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This exploratory qualitative study addressed the need for more research on identity construction in pre-service content-area teachers of emergent bilinguals (EBs). A deductive thematic analysis was performed on the coursework of a pre-service teacher of Hispanic descent enrolled in an online course at a Hispanic-serving university in the Southwestern United States. This course was designed to help pre-service secondary content-area teachers develop the knowledge, skills, and experience to provide effective instruction for EBs. Findings demonstrated examples of how the four axes of the participant’s identity (substance, authority sources, self-practices, and telos) manifested and interacted in her coursework. By engaging in reflective practices, she developed an increased awareness of her own sociocultural-linguistic identity and how to leverage that identity to more effectively teach and advocate for EBs. Implications are discussed for how teacher preparation programs can prepare teachers to enter the field with a stronger sense of who they are and who they want to be as future teachers and advocates for more culturally and linguistically responsive educational practices.

Cette étude qualitative exploratoire tente de combler le besoin de plus de recherches sur la construction de l’identité chez les futurs enseignants des matières disciplinaires auprès d’élèves bilingues émergents. Nous avons effectué une analyse thématique déductive sur les travaux universitaires d’une future enseignante d’origine hispanique inscrite dans un cours en ligne dans une université qui dessert la communauté hispanique dans le sud-ouest des États-Unis. Ce cours était conçu pour aider les futurs enseignants des matières disciplinaires au secondaire à développer les connaissances, les compétences et l’expérience requises pour fournir un enseignement efficace aux élèves bilingues émergents. Les résultats permettent d’extraire plusieurs exemples de la manière dont les quatre axes de l’identité de la participante (substance, sources d’autorité, pratiques personnelles et telos) se manifestent et interagissent dans ses travaux universitaires. En adoptant des pratiques réflexives, elle a pu développer une conscience accrue de sa propre identité socioculturelle et linguistique et de la manière dont elle peut tirer profit de cette identité afin d’enseigner et de soutenir les élèves bilingues émergents avec plus d’efficacité. Nous discutons des
Teacher identity construction continues to be a crucial area of focus in education. An increasingly diverse student population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021a, 2021b), coupled with prevailing ideologies that position diverse learners as deficient (Menken, 2013), necessitates the continued development of approaches to helping teachers become agents of social justice for multilingual students. Yazan (2019) argues that “explicit focus on identity work can facilitate teachers’ negotiation and adoption of research-based and social justice–oriented pedagogies” (p. 48). In addition, by developing a stronger identity, teachers will be able to enact teaching practices that positively impact student learning and achievement in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms (Clark & Flores, 2014). Therefore, it is crucial to investigate ways in which teachers may develop a professional identity that can resist harmful ideologies and provide culturally and linguistically diverse learners with an equitable learning experience.

A key time when this process may begin is in the pre-service teaching phase (Athanases et al., 2015; Athanases & Wong, 2018; Edwards et al., 2019; Harrison & Lakin, 2018; Wong et al., 2020). Lauwo et al. (2022) argue that “a nuanced understanding of relationships between teacher education and teacher identity development is crucial to supporting PSTs [pre-service teachers] to self-identify as plurilingual educators responsible for equitably serving linguistically, culturally, and racially diverse learners” (p. 115). In addition, providing opportunities for PSTs to engage in identity exploration and learn to navigate conflicts between home, school, and university experiences may serve as one way to address burnout and attrition (Harvey-Torres et al., 2022).

More research is needed, however, to better understand the nuances of how PSTs engage in identity construction through teacher education coursework. Moreover, teachers of diverse students face additional challenges as they construct their identities within dominant linguistic and political landscapes (Riches & Parks, 2021). Martin and Strom (2016) problematize an overall lack of studies addressing teacher identity as it relates to diverse student populations, resulting in an inadequate understanding of the ways in which teachers develop and enact their professional identities as teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Meanwhile, Laletina et al. (2022) assert that although content-area teachers require specialized knowledge in order to work with multilingual learners, their preparation “rarely includes an in-depth coverage of linguistic and cultural phenomena” (p. 245). This results in content-area teachers entering the field lacking the knowledge and skills necessary to enact a pedagogy that is inclusive of culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Therefore, more studies are needed to investigate teacher identity construction in future content-area PSTs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners as a unique population.

This qualitative study addresses this research need by asking the following research question: How does a pre-service teacher of Hispanic descent construct a professional identity as a future teacher of culturally and linguistically diverse learners through online teacher preparation coursework that builds upon her former, current, and future selves? To answer this question, we analyzed data collected from one
PST’s completed assignments in an online course dedicated to helping content-area PSTs develop the skills necessary to provide effective instruction for emergent bilinguals (EBs). By doing so, this study sheds additional light on how teacher preparation programs can help send content-area teachers into the workforce with a stronger sense of who they are and who they want to be as advocates for a more socially just education for multilingual learners.

