Dual Language Education (DLE) programs continue to exponentially proliferate across the nation, particularly in California where one third of the nation’s programs exist (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2015). This extremely rapid growth has propelled the need for the effective professional development of critically conscious DLE teachers (Alfaro, 2008; Alfaro, et al., 2014; Bartolomé, 2010; Gándara & Maxwell-Jolly, 2000; Darder, 2015; Garcia, 2014; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, 2013). We view this challenge as a fundamental matter of equity and social justice, given our perspective that teachers can either announce or denounce dimensions of equitable classroom practices (Alfaro, et al., 2014; Bartolomé, 2008), and can thus affect the equality or inequality of emergent bilingual students’ educational experiences in dual language classrooms (Cazden, 2001). We write from the vantage point of teacher educators and researchers, as well as former bilingual education teachers and administrators with over 30 years of experience in the field. Our intent in this article is to discuss the need to assist DLE teachers in developing greater clarity regarding the following four tenets: Ideology, Pedagogy, Access, Equity (IPAE), necessary to critically strengthen the work of DLE classroom practices.

Bilingual teacher professional development workshops typically focus on methodology to develop high levels of bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturation for all students (Baker, 2011, 2006; Quezada & Alfaro, 2012; Wright, et al., 2015). While research indicates that well implemented dual language strands promote academic achievement (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2009), we know very little about how DLE educators and their programs intentionally and strategically address the four critical tenets: Ideology, Pedagogy, Access, Equity (IPAE). Similar concerns and questions were published in a report titled: Urgent Research Questions and Issues in Dual-language Education (Parkes, Ruth, Anberg-Espinoza, & De Jong, 2009). Given this, we are left with the serious task of thinking deeply about the importance of IPAE in the effective implementation of DLE Programs.

The reality is that DLE teachers will most likely teach in classrooms made up of at least one half of students who are of low socioeconomic status (SES), nonwhite and come from cultural groups historically and/or currently viewed and treated as low status in the greater society. Therefore, it is imperative that the initial preparation and continued professional development of DLE teachers include an understanding of the IPAE dimensions, particularly for vulnerable student populations.

Due to the critical impact of political and ideological factors in education and the need to strategically address them, critical bilingual teacher educators’ conversations across the nation have begun to center around the challenges to identify, name, and confront the sociopolitical and ideological aspects in the preparation and professional development of DLE teachers, that intentionally and purposely address the four tenets of IPAE to create optimal learning conditions for all their students in DLE programs.

**Ideological Clarity**

It is essential for teachers to gain a firm understanding of dominant ideologies and develop effective counter-hegemonic discourses that can resist and transform oppressive practices in...
today’s classrooms (Darder, 2015). The process of critical dialogue, continuous self-questioning and reflection emanates the evolution of an awaking to critical consciousness (conscientização) that beacons us toward ideological clarity (Freire, 1985).

“A teacher’s well-articulated ideology is the beacon that will empower her/him to navigate through, with, and around restrictive language policies and other socio-political agendas.”

It is important for teachers to arrive at the realization that it is their ideology that “announces or denounces” teaching for equity and social justice. Ideological clarity requires that teachers’ individual explanations be continually compared and contrasted with those propagated by the dominant society (Bartolomé, 2002). It is to be hoped that the juxtaposing of ideologies forces teachers to better understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and support unfair and inequitable conditions (p.168). Additionally, Freire (1993) reminds us that teaching and learning in schools constitutes a political act tied to the ideological forces that operate on behalf of the dominant class. DLE teachers must guard themselves against perpetuating dominant hegemonic practices that have long existed in “English-only” classrooms and have made their way into DLE classrooms. In order for DLE teachers to experience a breakthrough to epistemological solidarity in their classroom practice, they must work diligently to develop pedagogical clarity by examining the critical questions (See Table 1).

**Pedagogical Perspective and Clarity**

Pedagogically clear teachers exercise a constant reciprocity of their ideology and classroom practice. Ideological clarity, critical reflection, and discourse inform a teacher’s practice and the intentional interaction between teaching and learning. A teacher’s pedagogical clarity that stems from an asset-based perspective centers on the belief that students and teachers construct knowledge together based on the funds of knowledge (assets) that students bring to the classroom (Yosso, 2005). Hence, teachers use instructional strategies to enhance the development of bilingualism and collaborate with students to create a democratic classroom environment. In order for DLE teachers to experience a critical breakthrough in their classroom practice, they must work diligently to develop pedagogical clarity by examining the critical questions (See Table 1).

