Becoming Linguistically Responsive Teachers

Generative Learning One Year
After Participating in Study Abroad
and Community-Based Service Learning Project

Lori Czop Assaf, Kristie O'Donnell Lussier, & Minda Lopez

Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative study was to uncover preservice teachers' generative learning and explore whether and how they built on and/or extended linguistically responsive teaching 1 year after participating in a study abroad program and community-based international service learning project. We relied on narrative reflections, interviews, and field notes to make the preservice teachers' thinking more visible and to reveal their generative learning and implementation of linguistically responsive teaching. Findings illustrate that the preservice teachers learned a variety of knowledge and skills specifically related to linguistically responsive teaching and explained how their understanding and use of these strategies grew more intentional after returning to their local situations. They initially felt tension

Lori Czop Assaf is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas. Kristie O'Donnell Lussier is a professor in the Department of English at Collin College, McKinley, Texas. Minda Lopez is an associate professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas. Email addresses are: lassaf@txstate.edu, klussier@collin.edu, & minda.lopez@txstate.edu

that eventually led to a deeper, sustained understanding of the complexities of language learning and cultural differences. As the participants consistently reflected on their identities as future teachers, only two participants articulated a consideration of the ideological and sociopolitical dimensions of language learning, such as inequities in resources, access to quality education, and issues around poverty.

Introduction

Current statistics from the Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES; 2018) noted approximately 4.5 million elementary and secondary public school students speak English as their second or third language, with higher percentages of multilingual learners living in urban areas. Higher percentages of language learners are Latinos in elementary grades, with 16.7% of kindergarteners compared to 7.8% of sixth graders. In addition to recent immigrants, high percentages of language learners are third-generation U.S.-born students with varied linguistic, cultural, and educational experiences. Yet there continues to be gaps in preparation and support for multilingual learners compared to their English-only peers. These figures shed light on the growing and complex instructional needs of language learners across the United States and represent one of the most important tasks facing teacher educators today.

As students become more linguistically diverse, teacher educators are challenged with designing and implementing innovative programs that prepare future teachers to effectively and productively support language learners. Short-term international immersion programs, where preservice teachers (PSTs) spend time studying and teaching abroad, are becoming increasingly popular in the United States. Most of the research on international immersion programs focuses on PSTs' intercultural development (Hauerwas, Skawinski, & Ryan, 2017) and shifting attitudes and beliefs regarding multiculturalism and linguistic diversity (Addleman, Nava, Cevallos, Brazo, & Dixon, 2014). There is also support for the fact that international experiences can contribute to PSTs' ability to become culturally responsive teachers (Medina, Hathaway, & Pilonieta, 2015) who develop empathy, advocacy, and self-efficacy regarding instruction for language learners. Yet, missing from this body of research is whether and how international immersion programs nurture long-term, generative learning opportunities for PSTs to become linguistically responsive educators and how new learned instructional strategies and changed attitudes about language learners play out and endure in U.S. teaching spaces. This is particularly important because teacher educators design international immersion programs to provide future teachers with powerful experiences (DeVillar & Jiang, 2012) that will enable them to effectively teach the increasingly diverse population in the United States. Based on the understanding that international immersion programs should help PSTs develop, refine, and adapt the knowledge and skills they learn abroad to their first year of teaching as well as enable them to continue learning throughout

their professional lives, then exploring generative learning is highly pertinent and needed.

In this qualitative study, we report on a 3-week study abroad and community service learning project that took place in the Eastern Cape of South Africa designed to integrate linguistically responsive pedagogy with literacy instruction. We chose South Africa because it provided multiple opportunities for PSTs to work with multilingual learners in rural communities, to examine and grapple with national language policies and practices (11 official languages), and to participate in a language immersion experience. Our project also provided much-needed language and literacy support to local students and community members. Aligned with Ball's (2009) model and theory of generative learning, we sought to understand what PSTs learned during and after participating in the program and what they reported implementing in their local teaching situations 1 year later. Unlike most research, which has examined PSTs' learning during or immediately following an international immersion experience, we focused on the long-term, sustained and developing learning of PSTs and how linguistically responsive principles and practices were implemented by PSTs upon returning to the United States. Two overarching questions guided this study: What do PSTs report learning while participating in a study abroad program and community service learning project in rural South Africa? and What do PSTs report implementing in their local teaching situations 1 year after participating in the program?

Theoretical Framework

Generative learning (Ball, 2009) is a process of ongoing, continuous learning that consists of professional knowledge, personal knowledge, and knowledge gained from interactions with students. Knowledge and experiences become generative (Ball, 2009) when a teacher continues new learning by "making connections with his or her students' knowledge and needs, and begins planning the teaching based on what he or she is learning" (p. 48). As a social activity, teachers integrate knowledge they learn in their course work with understandings they gain from their students. They use these insights as the basis for pedagogical problem solving. Generative learning goes beyond simply learning skills or attitudes that can be implemented with all students in all contexts. Generative learning can provide instructional opportunities for expansive learning and leadership. Generative learning weaves together the social, personal, and dialogical components necessary to uncover the nuanced process of expansive and adaptive learning. For this study, we used generative learning as both a theory and a model for our program. We wanted to understand how PSTs integrated knowledge they learned in their course work with understandings they gained from working with students in an international setting and how they used these insights as the basis for pedagogical problem solving in their unique teaching situations.

A model of generative learning that includes a combination of theories and phases of development (Ball, 2009) provides a framework to understand the processes that shape learning. In Phase 1, teachers narrate personal experiences and reflect on connections to develop metacognitive awareness (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). Generative teachers who are metacognitively aware of their abilities develop a "repertoire of tools and resources to assist them in attaining their goals" (Ball, 2009, p. 49). This tool kit includes a reconceptualization or deeper awareness of their students as resources in the teaching process. As teachers reflect on their personal and professional lives, they become more aware of and responsive to their students' needs (Assaf & Lopez, 2015). In Phase 2, teachers engage in thoughtful discussions about issues and look within themselves and their students' needs to determine their roles within the teaching/learning community. They move from introspection to agency. The theory of ideological becoming (Bakhtin, 1986) in Phase 2 helps explain changes in teachers' ideologies and identities as they grapple with new perspectives and multiple discourses and move toward new ways of acting and being. As teachers reframe who they are, their roles, and what they believe, they move toward ideological clarity. *Ideological clarity* is a process of recognizing the positive and negative aspects of all cultures (Expósito & Favela, 2003) and shedding assumptions of linguistic and cultural privileges.

Moving into Phase 3 of the generative learning model, teachers engage in hands-on, inquiry-based research or other thoughtful problem-solving activities and begin to internalize and develop generative thinking. Internalization (Vygotsky, 1978) is a higher intellectual progression of learning and involves the integration of new attitudes, values, and knowledge into one's own identity or sense of self. Finally, in the fourth and final phase, teachers combine theory, informed practices, and their students' needs to facilitate their own theory posing and generative thinking. In this phase, teachers gain a sense of efficacy (Bandura, 1997) or belief in their ability to be responsive and impact student learning.

