



The Reading Matrix © 2010
Volume 10, Number 1, April 2010

Student Attitudes Toward Bilingualism in a Dual Immersion Program

Linda Gerena

City University of New York, York College

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess students' attitudes toward several aspects of bilingualism within the context of a dual immersion program. Attitudes toward perceived competencies in reading in two languages, along with the social and personal values of literacy in each language (English and Spanish), and the personal and social value of bilingualism were measured by a survey and analyzed for similarities and differences in beliefs in eight categories. Findings reveal students' attitudes toward the social and personal values of literacy in both languages. Responses were analyzed by grade level, language group, and language group/grade level. When responses to specific questions were analyzed by grade level, a developing trend among students was noted.

INTRODUCTION

The historic Supreme Court Case of *Lau vs. Nichols* (1974) ushered in a period of educational reform to address the linguistic needs of English Language Learners across the nation. As a result of that decision, many bilingual program models were implemented over the years (Garcia & Baker, 2007; Baker, 2006; Crawford, 1999). One popular model is known as the dual immersion bilingual program (Lesso-Hurley, 2008). A dual immersion bilingual program is defined as a program which integrates language minority speakers (also referred to as Limited English or English Language Learners) with language majority speakers (also referred to as native English speakers), and provides instruction in and through both languages: one participant is acquiring English and the other participant (usually a native English speaker) is acquiring a second language. While there are programs in at least ten languages, the overall majority of dual immersion programs are in Spanish (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2007; Christian, 2006; Cloud, Genessee, & Hamayan, 2000; Lindholm, 1990). One of the key goals of a dual immersion bilingual program is literacy in both languages (Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

The purpose of this study was to assess children's perceptions of their own bilingualism in a dual immersion bilingual program. This research study examined students' attitudes toward literacy in two languages in a dual immersion bilingual program, by measuring students' attitudes relating to (1) personal values of English and Spanish literacy, (2) perceived

competence in English and Spanish literacy, (3) perceived social values of English and Spanish literacy, and (4) perceived personal and social values of biliteracy. By understanding children's attitudes, the researcher hopes to shape a curriculum and learning environment to promote biliteracy and counter hegemonic forces that tend to devalue other languages.

BILITERACY: WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT IS DESIRABLE?

Biliteracy, as defined by Pérez and Torres-Guzmán, (2002) is “the acquisition and learning of the decoding and encoding of and around print using two linguistic and cultural systems in order to convey messages in a variety of contexts” (p. 60). Hornberger (1990) states that biliteracy is “any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in or around written material” (p. 213). When students begin to develop literacy in their second language, the process is essentially the same as developing literacy in the first language. They use their previous background knowledge, along with reading strategies such as print awareness, sound/symbol relationships, word order, grammar, and contextual clues, to interpret and construct meaning.

If the students are literate in their first language, they bring sophisticated literacy knowledge of print as a systematic code that carries meaning to the task of literacy in the second language (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). Skills that transfer include sensory motor skills (spatial, directional, eye-hand coordination), orthographic skills (alphabet systems and punctuation use), language structure awareness (phonological and phonemic awareness), auditory skills (auditory perception and memory), comprehension strategies (predicting, inferring, main idea, using the cueing systems), study skills (note taking, information retrieval), habits and attitudes toward literacy (Riches & Genesee, 2007; Genesee & Riches, 2007; Brisk & Harrington, 2007; Reyes, 2001; Cloud et.al., 2000; Hakuta, 1990; Collier, 1987, 1995). Calero-Breckheimer and Goetz (1993) studied transfer of skills, strategies and concepts from the first language to the second language and their findings suggest that transfer strategies include those of scanning, skimming, contextual analysis, use of cueing (semantic, syntactic, graphophonetic) systems, skipping unknown words, tolerance for ambiguity, reading for meaning, making inferences, monitoring, using text structure, drawing on previous learning, and using background knowledge.

This means that the literacy skills a child learns in his/her primary language can be transferred to the second language. The ability to transfer is linked to metalinguistic skills that are developed in bilingual/biliterate abilities (Butler & Hakuta, 2004; Bialystock, 2004; Hakuta, 1990; Lambert, 1990). Primary language instruction does not teach only the surface language skills. Deep linguistic and conceptual proficiencies that are developed in a primary language are related to the development of literacy in any subsequent languages. Cummins (1994) states that, “although the surface aspects (e.g. pronunciation, fluency) of different languages are clearly separate, there is an underlying cognitive academic proficiency’ which is common across languages” (p. 19). It is this “common underlying principle” (Cummins, 1994) that states that there is a common storage space for knowledge and that knowledge learned in one language is transferred to a second language. These ‘underlying’ proficiencies make the transfer of cognitive and academic literacy related skills across languages possible.

In a review of studies on ELLs and academic achievement, Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian (2005) state that, “bilingual proficiency and biliteracy are positively related to academic achievement in both languages” and that there are “significant positive correlations between Spanish reading and English reading” (p. 376).

Dual Immersion Education

Dual immersion (two-way bilingual) programs have been referred to as foreign language immersion programs for language majority speakers (Ovando, Combs, & Collier, 2006). In other literature from Lindholm and Fairchild (1988), dual immersion is defined as a program which “combines bilingual education instruction for language minority students and second language immersion for language majority students” (p. 1).

Dual immersion programs are enrichment, additive bilingual programs (Lindholm-Leary, 2005a). Additive bilingual programs are those that add a second language at no cost to the first language (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007). Dual immersion programs are further defined as programs which integrate linguistically diverse English language learners (in the U.S.) with native English speaking students and where instruction is provided in and through the two languages and cultures (Christian, 2006). In these programs, English language learners and native English speakers are integrated and instruction is provided in and through two languages. Dual Immersion programs are often referred to as the best model for language maintenance for English language learners and second language immersion for native English speakers (Howard et. al., 2007).

