Research Papers in Education

Special topic Issue: International Policy and Practice in Literacy (2009)

"We teach reading this way because it is the model we've adopted":

Asymmetries in language and literacy policies in a Two Way Immersion Program

Minda M. López[1]
Assistant Professor
Literacy
Texas State University, San Marcos
United States

María E. Fránquiz
Associate Professor
Bilingual Education
University of Texas, Austin
United States

---

[1] Corresponding author. minda.lopez@txstate.edu or minda@satx.rr.com

Abstract:

In the United States there has been widespread growth in Two Way Immersion (TWI) programs in all states, including those who have outlawed bilingual education. The model offers language majority students the opportunity to become bilingual alongside their language minority peers. Research has shown TWI programs to be the most equitable and effective for teaching both native English speakers and linguistically subjugated populations (Lindholm-Leary and Borsato 2001, Thomas and Collier 1997, 2002). A central goal is that all students become proficient in oral and written communication of two languages (Howard, Sugarman and Christian 2003).

In this mixed methods study of a TWI program in Texas, Official Discourse (Gee 1999) and policies reflected social justice and equitable language and literacy goals for students. However, there was marked incongruence between the interpretation and enactment of policies. There were asymmetrical language and literacy outcomes as the strict observance of programmatic goals constrained the English language and literacy development of Spanish-dominant students but did not constrain the Spanish language and literacy development of English-dominant peers. As a result, Spanish-dominant students and their families became disillusioned and questioned their participation in the TWI program. Findings suggest that educators must examine literacy ideologies in policies and practice and be reflexive in regards to the local implementation of policy, particularly in meeting the language and literacy needs of students from linguistically subjugated communities.

Key words: language ideologies, Two Way Immersion, bilingual education

"We teach reading this way because it is the model we've adopted":

Asymmetries in language and literacy in a Two Way Immersion Program

Bilingual education has been implemented in schools in the United States since the colonial period, but its popularity frequently shifts in large part to social movements and political mandates. Policy toward bilingual education also has been changing, as demographic trends and philosophical views continue to evolve. Although there is no federal mandate for bilingual education, the Supreme Court decision in the landmark Lau v. Nichols case of 1974 requires academic assistance through comprehensible instruction for students who speak a language other than English. The Lau decision called for schools across the nation to support students in overcoming language barriers that impede their access to the curriculum but does not specify how schools can provide a meaningful and equitable education for students (Cummins 1996, Ovando, Collier and Combs 2004)

The absence of clear language policies in the United States has resulted in de facto policy shifts that align with contemporary historical events (Crawford 2000, Ovando 2003). In most states the consequence is a bicultural and bilingual educational experience that conflicts with dominant cultural values (Darder 1991). In 1982, lawmakers amended federal legislation to give school districts more flexibility in implementing the goals of bilingual programs, and to offer schools the option of using English exclusively, if they so chose. In 1985, the Secretary of Education, William Bennett, expressed his view of bilingual education as a failed project. He perceived instruction in native languages as exclusionary and detrimental to the English language (Escamilla 1989). In more recent years, many policy makers still concur with Bennett and are pushing for English as the only language of instruction in the United States.

Although the "English-only movement" has existed for centuries, it gained momentum at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first. Several states such as California, Massachusetts, and Arizona officially embraced a monolingual approach to education and all but outlawed bilingual education. The movement involved several organizations that sought to make English the official language of the nation (currently the US has no official language). The prevalent view was directed at immigrant Spanish-speaking children in schools. They were and continue to be seen as having a "problem" due to a lack of English proficiency (Flores 2005 93). This deficit perspective is a result of *linguicism*, the "ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, regulate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources...on the basis of language" (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000 30).

What the Research Literature Says About Two-Way Immersion Programs

In contrast to the deficit perspective, Two-Way Immersion (TWI) programs are based on a language ideology of linguistic pluralism, where multiple languages are valued and taught concurrently (Jeon 2003). TWI programs offer a model of bilingual education that is resistant to educational and linguistic homogenization. It represents one of the three options for bilingual education throughout the US. These are transitional, maintenance, and two-way bilingual programs. Both transitional and maintenance programs are designed to serve non-English speaking students exclusively. Transitional programs use native language as a means to English instruction and students are exited after three or four years (Genesee 1999). The goal is not to maintain or develop students' first language but rather to use it to achieve English proficiency. Maintenance bilingual education programs are longer in duration with more but decreasing native language support across a child's elementary school years. TWI programs are also longer

in duration (typically until the fifth or sixth year of school) and classes are made up of students who speak English as their dominant language as well as those who speak the target language as their dominant language. Two-Way Immersion programs are one of the few options in the US for children to maintain or achieve bilingualism (Garcia 2005).

Just as there are several models of bilingual education, there are also various models of Two-Way Immersion programs (also called "Dual Language"). Most TWI programs share certain characteristics. One characteristic is that the population of students includes some native English speakers and native speakers of the target language, which in the US is most often Spanish. For most of the day students learn language through academic content instruction in both languages (Lindholm 1997). A central goal is that all students become proficient in using two languages for communication and disciplinary learning (Gomez, Freeman and Freeman 2005). Typically, TWI programs require students and their families to commit for at least five to six years (Lindholm-Leary 2001). TWI programs promote the notion that language should be used as a resource rather than remediation to compensate for the child's "language problem" (Ruiz 1984). TWI programs are successful for both language majority and linguistically subordinated students and have raised the status and importance of languages other than English in many communities across the United States.

Lindholm-Leary (2001) studied sixteen TWI schools and found that after long-term participation in the program (five to six years), students achieved at least as well as their peers who were in non-TWI programs and performed on grade level in language arts and the content areas. Other studies have found that the majority of students who have participated in a TWI program perform at or above the levels of their non-participant peers on standardized tests (Alanís 2000, Thomas and Collier 1997, 2002). There is also a wealth of evidence that shows

TWI programs foster bilingual and biliteracy competencies for all participants more than any other program (Pérez 2004, Pellerano, Fradd, and Rovira 1998, Quintanar-Sarellana, 2004, Smith and Arnot-Hopffer, 1998).

In part because of the recent state mandates and the proven effectiveness of the programs, there has been exponential growth in Two-Way Immersion programs, with a 33% increase in programs nationwide between the years 2000 and 2006 (Center for Applied Linguistics 2006). In Texas, where this study took place, TWI programs are one of various program models (i.e. transitional or maintenance bilingual education, Two-Way Immersion, English as a Second Language, etc.) available under state law. However, TWI is the only program considered enrichment bilingual education (Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan 2000), designed to foster bilingualism in all children, English speaking and non-English speaking alike.

The Two-Way Immersion Study

This article reports the outcomes of a sixteen-month mixed method study that focused on language ideologies and literacy practices in Two-Way Immersion education. The primary question guiding the study was, What language ideologies are present in a Two-Way Immersion (school) community? In order to examine this question, the following subsidiary questions guided the research: 1) What are the language and literacy ideologies held by teachers working in schools with TWI programs? 2) What are the official Discourses and policies of one school with a TWI program? 3) How are language and literacy policies enacted in classrooms? 4) What were parents responses to the official TWI discourse and enacted policies?