Each of these components framed how we designed the course and how we analyzed the data. For example, during the program, the PSTs consistently reflected on their beliefs and compared their past educational experiences to their South African students' cultural and linguistic experiences. They were exposed to new perspectives and multiple discourses through interactions with community members, local teachers, and a variety learning opportunities (including course readings). They grappled with conflicting ideas and discussed new ways of acting and being. As they engaged in two inquiry projects on the local community and worked with students, the PSTs articulated what ideas, beliefs, and practices they used and which ones they struggled with. A year later, they reported how their learning shaped their local teaching. Generative learning theories allowed us to scaffold the program and analyze the data. We sought to uncover the PSTs' generative learning trajectories and explore how they built on or extended the instructional practices learned in the study abroad and community service learning project once in their

local teaching situations. We relied on narrative reflections, field notes, course assignments (during the program), and interviews (16 months after the program) to make the PSTs' thinking more visible and to reveal their generative learning of linguistically responsive teaching.

Research on International Immersion Programs

Some teacher educators may question the merit of international immersion programs and suggest they may reinforce deficit-based attitudes about language learners and privilege (Kulkarni & Hanley-Maxwell, 2015), yet a growing body of research has documented a range of learning opportunities for PSTs after participating in international experiences. Common findings across these studies include (a) changed dispositions and attitudes about language learners (Marx & Moss, 2011; Medina et al., 2015), (b) identity shifts that lead to a deepened interest in international teaching (Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Trent, 2011), (c) development of critical consciousness and awareness of privilege and societal inequities (Alfaro & Quezada, 2010; Kulkarni & Hanley-Maxwell, 2015), and (d) better understanding of the process of language learning (Addleman et al., 2014; DeVillar & Jiang, 2012; Hsiung, 2015). The questions of how and what PSTs are able to sustain what they learn while studying abroad and how they are able to implement new ideas are central tensions of this research.

Several studies have demonstrated that PSTs do indeed undergo changes in beliefs they hold regarding how they teach and the students with whom they interact. How PSTs grapple with cultural and linguistic challenges during their time abroad and how those challenges serve as catalysts for shifting beliefs was the focus of Marx and Moss's (2011) qualitative study with PSTs studying in Mexico. During the 3-week program, PSTs took Spanish language courses and worked in a Spanish classroom with students for several hours each day. During their time in Mexico, they experienced "cultural and language turbulence" (p. 519), in which they reported feeling vulnerable, embarrassed, and discriminated because of their lack of Spanish language abilities. Upon returning to the United States, the PSTs expressed a sense of empathy for the struggles language and cultural learners face each day and the unfairness of racial and language discrimination—a change of attitudes and beliefs developed while abroad. Similarly, Medina et al. (2015) examined PSTs' perceptions of "other" before and after participating in an 8-week study abroad course in Germany. Applying Mezirow's (1994) transformative theory and analyzing reflections, questionnaires, and group interviews, Medina et al. (2015) discovered that PSTs first expressed feelings of frustration and discomfort when interacting with German language learners but then developed dispositions of empathy and patience. After the program, most of the PSTs expressed the need to advocate for their future language learners and be more supportive of their experiences. These studies point to the importance of creating opportunities for PSTs to experience

both linguistic and cultural dissonance in order to shift beliefs about students and to reflect on how feelings of caring, empathy, and nonjudgement can be utilized in their future teaching. Furthermore, these studies demonstrated that PSTs take on key ideas of empathy, advocacy, and awareness based on their international experiences but not whether they implement sustained learning in their local contexts.

Beyond identifying PSTs' changing beliefs, several researchers explored how participating in international projects supports PSTs' understanding of themselves and their commitment to teaching. This relates not only to PSTs' knowledge of pedagogy and shifting attitudes but also to how PSTs perceive, contextualize, and recontextualize themselves as part of a learning transaction with diverse students. For instance, in their study of novice bilingual teachers participating in a short-term study abroad program in rural Mexico, Alfaro and Quezada (2010) discovered that PSTs shifted in their views of themselves from teachers as technicians to teachers as loving and caring human beings. This identity shift was not inconsequential, because it influenced how the PSTs designed curriculum and responded to the learning needs of their students. In Trent's (2011) study with eight PSTs from Hong Kong who spent six weeks in Australia learning how to teach English to primary-aged students, PSTs believed the international experience afforded them many opportunities to become "good language teachers" (p. 184) and influenced their confidence. While positive, many of the PSTs in Trent's study experienced an identity conflict and expressed tensions in naming their future identities as teachers beyond the international experience. They struggled with how to apply newly learned language teaching skills and knowledge in their home contexts. Transfer and implementation is possible, though not automatic. What PSTs learn from study abroad is multifaceted. Not only may students develop attitudes and actions but they may develop parts of the identities they hold as teachers. These studies showcased the claim that PSTs' identity work is an important learning process and can be enhanced by fieldwork with community members and critical reflection.

Identity shifts during and after an international experience can also shape one's critical consciousness into how the structures of school and society influence opportunities for language learning (Phillion, Malewski, Sharma, & Wang, 2009; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). This is an important part of understanding from a generative learning lens, as critical consciousness is part of ideological becoming (Bakhtin, 1986) and clarity. The PSTs in Alfaro and Quezada's (2010) study developed political and ideological clarity by "engaging in critical examination of the politics and ideologies that inform literacy practices across borders and questioned their assumptions and beliefs about teaching linguistically and culturally diverse students" (p. 56). Likewise, PSTs in Kulkarni and Hanley-Maxwell's (2015) research mentioned a deepened awareness of their own Whiteness and class privileges while student teaching in East Africa. Two of the PSTs came to better understand the historical nature of colonialism in East Africa and believed their experiences helped them grapple with feeling guilty about their race and social status. Two other PSTs maintained a deficit-based perspective about

people from nondominated backgrounds and positioned themselves as providers of hope and progress. Kulkarni and Hanley-Maxwell (2015) cautioned that international experiences can reinforce stereotypes and deficit-based perspectives if PSTs are not encouraged to critically examine previously held notions of education, inequities, and privilege. Not only did these studies demonstrate how shifts in identity may occur but also these authors discuss larger social implications of critical consciousness and ideological becoming when PSTs have the opportunity to address complex identity issues in an international setting where identity factors such as race and language are complicated.