Research findings in a longitudinal research study on school effectiveness for English language learners by Thomas and Collier (1997, 2002) confirmed that dual immersion programs offer the best of language maintenance for English language learners and second language acquisition for native English speaking students, and discovered consistent patterns across school districts that are generalizable beyond individual school contexts. Thomas and Collier (2002) conclude that “only students who have received strong cognitive and academic development through their first language for many years (at least through grade 5 or 6) as well as through the second language are doing well in school as they reach the last high school years” (p. 2).

As dual immersion has gained in popularity, researchers have developed a wide array of evaluation and assessment instruments to measure student progress (Lindholm-Leary & Hargett, 2006). Assessment studies of dual immersion programs have shown consistent academic gains and success for both language groups in both languages, across all language domains (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and across curriculum areas, especially in high school math (Lindholm-Leary, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, Hardman, & Meyer 2007; Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2005b; Genesee et.al., 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2005; Howard, Christian, & Genesee 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Lindholm & Molina, 2000). Trends in dual immersion research show high achievement of literacy in both languages (biliteracy) as well as cross cultural competencies for students participating in well established dual immersion programs (Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; Bikle, Billings, & Hakuta, 2004; Lindholm, 1996).

Hegemonic Forces at Work

Despite the continuing and growing need to provide linguistically and culturally diverse students with an equitable and comprehensible education, and the availability of research that indicates that maintaining academic competence in the native language leads to academic success, hegemonic forces continue to erode at the support base for literacy instruction in languages other than English. The word *hegemonic* is derived from the work of Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci (1971) and is used to express how certain groups dominate others (as cited in

Leonard, 1993). It is usually the uncritical, often unconscious, way people perceive their reality, anchored in fallacies, misconceptions, and erroneous assumptions. An example of hegemony in current educational practice is leading English learners to believe that only literacy in English is valuable (Diaz-Rico, 2004). This belief goes on to serve the purposes and values of the English speaking community. Hegemonic ideas become part of a collective ‘common sense’ that is difficult to oppose. Crawford (1997) states that the most common fallacies and misconceptions about bilingual education continue to be embraced in mainstream thinking. It is important to note that, while hegemonic fallacies can be disputed, they still enjoy much favorable public opinion and sentiment.

In a study by Griego-Jones (1994), student attitudes that affect literacy in the context of two-way programs were examined. Although the program’s goal was biliteracy and equality of status for the two languages, the results pointed to English as the ultimately preferred language among all students, both English and Spanish dominant. Hegemonic forces outside the classroom were considered factors that inhibited positive attitudes toward bilingualism and biliteracy. These hegemonic forces are often referred to as the “hidden curriculum” (McCullum, 1999) of schools. They include the implicit messages, objectives, routines, ideas and agendas of the socially and politically dominant groups. They are the conventions of behavior and knowledge that are valued by those in power (Jay, 2003).

Measuring Student Attitudes and Literacy

In order to measure children’s attitudes toward biliteracy in the context of a two-way bilingual program, a reliable and valid tool was needed. A review of the literature related to measuring attitudes toward reading provided a background of information and samples of instruments that have been used successfully in other studies. Lindholm-Leary (2003) and Lindholm-Leary and Ferrante (2003, 2005) document how student attitudes affect academic success and learning. Lindholm-Leary, Hargett, and Lambert (2007) provide an extensive kit of assessment rationales, along with data collection, management, and analysis tools. Specific guidelines for assessment include consistency in data collection in both languages and analysis that is interpreted with accuracy (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). McKenna and Kear (1990) developed a public domain Likert scale attitude survey to measure elementary children’s attitudes toward reading. They suggested an even number of interval scale points and the use of a child-friendly figure to represent choices. There were a total of twenty questions, divided equally between two sections: recreational reading and academic reading.

Lindholm (1993) produced a reading attitude questionnaire specifically for students participating in two-way bilingual programs. The questionnaire contained ten questions and used a three-point ordinal scale. This student reading attitude scale was a developmentally appropriate instrument that asked students about their reading ability as well as their love for books and reading.

Cazabon, Lambert, and Hall (1993) developed a scale to measure student attitudes toward bilingualism and biculturalism and self-assessment of academic competence. Attitude scales reflected students’ views on the social value of bilingualism, students’ personal values of bilingualism, students’ habitual usage of both languages, and students’ perceived competence of their academic abilities and achievements.

These existing questionnaires and surveys served as the theoretical models for the survey developed for this study. However, although these were used as models, and there was some

literature on students' attitudes toward dual immersion programs and their outcomes, it became apparent during the planning stages of this project that there were not many published studies on the topic of students' attitudes toward biliteracy at the elementary level or in dual immersion settings. Therefore, this study is of great interest and importance to those in the field of biliteracy and dual immersion education. Follow up studies will build on this contribution and will add to the body of knowledge available for all who are interested in this topic.

PROJECT POPULATION

The school, located in a suburban school district outside a large urban center, was in a district with nineteen K-8 schools. There were 916 students in this school. Approximately 45% of the students received free or reduced lunch, thus reflecting the low socio-economic standing of almost half the students at this site. Approximately 40% of the students were English Language Learners (ELLs).

The dual immersion program began with one class at the first grade level. At the time of this study there were two classes participating in the program, the initial one at first grade and one at second grade. Both the first and second grade classes consisted of 18 students each, with an approximate 50/50 breakdown of students' primary or dominant (in the case of bilingual students) language. Of the 36 students enrolled in the program, 33 first and second grade children participated in this research study. Of the total participants, 55% of the children (n=18) were Spanish dominant and 45% of students (n=15) were English dominant. There were 18 second grade students and 15 first grade students in this study.

The 33 children who participated in this study had many similarities in their school experiences. All lived in the immediate neighborhood of the school and came from similar socioeconomic backgrounds. All had entered the school in Kindergarten; thus, the second grade cohort was completing its third year at the school and the first grade cohort was completing its second year at the school. All students were placed in the program voluntarily by their parents, all of whom were supporters of dual immersion and biliteracy. All students knew that they were in a program that was distinct from the mainstream classrooms.

