additionally, Allison seemed to focus on establishing common ground with Ms. Lee by acknowledging her frustrations. In a post-simulation written reflection, she wrote about a different simulator experience in a previous course (see Fox & Salerno, 2021) and how it shaped her approach to the current simulation interaction:

> In the simulation with Ms. Lee, I empathized with the challenges she felt in teaching an English Language Learner. I think interacting with a tone of understanding and from a position of partnership helped Ms. Lee consider other perspectives. This is in contrast to my first experience in the simulator, during which I felt that I had to cite references and to defend a position to another teacher. This time I was intentional about deescalating the situation in order to facilitate collaboration.

Allison also reflected on how she would approach another conversation with Ms. Lee in the future. In these written reflections, she discussed a desire to have Gabriela work more closely with a designated ML instructor and/or with a small group of fellow MLs to address the language learning needs that Ms. Lee "might not have time to teach in her English Language Arts classroom." In this written reflection, she also detailed a variety of targeted instructional strategies to address Gabriela's errors with collective nouns and vocabulary usage. Emphasizing her position of partnership and collaboration, she also wrote that such suggestions "would be more effective to propose at a later time."

Allison represents ECs in the simulation that seemed to focus on Gabriela's strengths as a writer through an assets-orientation. Her reflections and simulation interaction also highlight challenges for ML advocates, as they navigate the complex dynamics between critical perspectives on language ideology, interpersonal relationships, and institutional pressures.

Strategies

In contrast to a conceptual approach, ECs in this category focused their advocacy on practicable instructional strategies to help improve Gabriela's writing. Overall, seven ECs approached the conversation with *strategies*. These approaches focused on providing explanations (e.g., cross-linguistic transfer) for Gabriela's errors and addressing her written errors with instructional suggestions, which did not appear to challenge Ms. Lee's theoretical orientation toward writing. For example, Peggy focused on ensuring Ms. Lee could apply a strategy for addressing errors: "We can start with identifying errors and you can attach a sheet that you make for her corrections and make sure she is held accountable for those errors and for understanding why she is making those errors" (Peggy). When ECs focused on providing strategies alone, they oftentimes used language that reinforced the deficit-orientation of the

avatar. For example, Denise focused on differences in prepositions, infinitives, or lexical categories from Spanish to English but also engaged in deficit-oriented language use: "I know that also, her language is transferring over with the infinitive because in Spanish, you know, the infinitive is just one word…and yeah, you can definitely tell, it does make it sound like she's a foreigner" (Denise).

ECs in this category consistently agreed with Ms. Lee's concerns about Gabriela's grammar errors and her worries about her passing the standardized writing test. Rather than simply acknowledging errors, ECs acquiesced to Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented language, reinforcing the deficit perspective. Many ECs struggled to provide substantive positive examples of the writing sample beyond surface-level features such as Gabriela's use of punctuation or that "she answered the question." Most ECs in this category did not engage in taking critical stances toward the notion of standard English, and in many cases appeared to ignore Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented language. Therefore, ECs in this category did not demonstrate a significant focus on addressing Ms. Lee's overall orientation toward Gabriela's writing in explicit ways. Rather than attempting to persuade Ms. Lee to change her perspective (e.g., Allison), these ECs focused on providing instructional strategies that did not challenge Ms. Lee's approach.

Shane

Shane, a monolingual middle school social studies teacher with three years of teaching experience, used language in subtle ways that went beyond acknowledging Gabriela's grammatical errors and seemed to reinforce Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented discourse. During the simulation, Shane offered his support to Ms. Lee by suggesting that he take Gabriela out of her class in order to focus on addressing more "basic grammar" issues—an offer that was to "make it easier" for Ms. Lee because she had "a whole class of other kids."

In this excerpt, Shane identifies specific syntactical and lexical confusion in Gabriela's writing and offers a practical solution to address the issue. However, he also uses language that seems to undermine his attempts to advocate on Gabriela's behalf:

> So, she starts off and she says, *it's important to be ourselves and everyone is guilty of their mistakes*. Y'know, it doesn't exactly make a lot of sense. Like, I'm not exactly sure what she's saying either—I get that right? But maybe instead of, you know, underlining it in red or highlighting it in red, it's all about the type of feedback that we give. So maybe next to it you put like, *what mistakes,* right? and then you get a second chance to elaborate on what exactly she's trying to say, because it isn't clear to you.

While offering a specific strategy to elicit clarification from Gabriela in a future meeting or written draft, Shane admits "it doesn't make a lot of sense" and "I'm not exactly sure what she's saying either." Rather than re-framing the discourse as an assets-based approach emphasizing content and meaning like Allison, Shane focuses his advocacy on identifying and addressing specific errors. Later in the dialogue, Shane attempts to highlight positive aspects of Gabriela's essay but struggles to generate substantive examples:

> But, you know, for Gabriela, if you come from another country and you know, and reading her writing, you know, she understands the question and she certainly is capable at times. And I think that's something to work with.

Later, when Ms. Lee intentionally prompts Shane to highlight some of the positive aspects of Gabriela's essay, Shane again struggles to generate significant or content-based examples. In his response, he encourages her to add positive comments in her written feedback, such as praising Gabriela for her good use of capitalization.