International immersion experiences where PSTs have the opportunity to critically reflect on their identity and how it impacts their work with multilingual students plays an important role in PSTs' understanding of the process of language learning. For instance, studies that examined PSTs' understanding of language learning found that when PSTs are seen as linguistic outsiders—immersed in a second language while working with children—they develop a deep understanding of the process of second language learning (Addleman et al., 2014; DeVillar & Jiang, 2012; Hsiung, 2015). Hsiung (2015) described the impact of an international service learning project on a group of PSTs from Taiwan after spending 30 days in Kathmandu, Nepal, working with children and in-service teachers. Using English as the common language, PSTs taught computer courses, assessed local children's literacy skills, and worked alongside kindergarten teachers to develop curriculum and instructional activities based on local resources and materials over four weeks. The PSTs acknowledged the importance of working in a foreign language (English) and how they became aware of their own inadequacies and linguistic abilities, which allowed them to express a deeper understanding of the complex process of language learning. Furthermore, they believed the project reinforced the importance of using local and authentic resources for meaningful language instruction. Similarly, Addleman et al. (2014) investigated PSTs' transformative learning after participating in a short-term practicum in Austria and Ecuador. PSTs reported developing an understanding for and greater awareness of the emotional issues that language learners experience. However, they did not integrate new knowledge and skills in their teaching once they returned to the United States. Instead, the PSTs expressed a "resolve to reorient" future actions as classroom teachers with a specific desire to be more sensitive to the learning needs of their students (Addleman et al., 2014, p. 197). It is important to note that transfer of knowledge and skill based on international study abroad learning is not a simple transfer, nor is it guaranteed. This is where a study using generative learning theories may be particularly helpful. By paying attention not only to skills per se but also to the metacognitive awareness, ideological becoming, internalization, and efficacy of the PSTs, research may show more complex outcomes of study abroad.

All of these studies have contributed to an important body of research on the potential benefits of international experiences for future teachers but lack a longitudinal, generative perspective on PSTs' learning. The present study came about from our

desire not only to uncover PSTs' initial learning but also to explore how they made sense of and sustained their understanding of linguistically responsive teaching one year after participating in a combined study abroad and community service learning project. Thus we not only address what PSTs take away and implement in the short and long term but uncover a nuanced understanding of PSTs' changing knowledge and ideologies related specifically to linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy

Linguistically responsive teachers (Lucas & Villegas, 2013) have the knowledge and skills necessary for effective language instruction and reflect on their ideologies in relation to the sociopolitical and sociolinguistic dimensions of language learning. We designed this study abroad program with the goal of helping our PSTs develop the necessary knowledge and skills to become linguistically responsive teachers. Linguistically responsive knowledge and skills include the ability to provide *comprehensible input* (Krashen, 1982) that is both scaffolded and engaging. According to Walqui (2006), an individual learns another language when the instruction is understandable one step above the individual's current stage of linguistic ability. Such instruction is socially interactive and includes (a) providing visual tools, maps, and videos; (b) modifying written language by providing guides, key vocabulary words, and outlines of major concepts; (c) facilitating and encouraging students' use of their home language; (d) supplementing and modifying oral language; (e) engaging students in purposeful activities in which they collaborate with others; and (f) minimizing the potential for anxiety associated with being a language learner. Since the PSTs were both language outsiders to the community and learning how to teach English language learners, the PSTs' language learning experience was twofold: Their own experiences were scaffolded while they were also learning how to scaffold language learning for others.

Research (e.g., Walqui, 2006) has suggested that using scaffolded instruction with language learners helps them develop disciplinary knowledge, engage them in purposeful activities in which they have many opportunities to interact with others, and negotiate meaning with less stress and anxiety. Scaffolded instruction is a collaborative and interactive process (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) that helps a learner "solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal beyond his unassisted efforts" (p. 90). With time, there is a change in who is in control, with the child taking over the task individually. Scaffolding includes structure and process. Scaffolding structure describes certain activities or tools used to provide support. Process scaffolding includes the way instruction and interactions are carried out moment to moment. During our work in South Africa, we modeled how to build on students' language backgrounds, experiences, and linguistic abilities to provide structure and process scaffolding and encouraged our PSTs to design interactive instruction that effectively responded to their students' needs.

Ideology is another important component of becoming a linguistically responsive teacher. Linguistically responsive ideologies (Lucas & Villegas, 2013) describe how teachers understand the connections between language, culture, and identity and consider the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education. Much like culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995), linguistically responsive ideologies are additive and value the dynamic linguistic and cultural repertoires learners bring to the classroom. Teachers with a linguistically responsive ideology foster the evolving nature by which learners use language within and outside of schools and are aware of the sociopolitical issues associated with language learning. However, research has suggested that PSTs often grapple with contradictory discourses about language learning and sociopolitical issues (Alfaro & Quezada, 2010; Assaf & Dooley, 2006) before reaching a sense of ideological clarity. When they do not examine their own ideologies, PSTs, regardless of ethnic or linguistic background, tend to unconsciously and uncritically hold beliefs and attitudes (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001) about the existing social order that reflect mainstream ideologies and can be harmful to many students, especially language learners. The PSTs in this study read and discussed articles on sociopolitical issues such as the relationship between poverty, language, and literacy learning and read current research on language policies and practices specific to a South African context. They were encouraged to use what they learned during their study abroad and service learning projects and to reflect critically on what they struggled with. Knowing that the process of becoming a linguistically responsive teacher takes time, requires multiple opportunities to reflect on one's instructional decisions and students' learning, and changes across different spaces and time, we leaned on Ball's (2009) generative learning theories to understand how the PSTs moved forward in their learning during and after the program.

Methodology

Participants

Using purposeful sampling (Patton, 2005), this study was conducted with five PSTs who participated in a short-term study abroad and community service learning project on the Eastern Cape of South Africa. The participants were chosen because they articulated culturally and linguistically related tensions experienced throughout the program and were in active teaching situations 16 months after the program. For the study abroad, participants were enrolled as undergraduate students in the Early-Childhood to Grade 6 English as a Second Language (ESL) certification program at a large, public Hispanic-Serving Institution in the southwestern United States. Of the five female participants, two are Latina and three are White. All of the participants are in their early to mid-20s (all names are pseudonyms). Only one participant completed a course on multiculturalism prior to the program. See Table 1 for a description of participants.

Assaf is a White female professor in language and literacy education and has worked on a variety of international projects with in-service teachers and PSTs. She designed the study abroad and community service learning project detailed in this article. Assaf directed and taught the program and has worked closely with community members and teachers in South Africa for the past 5 years. Lussier is a White female college professor who joined the research to provide an outsider's perspective on the data analysis and course influence. Lopez is a White female professor who cotaught parts of the program and helped gather data.

Study Abroad and Community Service Learning

The study abroad started five years ago in collaboration with a nonprofit organization in South Africa committed to serving a rural Eastern Cape community by setting up school-based computer labs and providing volunteers to teach computer literacy skills in the schools. As part of the program, PSTs took one reading course and one curriculum and instruction course focused on culturally diverse literacy instruction with an emphasis on supporting language learners. The PSTs attended five class meetings in the United States before departing for their 3-week program in South Africa. Additionally, they attended 12 class meetings while living in South Africa. Course readings and assignments explored a range of cultural and educational issues in regard to language and literacy learning, policies, and practices in the United States and South Africa as well as isiXhosa language and cultural traditions. Among several different assignments, the PSTs developed an autobiographical writing portfolio and digital story reflecting their life experiences and cultural values to draw attention to the sociocultural aspects of their own learning as well as the learning of others. See Figure 1 for a description of assignments.