**Access for All**

With all we know about the academic success and high motivation of students in DLE programs (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2002), we clearly lack studies related to students’ notion of access to quality curriculum, instruction, and materials. As rigorous standards and the complexity of vocabulary increase linguistic demands, DLE teachers need additional resources and/or professional development on instructional strategies to ensure access (Hernández, 2011).

Although DLE provides English Learners (ELs) the opportunities for advancement in academics, programs could potentially provide negative effects related to the success and failure of Mexican-origin children (Valdés, 1997). Possible drawbacks are the quality of instruction in the Spanish language, the effects of dual immersion on intergroup relations, and how DLE fits into the relationship between language and power, affecting the children and society. Valdés (1997) argued that DLE programs have the potential to reduce Latinos’ natural advantage as bilinguals. This is a critical and valuable insight that Valdés called to our attention two decades ago, and we now see it clearly. In bilingual/dual language programs made up of working-class native Spanish speakers and middle-class native English speakers, the English speakers learn the valued standard Spanish and typically do not feel denigrated in the process. Furthermore, they often come to school with middle-class cultural capital they can transfer from English to Spanish. Given this, the IPEA framework calls on DLE teachers to reframe the sociopolitical notion of keeping the dominant class powerful and the subordinate group powerless. As we see it, if we are serious about leveling the education playing field, it is imperative that dual language educators, who teach students from the economically poorest populations, intentionally resist and interrupt persistent hegemonic pedagogies.

The issue of using more English in DLE programs in order to perform better on standardized tests by reducing the time spent on the heritage language is a concern for many teachers. Lindholm-Leary and Genesee (2010) explained this tactic has no scientific proof that it works. On the contrary, adding more English “time-on-task” does not expedite the acquisition of English or improve test scores (Gandára & Hopkins, 2010). Understanding the conceptual underpinnings of the third tenet of IPEA—Access, requires a profound analysis (See Table 1).

**Equitable Spaces**

The IPAE tenet for Equity is defined as the core of social justice in DLE classrooms, including how we define and position the sociolinguistic and sociocultural goals for all students. Equity provides a lens for DLE teachers to exert their
ideological clarity for safe democratic spaces, examining group membership, and balancing language status in our classroom practice.

Maintaining social equity in the classroom is no easy task for DL educators, since English is the language of power in America. Even though DLE programs assert a cross-cultural goal, studies on cultural and linguistic status between Spanish and English (De Jong, 2006; Fitts, 2006; Hernández, 2011; Palmer, 2008) affirm issues pertaining to social justice and equity. Findings indicate that English dominant speakers disrespect the academic spaces of heritage language speakers by cutting off classmates and taking over oral contributions (Hernández, 2011; Palmer, 2008).

Potowski (2004) examined influences that increased importance to English and eroded valuable connections to the heritage language in DLE schools. These influences included the emphasis of English on standardized tests, electives, assemblies, sports, fairs, and other schoolwide practices conducted in English that clearly send subtle messages to students, as they begin to associate the status of power with the dominant school language. Heritage language speakers can have a tendency to conform to the language of their dominant classmates to assert their status and competence in English, even with newcomers who know very little English. Potowski reported that during Spanish instruction, 68% of the time of student conversations resulted in English and only 32% in Spanish. Once again, we must ask ourselves the difficult Equity questions (See Table 1).

Ultimas Palabras--Last Words

Language shift from Spanish to English affects the linguistic capital of heritage language speakers and undermines the vitality of Spanish in the classroom (Hernández, 2011, 2015). DLE teachers need to be cognizant of language preference during small group discussions and find ways to monitor linguistic equity. Given that language and cognition are the central elements to biliteracy and bilingual development in DLE settings, teachers need to create innovative and purposeful opportunities for target language use (e.g., Spanish) and ways to sustain conversations without language shift that favors the dominant language. Consequently, merely organizing students to perform tasks in Spanish (i.e., cooperative learning, literature circles) does not ensure student communication in Spanish. Teachers can manipulate these paradigms through alternative discourses/purposeful use of language (Palmer, 2008), monitoring language use (De Jong, 2006), seeking allies for Spanish in peer group activities (Fitts, 2006), using counterbalance approaches (Lyster, 2009), addressing language functions in tasks (Hernandez, 2011, 2015), and placing symbolic value to the “investments in identity” that motivate the use of Spanish (Norton, as cited in Potowski, 2004).