While Ms. Lee persists in her deficit-oriented language, Shane continues to struggle with maintaining an assets-orientation toward Gabriela's writing. Beyond having difficulties highlighting positive aspects, he also uses deficit-oriented language to describe Gabriela's work,

and MLs more generally. In this excerpt, Shane attempts to defend Gabriela by referencing her "non-native" English-speaking status:

> I mean, in all fairness, you know, she is not going to be able to speak perfect English at a native level, the same of some of your other students. You know, we as teachers have to try to do our best to accommodate for that.

While Shane does inform Ms. Lee that it is unrealistic Gabriela will reach "native" speaking proficiency in English, his very use of the term "native" seems to align with monoglossic perspectives regarding language use in society (MacSwan, 2020). Such a perspective contrasts with readings and discussions from the course that questioned the very concept of "native" language users (e.g., Global English; non-standard varieties). Later, Shane discusses the importance of focusing on specific grammar errors that impede comprehension because "there's going to be tons of grammar mistakes with English learners' writing." In his post-simulation reflection, he continued to use deficit-oriented language, writing that MLs "often use short sentences or have poor grammar."

Despite Shane's clear deficit-oriented language reinforcement in his simulation interaction, he demonstrated a critical stance toward "standard" English and a sense of responsibility to serve as an advocate for MLs in his post-simulation reflections. Responding to what he had learned about advocating for MLs in writing instruction, he focused on how general education teachers might "cause unintentional harm" by giving "ineffective criticism or inadequate support." Based on this, he wrote that an ML teacher should be prepared to share information with all teachers regarding best practices for MLs. This response seems to align with his focus on Gabriela's written errors and his desire to help "make it easier on Ms. Lee" by addressing them separately from her class—despite the fact that such a focus might not always

reflect best practices. Shane also reflected on what he had learned about "standard" English in education:

> The idea of standard English led Mrs. Lee to extreme grammar correction while giving feedback. This focus on every grammatical detail only hurts Gabriella instead of supports her in getting better. Lastly, Mrs. Lee's focus on standard English painted Gabriela as a nuisance and poisoned her general attitude toward her ELL students. Thus, standard English has a dangerous trickle-down effect that greatly harms our ELL students and requires us to serve as their advocates.

Shane's simulation interactions demonstrate the subtle nature of deficit-oriented language. Based on his post-simulation reflections where he seemed to demonstrate an inclination to advocate, it is also clear that ML advocates might unintentionally engage in the same deficit-oriented discursive practices they intend to address.

Conceptual and Strategies

The most common approach (11 out of 23 participants) among ECs was a balance of error correction, asset-orientations, and critical perspectives on language ideologies. The combined *conceptual and strategies* approach incorporated specific advice for addressing written errors while also maintaining a critical stance toward standardized language ideology. ECs in this category acknowledged the presence of grammatical errors and even agreed with Ms. Lee's concerns related to the comprehensibility of Gabriela's writing. These ECs offered practical advice regarding error correction over time, often imploring Ms. Lee to be sensitive so as not to demoralize Gabriela and suggesting that Ms. Lee look for patterns of errors rather than highlighting all errors. For example, Linda advised Ms. Lee to "focus on one error at a time so that she can really focus in and improve one skill…I know I get overwhelmed if I have a lot of things to work on all at once" (Linda). ECs in this category also discussed the importance of looking at the positive aspects of Gabriela's ML status as well as her writing—often citing

specific passages or characteristics of the writing sample. Holly exemplified efforts to address errors while maintaining assets language:

> Gabriela has unique strengths, particularly as an emerging bilingual…she is able to navigate multiple languages and multiple contexts…it's important to try to focus on not only standard English and grammar and spelling but also think about 'What is she doing right? What can I praise her for? What can I build up?'

These ECs demonstrated critical perspectives of language in society, conceding that "standard" English is not the way that most people use English on a regular basis. ECs defended linguistic diversity, suggesting that "standard English is one of many dialects, but not necessarily the correct model" (Elsie) and that standardized language forms are "not natural ways of speaking" (Linda). Despite these concessions, ECs offered practical strategies to address the pressing concerns of the English teacher during the collaboration. These ECs emphasized the importance of clear communication and being understood, often arguing that mistakes are a natural part of learning to express oneself which can be corrected over time. For example, Shelly seemed to balance error correction and the maintenance of students' sense of confidence and self-worth:

> Are we having them conform to what we call standard English and are we going to bottle them up or not give them a chance to express themselves and feel confident to make some mistakes and be able to correct them over time?" (Shelly)

In their advocacy efforts, ECs in this category sublimated critical perspectives into instructional approaches that maintained sensitivity to Gabriela's emergent English writing proficiency. Rather than challenge Ms. Lee's overall orientation toward standardized language in their collaborative dialogue, ECs attempted to work within an existing monolingual paradigm.