Two separate community service projects occurred during the 3-week program: a weeklong day camp focused on helping the South African students explore their future career options, and the computer literacy schools project focused on process

Table 1
Participants

Participant	Age (years)	Ethnicity/language	Teaching context
Mariana	21	Latina/bilingual	Preschool internship
Isabella	22	Latina/bilingual	Student teaching in secondary special education
Dominque	19	White/monolingual	Elementary student teaching
Heather	21	White/monolingual	First-year teacher, physical education
Beth	24	White/monolingual	First-year teacher, third-grade English as a second language

117

writing and inquiry. In both projects, South African students used iPads and laptop computers to create digital stories.

During the weeklong day camp (Geek Camp), primary- and secondary-aged students conducted an I-Search project (Macrorie, 1988) and designed a digital story. Twenty-two South African students between the ages of 10 and 18 years participated in the Geek Camp. The students researched and explored ways to achieve a personal dream (e.g., going to the university, becoming a lifeguard) or career option (e.g., environmental engineer, teacher, doctor), then created digital movies that described their learning and hopes for the future. In small groups, the PSTs helped their students complete a KWL graphic organizer that asked students to jot down what they *knew*

Figure 1
Course Assignments

Reading Reflections	Title of article/reading you responded to and date: (a) 1 paragraph that responds to the reading (b) 1 question (c) 1 golden line (d) 1 connection to service learning
Service Learning Tutoring and Lesson Plans	Monday–Friday you will work one-on-one and in small groups with South African children. Write daily lesson plans and reflections based on your work with the students. Lesson plans must include language learning strategies and modifications.
Writer's Notebook and Cultural Reflections	You will write every day. Once in South Africa, you will write 3–4 cultural reflections evaluating your responses and struggles with living in South Africa.
Personal Writing and Self-Reflection	You will write one autobiographical piece and use this piece to create your digital story. You will write a reflection.
Annotated Bibliography of South African Children's Literature and Mini Lesson	You will create an annotated bibliography of 8 South African children and/or young adult literature.
Digital Story	You will create a digital story highlighting personal and educational experiences and language learning in light of the historical, political, institutional, and cultural contexts.
Community Mapping	You will conduct a community mapping project.
ABC Project: Autobiography, Biography, and Cross-Case Analysis	You will interview another person in South Africa, analyze the interview, and then write a 2- to 3-page paper that highlights her/his educational trajectory in a thematic fashion and compares and contrasts your experiences with those of your interviewee.

about their topic, what they *wanted* to know, and what they *learned* in the end. The PST provided support with searching and reading on the internet and taking notes. They helped the students download images, take digital photos, and design their final digital stories with audio and narration. For more information on this project, see Assaf and Lussier (2019). Four community members were invited as guest speakers to talk to the students about their careers and educational paths.

During the school projects, PSTs were grouped into teams and assigned to local schools, where they worked with small groups of students for four hours, five days a week. They helped the South African students design inquiry-based projects and create digital stories on a variety of topics. Each day, the PSTs reflected on their daily teaching activities and collaborated with their group to plan for the next lesson. Assaf and Lopez led teaching teams at the different schools and helped the PSTs reflect on their interactions with students. We modeled and reflected on a variety of instructional strategies to scaffold language learners, such as using mother tongue written and oral language, minimizing anxiety by partnering students, creating safe spaces for learning, and engaging students in purposeful activities that built on their life experiences and linguistic abilities. We introduced theories and practices related to translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2011) and to leveraging students' communicative repertoires (Martinez, 2016), and we discussed how these theories connected to our practices during the service learning projects. All of the South African students spoke isiXhosa as their first language and English as an additional language. They were encouraged to code-switch and use their language of choice. PSTs received a 2-hour, informal lesson on isiXhosa, and local translators were available to support daily communication. The community service projects took place only during the time we lived and studied in the country.

Data Collection and Analysis

To understand the participants' generative learning over an extended period of time, we used a qualitative interpretive framework (Erickson, 1986). Interpretive methodologies honor participants' experiences as meaningful and historically valuable over other methods that seek to answer predetermined questions and phenomenon. Interpretive data collection and analysis allowed us to uncover and describe the participants' experiences as they emerged from encounters in the study abroad and community service projects. Primary sources of data included field notes from class discussions and service learning projects, participants' written reflections, lesson plans, and interviews. We conducted follow-up interviews 16 months after the program. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. During the interviews, we asked participants to read selected past reflections written in South Africa and to describe what they learned, what they thought changed in their understanding about language instruction, and how the program may have influenced their understanding of linguistically responsive teaching.

To protect the participants from vulnerability, and in line with Institutional Review Board requirements, Assaf and Lopez collected field notes during the study abroad program and service learning projects (July). Only after course assignments were evaluated and grades were assigned did we begin to analyze participants' reflections and collect all lesson-based artifacts. This procedure was explained to the participants, and all consented. Individual interviews were used to member-check by asking participants to explain more about their experiences in the study abroad program and about their reflections. In addition, Assaf and Lopez used their reflective journals as sources for data verification. Data analysis was ongoing and took place over several stages.

In the first stage of analysis, we used the constant-comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) by reading and rereading the data and identifying units of words or phrases related to linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Researchers coded independently. For discrepancies, we sought agreement by collectively revisiting the data, recalibrating our meaningful units, and refining codes as needed. We organized repeated phrases into categories and developed category titles for each set. To illustrate each category, we constructed analytic memos using participants' words as much as possible. Each category was reexamined, redefined, and combined with other similar categories until initial themes emerged (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In the second stage of analysis, we went back to the data to reexamine instances and evidence that illustrated generative learning, such as instances of metacognitive awareness, dialogic tensions, and examples of specific skills and knowledge used to scaffold students' language learning. We noted how and when the participants expressed contradictions in their language and how they articulated their learning as a tension that built from one context to another. We noted descriptions and reasons given by each participant, identifying how learning in South Africa related to current teaching and learning in the United States. We conducted member checks with the participants and amended our findings accordingly.

Findings

Language Barriers: "It Was Challenging . . ."

Many of the participants expressed feeling tension because they were not able to speak the same language as their South African students. All five participants described this tension as a "language barrier," and though each participant had her own phrasing, all believed it created many challenges and obstacles for communicating with and teaching the students. These language barriers caused the participants to question their ability to support their South African students' learning and nudged many of them to reflect on their personal experiences. Isabella felt exceptionally frustrated: "At first I felt very scared. Their faces looking at me.

I felt very defeated. They didn't open up and I didn't know how to communicate with them" (reflection). Similarly, during a class discussion, Dominque shared, "It was *very* hard to work with my learners who do not speak English. It is frustrating at times and you just want to spell it out for them. . . . So to try to talk to them and sit down next to them and have a conversation was hard."