**Theoretical Framework**

Conceptualizing a topic as complex as language teacher identity necessitates the implementation of multiple theoretical approaches, as suggested by Varghese et al. (2005). Previous scholarship has investigated language teacher identity through a variety of lenses, such as Esteban-Guitart and Moll’s (2014a, 2014b) funds of identity, Yazan’s (2018) conceptual framework for language teacher identity, or the Douglas Fir Group’s (2016) transdisciplinary framework for second language acquisition. In order to provide a richer understanding of how to conceptualize and frame the process of language teacher identity construction, this study adds to the existing scholarship by investigating it through Clarke’s (2009) framework of ethical self-formation (see Figure 1) by following Miller et al. (2017), He and Lin (2013), and Reeves (2018). Through this conceptual lens, teacher identity is viewed as a complex, ongoing process of self-construction composed of four ethico-political axes: substance, authority sources, self-practices, and telos. These axes are inspired by the four basic categories through which Foucault (1997) believed the free relationship to the self could be examined: ethical substance, mode of subjectivation, ethical work, and telos. Together these axes demonstrate identity formation as a historically influenced “nexus of the social and the individual” (p. 196). These axes are explained in further detail below.
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1 The term used in the syllabus and course texts was English language learners (ELLs); however, we choose to use instead the preferred term emergent bilingual as suggested by García (2009).
Substance

The substance of teacher identity is the material of which one’s identity as a teacher is composed (Miller et al., 2017). This material includes one’s personality and character, often manifesting in statements such as “I am a ... person” or “I am (not) the type of person who ....” Substance draws upon past, present, and future identities and experiences as well as the multiple roles one plays in one’s life besides teaching. Behaviours, emotions, beliefs, values, and ethical judgments also play a key role in the substance of teacher identity. Reeves (2018) exemplifies the substance of one teacher’s identity work as “both a maternal person and one comfortable with chaos” (p. 104), while Miller et al. (2017) illustrate the substance in another teacher’s identity work as that of a successful teacher. Meanwhile, He and Lin (2013) characterize the substance of a pre-service teacher as “love of teaching and students” (p. 214). Clarke (2009) affirms the relational nature of teacher identity in noting how another teacher’s concern was recognition as a teacher from the students’ point of view.

Authority Sources

Authority sources are external sources that a teacher acknowledges as having the power to recognize and validate good teaching (Reeves, 2018). These sources may include the theories, discourses, ideologies, and values that a teacher chooses to embrace or dismiss. They may also be linked to a teacher’s moral stance, which in turn is linked to their identity development (Barkhuizen & Mendieta, 2020). Reeves (2018) notes that the conflict between the authority sources valued by a teacher and those valued by others in their surrounding contexts may lead to a renegotiation or even crisis of identity. The teacher in Reeves’s (2018) study subscribed to neoliberalism and considered her mother and her Christian values to be sources of authority, while the teacher in Miller et al.’s (2017) study was influenced by “top-down, external assessment metrics” (p. 97). The PST in He and Lin’s (2013) study followed authority sources related to “teaching knowledge” and “educating people” (p. 214). The teacher in Clarke’s (2009) study promoted discourses surrounding teachers’ impact on student development. Although teachers may be influenced by or even dependent upon authority sources, they may not always embrace but instead critique them, as was the case with the teacher in Miller et al.’s study.

Self-Practices

Self-practices are the behaviours performed by teachers both within and outside of classrooms in order to enact their identities (Reeves, 2018). Teacher practices, as well as the materials that they use in those practices, have been implicated in language teacher identity development (Barkhuizen & Mendieta, 2020). Self-practices may occur both within and outside of the classroom. For example, Clarke (2009) notes that pre- and in-service teachers may engage in processes of reflection outside of the classroom, such as reflective journaling or emailing classmates to discuss incidents that had occurred in the classroom. However, Clarke also mentions practices that occur within the classroom, such as classroom discipline techniques. The PST in He and Lin’s (2013) study attempted to improve upon her “professional knowledge, teaching methods and interpersonal relations” (p. 214), a process that could occur both within and outside of the classroom. The teacher in Miller et al.’s (2017) study engaged in professional development practices outside of the classroom, but he later applied the reading strategies he learned within the classroom. As pre- and in-service teachers engage in self-practices both within and outside of the classroom, they continue to restructure and reinforce their current and imagined professional identity. Some educational contexts may facilitate this process by encouraging self-practices that align with those that teachers value as
contributing to their identity growth and development. However, in some situations, teachers may become disillusioned when they find themselves forced to adopt practices prescribed by their school which conflict with the practices that align with the other aspects of their identity (Reeves, 2018).

**Telos**

Telos refers to the end goal(s) of teaching as perceived by the teacher (Reeves, 2018). These goals may be practical, like staying afloat financially, or philosophical, like making a difference in students’ lives. They also may fluctuate as teachers’ identities grow and change. For example, a teacher who begins the profession with the goal of making a difference in students’ abilities to interact with a global community may change their goal to one of pure financial motivation if they become disillusioned with their career. This shift may cause tension and a sense of disillusionment for a teacher who has spent a long time envisioning a possible self as a teacher who makes a difference. In Reeves’s (2018) study, telos manifests in the teacher’s identity work as a desire to be someone who helps students achieve academically and advocates for their future success. Meanwhile, the teacher in Miller et al.’s (2017) study adopted a telos of being an effective teacher. The PST in He and Lin’s (2013) study strove “to be a ‘qualified teacher’ with ‘positive influence’ on students” (p. 214). In Clarke’s (2009) study, the teacher’s goal for teaching was to help students whose behaviour is typically pathologized, a view that the author problematizes.