Linda

Linda, a monolingual preservice teacher with some experience as a pre-K paraeducator, integrated critical perspectives on language ideologies, instructional strategies, and an assets-orientation in her advocacy. Immediately in the dialogue, Linda addresses Ms. Lee's concerns that Gabriela was not using standard English and that she would not pass the state standardized writing assessment. In this excerpt, Linda emphasizes the content of Gabriela's writing while addressing Ms. Lee's standard English focus and demonstrating empathy for her concerns:

> I hear you because while I think that Gabriela's overall message was there, I can see where you're concerned about her use of standard English because obviously, well you know, it's not, it's not a natural way to speak every day. Obviously, we don't speak using academic language, but it is, it's the way that we test our students unfortunately so, I totally understand your, your concerns.

Linda seems to hedge her acknowledgement of the errors in Gabriela's writing with an emphasis that her "overall message was there." Next, Linda attempts to establish a footing that "standard English" should be viewed as "academic English." Yet, she does not frame "academic English" as a dialect spoken commonly—or specifically associated with racial identities. Instead, Linda seems to address Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented language by juxtaposing oral and written expression (Gevers, 2018)—pointing out that "we don't speak academic language." In this discursive move, she also incorporates an inclusive indexical "we," (Wortham & Reyes, 2015)—indicating that as a society in general or in solidarity with other teachers such as Ms. Lee, academic language "is not a natural way to speak every day." She then takes on a critical perspective as she shifts to the role of assessments in educational contexts as measuring an unnatural way of using language. Her use of "unfortunately" seems to express an acknowledgement of the deficit-oriented nature of such practices.

Ms. Lee continues by expressing her frustrations that she has to read Gabriela's writing multiple times and slowly because she is having a difficult time understanding what she is trying

to say. She also expresses her fears that graders on the end-of-year assessment would have the same problem. Then, she makes her scripted statement regarding standardized language: "That's why we have a standard English, so that we can communicate with each other more easily. If we let everyone write however they want, we'd never understand each other as a country, would we?" Linda responds:

> That's a great point. And yeah, I mean, there is, there is a reason that it's important to write fluently and in a way that other people can understand us *right now*.

Linda does not appear to challenge Ms. Lee's assertion and even praises her evaluation. She seems to agree with Ms. Lee's assertions that standard English relates to written comprehensibility among ostensibly broader audiences—potentially pointing to the general value of grammatical accuracy (Truscott, 1996, p. 329).

Later in the dialogue, Linda notes Gabriela's English proficiency scores and discusses how she might benefit from "leveraging her oral language skills" in class to help her writing, since her speaking and listening scores were her strengths:

> I have a feeling that Gabriela is probably more comfortable using conversational English. I know that her writing scores are a little bit lower than her speaking and listening. So, I mean, that's, that's understandable that she's, she might show some signs of improvement in her writing by hopefully, we can sort of leverage her speaking and her listening skills in class so that she can improve her writing skills as well

Linda uses background knowledge about Gabriela (provided to all ECs prior to the simulation) to frame her approach to the collaboration. By directing Ms. Lee to focus on Gabriela's domain-specific linguistic strengths in English, Linda is utilizing an assets-based instructional strategy. Yet it is unclear from Linda's suggestion how Ms. Lee could use Gabriela's oral language to support her writing development.

Next, Ms. Lee continues to press Linda about her concerns with Gabriela's written errors and Linda finally responds with a challenge to Ms. Lee's orientation:

> If we focus on correcting every single mistake that she's making, it does become hard to, to understand her overall message, but if we take a step back and sort of start to look at what she's trying to say, I do think that there are some really wonderful things there

Linda directs Ms. Lee's attention to her conceptual approach to written instruction in general and encourages Ms. Lee to "take a step back and start to look at what she's trying to say" since focusing on "correcting every single mistake makes it hard to understand her overall message." Later in the dialogue, Linda suggests "in the grand scheme of things" that Gabriela's writing has "small grammatical errors" that could be helped by focusing on one error at a time (e.g., infinitives and subject-verb agreement) rather than all errors at once (Christenson, 2017; Lee, 2019). In these discursive moves, Linda does not challenge Ms. Lee's footing of standardized language discourse, but rather appeals to practical instructional strategies to address Gabriela's written errors.

Later, Ms. Lee continues to focus on Gabriela's written errors and Linda seems to agree with Ms. Lee's orientation toward written errors in general, yet she attempts to add an additional footing: that errors should not be viewed as negative. After praising a specific sentence in Gabriela's essay, Linda turns to re-framing the concept of written errors:

> The fact that there are so many mistakes in Gabriela's writing, while we can see that as an issue, it can also really be a positive, because it means that she's taking those risks and she's actually comfortable taking those risks in your class, which I really appreciate. I think that it means that you've created an open environment for her.

Linda simultaneously acknowledges the presence of errors in Gabriela's writing while offering an assets-oriented perspective. Rather than framing errors as impeding comprehensibility and positing their correction as necessary to overall meaning, Linda seems to propose linguistic

errors as a natural part of "taking risks" in seeking to communicate complex ideas. At the same time, she promotes interpersonal trust by praising Ms. Lee for fostering a classroom environment that allowed her to take such risks.