For the first time, the participants were positioned as vulnerable language learners who started to question their own language privileges. They struggled to express themselves or to grasp words or phrases that somewhat resembled their own language experiences. Marianna, the only bilingual Spanish–English participant, articulated her surprise at feeling challenged by the language differences:

> When I am in a bilingual setting, I know what is going on because it is in Spanish a lot of the time. Being here [South Africa] was a very different experience. I got here knowing nothing, I never had that issue of not understanding [before], so it was kind of daunting in my mind to be somewhere where they spoke such a different language where there wasn't a single word you know. (reflection)

This theme highlights how the participants' beliefs were shifting as they reflected on their past experiences of being in the language majority group to being in the minority, where they felt discouraged and fearful, an attribute of metacognition and ideological becoming.

While feeling discouraged, the participants seemed initially to place the responsibility for the "language barrier" on their South African students by using phrases like "they couldn't speak English." Facing personal challenges and feeling uncomfortable are crucial to effective language teaching (Marx & Moss, 2011). However, we noticed a change in several of the participants' talk during their post-program interviews after they had returned to the United States. Beth and Isabelle used language that shifted the responsibility for not speaking the students' language onto themselves. Beth explained, "I didn't know how to speak isiXhosa. I feel bad because I couldn't communicate with them." Isabelle explained, "I learned the more you build connections with the students, the more they open up. Students have their own story and my job is to learn their story to build trust and to understand where they are coming from" (interview). This shift in language responsibility is important because it illustrates a movement from deficit to additive thinking as well as agency, in which the participants expressed a propensity or inclination to take action to do something differently to improve their instruction.

Reflecting on their experiences in South Africa, the participants described how their beliefs about language learning changed because they were placed in a position of not knowing – a position they felt was uncomfortable but valuable. For example, Marianna connected her struggle with the language barrier to her instructional practices as a Head Start preschool intern. She imagined the fear and intimidation a child might feel as a new English learner in the United States and how she would support that child. She explained in her follow-up interview,

> I'm imagining a little boy or girl coming to the U.S. from somewhere and every-
> one around them is understanding what is going on in the conversation except
> them and that must be such a scary and intimidating experience for them. So as
> a teacher it is important to see those kids and now I understand how it must feel
> to make them feel like part of the conversation even if they don't understand and
> find ways to make them feel included.

Marianna's need to "see those kids" and "make them feel part of the conversation" illustrates her emotional sensitivity or empathy toward language learners. At the same time, it illustrates Marianna's movement toward ideological becoming as she struggles with two competing discourses about language learners: "those kids" and "now I understand." She initially distances herself from the children, then connects on a personal level. Heather came to see the importance of understanding each student's life experiences and tuning in to their learning approaches to scaffold their language abilities. She shared, "I do still think it is a challenge [working with language learners] and every student is a different kind of learner so you have to kind of learn about them as well as how you will teach them" (interview). Heather's statement expressed her larger understanding of how identity and language are intertwined, which is an important goal for linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Research on language instruction strongly points to the importance of building on students' life experiences and identities (Norton, 2017), and the participants began to articulate these connections by becoming metacognitively aware of their learning experiences in South Africa and describing how they teach in their current situations. The experience of being a minority language speaker in an unfamiliar culture sensitized the participants to make special effort to connect with language learners in their own classrooms in the United States. They described how they changed their teaching strategies based on the knowledge they gained from working with the students in South Africa and their new roles as teachers in the United States. Yet, they maintained the idea that teaching language learners is difficult. For example, Beth described how her responsibilities as a third-grade ESL teacher caused her to be more concerned about preparing her students for the state-mandated test while building on their cultural and linguistic repertoires. She articulated,

> Now the reason I feel it is hard is because as a third-grade teacher, I know this is
> their first year that they are going to be STAAR tested [statewide high-stakes test]
> and that is hard because I want to make sure they get the best instruction possible
> regardless of language barriers while also learning about them, their stories, and
> their approaches to learning. (interview)

Beth's need to prepare her students for the state test illustrates a process of generative learning from building new knowledge based on her students' language needs along with testing expectations.

Trying Out Linguistic Strategies and Extending Understanding: "I Learned How to . . ."

Each of the participants reported learning and using multiple strategies in South Africa and explained how her understanding and use of these strategies grew to be more intentional after returning to her local situation. We describe how these linguistic strategies, first learned in South Africa and later reported as being used in the classroom, are examples of generative learning of linguistically responsive pedagogy, where the PST built on her personal and professional knowledge and made sense of the needs of her students to guide their instruction. As the participants worked directly with students in South Africa, they were forced to problem solve. This process involves internalizing and implementing new strategies and developing a sense of one's own abilities—important aspects of generative learning.

To analyze this theme, we created a chart identifying all the linguistic strategies the PSTs noted while in South Africa and the strategies they reported using in their local situations. We identified when each strategy was mentioned and how each PST discussed (written and verbal) her learning. We identified three kinds of strategies regularly noted: physical (body language, eye contact, visual cues, nonverbal gestures), affective (confidence, lowering anxiety), and cultural (deliberate attention to learning about students' lives). When the participants explained how they used what they learned in their local situations, they explained the purpose for these instructional strategies and their struggles. Some participants, such as Beth and Heather, reported using more strategies than others because of their full-time teaching positions and constant interactions with students. Marianne and Dominque used more tentative language to describe how they "tried" strategies in their student teaching semesters, moving toward internalization of their learning.

Physical strategies. All of the PSTs relied heavily on physical strategies (body language, eye contact, visual cues, and nonverbal gestures) while working with students in South Africa. For example, Mariana wrote, "I am not super aware of technical terms for teaching strategies but I have tried a lot of new things. Gestures and body language played a huge role in my experience here. They helped me get my point across to kids a lot more" (reflection). Marianne's explanation for using gestures and body language was focused on her need to communicate and how she used both scaffolding structures and processes to describe her teaching. However, once in the United States, Mariana described how she tried singing along with other physical strategies while working in a pre-K Head Start classroom because "if you sing things you remember them [words] much differently than when you just speak them . . . and it engages students more because they can grasp the language—they can get the gist of it more easily." For Marianna, singing was connected to her students' engagement and could be used to scaffold their comprehension of words while increasing their memory. This example illustrates how Marianna was both problem solving and being responsive to her students' key components to generative

learning. She appears to build on her initial knowledge of using physical gestures by explaining the purpose of other language strategies that specifically focus on her pre-K students' learning levels and interests.

Dominque reported how she initially used drawing and translation as scaffolding structure. "In South Africa I would draw a picture of a cow and write COW and then I would have a translator come in and write 'cow' in isiXhosa" (interview). Using an outside translator does not encourage independence or create problem-solving opportunities but instead positioned students and teachers as passive learners. One year later, while completing her student teaching internship in a Spanish dual-language classroom, Dominque reported how she shifted her instruction by layering additional literacy strategies along with a picture to support students' learning:

> But now, if I am teaching a student how to say "cow" we would do things like find context clues, like if they didn't know what "cow" was in English, we would use context clues. If they needed a vocab word we might find like a matching picture, or words like how we did the word sorts like words that are in the same category instead of being just like, here is a notecard with front and back, cow, cow whatever it would be in isiXhosa.