The extremely rapid growth of DLE programs across the nation has made even more evident the pressing need for self-examination of practices that are critically conscious and fundamental to equity and social justice. Examining the four tenets Ideology, Pedagogy, Access and Equity (IPAE), as DLE teachers can allow us to ask ourselves the tough questions that cause us to reflect and recalibrate the core of IPAE. For this reason, we have developed a guide to assist teachers in asking themselves the tough questions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Given historical and deeply engrained English monolingual, assimilationist, and deficit ideologies regarding linguistic minority students, we maintain that DLE teacher professional development must explicitly address the role of ideological clarity, pedagogical clarity, access for all, and equity in shaping the curriculum, including the often asymmetrical power relations inherent between the middle-class White language preferences and the reality that emergent bilingual students often come to school speaking nonstandard linguistic varieties of Spanish and English (Garcia, 2009; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2013; Sayer, 2013). In DLE, it is particularly important to prepare teachers to be aware and vigilant of their own middle-class preferences, including their biases against non-standard language use.

It is important to point out that much of the literature on the preparation of DLE teachers focuses on imparting technical knowledge, such as the various methodologies that will help them develop expertise in a range of content areas for teaching in dual language settings (Wright et al., 2015). It is our belief that, equally as important to teachers’ knowledge of these technical and biliteracy methodological skills, is a teacher’s knowledge of how a critically developed ideology informs their pedagogy that creates access for students from diverse backgrounds to ensure equity in the DLE classroom. We subscribe to a framework that challenges the notion of biliteracy development as a monolithic construct. On the contrary, we view it as the balancing of asymmetric powers embedded in the educational complexity of socio-cultural relations, tensions, and possibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPA Tenets of DLE</th>
<th>Don’t be afraid to ask yourself the tough questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ideological Clarity** | • What beliefs, values, and epistemological theories inform my thinking?  
• What are the political, social, cultural, linguistic, gendered, and emotional circumstances in which I have learned?  
• Do I have the courage to speak up for the benefit of my students?  
• What kind of teacher do I want to be?  
• What do I want my students to know and do well?  
• What kind of changes do I need to make to my teaching that will enhance my students’ bicultural identity and biliteracy development? |
| Teacher announces or denounces teaching for equity and social justice. |

**BEACON**

Focus on critical consciousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Perspective and Clarity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Clarity** | • What core values and research inform my practice?  
• What messages do I send to my students?  
• How do I demonstrate respect for my students’ cultural and linguistic wealth?  
• Have I created a dialogical classroom environment or do I deposit knowledge?  
• Do I build on my students’ assets/funds of knowledge?  
• Do I honor my students’ non-standard language use while teaching standard language?  
• Do I co-construct knowledge with my students? |
| Focusing on critical consciousness |

**Access for All**

How language and power fit into the DLE classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access for All</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ACCESS FOR ALL** | • Who is getting my attention?  
• Am I strategically creating universal access for all students?  
• Who do I call on first to answer questions?  
• Who are my thriving students?  
• Who requires additional scaffolding?  
• Am I watering down the curriculum?  
• Am I applying rigor and high expectations for all learners? |
| |

**Equitable Spaces**

Equity is the core of IPAE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equitable Spaces</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **core** | • What kind of language role model am I, honestly?  
• Who is dominating class discussions?  
• How am I navigating the status of languages and cultures in the classroom?  
• How is English perceived by my students?  
• Are some of my students conforming to subordinate roles? Why?  
• How am I keeping the students engaged in the language of instruction (e.g., Spanish)?  
• How are assessments positioning languages in my classroom?  
• How are school or classroom activities influencing the power of the dominant language or group? |
|  |

Table 1: DLE Teacher’s Examination of Critical Consciousness