In her post-simulation reflections, Linda discussed her overall approach to the interaction and she reflected on ways she might improve in her advocacy efforts. She wrote about her discussion on standard English within the confines of such a short conversation, adding that "[a conversation about standard English] lends itself to a longer time frame" and that she wished she could have gone into more depth on the issue. She also described how during a future meeting with Ms. Lee she would introduce more strategies to address "one error at a time," as well as strategies that build "academic grammar" through conversations, thus harnessing Gabriela's linguistic strengths. Additionally, Linda wrote about her take-aways from the experience, particularly after debriefing with group members. In these written reflections, she demonstrated a more critical stance than her simulation interactions seemed to indicate:

> I think [group member] did a nice job recentering the meeting around the debate over the validity and necessity of standard English as well, because I think it took the criticism off of Gabriela as a student and refocused it on the system that forces us to value certain ways of speaking over others.
>
> The notion of academic English is rather artificial, and I believe more an indication and expression of the privilege that our society affords those who fit a specific mold, namely, the mold that mimics those who hold power in our country.
>
> One article in particular that I think will stick with me concerning "standard" English is the Flora and Rosa (2015) article, which effectively equates standardized testing to gatekeeping, ensuring that students of color conform to white standards. I think it also stood out to me because it takes into question the role of the listener in forming unconscious biases against nonstandard English.

Linda represents ECs in the simulation that seemed to view advocacy through the lens of providing practical instructional supports for the content-area teacher while also addressing

deficit-oriented language through maintaining an assets-oriented perspective. This is in contrast to ECs who only focused on addressing Ms. Lee's conceptual footings without providing instructional strategies, and with those ECs who focused on instructional strategies while engaging in the same deficit-oriented language they were supposed to address. After the simulation, ECs in this group (similar to the conceptual group) tended to reflect on ways in which discourses of "standard" English promoted racialized hegemony—yet this aspect did not emerge during their live simulation interactions.

Discussion

As part of an education-based course on English linguistics, ECs engaged in an advocacy-related simulated conversation with a colleague who was using deficit-oriented language to talk about an ML and her writing. In the simulation, the avatar consistently framed writing from a monoglossic language perspective, focusing almost exclusively on the ML's grammatical inaccuracies. However, not all ECs addressed Ms. Lee, or her standardized language perspective, in the same way (Rosa & Flores, 2015). ECs tended to approach (i.e., frame) the conversation in one of three ways: (1) from a conceptual orientation, (2) from a strategies orientation, and (3) from a combination of conceptual and strategies orientations. In this section, rather than focusing on whether each category constituted a "good" or "bad" approach to advocacy in ML writing instruction, I discuss the affordances and hindrances of each approach. Then, I discuss the implications of the three categories for research and teacher education.

Conceptual

Five ECs approached the conversation by focusing on Ms. Lee's deficit-oriented language—by addressing her *conceptual* orientation. These ECs critiqued standardized language

ideology and countered Ms. Lee's conceptual orientation by asserting assets-oriented perspectives toward the student and her writing. ECs who focused on addressing Ms. Lee's conceptual orientations through the maintenance of assets-oriented framing seemed to embody the work of scholars who recognize the negative impacts of approaches to language learning (and writing) that focus on "native-like" grammar through monoglossic lenses (e.g., Rosa & Flores, 2015; McKinley & Rose, 2018). By addressing oftentimes uncritically adopted language paradigms, *conceptual* approaches to advocacy might be viewed as a tool to challenge the status quo at its foundational level.

By focusing on the *conceptual* level, ECs worked to supplant Ms. Lee's deficit orientation, yet they did not provide supports to meet her immediate and practical instructional needs. Thus, those who maintained *conceptual* advocacy approaches within the simulation did not address written errors; and perhaps this is consistent with a critical perspective on standardized language which might question the very notion of errors—asking, "errors relative to whose standard?" Allison exemplified this category as she focused her advocacy efforts on addressing Ms. Lee's overall perspective on Gabriela's writing rather than on providing suggestions for how to address her specific "errors." Without follow-up conversations and collaboration, however, it is unclear whether a *conceptual* approach would lead to a change in Ms. Lee's instructional practices. Additionally, it is unclear whether an ML teacher-advocate should focus exclusively on *conceptual* orientations during a first meeting with another teacher. Furthermore, by choosing to focus on Ms. Lee's *conceptual* orientation, ECs might have missed opportunities to share content area expertise such as resources or strategies to promote Gabriela's growth as a writer.

Strategies

By contrast, seven ECs approached the conversation by focusing on providing *strategies*—suggesting instructional techniques, resources, and providing cross-linguistic explanations for the student's errors. By providing *strategies* in the moment, ECs met the practical and instructional needs of Ms. Lee, yet they did not attempt to counter her deficit-oriented language, and they often engaged in the same deficit language they were supposed to address. Thus, ECs focused their advocacy in ways that did not challenge Ms. Lee's assumed language education paradigm, despite its arbitrary and hegemonic nature, as they sought to support Gabriela in order to provide her access to the "cash language" (Christensen, 2017, p.101) of society. Advocacy approaches to ML writing that focused exclusively on *strategies* thus seemed to view error-correction and adherence to standardized linguistic forms as ways to improve MLs' future life opportunities (Linville, 2019). Therefore, ECs used language to frame advocacy as a version of providing MLs with access to upward mobility (Gevers, 2018). Such an approach stands in distinction to *conceptual* approaches which viewed Ms. Lee's overall orientation toward language as barriers to Gabriela's success as a writer (García & Wei, 2014; Valdés et al., 2011).