**Literature Review**

The importance of identity in teacher education has been noted in prior literature. According to Seltzer and de los Ríos (2018), “teachers’ stances and practices can be affected by their identities” (p. 49). In addition, Richards (2021) proposes that identity should be a central focus in theory and practice in the education of those who teach English to speakers of other languages. Morgan and Clarke (2011) highlight the necessity of focusing on language teacher identity in particular, citing its importance in pedagogy and policy. Because of the exponential increase in the number of language learners in US public schools, all teachers, regardless of content area, should consider themselves to be language teachers (Jimenez-Silva et al., 2016). As a consequence, it is necessary to conceptualize language teacher identity and discuss previous studies on identity construction in pre- and in-service teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

**Language Teacher Identity**

Conceptualizing language teacher identity (LTI) is an act that is as complex as the concept itself. Although exact definitions vary, scholars generally agree that identity construction in language teachers is a dynamic, discursive process that is influenced by surrounding contexts (Barkhuizen, 2016; Swanson, 2013; Varghese et al., 2005). LTIs are situated not just in the present but also in the imagined futures of teachers (Darvin & Norton, 2015; Li, 2020). These imagined futures, along with current and past teaching and language-learning experiences, guide the words, thoughts, and actions of language teachers as they engage in a process of self-creation that is simultaneously essential and external, stable and unstable, in harmony and in conflict. This process occurs within a site of struggle and acceptance that connects the past, present, and future.
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The ongoing importance of investigating identity construction in language teachers is well established (e.g., De Costa & Norton, 2017; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Morgan & Clarke, 2011). We therefore situate our study in a field of research dedicated to better understanding the ways in which pre- and in-service teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners engage in identity construction for a variety of purposes and within a variety of contexts.

Prior scholarship has suggested a need to recognize the linguistic diversity of teacher candidates and the importance of providing linguistically responsive instruction in education programs. For example, there exists a need for teacher educators to centre the experiences of Latinx teacher candidates to address the ways in which language ideologies impact their linguistic identities, including increased difficulty in linguistically and ethnically defining oneself, being perceived as linguistically deficient and ethnically inauthentic, and needing to adapt one’s language practices (Fallas-Escobar et al., 2022). It is also necessary to provide spaces through which PSTs may “reflect upon their ideological orientations toward themselves, their future learners, and society” (Lindahl et al., 2021, p. 1191). These spaces may be created within university classrooms, or through university–school partnerships that serve as a bridge between teacher candidates’ background experiences, university coursework, and field experiences (Ek & Domínguez Chávez, 2015; Harvey-Torres et al., 2022). Ultimately these types of spaces may help future teachers counter negative language ideologies and construct their identities as agents of change and advocates for themselves, their students, and their students’ families. In addition, teacher education programs may help to disrupt the notion of a divide between the “two worlds” of university coursework and field experiences by integrating the home as a third world and creating a bridge between these three worlds.

Beyond recognizing and problematizing raciolinguistic ideologies and their impacts on teacher identity, there also exists a general need for centring teacher identity as an explicit area of focus in language teacher education (Barkhuizen, 2017; Lindahl & Yazan, 2019; Varghese et al., 2016; Yazan & Lindahl, 2020). Research has explored language teacher identity as a potential area of focus in pre-service teaching through teacher education coursework (Wolff & De Costa, 2017), professional development workshops (Edwards et al., 2019), field-based practicum experiences (Martel, 2015; Yazan & Peercy, 2018), and mixed-reality classroom simulations (Lew et al., 2021). Studies have also explored language teacher identity as an area of focus for in-service teachers, particularly through professional development experiences (Giles, 2018; Hansen-Thomas et al., 2014; Lew, 2016). In some cases, identity construction has been explored longitudinally from the pre-service stage through the first few years of in-service teaching (Seyri & Nazari, 2022). Identity construction in pre- and in-service teachers has also been discussed in relation to specific theories, such as translanguaging (Tian & Zhang-Wu, 2022). Overall, research has indicated that engaging in reflective practices related to identity development helps teachers to develop a stronger sense of who they are and the role they play, or will play, as language teachers, although much work is still needed.

Virtual learning environments may serve as an important space in which PSTs may reflect upon their knowledge, beliefs, and values with regard to language teaching and learning (Gamboa González & Herrera Mateus, 2021). Some scholars have investigated reflective practices related to language teacher identity with regard to technology-assisted language learning (Bahari, 2022) and in-service teaching transitions from real-life to online learning contexts (Nazari & Seyri, 2021). However, more research is needed that specifically focuses on language teacher identity development in PSTs in online learning environments as opposed to face-to-face contexts.

The above-mentioned literature represents an ongoing discussion about how teacher education can provide intentional spaces in which pre- and in-service teachers may be encouraged to construct their identities as teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners in a variety of contexts. More research
is needed, particularly to better understand how PSTs may engage in imagined future practices within online contexts to further develop an understanding of the type of language teachers they aim to become. The current study therefore aims to add to this discussion by demonstrating how interacting with online university coursework enabled a PST to construct her own professional identity as a future teacher of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

Methodology

In this exploratory qualitative study, we analyze one PST’s coursework as part of a larger study that will compare the coursework of additional PSTs from the same course.

Research Question

The following research question guided our study: How does a pre-service teacher of Hispanic descent construct a professional identity as a future teacher of culturally and linguistically diverse learners through online teacher preparation coursework that builds upon her former, current, and future selves?