In order to uncover the ideological stances of participants in schools with TWI program models, we examined the language ideologies present in the official policies of an early

childhood TWI program in Central Texas and the ideologies held by the faculty and staff there and in four other TWI schools. We were also interested in how language policies stated in Official Discourse were presented to parents and enacted in classrooms. Such ponderings required collection of district documents, observation of classroom-based discourse, both oral and written, and interviews with teachers and parents. The mixed method design was utilized to capitalize on the strengths of each method and for triangulation of data sources (Denzin and Lincoln 2008).

The Context and Methods

Data from five schools: In order to make visible the language ideologies present in the macro context of TWI programs, we surveyed teachers at five schools in south central Texas with TWI programs. Utilizing a five point Likert scale questionnaire, *Teachers' Language Ideologies* (author 2008), we gathered 209 teachers' views on four constructs of language ideologies for a return rate of 73%. Through demographic data collected, we also examined different experiences that may have influenced the ideologies of teachers working in schools with TWI programs. Independent variables included experiences of bilingualism, teacher training as exhibited in their certification areas and/or degrees and teaching assignment. The following null hypothesis was put forth for testing: *There is no statistically significant difference on teachers' language ideologies due to their experiences.*

Quantitative Data Analysis. A Factor Analysis of the data was conducted using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and the result was of high reliability (Bartz 1988) with significance ($F(16) = 29.74$, $p < .001$). The four factors measured the constructs of 1)

Bilingualism, 2) Two Way Immersion Programs, 3) Bilingual Instruction and Economic

Advantages, and 4) Standard Language Ideologies. The first three factors had strong reliability

and the fourth factor was moderate but not significant. Overall, the TLI demonstrated internal

consistency and validity as indicated by the reliability and content analysis. To understand the

ideologies expressed by teachers on the TLI descriptive statistics were utilized and to explore

group differences regarding the four constructs, multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) were

conducted.

Data from Presidio Primary: The contexts of the school, classroom, and home were examined

through qualitative means. Eight months were spent at a public school (pseudonym Presidio

Primary) in south central Texas attending meetings, interviewing teachers, and participating in

two first grade TWI classes. During academic year 2006-2007 research methods included

observing, audio recording and constructing field notes. In addition, official documents were

collected regarding the program, curricula, lesson plans, and student work. At Presidio Primary

there were approximately 800 students in prekindergarten through first grades with generalist,

transitional bilingual and TWI strands. The TWI program, in its fifth year of implementation,

was a 90/10 model utilizing Spanish and English. To understand the language ideologies and

policies in place at Presidio Primary, ten educators were interviewed including the district

bilingual director, campus principal, biliteracy specialist, librarian and six teachers (two teaching

transitional bilingual education and four teaching TWI). Also collected at the school were

official documents such as brochures, handbooks and literature regarding language programs.

Because self reported data can be biased and incomplete, participant observations in two first

grade TWI classes were also conducted. The foci of these observations were on literacy

instruction during Spanish language arts and English as a Second Language class (ESL). For the parents' perspectives, eleven mothers were interviewed, six English speakers and five Spanish speakers. The interviews were conducted both at school and at home, in the mothers' language of preference.

Qualitative Data Analysis. The constant comparative method (Lincoln and Guba 1985) and Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 1995, Gee 1999, van Dijk 1998) were used to analyze qualitative data. Field notes, transcriptions of audio recordings, and texts were read and re-read in order to identify themes. The themes were compared and categorized to locate patterns of ideologies, or systems of beliefs. Since ideological discourse is often oriented semantically towards certain topics, including the description of a group's identity and goals (van Dijk 1998), pronouns and descriptive words were given special attention. A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach was taken in analyses of texts and talk. In CDA language is conceptualized as a form of social practice and not merely a linguistic code. Because of this view of language, this method of analysis takes into account the relationships between discourse and social power, making visible how power is enacted, reproduced or legitimized by the text and talk of dominant groups or institutions (Fairclough 1989, Rogers 2004, van Dijk1993).

Findings

This study examined language ideologies of participants in Two Way Immersion programs in multiple contexts as well as the policies, both official and enacted in classrooms. Data indicate there were competing ideologies at virtually every level—amongst the teachers,

students and parents—and were influenced primarily by participants' training, experiences and

linguistic backgrounds.

Teachers' Language Ideologies Instrument. Descriptive statistics indicated that teachers in this

sample demonstrated very positive ideologies towards bilingualism. The teachers all worked at

schools with TWI programs. Ideologically, they overwhelmingly supported bilingualism.

Teachers held moderately positive ideologies towards TWI programs and bilingual instruction

(Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on the constructs). This meant that the teachers did view

TWI programs and bilingual instruction in schools positively, although not to the degree that

they supported bilingualism. Teachers held moderate negative ideologies towards standardization

of language use, which could be interpreted as a positive trend towards accepting language

varieties in school contexts. Teachers did not agree with statements on the TLI that students'

language varieties were invalid or detrimental to their learning.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

These descriptive statistics indicate that this sample of teachers highly supported

bilingualism. They also supported TWI programs and the use of two languages in school.

Overall, teachers appeared to have inclusive and non-discriminatory views of their students'

language backgrounds. However, we wanted to know if there were group differences amongst

participants according to the following independent variables: bilingualism, years of teaching

experience, class assignment, certificate type and degree type. We used the Multivariate

Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for further analysis and found the first independent variable

of bilingual ability was statistically insignificant. Alternatively, teacher assignment and type of

certificate had a statistically significant effect on language ideologies (see Table 2). Thus, a

teachers' experience with language learning and ability to speak two or more languages did not have a statistically significant effect on her or his ideologies. What did have an effect was what program they were assigned to teach (generalist, ESL, transitional bilingual, or TWI) and the type of professional teaching certificate they held, two variables that are related as one cannot teach in a bilingual program without the appropriate certification. This finding suggests that one's ability or exposure to learning language does not necessarily create a positive outlook in relation to language and language learning. Since the teachers in this sample with certificates in Bilingual Education and ESL demonstrated the most positive ideological stances towards bilingualism and bilingual education, it can be inferred that language acquisition and bilingual education concepts and theories need to be infused throughout all teacher preparation programs (all certificate levels). In this way all teachers can have a more positive disposition towards English Language Learners (ELLs) and speakers of two or more languages.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

Along with type of certificate, the other significant variable was that of teacher assignment. This is one of the most surprising findings from the study, that program assignment mediated the ideologies expressed by teachers in TWI schools. The phenomenon of multiple strands of language education in one school complicates the ideological dimension of education for linguistically subjugated students. In Texas, it is common to have both transitional bilingual and TWI programs in the same school. Some elementary schools even have strands of generalist, TWI, bilingual and ESL classes, as did three of the five schools in this sample. These diverse language programs often have conflicting ideological underpinnings and must also compete for resources. Teacher responses on the TLI indicated that transitional bilingual and ESL teachers did not view the TWI Programs as favorably as other teachers (see Table 3). In

fact, they viewed the program less favorably than even the generalist teachers. This finding suggests that schools with multiple language programs need to be particularly sensitive to the needs of all students, teachers, and families. Although the survey data did not provide greater detail as to the underlying reasons for the tension between language programs, the qualitative data collected in this study does give some indication as to why there would be competing ideologies amongst the teachers in different language programs.