The teachers who participated in this study were experienced dual immersion teachers. The teacher at the first grade level was a native Spanish speaker who had three years experience in dual immersion. The teacher at the second grade level was a native English speaker with over ten years of teaching in a dual immersion setting. Both teachers were staunch advocates of literacy in both languages and followed the model time and separation of languages. However, the second grade teacher did not have the same intimate relationship with the home culture of Spanish speaking parents as the first grade teacher. Although she was bilingual, her dominant language was English, whereas the first grade teacher was a balanced bilingual.

METHODOLOGY

The survey was administered to a total of 33 students in grades one and two. The survey was first tested for internal reliability and then to analyze students' responses. Student responses were then analyzed as a total score, and again as eight separate sections: Personal Value of Spanish; Personal Value of English; Perceived Competence in Spanish; Perceived Competency

in English; Social Value of Spanish; Social Value of English; Personal Value of Biliteracy; Social Value of Biliteracy.

Dominant language and grade levels were used as independent variables for statistical analysis of responses. Statistical analysis of student's responses based on the dominant language and grade level was accomplished using ANOVA analyses of variance, with experimental sums of squares, at significance levels of .05.

Instrument

The instrument was written based on a previously validated survey of measuring attitudes toward reading (McKenna & Kear, 1990), and an attitude survey of students participating in a dual immersion bilingual program (Lindholm, 1993). Organization of the eight sections was based on Cazabon's (1993) progress report of the Amigos Project in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The survey was reviewed by professionals in the field of bilingual education and was revised several times, until the final forms were determined (see Appendices A and B).

The finalized instrument used in this project was a 26 item attitude scale of students' attitudes toward literacy in two languages, Spanish and English (Appendices A and B). The instrument used a four-point Likert scale using a range of faces to indicate the following attitudes: Very Happy, Happy, Not Sure, Unhappy. The values attached to the faces were: Very Happy =4, Happy =3, Not Sure =2, Unhappy=1. The survey was organized into eight sections:

1.	Personal Value of Spanish (PVS)	4 items	# 1, 9, 11, 25
2.	Personal Value of English (PVE)	4 items	# 2, 10, 12, 26
3.	Perceived Competence in Spanish (PCS)	3 items	# 3, 7, 13
4.	Perceived Competency in English (PCE)	3 items	# 4, 8, 14
5.	Social Value of Spanish (SVS)	4 items	# 5, 15, 18, 21
6.	Social Value of English (SVE)	4 items	# 6, 16, 19, 22
7.	Personal Value of Biliteracy (PVB)	2 items	# 17, 24
8.	Social Value of Biliteracy (SVB)	2 items	# 20, 23

As suggested by the research (McKenna & Kear, 1990), the survey was constructed with an even number of scale points to avoid a neutral, central category that allows respondents to avoid committing to a clear opinion. Items were written in a parallel fashion, always beginning with the attitudes toward Spanish first. Since the objective of this study was to know how students feel toward each item in both languages, each attitude is asked for both English and Spanish. There are approximately thirteen attitudes investigated in this survey, organized around the previously stated eight topics. By asking them for both English and Spanish, the number of items doubled to twenty-six.

This instrument was validated for internal consistency and reliability, as well as for content validity. It was found to have a .85 overall Alpha, with a .84 split half when adjusted with the Spearman Brown (sb) prophecy formula.

Content validity was provided by several experts in the field of bilingual education. The Spanish translation was reviewed by a native speaker of the language. The survey as a whole was thoroughly reviewed and revised by experts in the field of bilingual education.

Procedures

Surveys were administered at the end of the school year to children in their dominant language and administered in small groups not exceeding five children from the same grade level and language group. At the beginning of survey administration, the meanings of the ‘faces’ were discussed and how they related to the questions.

Realizing that first and second graders may not have the reading capacity to complete the survey independently, and that twenty-six items can seem daunting, each item was read to all children. Students were encouraged to think and reflect on their responses, and sufficient time was allowed for them to respond.

Statistical Analysis

Responses to the survey statements (#1-26) were scored first hand by the researcher to determine the Likert score (1-4) for each response. The data was then entered into an SPSS statistical program. Statistical analyses of dependent variables (responses) and independent variables (language and grade level) were conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the students’ attitudes toward biliteracy.

Totals of the responses by the 33 students on the entire survey (Items 1-26) as well as totals of the eight sections of the survey and each individual question was separately entered as a dependent variable and analyzed using an ANOVA analysis of variance at the .05 level using experimental sums of squares, with grade and language entered separately as independent variables. A two-way ANOVA analysis of variance by language/grade was also conducted at the .05 level using experimental sums of squares. Analyses then were as follows:

Figure 1. Analysis of Responses

	Total Survey	Total PVS	Total PVE	Total PCS	Total PCE	Total SVS	Total SVE	Total PVB	Total SVB	Ques. 1-26
Language	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Grade	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lang by Grade	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX

X = One Way ANOVA statistical analysis

XX = Two way ANOVA statistical analysis

RESULTS

Overall, there were no significant differences in the survey responses when analyzed as a whole. When the total responses to the survey (responses to Items 1-26 collectively) were analyzed using the ANOVA analyses of variance with experimental sums of squares at significance levels of .05., there were no significant differences based on grade, language, or grade/language combined. The results were positive in that there were no major differences between grade levels or language groups when the survey was analyzed as a whole. On the surface, it appears that the students all had positive attitudes toward their personal and social values of Spanish, English, and biliteracy skills and had a positive self image of their competence in both languages.

However, when responses were broken down into the eight sections, statistically significant differences in responses were found when analyzed by language, grade level, and a combination of language/grade. Of the eight sections of the survey, two indicated significant differences by language, grade, or both: the social value of Spanish and the personal value of English. Results from these two sections are analyzed below.