Participant

The participant in this study, identified by pseudonym as Carolina, was a PST enrolled in a second language teaching and learning course at a Hispanic-serving university in the Southwestern United States. Her goal was to teach language arts/reading/social studies for Grades 4–8. Although she mentioned having taken education courses focusing on multiculturalism and culturally diverse education, she stated, “I do not have much knowledge about teaching English learning students.” Her learning objective for the course was “to learn about the approaches teachers/educators can take to ensure a proper and deserving education to English learners.” Although she was born in Texas and raised in California, she identified with Mexican culture due to having been raised by two Mexican American parents. As she had submitted all of the coursework for the course, her assignments provided us with a rich corpus of written data. The fact that she started the semester with limited knowledge about teaching EBs also allowed us to see her growth throughout the course. We followed institutional review board protocol to ensure that the participant provided electronic informed consent to voluntarily participate in this study.

Context

Zhongfeng and Bedrettin collected the data for this study from an online course they taught in the fall semester of 2020 at a Hispanic-serving university in the Southwestern United States. Although face-to-face instruction had previously been more common for teacher preparation programs, the course in which the participant was enrolled was conducted asynchronously and entirely online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The two authors designed this course to help PSTs in a variety of teaching programs (e.g., generalist, bilingual, ESL, special education) develop the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience necessary to plan, implement, and assess effective instruction for EBs. For many content-area PSTs in the program, this course would be the only one they would take related to planning, implementing, and assessing effective instruction for emergent bilingual learners. In addition, many of the PSTs in this program come from raciolinguistically minoritized and marginalized communities. The course textbooks
included *Making Content Comprehensible for Secondary English Learners: The SIOP Model* (Echevarria et al., 2018) and *120 Content Strategies for English Language Learners* (Reiss, 2012).

**Data Collection**

We collected artifacts in the form of student responses to online course assignments (see Table 1). Larger assignments included reflective virtual field-experience assignments involving analyses of videos of real-world teaching scenarios, quick-share strategy videos in which PSTs demonstrated sheltered instruction strategies, strategy trackers in which PSTs collected and analyzed ideas from their classmates’ strategy demonstration videos, and a final written lesson plan. Smaller assignments included discussion-board responses, multimodal activities, a language portrait activity (see Busch, 2012), and individual written responses to prompts based on course readings and videos. Field experience assignments and minor assignments were submitted approximately once a month as part of a series of five modules. Quick-share videos, strategy trackers, and final lesson plans were submitted only once during the course of the semester, with the final lesson plans serving as a summative assessment for the course.

Many of these assignments encouraged the PSTs in the course to engage in self-reflexive inquiry, a practice frequently used in other courses involving the identity development of PSTs (e.g., Banes et al., 2016; Wong et al., 2020). Together these assignments provided us with a robust corpus of written data that allowed us to reach a point of data saturation, enabling us to make conclusions with respect to our research question. Overall, the use of numerous assignments as data allowed us to look for common themes and patterns that provided a better overall picture of the ways in which our participant applied and developed the various aspects of her identity while engaging with the online coursework.

**Analysis**

We followed Barkhuizen’s (2016) suggestion of using thematic analysis to investigate the identity experiences of novice language teachers. For our deductive thematic analysis of the data, we thoroughly read each artifact and marked instances of major themes from the theoretical framework as well as sub-themes that emerged. As we discussed the themes that we found, we further complexified how each axis in Clarke’s (2009) theorization of self-ethical formation was exemplified in the data.

We acknowledge that students frequently complete class assignments with an overarching goal of doing whatever it takes to receive credit for the course. However, we noticed a difference in the depth, reflection, and uniqueness in students’ responses to the above-listed assignments as compared to the eight assignments that did not yield this level of depth and reflection and thus provided no significant findings when trying to analyze them thematically. Typically, these assignments were highly descriptive and/or short in nature and frequently produced almost identical responses among students. After asking ourselves why these assignments yielded no significant findings, we ended up modifying or removing them in future iterations of the course. We also noted the integration of authority sources and experiences from outside the scope of the course, which helped us overcome the possibility that the participant was simply telling her professors what she thought they wanted to hear.
Table 1
Data Collection: Major and Minor Student Coursework Completed by Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major assignments</th>
<th>Minor assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Field experience assignment 1</td>
<td>• Advocacy collage and description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field experience assignment 2</td>
<td>• Discussion-board post and response for definitions of advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field experience assignment 3</td>
<td>• Teaching and learning a second language poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field experience assignment 4</td>
<td>• Short essay reflection for academic language video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field experience assignment 5</td>
<td>• Response paper on the potential merits and problems related to connecting new information to EBs’ cultural backgrounds versus relating to popular US influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quick-share video</td>
<td>• Short essay response to video talk by Jamila Lyiscott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quick-share strategy tracker</td>
<td>• Flipgrid reflection on beliefs about students’ diverse linguistic repertoires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final lesson plan</td>
<td>• Language portrait and explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short essay response to SIOP math lesson video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• List of ten planned future comprehensible input techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short essay on the potential advantages and/or disadvantages of allowing EBs to use their native language for part of the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching scenario video critique reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poster of envisioned future classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informal translanguaging assessment activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bumper sticker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positionality