(Insert Table 3 about here)

Official District TWI Program Goals. One of the first indications that there were competing ideologies between language programs was in official descriptions provided by the school district. Analyses of official school documents, handbooks distributed at parent meetings, and administrator interviews showed asymmetrical treatment of the two bilingual programs. One program was given a great deal of attention (TWI) versus one that met state mandates (Transitional Bilingual/ESL). The official Discourse for the Two-Way Immersion program was that of language-as-resource (Ruiz 1984) and linguistic pluralism whereas the underlying ideologies of the transitional bilingual and ESL programs pointed to language-as-problem (Ruiz 1984) and assimilationist ideologies.

We conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis of the district handbook for both Two-Way Immersion and Bilingual/ESL programs in order to make visible the Official Discourse and underlying ideologies of the programs. The TWI program listed four goals and the Transitional Bilingual/ESL handbook outlined one goal. These sometimes contrasting goals are included in Table 4. The program goals for TWI were more detailed and had higher expectations than the

single goal of the Transitional Bilingual/ESL program. The first TWI goal was for all students to achieve or exceed district and state standards in all subject areas. When compared to the Transitional Bilingual/ESL goal of mere competency in comprehension, reading and writing of English, there were clearly stated higher expectations for the TWI students.

A second goal stated in the TWI handbook was that students would achieve high levels of literacy in both Spanish and English by the end of fifth grade. This included "reading, writing, speaking and understanding". The stated goal for the Transitional Bilingual program was for students to "become competent in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of the English language." Students in TWI programs were expected to achieve high levels of literacy, but also were to become biliterate. In contrast, the Bilingual/ESL students were expected to become competent in English and there was no mention of native language literacy. The only reference to native language use in the Bilingual/ESL program goals was that the program "emphasizes the mastery of English language skills, as well as provides understandable instruction in a students' primary language in mathematics, science and social studies." This statement foregrounds the mastery of English. The third stated goal of the TWI program was for students to "develop an understanding and appreciation for multiculturalism." There was no mention of culture or multiculturalism for the Transitional Bilingual/ESL program. The final item listed for TWI pertained to traditional parental involvement throughout the school year. This goal was not clear but alluded to a "commitment" on the part of parents of TWI students and was articulated elsewhere in the initial correspondence to students accepted into the program. There was no stated expectation of family involvement for the Transitional Bilingual/ESL program.

(Insert Table 4 about here)

The district's goals for the TWI program were more elaborate and stated higher expectations for students and their families than the unitary goal of the Transitional Bilingual/ESL program. Discourse for TWI program goals aligned with the ideologies of language-as-resource (Ruiz 1984) and linguistic pluralism. The discourse for the Transitional Bilingual/ESL programs privileged English and severely limited native language skill development. The ideological differences between the two language programs are important because they set the tone for what teachers, parents, and students expect from the programs. These differences may have also contributed to the different responses on the TLI and some of the tensions present between teachers and parents participating in the separate language programs.

Enacted TWI Policies at Presidio Primary. The privileging of English for the Transitional Bilingual/ESL program and the importance of bilingualism and biliteracy in the stated goals for the TWI program had a direct influence on policies and practice enacted in classrooms. There was very little official regulation of language use in the transitional bilingual/ESL programs, but the TWI program followed strict language separation guidelines. As with many 90/10 programs, the emphasis on Spanish in kindergarten and first grade was meant to counteract the English hegemony in society (Shannon 1995) and to provide a strong foundation in Spanish for both Spanish and English speakers (Lindholm 1997). The strict separation was akin to "parallel monolingualism" (Heller 2001), creating spaces where students were artificially forced to use one language in isolation.

The language separation is evident in the schedule of classes and language distribution. A typical day for a first grader at Presidio Primary followed the schedule outlined in Table 5.

The students began their day in Spanish with the morning message, calendar and opening

activities. At 8:15 the students went to specials and were taught computers, music and physical

education on alternate days. Monolingual English-speaking teachers conducted these lessons in

English. Students returned to their homeroom classes at 9:10 and spent the rest of the morning

developing Spanish through Language Arts and Math, conducted completely in Spanish. After

lunch and recess the students learned social studies or science content in Spanish and finally

students exchanged classes for the English as a Second Language (ESL) portion of their day.

The only time of the day when students were grouped according to dominant home language was

during ESL.

(Insert Table 5 about here)

In first grade at Presidio Primary, ESL focused on oral language development. In order to

maintain the strict separation of languages, students went to a different teacher. This practice of

strict language separation according to teachers is akin to the "one language, one parent" method

of fostering infant bilingualism (Ronjat 1913 cited in Saunders 1988). In this method of teaching

two languages to infants, parents have different native languages and each parent communicates

with the child in their language, almost exclusively (Saunders 1988). The Two-Way Immersion

community adopted this ideology for fostering bilingualism and it has been referred to as "one

language, one teacher". In TWI programs that follow this policy, if a teacher was assigned a

group of students during the 10% English portion, students were not to hear her speak Spanish.

The same was true in reverse; the teacher for the 90% Spanish portion of the day would not let

students hear her speak English.

Officially, all of the teachers were in agreement with the "one language, one teacher"

ideology. This ideology was so strictly enforced, particularly during Spanish instructional time,

that teachers would excuse themselves and step out into the hall to speak with English speaking

parents or teachers (field notes, 15 October 2006). During parent recruitment meetings, if a child

from a teachers' Spanish class were in attendance, the teacher would not speak English in his or

her presence (field notes, 29 March 2007). The intent of this strict separation was to create an

immersion environment where students would be surrounded by the target language (Spanish),

counteracting the hegemony of English in society. It was also intended to motivate the students,

particularly the English-speaking students, to practice the target language. However, some

teachers expressed their doubts about the strict separation of languages. Mrs. Kaiser was highly

respected by other teachers in the TWI program and the school, but she felt inadequate meeting

the needs of her students while maintaining the strict language policies of the program. She

thought the policy was far too rigid and narrowed both students' and teachers' academic and

communicative resources. She said,

> "Honestly, sometimes I feel very constrained by the [Two-Way Immersion]
> program. I am supposed to hide my bilingualism from students, but they know. I
> am not supposed to talk to parents in English in front of them. I can't display
> posters in English, I can't play music and read books to my class in English. I
> feel like I miss out on teachable moments all the time in the name of Dual
> Language [Two-Way Immersion]." (interview, 29 March 2007)

Mrs. Kaiser did not think the language separation policy was authentic or optimal for her

students' learning.

Although they may not have always agreed with particular policies, the TWI teachers at

Presidio Primary were committed to Two-Way Immersion and expressed a desire for their

students to grow linguistically and culturally. Their stated goals in interviews were congruent

with the official goals of the program including high levels of bilingual and biliterate

proficiencies in Spanish and English in addition to multicultural understanding. The teachers

thought the primary benefit of the TWI classes over transitional bilingual education classes was

the population of both English and Spanish speaking students. The mixed population

desegregated students and allowed for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural learning, something all

the teachers found important. Mrs. Kaiser explained it this way,

> "The Spanish speakers learn a lot more English [than in bilingual classes] because
> it's such a friendly environment for them to learn and because the class is really
> geared towards language instruction. As teachers, we're always thinking about it,
> about explaining what we mean differently. Then the students help each other
> understand words and stories, and they are always asking each other about things"
> (interview, 3 April 2007).

Another teacher, Mrs. Bernal, thought the students themselves facilitated the learning of each

other's language. She said, "The TWI classes build more community because we learn together,

and each child has something the other one needs, whether it be English or Spanish." (field

notes, 18 March 2007).