Many ECs who focused on *strategies* seemed to agree with Ms. Lee's concerns and engaged in the same deficit language in subtle ways. In the case study of Shane, taking up Ms. Lee's footings toward standardized language rather than challenging them and providing instructional strategies within such a frame, seemed to undermine his efforts to assert an assets-oriented linguistic framework as an ML advocate. In Warren's (2020) study on preservice ML advocacy discourses, she identified the importance of future studies that "explore the underlying monolingual ideologies inherent in versions of advocacy that may focus on instructional change without questioning the status quo" (Warren, 2020, p. 15). In contexts where an ML teacher is

engaging in an instructional collaborative dialogue with a content-area/grade-level teacher, challenging the status quo might therefore entail the ability and willingness to address deficit-oriented footings.

Conceptual and Strategies

Finally, ECs approached the conversation by incorporating a focus on both *conceptual* orientations and providing *strategies*. In this most common category (11 out of 23 participants), these ECs critiqued Ms. Lee's deficit-orientation and worked to re-focus her perspective on the student's assets, yet they also provided practical instructional supports in the moment. By addressing Ms. Lee's *conceptual* orientation, ECs worked to supplant her deficit-oriented footing. However, by providing *strategies* in the moment, ECs' efforts to maintain assets-oriented perspectives were potentially undermined by their acknowledgement of the student's written errors.

ECs who focused on both *conceptual* and *strategies* seemed to accept Ms. Lee's footing toward standardized language within academic contexts by acknowledging Gabriela's written disfluencies as errors that necessitated correction. However, they also challenged this footing in a variety of ways. Similar to ECs who focused exclusively on *conceptual* orientations, ECs seemed to focus on raising Ms. Lee's awareness to the arbitrary and hegemonic nature of standardized language as a strategy to soften her hardline grammatical footing. Thus, many ECs emphasized the importance of the manner in which Ms. Lee approached error correction (Christenson, 2017). Attending to Gabriela's sense of self-worth was a unique feature that distinguished this category from those who focused exclusively on *strategies.* Further, this approach contrasted with *conceptual* orientations—who did not provide advice for corrective feedback and who focused exclusively on Gabriela's strengths. ML advocacy for the combined *conceptual* and *strategies*

group seemed to entail balancing tensions between conceptual arguments that question the foundation of standardized language in society (Rosa & Flores, 2015) and the practical and pressing needs of teachers and students to assimilate to existing structures (Curzan & Adams, 2012). Yet, in attempting to achieve a balance between seemingly contradictory approaches, ECs' assets-oriented assertions were potentially undermined by their willingness to accept a deficit-oriented framing of Gabriela's writing—in relation to standardized language.

Implications

Based on the results of this study, it is important for teacher educators to include opportunities for ECs to engage in formative, practice activities that enable them to begin to develop their own understandings and approaches to pedagogical skills and roles. A crucial role of an ML teacher is that of an advocate, yet advocacy might carry significantly different meanings from one person to another. Federal and state policies, contextual factors at district and school levels, as well as teachers' individual histories and beliefs can all influence the nature and extent of this advocacy work. In the context of writing instruction, such tensions can cause teachers to approach MLs and their writing from a range of perspectives. Based on the results of this study, it is important to promote teachers' awareness of this diversity of approaches, and to provide them with the space to engage in reflective practices on the hindrances and affordances of each approach. It is equally important for ECs to reflect on their own assumptions and experiences with language learning and writing, as well as the nature of their teaching contexts. The simulator assignment allowed ECs to engage with a variety of recent research and perspectives on language ideology as it related to writing instruction. Thus, teacher educators interested in the intersections of advocacy and ML writing instruction should provide ECs with

resources on multiple ML writing instructional/ideological approaches with provisions for ECs to explore and to develop their own approaches and reasons for doing so.

Based on themes that emerged from this study, teacher educators preparing future ML teachers to engage in the work of advocacy in ESL writing contexts might benefit from focusing on *both* conceptual and strategies approaches. MLs in U.S. schools encounter educational and life challenges that manifest both at individual and structural levels. At individual levels, providing teachers with ML-specific tools, resources, and strategies for promoting MLs' educational and life opportunities is fundamental to advocacy work. With such tools, ML advocates have opportunities to support the needs of both individual MLs and colleagues around them. At structural levels, providing ML teachers with opportunities to develop awareness of the sociocultural and sociopolitical underpinnings of language in society can influence how ML teachers approach, frame, or discuss ML-specific tools, resources, and strategies for writing instruction. Balancing conceptual and strategies approaches enables a teacher of ML writing in ESL contexts to facilitate MLs' access to linguistic capital while simultaneously promoting their cognitive and socio-emotional development.