As we engage in this qualitative research, we acknowledge the potential impact of our positionalities on the research process (Manohar et al., 2017; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Therefore, we provide information about our identities as researchers and scholars. I (Jessica) am a multilingual speaker of English, French, and Spanish and a former high-school world languages teacher. At the time the research was conducted, I was pursuing my PhD in the Culture, Literacy, and Language program. My own family history of heritage language loss fuels my passion for promoting culturally and linguistically sustaining practices in education. I continue to investigate ways to better meet the needs of language learners and teachers. I (Zhongfeng 中锋) am a multilingual speaker of Mandarin, English, and Cantonese and a former English and Mandarin teacher in China, Cambodia, and the United States. Informed by my transnational and translanguaging experiences, I strive to develop equity-oriented pedagogies with pre- and in-service teachers to advance cultural and linguistic pluralism and justice in K–12 urban classrooms and beyond. I (Bedrettin) taught English as a foreign language in Türkiye at K–12 and post-secondary levels for about five years before moving to the United States to pursue my PhD. I have been working with pre-service language teachers for more than 10 years in the US context, and my research includes exploring the complex ways
in which language teachers learn to work with EBs in US K–12 schools. My active language repertoire includes English and Turkish, and I studied classical Arabic for about 15 years, and German and French in high school and college, respectively.

**Findings**

The findings below demonstrate how the substance of Carolina’s identity and her telos, or ultimate goal for teaching, dynamically influenced the authority sources she embraced and the self-practices that she plans to utilize as a future educator of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

**Substance**

Carolina draws strongly upon her connection to Mexican/Hispanic culture. This connection is noticeably clear in her response to the assigned language portrait activity, for which she mapped out her language practices and repertoires in different social contexts that she has been a part of:

> The two major languages I included in my language portrait is Spanish and English. I first learned Spanish through my parents and grandmother while growing up. This language was always spoken around the house and was evident in the music we listened to. I learned English alongside Spanish when I was younger, and this language became more dominant while I started and continued my schooling. My parents both are fluent in both languages, so these two languages became interchangeable in preference over time. In my drawing, I colored the Spanish side with yellow because I think this language is beautiful, and it makes me happy because it connects me to my Mexican/Hispanic culture. I also included blue at the top of the Spanish side because it makes me sad that I have lost much of this language over time. I colored my English side green because I am indifferent/neutral to the language. Because English is spoken by most in the United States, I do not necessarily feel special or connected to a particular identity (other than American) when I speak this language.

Although Carolina notes that English became more dominant as she continued her schooling, she splits her language portrait exactly in half between Spanish and English (see Figure 2). This visual dichotomy through the use of a solid blue line down the middle of the figure is disrupted through the use of different colours and her written description. She rationalizes her use of the colour green for the English language side as representing her feelings of indifference toward that language. Meanwhile, she explains how her use of both yellow and blue represents the mixture of both happiness and sadness: happiness for the connection to heritage that it provides, and sadness for having lost much of her ability to use this heritage language. Interestingly, the words “Spanish” and “English” are written larger and in more colourful lettering in English than their Spanish translations (“español” and “inglés”), which perhaps may further illustrate the dominance of the English language that she has experienced in her life trajectory. She also writes that although these two languages “became interchangeable in preference over time,” she does not feel the same sense of connection from the English language that she does from the Spanish language.

The conflict between Carolina’s Spanish-speaking and English-speaking sides fuels her opinion on the merits and problems related to connecting new information to EBs’ cultural backgrounds versus relating new information to popular US influences:

> Firstly, I do not think you have to be born in a particular place to identify with a certain culture. Personally, I was born in Texas and raised in California. I never lived in Mexico. However, I still
identify with Mexican culture, because that is what I have been surrounded by, having had been raised by two Mexican American parents. As for students, I think they should be able to have access to resources in the classroom that include both pop culture in the United States and their cultural backgrounds. Community is important to everyone, whether that be the place you are currently living (the United States in this case), or where your family is from. One is not more valid than the other, because children are a result of multiple identities and varying past experiences. (Response paper)

Although Carolina identifies more strongly with Mexican culture, she recognizes the need to engage in self-practices that validate both the background experiences and new experiences of students. Of interest is the fact that she mentions that “one is not more valid than the other,” even though she mentions in her language portrait that she identifies more strongly with one than the other. This contradiction may potentially be the result of her interaction with authority sources through coursework, or a result of her own background experience of seeing her parents become fluent in two languages. In addition, she doesn’t acknowledge the fact that although she feels that one is not more valid than the other, the current sociopolitical climate frequently suggests otherwise.
Authority Sources

As we read Carolina’s coursework, two types of authority sources emerged: authority sources known to us (e.g., the textbook, the SIOP model, Texas proficiency standards, the articles and video lectures provided) and unknown influences from outside the course (e.g., other coursework, media representations of what a good teacher should do, former teachers from prior K–12 schooling experiences). These two types of authority sources exemplified in her coursework are discussed below. Due to the complex interconnections between them, they are not divided by headings but instead are explained in tandem.

For example, after reading an article on advocacy (Fenner, 2015), Carolina provides her own unique ideas about advocacy, which seem to draw not only from the course reading but also from unknown outside sources. In her collage (see Figure 3), we see a visual manifestation of her idea of what advocacy looks like for teachers.