Each item was also individually analyzed based on language, grade, or a combination of both. Of the twenty-six individual items, ten indicated a significant difference of attitudes by language (3 items), grade (5 items), or both language/grade (2 items). Sections will be reported first, followed by individual items.

Analysis of Sections

In analyzing children's attitudes toward biliteracy, some interesting patterns were revealed. The sections *Social Value of Spanish by Grade Level*, *Social Value Spanish by Language/Grade*, and *Personal Value English by Language* were found to have results with statistically significant differences when analyzed by language, grade, or language/grade. Tables 1-3 present the data in each of the three sections. All boldface narrative text corresponds to boldfaced results in Tables 1-13.

<p><i>Social Value of Spanish (SVS) by Grade Level</i></p> <p>The questions included in this section measured students' overall attitudes toward the social value of Spanish. The results of this section, when analyzed grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. Second grade children had a significantly lower mean score on their overall attitudes toward the social value of Spanish than first grade students as shown in Table 1.</p>	<p>Table 1. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA, SVS by Grade</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="935 1003 1333 1220"> <tr> <td>Grade 1</td> <td>15.60 (15)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 2</td> <td>13.67 (18)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>14.55 (33)</td> </tr> </table> <p>F= 7.67 Sig. of F= .009 p < .05</p>	Grade 1	15.60 (15)	Grade 2	13.67 (18)	Total	14.55 (33)			
Grade 1	15.60 (15)									
Grade 2	13.67 (18)									
Total	14.55 (33)									
<p><i>Social Value Spanish (SVS) by Language/Grade</i></p> <p>Additionally, when this section was analyzed using a two-way ANOVA by language/ grade level, a statistically significant difference of opinion resulted. Spanish dominant children in grade two had a significantly less favorable perception of the social value of Spanish than all other participants in the study as shown in Table 2.</p>	<p>Table 2. Cell Means and Numbers for Two-Way ANOVA, SVS by Language/Grade</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="854 1444 1390 1640"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Grade 1</td> <td>Grade 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spanish Dominant</td> <td>15.57 (7)</td> <td>13.27 (11)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Dominant</td> <td>15.63 (8)</td> <td>14.29 (7)</td> </tr> </table> <p>F= 6.682 Sig. of F= .015 p < .05</p>		Grade 1	Grade 2	Spanish Dominant	15.57 (7)	13.27 (11)	English Dominant	15.63 (8)	14.29 (7)
	Grade 1	Grade 2								
Spanish Dominant	15.57 (7)	13.27 (11)								
English Dominant	15.63 (8)	14.29 (7)								

Personal Value English (PVE) by Language

This section measured students' overall perception of the personal value of English. The results of this section, when analyzed individually by language, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **English dominant** children had a significantly higher mean score on the personal value of English over Spanish dominant children as seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA, PVE by Language

Spanish	14.17 (18)
English	15.87 (15)
Total	14.94 (33)

F= 10.74 Sig. of F= .003 p < .05

Analysis of Individual Questions

The individual Questions 10, 12, and 22 were found to have results with statistically significant differences when analyzed by the **dominant language** of the students (Spanish or English). Tables 4-6 present the data in each of the three questions under investigation.

Q10. How Do You Feel About Writing in English?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward their personal value of writing in English. The results of this question, when analyzed by language, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **English dominant** students had a significantly higher mean score on their personal value of English than Spanish dominant students.

Table 4. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q10 by Language

Spanish	3.39 (18)
English	3.93 (15)
Total	3.64 (33)

F= 7.143 Sig. of F= .012 p < .05

Q12. How Do You Feel About Yourself When You Write in English?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward personal value attached to writing in English. The results of this question, when analyzed by language resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **English dominant** students had a significantly higher mean score on their personal value of English than Spanish dominant students.

Table 5. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q12 by Language

Spanish	3.56 (18)
English	4.00 (15)
Total	3.76 (33)

F= 4.797 Sig. of F= .036 p < .05

Q22. How Important is Writing in English to Being a Good Student?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward the social value of writing in English. The results of this question, when analyzed by language, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **English dominant** students had a significantly higher mean score on their social value of English than Spanish dominant students.

Table 6. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q22 by Language

Spanish	3.67 (18)
English	4.00 (15)
Total	3.82 (33)

F= 5.691 Sig. of F= .023 p < .05

When analyzed by **grade level** of the students (first and second), Questions 1, 4, 18, 19, and 21 were found to have results with statistically significant differences. Tables 7-11 present the data in each of the five questions under investigation.

Q1. How Important Is Spanish Reading to You?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward their personal value of Spanish reading. The results of this question, when analyzed by grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade** children had a significantly lower mean score on their personal value in Spanish reading than first grade students.

Table 7. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q1 by Grade

Grade 1	4.00 (15)
Grade 2	3.61 (18)
Total	3.79 (33)

F= 6.110 Sig. of F= .019 p < .05

Q4. How Do You Feel About Yourself When You Read in English?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward their perceived competency in English reading. The results of this question, when analyzed by grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade** children had a significantly higher mean score on their perceived competency in English reading than first grade students.

Table 8. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q4 by Grade

Grade 1	3.53 (15)
Grade 2	4.00 (18)
Total	3.79 (33)

F= 7.413 Sig. of F= .012 p < .05

Q18. How Important is Reading in Spanish to Being a Good Student?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward the social value of Spanish reading. The results of this question, when analyzed by grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade** children had a significantly lower mean score on their social value of Spanish reading than first grade students.

Table 9. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q18 by Grade

Grade 1	3.73 (15)
Grade 2	3.17 (18)
Total	3.42 (33)

F= 4.191 Sig. of F= .049 p < .05

Q19. How Important is Reading in English to Being a Good Student?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward the social value of English reading. The results of this question, when analyzed by grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade** children had a significantly higher mean score on the social value of English reading than first grade students.