The field of ML writing needs more research on the impacts of developing teachers' critical language awareness and ML writing outcomes. While much attention has been given to the effects of corrective feedback on MLs' writing accuracy over time, such a focus often limits writing, and language development writ large, to the acquisition of grammar alone—with specific attention to one standardized variety. More research is needed to examine whether raising teachers' awareness of issues related to "standard" English leads to a change in their writing pedagogy over time, as well as whether/how such changes might impact MLs' writing.

Limitations and Conclusion

The three approaches to advocacy in ML writing from this study do not represent *all* possible approaches. It is important to consider that the writing sample itself was taken from an instructional context of English as a Second Language and was a final draft of a writing assignment. Thus, the writing sample on which the simulation interaction was based did not include process-oriented iterations where the ML utilized hybrid language practices such as might be found in bilingual (translingual) education paradigms. Additionally, it is important to note that while ECs' interactions with the simulator fell predictably into the three categories, ECs also reflected after the simulation on ways in which they might follow-up with Ms. Lee with additional support. Thus, the simulation assignment should be viewed as a formative learning tool rather than as a summative, or even definitive, indicator of how ECs think about language, race, and society.

Advocacy for MLs, as discussed in literature, distinguishes between actions that challenge institutional/societal norms and those actions that align with existing norms (Dubetz & de Jong, 2011). Yet a cornerstone of ML advocacy remains noticing and taking actions where MLs' educational opportunities or outcomes are challenged (Linville, 2019). Advocacy for MLs could then be framed as any action taken on behalf of an ML in order to mitigate challenges to their educational and life opportunities. In some instances, challenging the status quo, such as directly addressing a colleague's deficit language, might be what is required to mitigate such challenges. In other contexts, it might be more difficult to discern whether/when to focus on addressing systemic issues that might necessitate solutions that develop over long periods of time, or whether an advocate should focus on providing strategies that are practicable immediately. Discerning appropriate times, methods, and approaches to foster equitable

educational environments surely takes wisdom—which also requires opportunities for teacher-advocates to practice and to reflect on their practices.

References

Athanases, S.Z., & de Oliveira, L.C. (2007). Conviction, confrontation, and risk in new teachers' advocating for equity. *Teaching Education, 18*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476 21070 1325150.

Athanases, S.Z., & de Oliveira, L.C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers' challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record, 110*(1), 64–104.

Athanases, S.Z., & Martin, K.J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 627–646. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008.

Bacon, C.K. (2017). Dichotomies, dialects, and deficits: Confronting the "standard English" myth in literacy and teacher education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 66*, 341-357. https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917719255

Bailey, F., Burkett, B., & Freeman, D. (2010). The mediating role of language in teaching and learning: A classroom perspective. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 606–625). Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470694138.ch43

Ball, D., & Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479

Bautista, N.U., & Boone, W.J. (2015). Exploring the impact of TeachME™ Lab Virtual Classroom Teaching Simulation on early childhood education majors' self-efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26*(3), 237-262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9418-8

Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B. H. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Bunch, G.C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298–341. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Caldas, B. (2017). Shifting Discourses in teacher education: Performing the advocate bilingual teacher. *Arts Education Policy Review, 118* (4), 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2017.1287801.

Chen, G.A. (2020). "That's Obviously Really Insensitive:" Attuning to marginalization in a parent-teacher encounter. *Cognition and Instruction, 38*(2), 153-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2020.1722128

Christensen, L. (2017a). "Uncovering the legacy of language and power" and "Putting out the linguistic welcome mat." In *Rethinking Bilingual Education: Welcoming home languages in our classrooms*. Rethinking Schools.

Christensen, L. (2017b). "Teaching Standard English: Whose Standard?" In *Reading, Writing, and Rising Up*. Rethinking Schools.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance.* Teachers College Press.

Cohen, J., Wong, V., Krishnamachari, A., & Berlin, R. (2020). Teacher coaching in a simulated environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720906217

Coughlin, A.B., & Dotger, B.H. (2016). How can I help: Practicing familial support through simulation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 43*(4), 77–96.

Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Creswell, J., & Poth, C. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design* (Fourth ed.). SAGE.

Cummins, J. (2017). Teaching minoritized students: Are additive approaches legitimate? *Harvard Educational Review, 87*(3), 404–425. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.3.404.

Curzan, A., & Adams, M. (2011). *How English works: A linguistic introduction*. (Third ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Dalgarno, B., Gregory, S., Knox, V., & Reiners, T. (2016). Practicing teaching using virtual classroom roleplays. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 126–154. https://doi.org/ 10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.8

Dawson, M.R., & Lignugaris, B. (2016). Meaningful practice: Generalizing foundation teaching skills from TLE TeachLivE to the classroom. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 39*(3),1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406416664184

Dubetz, N.E., & de Jong, E. (2011). Teacher advocacy in bilingual education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 248-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623603

Echevarría & Bear, J., & Bear, D. (n.d.). Language transfers: The interaction between English and students' primary languages. Retrieved from: http://tesoros.macmillanmh.com/assets/extras/0001/3620/LangTransPOST.pdf

Ferry, B., Kervin, L.K., Cambourne, B.L., Turbill, J.B., & Hedberg. (2005). Incorporating real experience into the development of a classroom-based simulation. *Journal of Learning Design, 1*(1), 22–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.8

Fillmore, L.W., & Snow, C. (2018). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 8-51). Multilingual Matters.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review,* 85, 149-171.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

García, Ofelia & Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.