Carolina envisions a teacher who advocates for EBs as one who embraces their diversity and asks questions that will help them to better understand their students. Furthermore, a good teacher is one who fights for their students. She further discusses this view in the written description that she provided alongside this collage:

After the reading, it was evident that an advocate should fight for those who are not able or equipped to fight for themselves. It is important for English Learners to have an education equal to that of their peers and other students across the country. A good teacher advocate will recognize their place in society and ask the questions necessary to understand their students. Not only this, but an advocate for English Learners will embrace diversity in language and culture, in order to build a well-rounded classroom and education for their students.

Along with the narrative describing the importance of teachers providing EBs with an equal education and recognizing their position as advocates who embrace cultural and linguistic diversity, Carolina adds a comment about fighting “for those who are not able or equipped to fight for themselves.” It is likely that this comment reflects a concern about the barriers faced by those in traditionally marginalized communities. However, students and their families in these communities are not only equipped to advocate and fight for themselves but have also been doing so for years (García-Louis, 2021; Solorzano & Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2013).

Carolina further solidifies her position on teachers as advocates in her response to a classmate in a discussion board created to allow PSTs to share their definitions of advocacy:

It is definitely important that we (as educators) be the voice for our students and their families. I think people can easily get lost in simply restating the importance in finding resources, when one of the best is the one in the mirror. Us! We are the resources for our students, and we should strive to advocate for them.

Another possible concern that we noted in this artifact is the fact that Carolina positions teachers as one of the best resources for students without acknowledging the cultural wealth (Yosso, 2013) possessed by students and their families or the funds of identity (Esteban-Guitart & Moll, 2014a, 2014b) and funds of knowledge (González et al., 2005; Moll, 2019; Moll et al., 1992) that students and their families draw upon to define themselves. She emphasizes the need for educators to be the voice for students rather than amplifying the voices they already have. This idea of being the voice for students may have emerged from the required reading, which describes advocacy as “stepping in and providing a voice for those students—and their families—who have not yet developed their own strong voice in their education”
(Fenner, 2015, p. 8). However, the article later includes a brief discussion of the need for EBs to “develop their own voices as advocates from themselves” (p. 9), which is not included in Carolina’s response.

Figure 3
Advocacy Collage

However, this discussion of advocacy was only the first assignment in her coursework, and we see Carolina’s position shift and develop as she progresses further in the class. For example, in one of her last course assignments, Carolina created a sample informal assessment activity in which she asks, “What is the importance in providing regular feedback to ELLs on their work?” She then provides a sample response in which she emphasizes the responsibility of the teacher to validate the knowledge of the student: “Learning a new language and new content is hard, so teachers should be making the effort to provide feedback in a way that is encouraging to each individual student in which the student’s knowledge is validated.” This commitment to valuing the background knowledge of students, likely influenced by the SIOP model as described in the course textbook (Echevarria et al., 2018), is further emphasized in the final small assignment for the course, a bumper sticker created by students in response to an assignment asking them to convey a key idea or message from the course (see Figure 4).
Although the statements in this bumper sticker fail to recognize the reality that some dominant groups’ knowledge and languages are valued more than others in the larger sociopolitical context in which she will be teaching, she demonstrates an awareness of this reality in earlier assignments. In a short essay response to a video talk by scholar Jamila Lyiscott, she notes that, “in traditional schooling, English is thought to be the superior language, and has been more valued when teaching.” In her response to the prompt “discuss the advantages and/or disadvantages of allowing English learners to use their native language for part of the lesson, if doing so enables them to participate at a higher cognitive level,” she asserts that, “making students only read, write, speak, and collaborate in English only hinders the development and understanding of EBs. This idea values standard English above other languages, dialects, and experiences that our students obtain.” Carolina recognizes English-only ideologies as an authority source that she speaks back against, possibly drawing upon her previously discussed substance as someone who has experienced heritage language loss as a result of these ideologies.

**Self-Practices**

In contrast to other scholarship that analyzes the actualization of self-practices in an actual classroom setting, the current study is unique in that it investigates imagined self-practices, as the COVID-19 pandemic precluded in-classroom interaction for PSTs who, in other circumstances, would have had the chance to observe and enact self-practices in real-world classrooms. The self-practices discussed in this section are those that Carolina describes as the ones she might potentially enact herself, such as those included in her lesson plan, or the ones that she chooses to embrace or critique, such as those she evaluates in videos of other teachers’ lesson plans. Some self-practices she values are stated more explicitly than others. For example, statements such as “I will use graphic organizers in my class” or “as a teacher in this classroom, I would have encouraged my students to share more of their own experiences rather than giving general/broad examples” specifically describe what she will do or would have done. Meanwhile, statements like “one issue I saw in this lesson was the teacher giving more attention to certain students while leaving others without mediation” do not plainly indicate an intended action but rather an implied action of value that she might take, such as making sure to provide students with equal amounts of attention.
Imagined Self-Practices

In the previously mentioned written essay response to a prompt asking her to describe the advantages and/or disadvantages of allowing EBs to use their native language, Carolina asserts that “if we are to value the thoughtfulness of the responses our students give, teachers have to accept and welcome the use of other languages that our students may be more familiar with.” She draws upon this belief as well as the course textbook in suggesting actions that she will take in her future classroom. For example, in a list of ten future comprehensible input techniques that she was asked to create, she discusses both specific strategies from the course texts (e.g., using graphic organizers, using pictures and objects, and previewing material for optimal learning) as well as general practices that may be infused into all strategies, such as allowing students to use their diverse abilities and strengths “to show that they are understanding what is being taught” and making connections to students’ background knowledge. Although it is unknown whether she will eventually apply these practices in her own future classroom, there is evidence that she has made connections between the practices she has selected and her telos as a teacher. For example, in stating that the technique of reducing the use of synonyms that have not been taught “reduces the chance of students becoming overwhelmed and disengaged,” Carolina demonstrates an alignment between the techniques she has listed and her goals of student engagement and a comfortable classroom environment.