Table 10. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q19 by Grade

Grade 1	3.67 (15)
Grade 2	4.00 (18)
Total	3.85 (33)

F= 8.455 Sig. of F= .007 p < .05

Q21. How Important is Writing in Spanish to Being a Good Student?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward the social value of Spanish writing. The results of this question, when analyzed by grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade** children had a significantly lower mean score on social value of Spanish reading than first grade students.

Table 11. Cell Means and Numbers for One-Way ANOVA Q21 by Grade

Grade 1	3.93 (15)
Grade 2	3.33 (18)
Total	3.61 (33)

F= 5.392 Sig. of F= .027 p < .05

Similarly, Questions 19 and 21 were found to have results with statistically significant differences when analyzed by dominant language (Spanish or English) and grade level of the students (first and second). Tables 12-13 present the data in each of the two questions under investigation.

Q19. How Important is Reading in English to Being a Good Student?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward their social value of reading in English. The results of this question, when analyzed by language/grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade Spanish dominant** and **second grade English dominant** students had significantly higher mean scores on the social value of English reading than all first grade students.

Table 12. Cell Means and Numbers for Two-Way ANOVA Q19 by Language/Grade

	Grade 1	Grade 2
Spanish Dominant	3.71 (7)	4.00 (11)
English Dominant	3.75 (8)	4.00 (7)

F= 8.621 Sig. of F= .006 p < .05

Q26. How Important is Writing in English to Being a Good Student?

This question measured students' overall attitudes toward their social value of writing in English. The results of this question, when analyzed by language/grade level, resulted in a statistically significant difference of opinion. **Second grade Spanish dominant** students had a significantly lower mean score on the social value of English writing than all other participants.

Table 13. Cell Means and Numbers for Two-Way ANOVA Q21 by Language/Grade

	Grade 1	Grade 2
Spanish Dominant	3.86 (7)	3.09 (11)
English Dominant	4.00 (8)	3.71 (7)

F= 5.622 Sig. of F= .025 p < .05

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Analysis of total mean scores on the eight sections yielded noteworthy differences in two sections: Social Value of Spanish (SVS) and Personal Value of English (PVE). Analysis of total mean scores on each question yielded statistically significant differences on eight individual questions: (Q1, Q4, Q10, Q12, Q18, Q19, Q21, Q26) with two questions posting considerable differences in both one-way and two-way ANOVA analyses of variance (Q19, Q21).

The first group of questions that indicated statistical significance was the section measuring students' personal value of English (PVE). English speakers had statistically significant higher means than Spanish speaking students. Overall, Spanish dominant students did not perceive the personal value of English as strongly as dominant English speakers.

While the above findings may be construed as cautiously positive, the following results are not so optimistic. In the section of questions measuring students' social value of Spanish (SVS), analyzed by grade, the results yielded statistically significant results between the grade levels. Students in second grade recorded significantly lower means than students in first grade.

When total scores were analyzed by both language/grade levels, the social value of Spanish also indicated a statistical difference based on these two factors. Once again, second grade Spanish speakers registered the lowest mean score for the social value of Spanish, indicating that the social value of Spanish has been diminished. It is perhaps a concern that Spanish-speaking children felt the least value in this category.

When questions were individually analyzed by language groups, the results showed three questions that posted important differences. The differences between language groups were found in questions pertaining to the personal value of English (Q10, Q12, Q26). All three questions indicated that dominant English speakers had a higher personal value of English than dominant Spanish speakers. Once again, this is not surprising, since the overall section of questions pertaining to the personal value of English showed similar results.

DISCUSSION

Results

The results of this study seem to indicate that the social value of Spanish begins to diminish as students spend more time in school. This perhaps is a first indication that as students proceed through the grades, the social value of Spanish is diminished, perhaps due to the hegemonic nature of English, such as the differences in teacher sensibility and language preference, the school wide dominance of English or the hidden curriculum, or perhaps due to other variables such as parental encouragement to excel in English (which too may be a response to the hegemony of English in the larger community). As children realize that English is the language of the educational and larger community, they are more likely to place less social value on the use of Spanish.

In the second grade, Spanish speakers know the social implications of speaking a language other than English. This eroding of social values placed on the use of Spanish should be of concern to teachers as they attempt to promote bilingualism and biculturalism in students enrolled in the two-way bilingual program. If students begin school with positive attitudes, considerable care needs to be exercised to not allow these personal or social values of Spanish use to be diminished or marginalized.

Overall, the results for the English speakers are not surprising, in that English dominant students would be expected to have a high personal and social value of English, along with a sense of competency in the language. It is an undeniable fact that English speakers are surrounded by their language, in and out of school. The socio-cultural and socio-political environment in which these students are living has a strong effect on perceptions and values. Dominant English speakers have every advantage, in and out of school, to nurture and develop their language without negative consequences.

Perhaps the more startling and surprising differences were found when individual responses were analyzed by grade level. All differences between the two grade levels point to an eroding of the personal or social value of Spanish, and an increase in perceived competency and social value of English. English seems to be taking a firm hold of these students at an early age. By the time they were in second grade, all second grade students felt less happy about the importance of reading in Spanish in second grade (Q1), yet they felt “more happy” about reading in English (Q4). The importance of reading and writing in Spanish to being a good student (Q18 and 21) was lower in second grade, while the importance of reading in English to being a good student was higher (Q19).

It is evident that, as Spanish declines, English gains momentum. In analyzing the variances in the two-way ANOVAs, it becomes evident that by second grade, both Spanish and English dominant students overwhelmingly and significantly value English reading as an

indication of being a good student (Q19), and Spanish dominant students in the second grade significantly devalue writing in Spanish as an important criterion to being a good student (Q21).