Gevers, Jeroen (2018). "Translingualism Revisited: Language Difference and Hybridity in L2 Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40,* 73-83.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9). http://www.tcrecord.org/content. asp?contentid=15018.

Grossman, P., Valencia, S., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. J*ournal of Literacy Research, 32,* 631–662.

Haneda, M., & Alexander, M. (2015). ESL teacher advocacy beyond the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49,* 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.009.

Harrison, J. (2019). Building Advocacy Capacity in a Teacher Training Program. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 44-52). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Harrison, J., & McIlwain, M.J. (2019). ESOL teachers' experiences in their role as advocate: Making the case for transitive advocacy. *TESOL Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.464

Huelsenbeck, C., Baecher, L., & Staehr Fenner, D. (2019). Action research for advocacy in a supervised teaching seminar. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 71-83). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351036665

Master, B., Loeb, S., Whitney, C., & Wyckoff, J. (2016). Different skills? Identifying differentially effective teachers of English language learners. *The Elementary School Journal*, *117*(2), 261–284.

Labov, W. (1969). The logic of nonstandard English. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Report of the twentieth annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies: Linguistic as the teaching of standard English to speakers of other languages or dialects* (pp. 1–44). Georgetown University Press. Retrieved from https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/555462/GURT_1969.pdf?sequence1⁄41#page1⁄417

Lantolf, J.P. (2006). Sociocultural theory and L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 67–109.

Lantolf, J., Thorne, S.L., & Poehner, M. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 207–226). Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching, 52*(4), 524-536. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247

Lee, I. (2014). Revisiting teacher feedback in EFL writing from sociocultural perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 48,* 201–213. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.153

Linville, H. (2015). ESOL teachers as advocates: An important role? *TESOL Journal,* 7(1), 98–131. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.193

Linville, H.A. (2019). Advocacy skills for teachers: "A real careful little dance". In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 3–17). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97813 51036665

Linville, H.A. (2020). A closer look at ESOL teacher advocacy: What we do and why. *TESOL Journal, 11*(3) 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.508

Loeb, S., Soland, J., & Fox, L. (2014). Is a good teacher a good teacher for all? Comparing value-added of teachers with their English learners and non-English learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 36*(4), 399–416.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press. -636). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators.* Routledge.

MacSwan, J. (2020). Academic English as standard language ideology: A renewed research agenda for asset-based language education. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(1), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818777540

McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2018). Conceptualizations of language errors, standards, norms and nativeness in English for research publication purposes: An analysis of journal submission guidelines. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 42,* 1-11.

Merriam, S.B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. Jossey Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook. 3rd. ed: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D, & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132 141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534

Paris, D., & Alim, S. (Eds.) (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* Teachers College Press.

Self, E.A., & Stengel, B.S. (2020). *Toward anti-oppressive pedagogy: Designing and using simulated encounters.* Harvard Education Press.

Shatz, M., & Wilkinson, L. (2013). *Understanding language in diverse classrooms: A primer for all teachers.* New York: Routledge.

Staehr Fenner, D. (2014). *Advocating for English learners: A guide for educators*. Corwin Press.

Stake, R.E. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. The Guilford Press.

TESOL International Association (TESOL). (2019). *Standards for Initial TESOL Pre-K-12 Teacher Preparation Programs*. Author.

Trickett, E.J., Rokhostkiy, E., Jeong, A., Genkova, A., Oberoi, A., Weinstein, T., & Delgado, Y. (2012). “The kids are terrific: It’s the job that’s tough”: The ELL teacher role in an urban context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28,* 283–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.10.005

Truscott, J. (1996). Review article: The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327–369.

Walker, J.J., & Legg, A.M. (2018). Parent-teacher conference communication: A guide to integrating family engagement through simulated conversations about student academic progress. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 44*(3), 366-380. doi:10.1080/02607476.2018.1465661

Valdés, G., Capitelli, S., & Alvarez, L. (2011). *Latino children learning English: Steps in the journey.* Teachers College Press.

Warren, A.N. (2020): Toward an inclination to advocate: a discursive study of teachers' stance toward linguistically-responsive pedagogy in online language teacher education. *Language and Education, 35*(1), 60-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1801716

Whiting, J. (2016). Training ELL teacher advocates. *Fourth Estate, 32*(2), 9–10. http://textesoliv.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Complete-PDF.pdf

Whiting, J. (2019). Beyond the philosophy statement: Bringing advocacy center stage in TESOL teacher education. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 31–43). Routledge.