The self-practices that Carolina illustrates as effective both in regular coursework and the final lesson plan demonstrate a great deal of consistency. However, there appears to be some disconnect between the desire to embrace diversity and promote equality in education in her regular coursework and an almost mechanistic list of strategies presented in her final lesson plan, with only two of the higher-order questions listed providing a chance for students to leverage their own backgrounds in the lesson (“Where have you seen argumentative works outside of school?” and “What are some reasons you would try to persuade a person to take your side?”). This lack of cohesion demonstrates the possibility that as Carolina navigated her identity as an advocate for culturally and linguistically diverse learners, she was also constrained by outside factors such as the textbook and the format of the lesson plan, which required students to include the estimated time, the lesson component, and the relevant SIOP strategy name with page number for each element. It is also possible that Carolina was limited in the amount of time she had to dedicate to creating a lesson plan that moved beyond providing the minimum requirements necessary to complete the assignment.

Evaluations of Other Teachers’ Self-Practices

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, students watched and evaluated a variety of lesson videos online rather than in person. After watching a series of SIOP lesson videos, students were asked to discuss whether they would like to be an EB in that teacher’s classroom, questions they might ask that teacher, issues they noticed, and ideas for what they might do differently as a teacher. Throughout her responses Carolina consistently places a high value on creating a positive, comfortable learning environment that provides students with opportunities for meaningful engagement and validation. The SIOP model likely influenced practices such as providing sufficient time, providing opportunities for interaction, incorporating students’ backgrounds and experiences, incorporating content and learning objectives, checking for understanding, and a variety of other specific strategies (e.g., sentence frames, graphic organizers, key word identification). Practices of less obvious origin included classroom management and keeping students on task. In her responses to these and other videos she watched during the course, Carolina praises teachers who engage in the practices she values, and she critiques those who fail to engage in such practices. For example, in
stating that she would want to be an emergent bilingual in one teacher’s classroom, she provides the rationale that “in being an emergent bilingual, I would like the chance to discuss content and knowledge with fellow students, before putting my understandings on display for my teacher to witness.” In this case she is praising the teacher for both providing opportunities for interaction and creating a comfortable learning environment. Meanwhile, after watching another video lesson she notes that one thing she would do differently would be “to spend more time building on the background knowledge of my students,” as she had noticed that “not much time was given to students to gather what they already know about the topic at hand.” Here we see how her value of incorporating students’ backgrounds and experiences emerges in her critique of an in-service teacher.

Telos

Carolina expresses her goals in teaching both explicitly and implicitly through her coursework. Examples of each approach are discussed below.

Explicit Telos

Carolina’s commitment to improving the educational experiences of her future EB students was clear even before she started engaging with her official coursework. When asked, “what is something you are hoping to learn in this class?” in a student survey at the beginning of the semester, Carolina responded, “I hope to learn about the approaches teachers/educators can take to ensure a proper and deserving education to English Learners.” This commitment continues to surface in her responses to later assignments, such as in the poster she created to explain her personal approaches to new language learning and teaching. Each student chose a unique format and structure in their response. In her poster, Carolina created four self-titled sections devoted to teaching strategy, learning technique, personal teaching goals, and her own prior experiences as a student (see Figure 5).

Carolina’s substance (experience as a student), authority sources (the importance of using the prior knowledge of students and becoming active in the community), and self-practices (strategies that could be used to teach second language learners) align with her ultimate goal for teaching, or telos, of creating “a safe and engaging classroom environment.” She elaborates upon this goal later in her list of planned future comprehensible input techniques, in which she notes that, “in my class, I hope to make learning less intimidating by making students feel like they are prepared to learn new information.” Her commitment to this telos of making her students feel safe and engaged is reflected in the activities that she plans to enact in her future classroom as well as in the activities that she praises in her reflections on other teachers’ self-practices.

In addition to wanting to make her students feel safe and engaged, Carolina also expresses a goal of creating a classroom that is inclusive and equitable, which is reflected in a poster that she created to envision her ideal classroom for EBs (see Figure 6). In analyzing these artifacts in tandem, we observe Carolina planning on enacting future self-practices that bridge the gaps between home and school and ensure that her classroom is one that acknowledges the uniqueness of each student and promotes equity, inclusivity, and safety.
Finally, a goal of ensuring student understanding recurs in many of Carolina’s assignments. For example, in response to the above-mentioned prompt related to the advantages and/or disadvantages of allowing English learners to use their native language, she responds, “As a teacher, I would rather my students understand all of a specific concept, than only understand about 50% of what was taught. Making students only read, write, speak, and collaborate in English only hinders the development and understanding of EBs” (Short essay). Carolina infuses this telos in her imagined self-practices (e.g., “In allowing children to discuss their understanding with other students, they may feel more at ease and confident in expressing/showcasing their comprehension with the teacher”) as well as in her praise and critique of other teachers’ self-practices as evidenced in lesson-plan videos (e.g., “This lesson really allowed for students to expand their understanding by enlisting a wide range of support for students to grasp complex concepts”). This finding resonates with Reeves’s (2018) finding that the participant in her study “was willing to change her teaching practices in whatever way was necessary to realize her students’ academic success” (p. 104). Whether the goal is student understanding or success, teachers will adjust their self-practices accordingly.