Literacy Instruction at Presidio Elementary. Although encouraged to learn together and

contribute to each other's learning, when it came to literacy instruction, there were very rigid

guidelines. The literacy instruction in the TWI program was conducted solely in Spanish for both

populations. This policy and practice of "sequential literacy instruction" (Lindholm-Leary 2001)

meant all students were taught to read in Spanish first and, with the exception of ESL class,

would not receive explicit English literacy instruction until the third grade. This also meant

literacy development was unidirectional—all students were expected to engage in reading and

writing in Spanish exclusively, and were frequently discouraged from code switching, a

linguistic strategy that was commonly used in many students' homes and in the broader bilingual

community.

Sequential biliteracy instruction has been named a central characteristic of Two-Way

Immersion programs (Lindholm-Leary 2001) and is very common in TWI programs across the

US. The policy to formally introduce English literacy skills in the third or fourth grade is informed in large part by Cummins' (1981) theory of "common underlying proficiency" (Gort 2006, Pérez 2004). According to this theory, literacy gained in one language serves as a foundation and facilitates the development of literacy in the other, often without formal instruction.

At Presidio Primary, it was decided by the initial planning committee that literacy instruction would be in Spanish for all students, in order to maintain the separation of languages and to simplify the model (principal interview, 2 April 2007). The decision was influenced by research (Christian et al. 1997) suggesting that teaching literacy in the target language (Spanish) is appropriate where TWI programs serve a population consisting primarily of middle class English speakers along with middle and low-income Spanish speakers. In regards to literacy instruction, the teachers at Presidio Primary were unified in their ideological stance. When we questioned the practice of sequential literacy instruction the teachers' responses can be summed up in the response by the biliteracy specialist, "We teach reading this way because it is the model we've adopted."

Although research in some TWI contexts supports the practice of sequential biliteracy, the ideology of a solitary path to literacy has been challenged (Reyes 2001, Fránquiz and Reyes 1998) and can constrain student learning. For example, on several occasions, we observed a teacher telling students to erase words in English from their writing responses because it was not allowed. This banning of English did not support the language and literacy goals present in the Official Discourse of the district, nor is it the only option for teaching Spanish literacy in Two-Way Immersion programs. Teachers in two highly acclaimed TWI schools less than fifty miles from Presidio Primary reported a positive correlation of knowledge and literacy between

students' first and second languages during the first two years of participating in their TWI

program (Pérez 2004). Students at those schools reported making sense of English print by using

their knowledge of Spanish and English literacy. The students at the schools in Perez's study

were able to build on all of their cultural and linguistic resources when engaging in literacy

practices.

At Presidio Primary a conscious effort to build upon all students' cultural and linguistic

resources was lacking in both language and literacy. In the following example of a read aloud,

one of the first grade teachers reinforced a monolingual approach to language and literacy

learning in the class discussion about language and language users. Mrs. Kaiser was reading

"*Canción de todos los niños del mundo*" (Ada 1996). The book shows children from different

parts of the world participating in different kinds of events, such as eating, speaking, going to

school, etc. After reading the page, "*Yo no hablo tu idioma, pero todos hablamos/* I don't speak

your language, but we all speak," Mrs. Kaiser asked the class, "*¿Todos hablamos el mismo*

idioma? /Do we all speak the same language?" Many students answered with, "No." The

discussion continued:

857	Cody:	*Algunos hablan English*
858		and others no.
859	Mrs. K:	*¿Cual es **nuestro** idioma?*
860	Multiple students:	English!
861	Johanna:	*Aquí en los Estados Unidos hablamos inglés*
862		*...y español también!*
863	Mrs. K:	*y español también...*
864		*y aquí en la clase?*
865	Cody:	*Hablamos español.*
866	Mrs. K:	*Si, muy bien.*

Translation:

| 857 | Cody: | Some speak English |
| 858 | | and others not |

859	Mrs. K:	What language do **we** speak?
860	Multiple students:	English!
861	Johanna:	Here in the United States we speak English
862		…oh and Spanish, too!
863	Mrs. K:	and Spanish too…
864		and what about here in class?
865	Cody:	We speak Spanish
866	Mrs. K:	Yes, very good.

In lines 857-58, Cody, an English dominant student responded to the teachers' question with code mixing "*algunos hablan* English and others no." He acknowledged that some of his fellow students were less proficient in English than he was. He also recognized that some students broke the rules of the class by switching into English more frequently than others and at this point he chose to codeswitch. Mrs. Kaiser asked the entire class for clarification with an emphasis on *nuestro*/our, *¿Cual es **nuestro** idioma*?/What is **our** language? (line 859). Several students replied emphatically with "English" said in English (during the Spanish language arts block). At this point, one of the students, Johanna, who was a native Spanish speaker, took up Mrs. Kaiser's question. She answered that there were more options than just English in the United States and in fact, in their class they spoke Spanish (lines 861-862). Mrs. Kaiser confirmed Johanna's monolingual Spanish response by revoicing her statement, and then probed further. She asked students to think about what language they spoke in class. Cody responded with the monolingual Spanish answer she sought during language arts, "*Hablamos español*" (line 865) and she positively evaluated his statement, "*Sí, muy bien*!"

This response to literature was intriguing because students were asked in Spanish about the language they spoke. Although this exchange occurred in Spanish as was required of them everyday, the students responded that English was the language spoken in the United States. Not until the teacher probed deeper did some of the students realize they were reading literature and

speaking in Spanish and therefore more than one language was spoken in the United States. Secondly, the teacher asked them about what language they spoke (singular). She did not ask if they spoke more than one or what languages they spoke. In this bilingual setting where bilingualism and biliteracy was the stated goal for all students, it is intriguing that the teacher did not ask about what language**s** (plural) they spoke. Furthermore, it was common knowledge that many of the students in this classroom and community had grandparents and other family members who spoke German. Mrs. Kaiser could have asked about the multiple languages that the students spoke or had heard spoken in the United States. Instead, she reinforced the monolingual ideology or "parallel monolingualism" (Heller 2001) that was set forth by the strict separation of languages in this TWI program. This small segment of discourse also illustrates that the hegemony of English in the United States had seeped into the students' lives and young children understood on some level that the linguistic goal of schools is English dominance (Smith 1999). Whether they were conscious of it or not, they responded in Spanish that English was the de facto official language of the United States.

Although Mrs. Kaiser believed in bilingualism as an ideology and wanted her students to practice biliteracy, her practices in the classroom showed that she had adopted parallel monolingualism and a contrasting ideology that the two languages must be kept separate for language learning. The other TWI first grade teacher, Mrs. Delgado, also indicated she was a strong advocate for bilingualism. She had chosen to teach in the TWI program and often spoke about the importance of teaching all students multiple languages. However, she also engaged in practices that appeared to constrain the English language and literacy development of her students.

When we first approached Mrs. Delgado with Ofelia Dumas Lachtman's (1995) book, *Pepita Habla Dos Veces/Pepita Talks Twice* she seemed surprised. We suggested its use in order to elicit her first graders' language ideologies. She knew that we were aware of the language separation rules of the TWI classes, and explained that teachers had only read the book in the English classes because there were a few minimal instances of code-switching into Spanish (i.e. *Lobo* for Wolf, the name of Pepita's dog). Although the story is one of the best examples of children's literature because it reinforces and validates young children's bilingual and bicultural development (Baxter 1998), Mrs. Delgado had never considered using it for Spanish language arts class.