Dominque's intentional yet tentative use of context clues and sorting words alongside physical strategies illustrates the possibility of her expanded knowledge that language learners improve by using their native language and building on previous experiences. It also illustrates how Dominque considered using both process and structural scaffolding to support her students' learning.

Affective considerations. Throughout their work in South Africa, some of the PSTs created opportunities for their students to feel confident, comfortable, and engaged while working on their English writing and digital stories. These affective considerations were maintained once in the United States by three of the five participants. For example, Beth wrote that working with students during the Geek Camp and completing a KWL chart on their career dreams "definitely gave me perspective on how to motivate them, how to connect their interests with the work needed, how to get them to their end goal" (reflection). Later, Beth described, "I use that experience now. I ask kids what they know and what they are interested in and it really helps me get my students to get deep—to think about what motivates them" (interview). Beth referred to helping her current students "get deep" and take ownership of their learning in a way that is meaningful to their lives. Her explanation illustrates a growing understanding of the relationship between identity, culture, and language learning and how scaffolding students' learning can support their personal agency.

Unlike Beth, Dominque rarely considered a student's self-esteem or anxiety while working in South Africa and instead focused on correcting errors. "If a student said something wrong, like if he said, 'I chew water,' I would say, 'No.' Like I'd have to correct it and explain it right there" (reflection). Correcting errors can provide

immediate feedback, but it is a deficit practice that does not encourage students to use their linguistic resources, nor does it allow them to become independent. However, once in the United States, Dominque spoke differently about how she could support her students' language learning:

> Now, if they say "I chew water," I say, "Oh, OK, that's interesting, and what else do you chew?" And I let them make that mistake and go back later and say, I actually chew food, you know? And we would have more conversations in the time frame instead of simply correcting mistakes. (interview)

Dominque's explanation is important because it illustrates a slight but important change in how she describes a student's language abilities (from deficit to affirmative) and a progression toward generative learning. She shifted from only correcting a mistake to acknowledging her student's linguistic repertoire, moving to instruction that is more additive and intentional. Beth and Dominque represent the majority of participants who implemented affective strategies to support their students' language learning.

Learning about students' lives. Isabelle, Dominque, and Beth were the three participants who articulated the importance of building relationships with the students in South Africa. This experience taught them important lessons in how to connect with students' cultural and linguistic identities and be more responsive in their local situations. Beth wrote,

> Working with these students and getting to know their personal stories gave me a lot of perspective on different lifestyles and different things. Here their big thing is they like surfing. I didn't realize how important surfing is to these children. They were so interested in sharing and writing about their lives. (reflection)

In our follow-up interview, Beth recalled her foregoing reflection and described how it helped her realize the power of tapping into students' lives. She explained that as a new teacher in the United States, she felt pressured to focus on test prep and to help students read and write on grade level, in English. She realized that as her students became resistant, they didn't want to read passages and answer test questions. So she created a unit focused on her students' interests and activities outside of school. She recalled, "I forgot how important it is to know about students' lives and to allow them to share their lives in class." Beth negotiated the tensions between focusing on test prep and creating instruction that built on students' backgrounds, experiences, and interests. Similarly, Dominque described how talking with students in South Africa about their lives and building on their ideas to create their digital stories changed how she taught writing in the United States. Instead of relying on set questions or a narrow view of how to work with students, Dominque became more responsive to their individual experiences. She explained,

> And my students now during free write are like, I don't know what to write about. And I'm like, I don't know either, but let's talk. Let's have a conversation and let's

brainstorm. And I'm not giving them a list of, OK we will write about pets and your mom and your house. I just talk to them. And I feel like we did that in South Africa too where I'd be like, OK, what kind of things do you like, you like ice cream, OK what is your favorite flavor? . . . I did that in [South Africa] and I do that now here too. Instead of sitting with my kids and saying, we just read a book on Dia de Los Muertos let's write about that, I say, "Well, what traditions do you have in your family? Oh why do you do that? What do you like?" And then that gives them the motivation to write different things. It was the confidence. The relationship, the confidence of "Oh wow, this teacher cares about me. Somebody cares about me." That's been something I took from South Africa that I've been applying to teaching now. (interview)

Dominque's explanation illuminates how she was moving from teacher-centered instruction to a child-centered, responsive stance that encouraged conversations to build relationships. She explained how asking students about their lives not only supports their language and literacy learning but scaffolds their self-confidence and helps them feel cared for. These skills and knowledge are essential to becoming a linguistically responsive teacher. Heather did not report building on her students' lives while teaching in the United States. Her current position as a secondary physical education teacher with more than 150 students may impede her ability to tap into students' lives, or perhaps she has viewed the two experiences as unique.

Considering Identity: "I Want to Be a Teacher Who . . ."

In South Africa, and later in the United States, all of the participants consistently reflected on their identities as teachers, considering how their self-perceptions related to their experiences and subsequent goals. Initially, most described themselves as passionate, caring teachers who wanted to work with students from underresourced homes and communities. For Mariana, participating in the program helped her "feel very passionate about working with those kids who might come from more difficult backgrounds you know, less involved parents, and lower socioeconomic levels, you know . . . like kids who might have a harder time who don't have everything provided to them" (reflection). Others, such as Beth, explained how the program helped her become a globally minded teacher. Using South African children's lit-erature much like the assignment from the study abroad program in her classroom a year later gave Beth the opportunity to share different perspectives and cultural practices with her students. She felt responsible for helping her students expand their knowledge of the world. "Not all of the teachers have these kinds of stories and I get to give it to them. About what I did in South Africa. . . . They love to hear stories about it" (interview). Dominque talked about how her role shifted from one who teaches the curriculum to one who teaches the child:

So in South Africa I had that mind-set of you know, teaching isn't "get to know your students and be their mentor and role model and be there for them," it is "teach them the curriculum." And so actually being brought right into South Africa

and being like, OK ask them what their dreams are. . . . That is a personal subject and I don't know how to help them but like just being on that personal level with them immediately kind of shifted my mind-set from being like it doesn't really matter step by step how I teach them but how they get there and what they want to do and just tell me about yourself. (interview)

While considering their identities, only two participants articulated a consideration of the ideological and sociopolitical dimensions of language learning, such as inequities in resources, access to quality education, and issues around poverty. Beth discussed the importance of advocating for her students, valuing all of their experiences, and being a nonjudgmental teacher. She explained,

So when I have students who come to me and their parents don't have the resources to provide them books at home. Because of what I had seen as a more extreme situation and I see where the students come from and what the students used what they had at the time, it gives me more insight as to don't judge them. (interview)

Yet, Beth expressed discomfort when she overheard colleagues pass judgment and complain about students' economic struggles:

And I hear them [teachers] and they say things that student hasn't showered in four days and I am like maybe they just don't have . . . I think that being in South Africa and seeing some of the most extreme situations. Kids who have hand-me-down clothes from four siblings and seeing it from that point and yet those children are smiling. . . . It gave me a completely different perspective and I feel that I am more willing to be more understanding . . . than I would have been if I hadn't gone. (interview)

Beth's experiences in South Africa seemed to bleed into her work with students in her U.S. context, where she viewed her identity as an advocate and mentor empathetic to her students' struggles and aware of her own responsibility to support her students.