These results seem to indicate that the social value of Spanish begins to diminish as students go up a grade level. This perhaps is a first indication that as students proceed through the grades, that social value of Spanish is diminished, perhaps due to the hegemonic nature of English. The older and more cognizant of the larger educational community children are, the less social value they place on the use of Spanish. By second grade, Spanish speakers know the social implications of speaking a language other than English.

A more encouraging perspective of these results however, is that, perhaps, two-way bilingual programs help English language learners maintain their linguistic and cultural identity even in the face of greater hegemonic forces operating throughout the socio-cultural and socio-political environments in which children are schooled. Despite the fact that Spanish speakers are consistently barraged with hegemonic input, they are maintaining nonetheless a strong tie to their personal value of Spanish.

Based on the information provided by this survey, it is incumbent upon us to ask ourselves the following question: *Why does it seem that, even in an environment where Spanish is stressed, English becomes the more socially valued language, with students feeling more competent in English?* This question may have at its root the hegemonic forces of English. McCollum (1999) attributes this to “the hidden curriculum, instructional practices, and assessment policy served to devalue students’ native linguistic cultural capital compelling them to use English in the classroom and within peer culture” (p. 114). Greigo-Jones (1993) and Escamilla (1994) also caution teachers to be aware of the relative status and hidden messages of language use.

Even though this dual immersion program stressed an equality of languages and provided for many opportunities for students to value both languages and to become proficient in both languages, English succeeded in becoming the more valued of the two languages. It is not difficult for students to observe what is happening in the socio-cultural and political contexts of their lives and their schooling. The hegemonic forces of English permeate all educational programs, even those that have bilingualism and biculturalism as their goals and value linguistic and cultural diversity. The context in which a dual immersion program is located can neutralize or eradicate the program’s main objectives: bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism.

These results are even more interesting since both teachers in this program stressed Spanish throughout the day and taught more time in Spanish than in English. In first grade, the teacher taught all morning within the curriculum areas in Spanish, along with selected afternoon lessons. The second grade teacher taught three days a week in Spanish and stressed Spanish language arts. She felt that all students needed greater time and exposure in Spanish to counteract the hegemony of English and to give both English and Spanish dominant students a firm, established base in Spanish, before moving on to a more 50/50 division of time in the coming years. It seems that even with teachers stressing the social and personal values of Spanish, children see and hear the larger community’s values and take them to heart.

School practices must be examined to see if there is a sense of devaluing Spanish in the larger academic community. When the mainstream community of a school does not share the philosophy of additive bilingualism, the effect on the students participating in such a program must be expected. Students who continually witness the devaluing of Spanish in the larger context will have a difficult time maintaining the values their parents, teachers, and classmates believe in and promote.

Parents, teachers, and school administrators then must champion and sponsor the goals of dual immersion if children are to maintain and develop the values embraced by dual immersion programs. Parents in this particular program were very active in developing the dual immersion program and in maintaining cross cultural communication and friendships. It seems however, that that is not sufficient. Parents must discourage an erosion of values in either language or understand how the larger community of the school and beyond can affect their child's values and attitudes. Teachers must act as advocates and spokespersons for the benefits of bilingualism and biliteracy in the context of the entire school. Teachers must believe in the outcomes that a dual immersion program strives for and they must be energetic in disseminating positive and factual information to colleagues and community members.

However, there is room for hope. Although the eight questions and the two categories which produced statistically significant differences point to a devaluing of Spanish and an increasing of the value of English, there is something to be said for the remaining sections and questions that did not show any statistical differences between the grade levels or the language groups. By not posting significant differences, the remaining sections and questions show that children in this program share similar values and perspectives to both languages in many areas and cultural maintenance seems to be promoted in this dual immersion program. Parents and teachers in the program should continue to instill values consistent with the goals of dual immersion bilingual programs.

Recommendations

Based on the summary of results and discussion of this study, it is recommended that:

- Since this study was conducted on a small scale and as a pilot study, it is recommended that a follow-up study with larger number of participants be conducted. With such research, the results may be more generalizable to larger populations.
- Administrators and teachers need to address the value of each language at the entire school site. Equal division of language use, in all forms, both oral and written, should be apparent throughout the school site.
- Dual immersion teachers need to continue to stress the social and academic value of Spanish through academic and social contexts.
- Teachers must be sensitive to the culture of the Spanish speaking children and look for ways to meaningfully engage and invite parents to participate in their classrooms.
- All parents must be encouraged to continue to nurture and develop positive attitudes and values in the home and to counter hegemonic forces that they encounter in the larger community.
- Teachers in the dual immersion program should administer this survey at the end of every school year to measure student attitudes longitudinally as they move up the grade levels.
- The survey might need to be adjusted to include 5 levels of responses instead of 4. As it was administered, it was skewed to the "happy" responses. Researchers may need to pilot a survey that contains a "Very Unhappy" level response.

- If there are noticeable changes in attitudes, teachers and administrators need to direct their attentions to improving school conditions to counteract negative images and values that may be impacting the students.
- Students' successful development of biliteracy skills depends on what biliteracy means to them and how they perceive the benefits of biliteracy. Parents, teachers, and administrators must focus on establishing positive learning environments and contexts for students to value biliteracy. Awareness of hegemony is needed to counteract the negative forces and hegemonic messages that abound in schools and outside communities.
- Students should be interviewed, either individually or in focus groups, to have more narrative information to use as feedback on this issue.

Limitations

This was a pilot study and, as a result, there were several major limitations to this project. Since this study was conducted on a limited scale, the results may not be generalizable to larger populations. However, the researcher felt that it was a good first step in identifying the attitudes of the participating students to gauge how students valued each language in different contexts and with distinct purposes.

Also, the difference between the teachers could also be construed as a limiting factor. As mentioned above, there was a difference in the cultural sensitivity and connectedness between the first and second grade teachers. Parents were much more active in the first grade class (in both years) and participated and volunteered with greater frequency than in the second grade class. It was later confirmed in a focus group interview with the second grade Spanish- and English-speaking parents that they felt more welcomed and useful in the first grade classroom. In other words, all parents, including those who had children in the first grade class the previous year, felt a greater sense of connection with the first grade teacher.