WIDA (2019). *K-12 Can Do Descriptors*. Retrieved from https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/can-do/descriptors

Table 1
Participant Approaches and Background

Name (pseudonym)	**Background Information**	**Advocacy Approach**
Caren	Middle school teaching experience in past, currently elementary teacher in private school; multilingual (French and Arabic); Black, female	Conceptual
Allison*	Middle school English teacher at private school, Spanish fluent, Spanish major, lived/studied in Spain; White, female	Conceptual
Michelle	Works at education policy analysis institute, preservice teacher; wants to be ESL teacher, knows Spanish and Arabic, self-described as not proficient; White, female	Conceptual
Sharon	Preservice teacher, master's degree in early childhood education, has student teaching experience, wants to teach kindergarten, monolingual; White, female	Conceptual
Brittney	Just got back from 3 years in Japan as a teacher, getting certified to teach secondary social studies, but maybe wants to teach ESL; not currently teaching. Experience abroad and knowledge of multiple languages, including Japanese; White, female	Conceptual
Andy	From Ethiopia, multilingual (Amharic and English), bilingual specialist at large urban school division for 5 years, preservice, wants to be ESL teacher, in M.Ed program; Black, male	Strategies
Stephany	Multilingual, from Eastern Europe, PhD in Educational Psychology from university in Eastern Europe, written books, presentations, focus on behavioral studies, enrolled in M.Ed and wants to be ESL teacher; White, female	Strategies
Shane*	Middle school history teacher, wants to teach ESL and live/teach abroad as well, monolingual; White, male	Strategies
Denise	Multilingual (Russian, English, Spanish), 10 years of teaching experience, wants to switch to ESL, background in K-6, with adult ESL experience; White, female	Strategies
Peggy	Multilingual (French and English); 10 years of experience in teaching, 7 as assistant, now French teacher in high school; White, female	Strategies

Monica	Multilingual (Filipino, Mandarin, Cantonese, English), 6 years of ESL teaching in East Asia, wants to start own kindergarten; Asian, female	Strategies
Rick	Not teaching, on football team, works with youth, wants to work with youth if not in professional football, M.Ed Ed Psych; monolingual Black, male	Strategies
Angela	First year teacher in elementary; working on obtaining a master's degree. Working on becoming proficient in Spanish; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Holly	Preservice, multilingual (Spanish, French, Portuguese), hopes to teach in elementary or dual language program; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Elsie	Multilingual (French and English); born, raised, lived in Europe, teaches PreK (dual language) International School; working on M.Ed with specialization in ESL; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Faith	Spanish abroad experience as an au pair, preservice teacher; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Glenda	5th year teaching, middle school English, working on M.Ed, monolingual; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Shelly	Multilingual (Urdu and English), 8 years of teaching experience, works as Learning Disabilities teacher, has M.Ed and diploma in Montessori education; Asian, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Jill	PreK/Kindergarten experience (at least four years), wants to be ESL teacher, monolingual; Black, female	Conceptual and Strategies
Linda*	Kindergarten paraeducator experience, full time student now, wants to be an ESL teacher or a kindergarten teacher that serves ELs, monolingual; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies

Mark	Preservice teacher, undergraduate degree in linguistics, knowledge of many different languages, but "not proficient in any of them;" White, male	Conceptual and Strategies
Nate	Multilingual; Spanish instructor at university, experience abroad, wants to teach ESL; White, male	Conceptual and Strategies
Rachel	Multilingual (Spanish, French, Arabic); parent liaison at school district, helps out ESL students, too; M.Ed Ed. Psych program; White, female	Conceptual and Strategies

*Case-study participants

Table 2
Approaches with Examples

Approaches	*EC interactions included…*
Conceptual	Discourses that focused on (a) addressing mainly theoretical orientations toward writing, (b) challenging deficit-oriented framing of student, the writing sample, and standardized language ideology, and/or (c) identifying specific strengths of writer/written work through assets-oriented framing. Did not focus on providing specific and actionable instructional strategies for addressing written errors.
Strategies	Discourses that focused on (a) addressing written errors with explanations and instructional suggestions, (b) cross-linguistic transfer as reasons for errors, (c) limited or surface-level identification of strengths in writing sample, and/or (d) language use that engaged in deficit-oriented framing of student and/or the writing sample. Did not challenge theoretical orientation toward writing.
Conceptual and Strategies	Discourses that focused on (a) specific advice for addressing written errors while also maintaining a critical stance toward standardized language ideology, (b) challenging deficit-oriented framing of student and the writing sample, (c) appealing to sensitivity when addressing errors, and/or (d) identifying specific strengths in writing sample. Acknowledged problems with standardized language ideologies but did not challenge them.

Appendix A

Writing Sample (errors highlighted in red)

Name: Gabriela Cabrera

Respond to the following:
Author Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "To be yourself in a world that is constantly trying to make you something else is the greatest accomplishment." Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Why or why not?

It is important to be ourselves because everyone can choose what they want to be. We have freedom and everyone is guilty of their mistakes. You know what is good and bad and you take a decision if you want make good things or bad things, nobody can tell you what to do.

If this is your life why you would you be someone other than yourself? The answer is: because external pressures. Families put pressure on their children to be others person. At work bosses, clients, etc. demand that the workers to be others person. At school there are pressures to behavior than yourself. But you need know who you are and be who you want be. Always people try to change you, they want that you be the person that they want.

Do not let yourself be afraid of what others think of you, you need courage, you decide how far you want to go; stop paying attention to what others think and focus and on your own goals. Increase your confidence, you must be authentic because if you are authentic your confidence increases. Also you must let the others be authentic.

[i] The state refers to the program as ESL endorsement