Similarly, Heather focused on poverty. She described, "A lot of my students at my school now are economically disadvantaged, so with my firsthand experience in South Africa, I can better understand and relate to their life struggles." She goes on to explain how she has "learned how to not judge a student because you never know what they are going through." While it is important that Heather is trying to honor her students' lives without pointing out deficits, she only does so superficially, with little to no regard for educational inequities or power disparities.

Discussion

Findings from this study describe PSTs' process of generative learning of linguistically responsive pedagogy 16 months after participating in a study abroad and community service learning project. Generative learning is an endless, back-and-forth progression (Ball, 2009) that changes between time and contexts. While we report on the PSTs' generative learning, we are aware that our findings illus-

trate a partial understanding of their ongoing learning as future teachers. Still, this study did parallel the literature in demonstrating variations of sustained knowledge transfer and implementation, identity shaping, and becoming critically conscious. The elements of the study abroad program, such as an international setting, service learning, and language and racial diversity, were crucial to the outcomes reported. In this section, we review findings that answer our research questions, (Q1) What do PSTs report learning after a study abroad and community service learning? and (Q2) What do PSTs report implementing one year after the study's completion?

The PSTs learned empathy for language learners (Addleman et al., 2014; Hsiung, 2015) and felt more responsible and responsive toward students' needs. Initially, they felt unprepared to deal with the language differences between themselves and their students and expressed frustration at not being able to understand and converse easily (Marx & Moss, 2011). Being positioned as a language other played a vital role in helping the PSTs shift from deficit to additive beliefs about language learners and extended their understanding of the complex process of language learning (Medina et al., 2015). Feeling marginalized was both uncomfortable and disconcerting, but these experiences eventually led to a deeper, sustained understanding of the complexities of language learning and cultural differences, 16 months after the program. In fact, most of the PSTs expressed metacognitive awareness of their specific challenges in South Africa and articulated how those experiences helped them gain greater understanding about their professional and personal responsibilities as language teachers. This metacognitive awareness (Ball, 2009) allowed them to prioritize the importance of building relationships with their students and connecting their instruction to students' lives. Many shifted from deficit perspectives, where lack of communication or success was blamed on students' language barriers, to approaches where they could appreciate students' identities and linguistic resources.

Most of the PSTs reported a growing understanding of linguistically responsive concepts, skills, and strategies during their time in South Africa. They used physical strategies, such as gestures, pictures, and singing, to provide comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982) and affective strategies to scaffold their students' self-confidence, engagement, and motivation. They noted the importance of using affective strategies that showed students that they valued their identities and rich cultural and linguistic experiences (Alfaro & Quezada, 2010). Initially, the PSTs used many of these linguistic strategies somewhat unknowingly—mostly because their professors suggested them. Once back in their local contexts, the PSTs showed a continued desire to implement what they had learned.

They reported implementing these same strategies in the United States more purposefully and intentionally based on their students' needs and their deeper understanding of language learning, demonstrating how the PSTs started to integrate knowledge they learned in the program with understandings they gained from their students in the United States. For example, Beth relied on physical strategies in South Africa but added more literacy instruction and assessment while working with her

third-grade students in United States. Similarly, Dominque described adding word sorts, context clues, and shared writing instruction with her dual-language students in the United States. Both described how providing additional literacy scaffolds enhanced their students' understanding and engagement. Unlike in Addleman et al. (2014), where PSTs only expressed a "resolve to reorient" (p. 197) their future actions as classroom teachers, the PSTs in this study provided specific examples of how they were attempting to intentionally implement a repertoire of knowledge and skills related to linguistically responsive teaching with their U.S. students.

When discussing the use of affective strategies in their local situations, the PSTs expressed a nuanced understanding of the challenges many students face when learning English in a U.S. school setting (Medina et al., 2015). Much like their shifting understanding of linguistic strategies, their growing insight into how it feels to be a language learner in the United States and be part of a marginalized group demonstrates how the PSTs were moving toward ideological clarity (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001). For instance, when Marianna initially described newly immigrated children as "those kids" and in the same sentence stated "I understand how it must feel," she demonstrated a discursive tension typical in the process of ideological clarity (Author, 2006), illustrating the ongoing process of generative learning.

As the PSTs critically reflected on their beliefs and identities as future teachers (Trent, 2011), they articulated their passion for wanting to work with students from underresourced communities and for being inquiry-minded, nonjudgemental teachers who honored students' cultural backgrounds (Addleman et al., 2014). Dominque saw her role as a teacher shift from one who teaches the curriculum to one who instructs students by tapping into their personal stories and understanding who they are as individuals. Beth believed that working in South Africa provided her positive experiences to be more culturally sensitive and globally minded, thus enabling her to use literature, writing, and other multimodal activities to help students explore a variety of perspectives from around the world. Working with students provided opportunities for the PSTs to consider what they were learning and who they wanted to become as teachers.

Linguistically responsive teachers not only value the dynamic language and cultural backgrounds of their students but also are aware of the sociopolitical issues (Lucas & Villegas, 2013) associated with language learning. Three of the PSTs expressed a deeper understanding of the sociopolitical issues involved in language instruction, such as educational access, poverty, and their own privileges (Kulkarni & Hanley-Maxwell, 2015), when reflecting on their teaching experiences in South Africa and locally. Mariana made direct connections between her learning in South Africa with teaching students in the United States who may have immigrated there. She connected helping students break the cycle of poverty and underachievement by providing responsive language instruction that acknowledges students' cultural experiences and personal dreams. Similarly, Beth explained that teaching in South Africa provided her with the opportunity to have "more insight to not judge students"

and to develop "a completely different perspective and a willingness to be more understanding." While the PSTs showed a nascent understanding of the sociopolitical nature of language learning and teaching, we expected them to critically reflect more on such issues and relate them to their local contexts. We wonder if the lack of attention to issues of power, equity, and access in the PSTs' local situations and the intense instructional demands they experienced as new teachers contribute to this finding. We also recognize that learning to teach is a very complex issue, made more complex when you take into account the diverse populations and types of student needs we must prepare teachers for (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). We believe it is important to measure PSTs' generative learning through a continuum. The PSTs were "transitioning teachers" (Ball, 2009, p. 53) who drew

Table 2
Aligning Phases of Generative Learning

Concepts in Ball's generative learning	*Phases in generative learning*	*Findings*
Metacognitive awareness	Reflection and awakening	PST developed repertoire of strategies to scaffold language learners.
		Linguistic strategies became more intentional and purposeful based on students' needs in United States.
Ideological becoming	Introspection and agency	Reflection on linguistic other shaped empathy and understanding of process of language learning.
		Reflection on language barriers shifted from deficit beliefs to additive beliefs about students.
		Grappling with competing ideas about language learners and beginning to consider sociopolitical issues.
Internalization	Critique and advocacy	Application of linguistic skills and strategies and expressing more responsibility and commitment to teaching language learners.
		Developing caring relationships with students.
Efficacy	Voice and efficacy	Continued learning one year after international experience.
		Evidence of problem solving and using modified strategies based on students' needs in the United States.

on the instructional approaches used in their course work and experiences in South Africa when planning their own teaching in the United States. They were able to articulate their generativity and emerging senses of who they were as teachers, who they were becoming by reflecting on what they learned in the course work and service learning in South Africa, how that integrated with their course work, and how it was manifested in their local teaching situations. Table 2 is a chart that aligns the phases of generative learning to the findings from our study.