Mrs. Delgado was similar to Lachtman and the protagonist of the story, Pepita, in many ways. She had immigrated to the United States with her family when she was in elementary school. They were from the interior of Mexico and settled in an area along the Texas-Mexico border. As a child, she had engaged in language brokering activities for her family members. She often shared these experiences in school with her students (field notes, 30 March 2007).

She agreed to use the book for Spanish language arts and when she introduced *Pepita habla dos veces/Pepita Talks Twice* (Lachtman 1983), students indicated that they had indeed read the book in their English language development class. Mrs. Delgado assured them that since it was a bilingual book, they could read it in both classes. She also informed them that the book contained some English words and since she was in the process of learning English, they would need to help her with them and that she would have to read the English words very slowly, because of her lack of proficiency. This was, of course, a fabricated story. In fact, Mrs. Delgado was married to a native English speaker and was quite fluent in English, although it was not her dominant or preferred language. This lack of authenticity fueled the monolingual

ideology and also denied the existence of a bilingual and bicultural borderlands. Such borderlands are described by Anzaldúa (1987) as a space beyond geographic borders, where being of mixed linguistic origin within an American context is negotiated.

Mrs. Delgado's hesitation and disingenuous reading performance points towards the monolingual ideology upheld by the TWI program at Presidio Primary and was also illustrated in the vignette with Mrs. Kaiser discussed previously. This "separate" monolingual ideology was meant to be "equal" and not limited to teachers in the TWI program, but enacted throughout the school. When asked about how she planned resources to include students in the TWI program, the librarian professed a strong desire to acquire books exclusively in Spanish. She and the administrators wanted to reinforce the learning of Spanish by not allowing students to read the English portion of bilingual books (interview with librarian, 5 April 2007). Some researchers have found that when both English and Spanish are on the same page, readers naturally gravitate towards their dominant language (Nathenson-Mejía and Escamilla 2003). Because of the dearth of materials available exclusively in Spanish, this "separate but equal" desire contributed to the Spanish literature resource-poor environment at Presidio Primary, which posed problems for participants in the TWI program. Having less than five percent of all books in the library available in Spanish resulted in children's biliteracy experiences being severely limited rather than enhanced by school policy.

These practices of limiting the books available, delaying English literacy instruction, and the severe language separation rules through the "one language, one teacher" ideology created an artificial environment and even noxious view of bilingualism and biliteracy. Virtually no TWI teacher on campus was able to serve as a bilingual role model for students. The principal acknowledged the strange result of their language separation policy when he confessed in an

interview that he was indeed one of the few people on campus who publicly spoke both English and Spanish (principal interview, 18 April 2007).

The monolingual environment created inside Presidio Primary contrasted starkly with the community in South Central Texas surrounding the school. If someone were to visit this area in 2009 they would find a visibly multilingual and multicultural community. Historically a German enclave in Texas, many businesses and street or neighborhood names are in German. Many residents still claim German ancestry (30% of the total population) and a few (about 3%) still speak the local German dialect. The city relies on its reputation as a German town for tourism, the largest industry. However, the modern reality of the town is different, with more than a third of the residents from Latina/o backgrounds and speaking Spanish at home (US Census 2000). The new immigrant reality is also evident in billboards and businesses catering to the Spanish speaking community. In the immediate area surrounding the school, billboards in Spanish and English can be found as well as businesses where Spanish is the language used in transactions. Thus, old timers and newcomers alike are invested in the language ideologies and educational policies promoted within the school.

Parents' Views of the TWI Program. Our initial assumption based on personal experiences as well as the literature was that parents whose children were enrolled in the TWI program would support bilingualism and bilingual education. We chose to interview mothers regarding their experiences with the TWI program because they were more visible at school functions as well as their central role in decisions regarding the language maintenance and education of their children (Lareau 2000). Seminal work on the language socialization of Spanish speaking children describes women from linguistically subjugated communities as those with the most

responsibility for language maintenance decisions (Zentella 1987). For many young children, mothers hold powerful influences on their language learning (Brisk and Harrington 2000, González 2001) and lay an important foundation for becoming bilingual (Valdéz 2005).

We conducted interviews with mothers from both Spanish dominant and English dominant backgrounds whose children were enrolled in first grade TWI classes at Presidio Primary. In accordance with the mothers' preferences, the interviews took place in their homes and conducted in the mothers' language of choice, usually their dominant language. Interviews included reasons for enrolling their children in the TWI program and their own personal experiences with learning languages.

Although all the mothers interviewed strongly supported the ideology of bilingualism, they reported conflicting support for policies in the TWI program at Presidio Primary. This is a contrast to earlier studies of parents from both Spanish and English backgrounds whose children were enrolled in TWI programs. Lindholm-Leary (2001) found that all parents supported bilingualism and were uniformly positive about Two-Way Immersion. Other studies suggest that both Spanish and English dominant parents overwhelmingly supported the TWI program and would recommend it to others (Craig 1996, Giacchino-Baker and Piller 2006, Saucedo 1997, Shannon and Milian 2002). However, most of these studies relied primarily on survey data without in-depth interviews. The mixed responses from parents in our data mirrors the survey data we conducted with teachers: while all the teachers strongly supported bilingualism, some were less enthusiastic about TWI programs.

We are not suggesting that the vast majority of parents whose children were enrolled in this program did not support it. On the other hand, it is important to note there were opposing opinions among some mothers regarding the Two-Way Immersion program at Presidio Primary.

The six English dominant mothers of children enrolled in the TWI program reported positive experiences and none indicated dissatisfaction with the policies or teaching practices. However, of the five Spanish dominant mothers interviewed, there was a spectrum of experiences and levels of satisfaction with the TWI program. Following are responses of two English dominant and three Spanish dominant mothers and their experiences regarding their children's education in the TWI program.

All mothers interviewed varied according to socioeconomic, educational, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds and the sampling of three Spanish dominant mothers represent a range of life experiences and perspectives. Table 6 provides an overview of this variance that can be viewed along a continuum from monolingual Spanish or English dominant to bilingual home settings. This table aligns with Hornberger's (1989) continua of biliteracy. The context of Azucena's household was the most bilingual and the Spanish-speaking home of Marisol and English-speaking home of Kathy were the least bilingual or most monolingual. This range illustrates the wide variance within the TWI community. It is important to recognize such distinctions both within and across groups as well as the push and pull of shifting language ideologies in the borderlands (González 2001). Accordingly, mothers had various reasons for enrolling their children in TWI programs that may have shifted after eight months or more of their children's schooling and acculturation to the wider community.

(Insert Table 6 about here)

In these families, the home language of two mothers (Marisol and Ester) was exclusively Spanish. In Azucena's family, her dominant language was Spanish and her husband's dominant language was English but they had agreed they would speak primarily Spanish in the home.

Debbie's immediate family spoke mostly English but her husband's parents spoke Spanish and her parents spoke German. The home language of Kathy's family was exclusively English.

Marisol was an immigrant from Mexico. Her English was very limited and she had mostly English speaking neighbors. She found it difficult to communicate with them and didn't leave the house very much, mainly because she didn't have transportation. All three children were enrolled in the TWI program at Presidio Primary. Marisol agreed with the goals of the TWI program but because of her own lack of English fluency and material resources, found it difficult to understand how her daughters were progressing in English language development.