Implicit Telos

Some instances of the telos of Carolina’s teacher identity are not as clearly stated but rather underlie other statements that may be ascribed to her substance, self-practices, or the authority sources she chooses to embrace. For example, after engaging with Fenner (2015) as an authority source, she describes teachers as “the voice for our students” whose role is to engage in practices of advocacy. In her essay reflection after watching a video on academic language (Freeman & Freeman, 2014), she emphasizes that “it is up to the
educator to be able to give their students the help they need without denoting established abilities and overlooking skill diversity.” Furthermore, in her reflection after watching a SIOP math-lesson video, Carolina focuses on the fact that “the teacher also uses diverse techniques to help her students get the knowledge they need from the lesson.” Although the explicit focus of these assignments is on discussing the substance and self-practices of educators, Carolina’s telos of advocating for and attending to the needs of diverse learners is present throughout numerous assignments and maintains its presence as a guiding force behind them.

**Discussion and Implications**

Through interactions with the online learning context and others within that context, the participant in this study appeared to develop an increased awareness of her own sociocultural-linguistic identity as well as a deeper understanding of multilingual education. She also strengthened her commitment to advocate for
EBs and take responsibility for their learning. This study demonstrates how she drew upon her past, current, and imagined future identities as she engaged in online coursework that pushed her to examine her role in meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners. The substance, authority sources, self-practices, and telos of her identity interacted dynamically as she continued to develop her sense of self as a future teacher of EBs. Her self-identification as a child of Mexican American parents and her experience with heritage language loss impacted the authority sources she chose to embrace. These authority sources in turn inspired the self-practices she selected as those that she might incorporate into her own future classroom. All the while she remained committed to creating a classroom environment that would make her learners feel safe and engaged. We acknowledge that Carolina’s experience reflects the current research-supported understanding of how teacher candidates develop their professional identities, and such a finding resonates with previous studies. Yet the use of ethical self-formation as a theoretical framework corroborated that finding, and Carolina’s case helped us complexify the framework further.

This interrelatedness of the four axes of teacher identity resonates with the findings of prior studies that have also used Clarke’s (2009) framework of ethical self-formation. He and Lin (2013) discuss how a PST’s telos affected her identity formation while also exhibiting an interrelatedness with the substance, authority sources, and self-practices of her identity. Furthermore, the experiences of both the participant in the current study and the participant in He and Lin’s study “were influenced by, but not totally determined by, the university and school discourses” (p. 214). Although the contexts and specific findings for each study differ, the underlying processes align.

Although the participant in Miller et al.’s (2017) study was already teaching in a real-world classroom while the participant in the current study was only imagining future classroom practices, areas of alignment emerged between them. Like the participant in Miller et al.’s study, a strong desire to become an effective teacher influenced the participant. This desire fuelled the identity work of both participants, including the authority sources and strategies that each valued and the substance and telos that each crafted.

While the findings of our study align in many ways with previous scholarship grounded in Clarke’s (2009) framework of ethical self-formation, our work also expands upon this framework in unique ways. As in the previously mentioned studies (Clarke, 2009; He & Lin, 2013; Miller et al., 2017; Reeves, 2018), rich new understandings surfaced from analyzing data from a single focal participant. Our study demonstrates how new understandings of identity construction as conceptualized through this framework may emerge by investigating student-created artifacts in response to teacher education coursework. Moreover, our findings suggest ways in which this framework may be complexified, including the possibility for PSTs to negotiate multiple telos, some of which may act in harmony and others which may act in discordance. However, we acknowledge that additional data, especially interviews, could further complement and enrich the database we gleaned from Carolina’s course assignments, which we will consider in our future research plans.

Several implications for content-area PSTs and their role as language teachers emerge from this study. Teacher educators must acknowledge the dynamic, multifaceted nature of the identities of PSTs and provide in-class assignments that promote the positive growth of these identities. Reeves (2018) notes that teacher preparation programs may serve as a space within which teachers may identify, examine, and explore the substance, authority sources, self-practices, and telos of their teacher identity. In doing so, they may consider how their own personal beliefs and values may align with or conflict with those in the environments in which they will teach, and reflect upon imagined practices that they may enact in order to “practice ethical, professional agency and speak back against educational policies that threaten ‘good’ teaching and define the ‘good’ teacher in narrow and limiting ways” (p. 105).
In addition, a well-developed teacher education curriculum should not simply provide a set of mechanistic strategies to be implemented in a future classroom but should encourage PSTs to engage in activities that draw upon the substance of their identities, encouraging them to critically analyze the authority sources they choose to embrace and to create a telos that can serve as a point of focus that they can progress toward both in their studies and in their future careers. We encourage teacher educators to purposefully create activities that push PSTs to reflect upon who they are and who they want to be as future teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners in a way that aligns with their dynamically evolving sense of self.
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