Thirdly, while the school administration supported this program, the entire school site did not participate in the dual immersion program. The principal was a supporter of the program, one important criterion in program success (Lindholm-Leary, 2005b). However, this program was but a small, almost isolated, segment of the school. It was apparent that English was the preferred language of the school for the great majority of its students and teachers. Daily announcements, bulletin boards and general oral and written discourse throughout the school were conducted in English. Nevertheless, all parental written notices for all students, were sent in both languages and there was a translator available in the front office for parental questions and information.

Finally, the results of this study were not longitudinal. The survey was administered to two sets of students: those completing their first year of the program (first graders) and those completing the second year of the program (second graders). While the results can be reported for this population, they are not intended to be considered as generalizable across populations. The results of this study, however, coincide with other studies that show that English becomes the preferred language of choice as children progress through school in the US (Lindholm-Leary & Ferrante, 2003; McCollum, 1999; Greigo-Jones, 1994).

CONCLUSION

It is hoped that the recommendations based on this survey will assist in continuing to develop positive attitudes toward biliteracy, to promote positive social and personal values toward both English and Spanish and to increase student perceived competencies in both languages among students participating in this dual immersion program. It is anticipated that biliteracy will continue to enjoy the support of teachers, parents and administration both at the school level and at the district level, and that teachers and parents will continue to work together in solidarity to promote the academic and social values of both languages and to counter the hegemonic forces in society that diminish the value of languages other than English. It is also expected that more research will be conducted in this area to fully understand the dynamics of biliteracy and students' attitudes toward biliteracy in our social and school settings.

REFERENCES

- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Bialystock, E. (2004). The impact of bilingualism on language and literacy development. In Bhatia & Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual education* (pp. 567-602). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bikle, K., Billings, E., & Hakuta, K. (2004). Two-way immersion: Lessons for language education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of research in multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 589-604). New York: MacMillan.
- Brisk, M., & Harrington, M. M. (2007). *Literacy and bilingualism: A handbook for all teachers* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Butler, Y., & Hakuta, K. (2004). Bilingualism and second language acquisition. In T. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 114-145). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2008). *Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the U.S.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Calero-Breckheimer, A., & Goetz, E. T. (1993). Reading strategies of biliterate children for English and Spanish texts. *Reading Psychology, 14*, 177-204.
- Cazabon, M. T., Lambert, W. E., & Hall, G. (1993). *Two-way bilingual education: A progress report on the Amigos program*. Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Christian, D. (2006). Introduction. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian, (Eds.), *Educating English language learners* (pp. 1-13). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Collier, V. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1*(4). Retrieved 4/23/10
http://www.thomasandcollier.com/Downloads/1995_Acquiring-a-Second-Language-for-School_DLE4.pdf

- Collier, V. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(4), 617-641.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice* (4th ed.). Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Co.
- Crawford, J. (1997). *Best evidence: Research foundations of the Bilingual Education Act*. Washington, DC.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (1994). Primary language instruction and the education of language minority students. In C. F. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (2nd ed., pp. 3-46). Los Angeles: California State University, Los Angeles.
- Diaz-Rico, L. (2004). *Teaching English learners: Strategies and methods*. Boston: Pearson.
- Escamilla, K. (1994). The sociolinguistic environment of a bilingual school: A case study introduction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 18(2), 21.
- Garcia, O., & Baker, C. (2007). *Bilingual education: An introductory reader*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Genesee, F., & Riches, C. (2007). Literacy: Instructional issues. In F. Genesee, K. J. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 109-175). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10(4), 363-385.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. London England: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Griego-Jones, T. (1994). Assessing students' perceptions of biliteracy in two-way bilingual classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 13, 79-93.
- Hakuta, K. (1990). Language and cognition in bilingual children. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 47-59). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hornberger, N. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Records*, 92 (2), 212-229.
- Howard, E. R., Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (2004). *The development of bilingualism and biliteracy from grade 3 to 5: A summary of findings from the CAL/CREDE study of two way immersion education*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved June 22, 2009, from <http://www.cal.org/crede/pdfs/rr13.pdf>
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jay, M. (2003). Critical race theory, multicultural education, and the hidden curriculum of hegemony. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(4), 3-9.
- Lau v. Nichols. (1974). 414 U.S. 563, 94 S.Ct. 786, 39 L. Ed. 2dl.
- Lambert, W. E. (1990). Issues in foreign language and second language education. *Proceedings of the first research symposium on limited English proficient students' issues* (pp. 321-359). Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education & Minority Languages Affairs.
- Leonard, P. (1993). Critical pedagogy and state welfare. In P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. 155-168). New York: Routledge.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2008). *The foundations of dual language instruction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.













































































- Lindholm, K. J. (1996). *Evaluation of academic achievement in two-way bilingual immersion programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York, San Jose, CA.
- Lindholm, K. J. (1993). *Two-way bilingual language arts portfolio*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Lindholm, K. J. (1990). Bilingual immersion education: Criteria for program development. In A. M. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. M. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 91-105). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lindholm, K. J., & Fairchild H. H. (1988). *Evaluation of an "Exemplary" bilingual immersion program*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED 307 820).
- Lindholm, K. J., & Molina, R. (2000). Two-way bilingual education: The power of two languages in promoting educational success. In J. V. Tinajero & R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum*. New York: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005a). The rich promise of two-way immersion. *Educational Leadership*, 62, 56-59.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005b). *Review of research and best practices on effective features of dual language education programs*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2003). Dual language achievement, proficiency, and attitudes among current high school graduates of two-way bilingual programs. *NABE News*, 26(6), 20-25.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Avon, England: Multilingua Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary K. J., & Borsato, G. (2005). Hispanic high schoolers and mathematics: Follow-up of students who had participated in two-way bilingual elementary programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(3), 641-652.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2001). *Impact of two-way bilingual elementary programs on students' attitudes toward school and college* (Research Report 10). Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Ferrante, A. (2005). Follow-up study of middle school two-way students: Language proficiency, achievement and attitudes. In R. Hoosain & F. Salili (Eds.), *Language in multicultural education*. (pp. 157-179). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Ferrante, A. (2003). *Middle school students' attitudes toward school and college: Influence of two-way immersion* (Final report). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Hargett, G. (2006). *Evaluator's toolkit for dual language programs*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Howard, E. R. (2008). Language development and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 177-200). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Hardman, L., & Meyer, P. (2007). What makes two-way programs successful at the elementary and middle school levels? *Language Magazine: The Journal of Communication and Education*, 6(5), 10-23.





























- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Hargett, G., & Lambert, J. (2007). How to evaluate your dual language program: A beginner's toolkit. *Multilingual Educator*, 26-27. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved June 22, 2009, from www.cal.org/twi/evaltoolkit
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Molina, R. (2006). The power of two-way bilingual immersion programs in promoting educational success in Latino communities. In L. Diaz Soto (Ed.), *Handbook of Latino education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- McCollum, P. (1999). Learning to value English: Cultural capital in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23(2-3), 114-134.
- McKenna, M. C., & Kear, D. J. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 43(9), 626-639.
- Ovando, C., Combs, M., & Collier, V. (2006). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. (2008). *Reading, writing and learning in ESL* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Pérez, B., & Torres-Guzmán, M. (2002). *Learning in two worlds: An integrated Spanish/English biliteracy approach* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Reyes, M. L. (2001). Unleashing possibilities: Biliteracy in the primary grades. In M. L. Reyes & J. Halcon (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 96-121). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Riches, C., & Genesee, F. (2007). Literacy: Crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. In F. Genesee, K. J. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 64-108). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California-Santa Cruz.

Dr. Linda Gerena is an associate professor in the Department of Teacher Education at City University of New York, York College. Dr. Gerena's research interests include second language acquisition theory and pedagogy, dual immersion/bilingual education, secondary ELL content literacy instruction (biology and integrated algebra), biliteracy, and educational policy reform. She is also keenly interested in preparing highly qualified teachers who will provide equitable and academically challenging instruction for linguistically and culturally diverse students.













































































Email: lgerena@york.cuny.edu

























Appendix A. Survey in Spanish

1.	¿Qué tan importante es para ti saber leer en español?				
2.	¿Qué tan importante es para ti saber leer en inglés?				
3.	¿Cómo te sientes de ti mismo(a) al leer en español?				
4.	¿Cómo te sientes de ti mismo(a) al leer en inglés?				
5.	¿Cómo te sientes cuando alguien te lee en español?				
6.	¿Cómo te sientes cuando alguien te lee en inglés?				
7.	¿Qué tan bueno(a) serás al leer en español en el año que viene?				
8.	¿Qué tan bueno(a) serás al leer en inglés en el año que viene?				
9.	¿Cómo te sientes acerca de escribir en español?				
10.	¿Cómo te sientes acerca de escribir en inglés?				
11.	¿Cómo te sientes de ti mismo(a) al escribir en español?				
12.	¿Cómo te sientes de ti mismo(a) al escribir en inglés?				
13.	¿Qué tan bueno(a) serás al escribir en español en el año que viene?				
14.	¿Qué tan bueno(a) serás al escribir en inglés en el año que viene?				
15.	¿Cómo te sientes acerca de aprender de libros escritos en español?				
16.	¿Cómo te sientes acerca de aprender de libros escritos en inglés?				
17.	¿Cómo te sentirá cuando sepas leer y escribir muy bien en ambos idiomas?				
18.	¿Qué tan importante es saber leer en español para ser buen estudiante?				
19.	¿Qué tan importante es saber leer en inglés para ser buen estudiante?				

20.	¿Qué tan importante es saber leer en los dos idiomas para ser buen estudiante?				
21.	¿Qué tan importante es saber escribir en español para ser buen estudiante?				
22.	¿Qué tan importante es saber escribir en inglés para ser buen estudiante?				
23.	¿Qué tan importante es saber escribir en los dos idiomas para ser buen estudiante?				
24.	¿Cómo te sientes acerca de aprender en los dos idiomas?				
25.	¿Qué tan importante es para ti saber escribir en español?				
26.	¿Qué tan importante es para ti saber escribir en inglés?				

Appendix B. Survey in English

1.	How important is reading in Spanish to you?				
2.	How important is reading in English to you?				
3.	How do you feel about yourself when you read in Spanish?				
4.	How do you feel about yourself when you read in English?				
5.	How do you feel when someone reads aloud to you in Spanish?				
6.	How do you feel when someone reads aloud to you in English?				
7.	How do you feel your reading in Spanish will be next year?				
8.	How do you feel your reading in English will be next year?				
9.	How do you feel about writing in Spanish?				
10.	How do you feel about writing in English?				
11.	How do you feel about yourself when you write in Spanish?				
12.	How do you feel about yourself when you write in English?				
13.	How do you feel your writing in Spanish will be next year?				
14.	How do you feel your writing in English will be next year?				
15.	How do you feel about learning from books in Spanish?				
16.	How do you feel about learning from books in English?				
17.	How will you feel when you can read and write really well in both languages?				
18.	How important is reading in Spanish to being a good student?				
19.	How important is reading in English to being a good student?				

20.	How important is reading in both languages to being a good student?				
21.	How important is writing in Spanish to being a good student?				
22.	How important is writing in English to being a good student?				
23.	How important is writing in both languages to being a good student?				
24.	How do you feel about learning in both languages?				
25.	How important is writing in Spanish to you?				
26.	How important is writing in English to you?	