Ester grew up and worked as a *normalista* (teacher) in Piedras Negras, a small city across the border from Eagle Pass, Texas. Her experience was in early childhood education in public schools in Mexico and she had more formal schooling than her husband, Mario. Due to their immigration status, Ester and Mario rarely returned to Mexico and had not seen some of their family members in quite some time. Ester's two sons were both in the Two-Way Immersion program. Ester and her husband were committed to providing their sons a quality education and although they did not speak English well, they thought it was important for their sons to learn English quickly. As a result, Ester provided them with books in English and they watched cartoons together to hear the English language.

Azucena was an immigrant from Mexico and was raised in a middle class family where education was of supreme importance. Her parents sacrificed to provide her and her siblings a private Catholic school education in Monterrey, the capital city of Nuevo León. Azucena was trained as a clothing designer and at one time had her own shop where she designed and oversaw the production of garments. She was married to Tom, a native English speaker from the eastern US state of Pennsylvania. When they first met, Tom did not know Spanish but they

communicated through gestures, pictures and using bilingual dictionaries. Both of them spoke Spanish with their children at home who were enrolled in the TWI program.

Debbie and her family lived in the middle class neighborhood directly across the street from the school. She was a native English speaker and grew up in the community. Her grandparents and parents spoke German but did not pass it down to Debbie and her siblings. Debbie was married to José, a second generation Mexican-American who grew up in central Texas. His parents spoke Spanish as their first language, but as occurred throughout Texas and the southwestern part of the US, they were punished for speaking Spanish and as a result did not teach it to their children. José understood some Spanish and could get by in certain situations but was not fluent. Although English was the language spoken in the home, their children had frequent opportunities to speak Spanish with their grandparents.

Kathy lived in the wealthiest suburb of homes zoned to Presidio Primary. She and her husband, Bob were not Spanish speakers and moved to Texas from the northeastern part of the US. Kathy was very active in school activities, having served on the school Parent Teacher Association (PTA) as an officer for several years and t hey first heard of the TWI program in the initial stages of implementation. While Kathy immediately thought it was a sound idea for their children's education, but Bob needed more convincing. They enrolled both of their children in the program. Kathy was clear, however, that if there were magnet schools for math, science or technology, they would prefer such a program and would want their children to participate.

For Marisol and Azucena a strong ideological rationale for choosing to enroll their children in the TWI program was that learning Spanish fluently would maintain the family's ties to Mexico and maintain linguistic and cultural *"raíces"* or roots. The belief was that maintaining one's language was akin to maintaining one's culture. Ester also expressed the

desire for her children to be connected to Mexico, in traditions, language, and culture. These

mothers stressed the importance of their children being able to communicate with extended

family. Marisol was particularly appreciative that the principal valued linguistic and cultural

maintenance at home as well as at school. She said,

> *El director nos dijo,"háblenle mucho ustedes en español, que a ellos sus raíces no se les*
> *olviden. Por que si no, empiezan a hablar el inglés, y desde abajo empiezan a agarrar el*
> *inglés y el español lo van a echar para un lado." Es lo que le decía a mi esposo para*
> *que aprendan los dos lenguajes, y me gusta que agarren ese lenguaje por que realmente*
> *las familias de nosotros, todos hablan español.*

> Translation:

> The principal told us, "Speak to them a lot in Spanish so that they don't forget their roots
> because if not they start to speak English and from an early age they start to learn English
> and they will put Spanish aside." That is what I tell my husband but they need to learn
> two languages, and I would like for them to learn this language [Spanish] because really
> our families they all speak Spanish.

Marisol repeated what the principal said to parents in a meeting, the importance of *raíces* or

roots. She discussed the matter at home with her husband, a joint decision maker in the

education of their children. She told her husband that she recognized the need for their daughters

to learn two languages, Spanish and English, but she wanted their children to learn Spanish so

they could communicate with extended family. Marisol's ideological stance contained a cultural

rationale for bilingualism—that her children would preserve their cultural values.

Cultural values may even take the form of recapturing a heritage language, a

theme brought up by Debbie. When asked about their decision to enroll their daughter,

Debbie replied, "We had never even heard about it [TWI], but we thought, 'well, that

would be kind of cool,' because my in-laws speak Spanish. It would also give Tanya the

opportunity to learn the Spanish that her Dad didn't ever get to learn." Because her in-

laws, like many Mexican-Americans were forced to assimilate and punished for speaking

Spanish in schools and in public (San Miguel 1988), the family had experienced rapid

language loss. Although her husband was not taught Spanish as a child in part due to the

treatment his parents received, Debbie wanted their daughter to have the opportunity to

learn Spanish and to speak with her grandparents in their native language.

Although all of the mothers elected to enroll their children in the TWI program, some

began to question their choice. Ester noticed differences in how parents from different language

backgrounds were treated at the school and felt that teachers and staff often projected this

differential treatment in adherence to policies. In an interview she stated, *"A.mis niños yo pienso*

que no lo esta beneficiando como le esta beneficiando a un Americano al cien por ciento./ I think

that my children are not benefiting one hundred percent like an American is benefiting."] She

positioned herself in opposition to [English-speaking] Americans because she felt English

dominant children begin the program with a strong English literacy advantage. Azucena agreed

on this point and was concerned about the English literacy disadvantage for her Spanish-

speaking children. The mothers recognized that in order to be successful in American society

their Spanish dominant child needed to learn English quickly and they were concerned because

their children were not learning the language as quickly as they had hoped, at least not yet in this

program. So the benefits of TWI were out of balance, according to these two Spanish-speaking

mothers. They seemed convinced that the English speakers benefited more from the Spanish

speaker's Spanish than vice versa. In Ester's own words, *"veo beneficio que están agarrando*

ventaja de nosotros para beneficiarlos/I see benefits that they are gaining from us to benefit

themselves."

Ester viewed the TWI program as having asymmetrical benefits whereby the Latina/o

Spanish dominant children did not benefit as much as the English dominant children. In the

sample of five Spanish-speaking mothers who were interviewed, three Latina mothers shared

this sentiment, but Ester's was the strongest stance against the TWI program. Two of the

mothers with this view, Ester and Azucena, had a high level of education in their home country

of Mexico and regularly volunteered in their children's classrooms at Presidio Primary. In

contrast, the English dominant mothers were satisfied with their children's bilingual/biliterate

development and did not appear to notice if there was any kind of difference in opportunities or

privilege in the TWI program, something that may be attributed to a lack of awareness of

linguistic, cultural, and social privilege in the school and the wider community (McIntosh 1992).

When asked if she thought both groups of children (Spanish dominant and English dominant)

benefited equally from the program, Kathy answered, "I have no idea if the program is equitable

to both populations. It has been great for our family."

Conclusion

This paper describes the language ideologies and the language and literacy policies and

practices of a TWI program in Texas. Findings indicate that although the ideological

underpinnings of the program and stances of participants were highly positive towards

bilingualism and biliteracy, in practice there were competing ideologies at work. The study's

significance lies in how it goes beyond self-reported data and official policies and delves into the

enactment of ideologies and policies in a primary school. It highlights how despite the positive

and egalitarian goals of the program and ideologies held by teachers, staff, and parents, some

Spanish-speaking mothers felt their children were being shortchanged by the language and

literacy practices enacted in the TWI program during the primary grades.