Conclusion

Generative learning theories provided a framework to understand how the PSTs shifted in their approaches to and beliefs about linguistically responsive teaching and adds to extant literature on the impact of study abroad and community service learning on PSTs. In the short and long term, the findings demonstrate that PSTs were able to sustain and implement some of what they learned. Course and service learning reflections as well as postprogram interviews enabled the PSTs to reflect on their experiences and become more aware of their own thinking and learning processes. Furthermore, the generative learning framework allowed a lens to understand what the PSTs gained beyond knowledge and skill. This level of metacognitive awareness enabled the PSTs to reconsider the instructional practices used in South Africa alongside their current practices in their local situations. As the PSTs reflected on these experiences, they became more attuned to their students' needs locally and to how their instruction needed to be more responsive—thus becoming more intentional and purposeful in their teaching. As the PSTs experienced cultural and linguistic dissonance (Marx & Moss, 2011) and were challenged by experiences of teaching in an international context, they considered multiple solutions to ease their frustrations and better communicate with and instruct their South African students. By reflecting on these challenges, the PSTs were able to reconsider their beliefs about their responsibilities as teachers—moving into ideological clarity—and the importance of nurturing caring relationships with students.

Unlike other studies on PSTs' experiences after participating in an international experience, we described PSTs' reported learning while working directly with students in South Africa and working with students 1 year later in their local teaching contexts. Study abroad course work alone would not have provided the PSTs with opportunities to solve real instructional problems and grapple with ways to best support their students' linguistic needs. The longitudinal and sustained nature of this study allowed us to tap into how PSTs applied learning in new contexts and illustrate how PSTs used a repertoire of skills and strategies to support language learners that honored their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and scaffolded their individual needs. Thus the research provides the field with a deeper scope of the purposes and benefits of study abroad and community service learning for PSTs. Whether in skills or ideological development, the PSTs gained various types of new tools to better

prepare them for careers working with diverse populations, at home or abroad. To prepare future teachers to effectively and productively support language learners and help them sustain their learning well beyond their first years of teaching, we believe teacher educators should make a commitment to including instructional-focused service learning opportunities for PSTs studying abroad. Working with linguistically diverse students in an international setting with a community of peers and teacher educators can provide numerous opportunities to reflect on the tensions and shifts in one's learning—including ideology and identity as a future teacher.

References

Addleman, B., Nava, R., Cevallos, T., Brazo, C. J., & Dixon, K. (2014). Preparing teacher candidates to serve students from diverse backgrounds: Triggering transformative learning through short-term cultural immersion. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 43*, 189–200.

Alfaro, C., & Quezada, R. L. (2010). International teacher professional development: Teacher reflections of authentic teaching and learning experiences. *Teaching Education, 21*(1), 47–59.

Assaf, L. C., & Dooley, C. M. (2006). "Everything they were giving us created tension": Creating and managing tension in a graduate level multicultural course focused on literacy methods. *Multicultural Education, 14*(2), 42–49.

Assaf, L. C., & Lopez, M. (2015). Generative learning on a service learning project and field-based teacher education program: Learning to become culturally responsive teachers. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 64*, 323–338.

Assaf, L. C., & Lussier, K, (2019). Dream camp: Drawing on community cultural wealth capital to make sense of career dreams. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1569020

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Ball, A. F. (2009). Toward a theory of generative change in culturally and linguistically complex classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*, 45–72.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. W. Freeman.

Bartolomé, L., & Balderrama, M. (2001). The need for educators with political and ideological clarity. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. Halcon (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 48–64). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal, 95*, 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

DeVillar, R. A., & Jiang, B. (2012). From student teaching abroad to teaching in the U.S. classroom: Effects on global experiences on local instructional practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 39*(2), 7–24.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods of in research in teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119–161). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Expósito, S., & Favela, A. (2003). Reflective voices: Valuing immigrant students and teaching with ideological clarity. *Urban Review, 35*(1), 73–91.

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*, 273–289.

Hauerwas, L. B., Skawinski, S. F., & Ryan, L. B. (2017). The longitudinal impact of teaching abroad: An analysis of intercultural development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 202–213.

Hsiung, T. H. (2015). Learning through service: Preservice teachers' reflections from an international service learning. *New Waves Educational Research and Development, 18*(1), 52–63.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Kulkarni, S. S., & Hanley-Maxwell, C. (2015). Preservice teachers' student teaching experiences in East Africa. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 42*(4), 59–81.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 465–491.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London, UK: Sage.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice, 52*, 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770327

Macrorie, K. (1988). *The I-Search paper* (Rev. Ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Martinez, D. C. (2016). Emerging critical meta-awareness among Black and Latina/o youth during corrective feedback practices in urban English language arts classrooms. *Urban Education, 52*(5). https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915623345

Marx, H., & Moss, D. M. (2011). Please mind the culture gap: Intercultural development during a teacher education study abroad program. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(1), 35–47.

Medina, A. L., Hathaway, J. I., & Pilonieta, P. (2015). How preservice teachers' study abroad experiences lead to changes in their perceptions of English language learners. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 25*, 73–91.

Mezirow, J. (1994). Understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly, 44*, 222–232.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *English language learners in public schools*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

Norton, B. (2017). Learner investment and language teacher identity. In *Reflections on language teacher identity* (pp. 80–86). New York, NY: Routledge.

Patton, M. Q. (2005). Qualitative research. In B. S. Everitt & D. C. Howell (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science* (pp. 2–20). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013192.bsa514

Pence, H. M., & Macgillivray, I. K. (2008). The impact of an international field experience on preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 14–25.

Phillion, J., Malewski, E. L., Sharma, S., & Wang, Y. (2009). Reimagining the curriculum: Future teachers and study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18*, 323–339.

Trent, J. (2011). Learning, teaching, and constructing identities: ESL pre-service teacher experiences during a short-term international experience programme. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 31*, 177–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2011.566997

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*, 159–180.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100.