The ideologies held by all teachers in five schools with TWI programs were very positive

towards bilingualism and moderately positive towards TWI programs and bilingual education, as

shown on the TLI. Interestingly, the teachers assigned to transitional bilingual education and ESL programs were less supportive of TWI programs. Through interviews and analysis of official documents pertaining to the language programs, it became evident that the programs were given differential treatment. The TWI programs were highly lauded and showcased; the other language programs were relegated to compensatory status. This differential treatment had an effect on the teachers' views of the programs and created a sense of competition rather than collaboration between the programs.

Administrators and teachers who are charged with creating and implementing TWI programs need to be aware of the presence of competing Discourses regarding the goals and underlying ideological foundations of programs, not to mention the allocation of resources. Educators should take into account how their own ideologies as well as the official Discourses and policies are enacted in practice. Although the ideological support of bilingualism and biliteracy was present in participants of the TWI program at Presidio Primary, the strict separation of languages was an interpretation the school personnel made of official district policy regarding TWI programs. Unlike other interpretations of what biliterate schooling experiences can be, students at Presidio Elementary were constrained from experiencing social and academic transactions with two overlapping and interacting literate worlds (Moll and Dworin 1996, Reyes 2001) in the learning space that Anzaldúa (1987) refers to as the bilingual and bicultural borderlands. Furthermore, the "one teacher, one language" policy severely limits opportunities for students to become biliterate in a spontaneous (Reyes 2001) or authentic way. To compound the situation even further, there were not equitable resources in the library that encouraged students, teachers, and families to call upon the use of all of their literate and linguistic resources (Fránquiz and Reyes 1998) for reading, writing, and making meaning in and through two

languages. These inequities illustrate that the fundamental question asked by Valdés (1997) of

who benefits from TWI programs is still a very pertinent question to consider today.

Although we recognize that TWI are programs that require long-term participation for

maximum benefit, including bilingual and biliterate competencies, it is important to note that the

dissatisfaction of some Spanish-speaking parents resulted in the removal of their children from

the program, as was the case of Ester's family. This educational decision may have a detrimental

effect on both the children who were removed and the long-term success of the TWI program.

When Spanish dominant children are placed in monolingual English or transitional bilingual

programs, they have a lower likelihood of developing bilingual and biliterate competencies and

of educational success over the course of their academic career (Thomas and Collier 1997,

2002). Moreover, in order for TWI programs to be successful, there must be participation of

both Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students (Lindholm 1997). If enough Spanish

dominant families opt out, the program cannot succeed, resulting in a lost opportunity for all

participants. Policies, both stated and enacted, therefore, must be carefully constructed and

revisited to ensure that they are aligned with both ideologies in the local setting and practices that

will indeed result in the intended outcomes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ada, A. F. 1996. *Canción de todos los niños del mundo*. San Diego, CA: Del Sol Books.

Alanís, I. 2000. A Texas Two-Way Bilingual Program: Its effects on linguistic and academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24, 3.

Amrein, A. and R. Peña. 2000. Asymmetry in Dual Language practice: Assessing imbalance in a program promoting equity. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 8.

Anzaldúa, G. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Babbie, E. 1990. *Survey Research Methods.* CA: Wadsworth

Bartolomé, L. and M. Balderrama. 2001. The Need for Educators with Political and Ideological Clarity. In Maria de la Luz Reyes and John Halcon Eds. *The Best for Our Children: Critical Perspectives on Literacy for Latino Students.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bartz. A. E. 1988. *Basic statistical concepts*. 3rd ed. Macmillan.

Baxter, K. 1998, January 1. For Young Readers: A Fine Blossoming of Bilingual Offerings. *Los Angeles Times*, p. 3.

Brisk, M. E. and M. M. Harrington. 2000 . *Literacy and bilingualism: A handbook for all teachers.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Center for Applied Linguistics. 2006. *Directory of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs in the U.S.* Retrieved June 16, 2006 from http://www.cal.org/twi/directory.

Chamot, A. U., S. Barnhardt, P.B. El-Dinary, and J. Robbins. 1999 . *The learning strategies handbook.* White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Christian, D., C.L. Montone, K.J. Lindholm, and I. Carranza. 1997. *Profiles in Two-Way Immersion Education.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Cloud, N., F. Genesee, and E. Hamayan. 2000. *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Crawford, J. 2000 *At War with Diversity: U.S. Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. 1981. The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: California State University; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. 1996. *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society.* Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Darder, A. 1991. *Culture and Power in the Classroom: A Critical Foundation for Bicultural Education.* Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Denzin, N., and Y. Lincoln. eds. 2008. 3rd edition. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Escamilla, K. 1989. *A brief history of bilingual education.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools Charleston WV. ED308055

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power.* New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* New York: Longman.

Flores, B. 2005. The intellectual presence of the deficit view of Spanish-speaking children in the educational literature during the 20th century. In *Latino Education: An agenda for community action research* ed. P. Pedraza and M. Rivera, 75-99. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fránquiz, M., and M. de la Luz Reyes. 1998. Creating Inclusive Learning Communities through English Language Arts: From *chanclas* to *canicas*. *Language Arts,* 75 3, 211-219.

Garcia, O. 2005. Positioning Heritage Languages in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, iii, pp. 601-605.

Gee, J. P. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*. London: Routledge

Genesee, F. 1999. *Program alternatives for linguistically diverse students*. Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. www.cal.org/crede/pubs/edpractice/EPR1.pdfr

Giacchino-Baker, R., and B. Piller. 2006. Parental motivation, attitudes, support, and commitment in a southern Californian two-way immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *5,* 1, 5–28.

Gillanders, C.. and R. T. Jiménez. 2004. Reaching for success: A close-up of Mexican immigrant parents who foster literacy success for their kindergarten children. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 4,* 3, 243-269.

Gomez, L., D. Freeman, and Y. Freeman. 2005. Dual Language Education: A Promising 50-50 Model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29 1, 145-164.

González, N. 2001 . *I am my language: discourses of women and children in the borderlands*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Gort, M. 2006 . Strategic codeswitching, interliteracy, and other phenomena of emergent bilingual writing: Lessons from first grade dual language classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 6 3, pp. 323- 354.

Heller, M. 2001. Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: Ideology and categorization in a linguistic minority school. In Coupland, Srangi and Candlin Eds. , *Sociolinguistics and social theory*, pp. 261-296 . Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Hornberger, N.H. 1989. Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research* 59 3 ,

Howard, E., J. Sugarman, and D. Christian. 2003. *Trends in Two-Way Immersion Education: A review of the research.* Baltimore, MD: CRESPAR/Johns Hopkins University.

Jeon, M. 2003. Searching for the rationale for two-way immersion program policies. In *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual settings*, ed. N.H. Hornberger, 122-148. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lachtman, O. D. 1995 . *Pepita Talks Twice/Pepita habla dos veces*. Houston: Piñata Books.

Lareau, A. 2000. *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education* 2nd Edition . Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Lincoln, Y. S., and E. G. Guba 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lindholm, K.J. 1997 . Two-way bilingual education programs in the United States. In *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 5, Bilingual Education,* ed. J. Cummins and D. Corson. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. 2001. *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J., and G. Borsato. 2001 . *Impact of two-way bilingual elemetnary programs on students' attitudes toward school and college* Research Report 10 . Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.

McIntosh, P. 1992. White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies pp. 70-81 . In M. Anderson and P. Collins Eds. *Race, Class and Gender*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Moll, L. C., and J. E. Dworin. 1996. Biliteracy development in classrooms: Social dynamics and cultural possibilities. In *Discourse, learning and schooling: An interdisciplinary perspective*, ed. D. Hicks, 221-246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nathenson-Mejía, S., and K. Escamilla. 2003. Connecting with Latino Children: Bridging Cultural Gaps with Children's Literature. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27, 1, 101-116.

Ovando, C. 2003. Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27, 1, 1-23.

Ovando, C., V. Collier, and M. C. Combs. 2003. *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* 3rd edition . Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Pellerano, C., S. Fradd, and L. Rovira. 1998. Coral Way Elementary School: A success story in bilingualism and biliteracy. NCBE report.

Pérez, B. 2004. *Becoming Biliterate: A study of two-way bilingual immersion education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pérez, B., and M. Torres-Guzman. 2002. *Learning in Two Worlds*. NY: Allyn and Bacon.

Quintanar-Sarellana, R. 2004. ¡Si se puede! Academic excellence and bilingual competency in a K-8 Two Way Dual Immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 3 2, 87-102.

Ramirez, J.D., Yuen, S.D., and Ramey, D.R. 1991 . *Executive summary, Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children,* U.S. Department of Education Contract No. 300-87-0156. San Mateo, CA: Aguire International.

Reese, L. J., and R. Gallimore. 2000 . Immigrant Latinos' cultural model of literacy development: An evolving perspective on home-school discontinuities. *American Journal of Education, 108*: 2, 103-134.

Reyes, M. de la Luz. 2001. Unleashing Possibilities: Biliteracy in the Primary Grades. In *The Best for Our Children: Critical Perspectives on Literacy for Latino Students*, ed. M. de la Luz Reyes and John J. Halcón, 96–121. New York: Columbia.

Rogers, R. 2004. An introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education. In *Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*, ed. R. Rogers, 1-18. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ronjat, J. 1913. *Le développement du language observé chez un enfant bilingue*. Paris: Librarie Ancienne H. Champion.

Ruiz, R. 1984. Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal* 8 2, 15–34.

San Miguel, G. 1988. *"Let all of them take heed": Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910 – 1981.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Saunders, G. 1988. *Bilingual Children: From Birth to Teens.* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Shannon, S. 1995. The hegemony of English: A case study of one bilingual classroom as a site of resistance. *Linguistics and Education: An International Research Journal*, 7 3, 177-202.

Shannon, S. M., and M. Milian. 2002. Parents Choose Dual Language Programs in Colorado: A Survey. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26* 3, 681-696.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smith, H. L. 1999. Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: The Child's Perspective. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2* 4, 268-281.

Smith, P., and E. Arnot-Hopffer. 1998. Exito Bilingue: Promoting Spanish literacy in a Dual language immersion program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22, 2, 3 and 4, 103-119.

Tatum, B. 1997. "*Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria" and other Conversations About Race.* New York: Basic Books.

Thomas, W., and V. Collier. 1997. *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: NCBE. Available at: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness/index.htm

Thomas, W., and V. Collier. 2002. *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: CREDE. http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Housing Characteristics for States, Cities, and Counties.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved December 10, 2006 from: http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html

Valdés, G. 1997. Dual Language Immersion Programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67 3, pp. 391-429.

Valdéz, V. 2005. *Mothers of Mexican Origin Within Day-to-Day Parent Involvement: Agency and Spanish Language Maintenance.* The University of Texas: unpublished doctoral dissertation.

van Dijk, T. 1993. *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

van Dijk, T. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.

Zentella, A. C. 1987. Language and female identity in the Puerto Rican community. In *Women and language in transition*, ed. J. Penfield, Albany: SUNY Press.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of four constructs of TLI

Construct	Mean	Standard Deviation
Bilingualism	4.26	.54
Two Way Immersion Programs	3.80	.68
Bilingual Instruction	3.69	.70
Standard Language Ideologies	2.58	.81

(Key: 5 point Likert Scale range from 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neither agree nor disagree, 4 agree, 5 strongly agree)

Table 2: Multivariate analysis of variance main effects

Main effect	Significance	Partial *Eta* squared	Observed Power
Teaching Assignment	.003	.062	.956
Certificate held	.007	.074	.988

Table 3: Two-Way Immersion construct MANOVA with assignment

Assignment	Mean	Standard Deviation
Generalists	3.73	.68
Dual Language	4.40	.41
Bilingual	3.54	.74
ESL	3.63	.57

(Key: 5 point Likert Scale range from 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neither agree nor disagree, 4 agree, 5 strongly agree)

Table 4: District program goals as outlined in the official handbooks

Two-Way Immersion	Transitional Bilingual/ESL
"**Goal 1:** All students will achieve or exceed the [SCISD] and Texas standards in all academic subjects guided by the TEKS **Goal 2:** Elementary students will achieve high levels of literacy (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Understanding) in both Spanish and English by the end of 5th grade. **Goal 3:** All students will develop an understanding and appreciation of multiculturalism. **Goal 4:** Fall and Spring Parental District Involvement"	"The goal of the bilingual education program is to facilitate second language learners to become competent in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of the English language through the development of literacy and academic skills through an integrated curriculum. The program—offered in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth grade—emphasizes the mastery of English language skills, as well as provides understandable instruction in a students' primary language in mathematics, science and social studies."

(Row label: Program goals)

Table 5: First grade Two-Way Immersion class schedule

Time	Activity	Language of Instruction
7:45 – 8:15	Morning Message, Calendar	Spanish
8:15 – 9:10	Specials (Computers, Music, P.E.)	English
9:15 – 11:00	Language Arts	Spanish
11:00 – 12:30	Math	Spanish
12:30 – 1:00	Lunch	
1:00 – 1:20	Recess	
1:20 – 2:25	Social Studies or Science	Spanish
2:30 – 3:00	English Language Development	English
3:15	Dismissal	

Key: 90% of instruction allocated to Spanish in white; 10% allocated to English represented in grey

Table 6: Continua of families' linguistic environments

Name (pseudonym)	Marisol	Ester	Azucena	Debbie	Kathy
Dominant language	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish	English	English
Husband's dominant language	Spanish	Spanish	English	English	English
Her children's grandparents' dominant languages	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish (M) English/ German (P)	English/German (M) Spanish/English (P)	English
Educational background	limited education (6th grade)	more education (normalista)	some college education	some college education	college degree
Citizenship status	undocumented immigrant	undocumented immigrant	U. S. resident (immigrant married to U.S. citizen)	U.S. born citizen	U.S. born citizen
Socioeconomic status	working poor	working poor	middle class	middle class	upper middle class/affluent
Primary Language used in the home	Spanish with very limited English (children interacted with neighbors and talked on telephone with classmates in English)	Spanish with limited English use in home (some books, television in English)	Spanish with some English use in home (books, television, games, religious education, some interaction with father, all interaction with paternal relatives in English)	English with some Spanish use in home (some books, music, interactions with paternal grandparents in Spanish)	English with very limited Spanish use in home (homework, books from school in Spanish)
Language and literacy continua	←------------- **monolingual Spa**	--------------	-------------- **bilingual**	-----------------	----------→ **monolingual Eng**