Talking with the “Spanish Kids”: Experiences and Language Ideologies and Dual

Language Graduates in Illinois

by

Ashley Lenz

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved May 2022 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Sara Beaudrie, Co-Chair
Álvaro Cerrón-Palomino, Co-Chair
Michael Gradoville
Yalda Kaveh

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2022

ABSTRACT

This study examined and compared language ideologies and attitudes among dual language program (Spanish-English) graduates regarding their use of Spanish and perceptions of their bilingual education experience through surveys and semi-structured interviews. Drawing from the theory of ideology, data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Surveys were divided into two sections and contained 30 Likert-style items related to participants' attitudes regarding Spanish, English, bilingualism and their experiences in the dual language program. Interviews, which were 40-60 minutes in length, were coded in two cycles based on general themes related to dual language graduates' experiences in the dual language program and language attitudes and ideologies. Patterns among codes were identified, analyzed and compared with quantitative findings to create major themes. Findings reveal that graduates generally consider themselves bilingual and had both positive and negative experiences in the program. Additionally, dual language graduates exhibit conflicting attitudes and ideologies regarding monolingualism, standardization and the value of bilingualism. Finally, results indicate a difference in the experiences of the Latinx and non-Latinx students, which have implications regarding the equity of the dual language program. Findings from this study give insight into the experiences of dual language graduates, an area that has received little attention, and provides insight into the issues regarding educational and attitudinal outcomes in bilingual contexts, specifically in dual language programs. Pedagogical implications are discussed as related to the most salient themes identified in this research.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my former students and all of the dual language graduates that shared their experiences with me to make this work possible

Les dedico esta disertación a mis ex estudiantes y a todos los graduados de dual language que compartieron sus experiencias conmigo y que hicieron este trabajo posible

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my committee: Thank you for your support and guidance throughout my four years in grad school and for being supportive of my ideas, while guiding me to make connections to other research areas. Thank you for sharing your expertise and preparing me for life after grad school.

To Yalda Kaveh: Thank you not only for your availability and dedication to my academic success, but also your guidance navigating life as a student. I am so thankful for your mentorship.

My dear Sofia with an f. I do not have the words to describe my gratitude for your friendship and support throughout my PhD process. I truly believe I would not have been able to do this without you. I am filled with gratitude for the countless memories we have created together, and I cherish all the times we ate *papas* together. Thank you for putting up with me and still deciding to be my best friend.

Marce: Por fin te puedo responder que ya no me falta nada. Asuuu. Gracias por apoyarme durante mis peores momentos. Estoy agradecida por la oportunidad de crecer juntos. Qué comience la siguiente etapa de nuestra vida juntos.

Mi mamita: Gracias por ser mi segunda madre y una de mis mejores amigas. Agradezco tu apoyo incondicional. Me siento tan bendecida por haberte conocido y por la oportunidad de tenerte en mi vida.

Mom and Dad: Thank you for all your love and support throughout my graduate school experience. Thank you for always having a solution to any problem that I may have and inspiring me to keep going when things get hard.

Anna, Audrey, Brenda: Gracias chicas por ayudarme mantener mi cordura durante los últimos años. Valoro su amistad.

Steven: Thank you for reminding me to breathe and for your guidance during my four years of grad school, but especially during the last few weeks leading up to my defense. I am so thankful for you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vii

DEFINITION OF TERMS viii

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study 6

Organization of the Dissertation 7

Bilingual Education 8

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW 25

Language Attitudes 25

Language Ideologies 27

Language Attitudes in Dual Language Education 41

Language Ideologies in Dual Language Education 44

3 METHODOLOGY 64

Research Questions 65

Statement of Positionality 66

Context 65

Participants 67

Research Design 71

Instruments 72

Procedure 75

Analysis 76

CHAPTER Page

4 RESULTS 81

Graduates' Experiences and Attitudes Related to Dual Language 81

Dual Language Graduates' Language Attitudes and Ideologies 107

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 144

Dual Language Graduates' Attitudes 145

Dual Langauge Graduates Ideologies 148

Pedagogical Implications 163

Limitations 168

Summary 169

REFERENCES 173

APPENDIX

A SURVEY INSTRUMENT 188

B SEMI-STRUCTIRED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 191

C PARENTAL INVITATION AND CONSENT 194

D PARENTAL INVITATION AND CONSENT (SPANISH) 197

E STUDENT CONSENT 199

F IRB APPROVAL 201

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. District Socioeconomic and Demographic Information 65

2. Description of Benson School District Dual Language Model 67

3. Participant Information.. 69

4. Interviewee Information 70

5. Survey Components and Design 73

6. Weighted Means and Verbal Descriptions.. 78

7. Independent t-test Results of Dual Language Experiences 82

8. Independent t-test Results of Language Attitudes 107

DEFINITION OF TERMS

English Learner (EL): Any student who speaks any language other than English at home. Els are identified in Illinois through a home language questionnaire.

Heritage Speaker: A speaker of a language raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken and is to some degree bilingual (Valdés, 2001).

Bilingual Language Education (BLE): The use of multiple multilingual practices among teachers and students with the goal of achieving bilingual proficiency, fostering appreciation of linguistic variety, and developing tolerance towards linguistic differences (García, 2011, p. 5).

Bilingual Education Act (BEA): Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act which was originally passed formally address the needs of minoritized language students by providing financial incentives to the states that adopted bilingual education programs to aid students who spoke languages other than English.

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE): A form of bilingual education with the primary purpose of transitioning students to all English instruction through the use of native language support (Baker, 2006).

Dual Language Education (DLE): A form of additive bilingual education in which two languages are acquired through subject-matter instruction (Howard et al., 2018). The 50/50 model provides an equal amount of instruction in both languages. The 90/10 model provides 90% of instruction in the minoritized language during early grades and time dedicated to English instruction increases each year until reaching 50%.

Two-Way Immersion (TWI): Two language groups receive formal education through the use of their two languages. Ideally, half of the students are native English speakers and half are native/heritage speakers of the partner language (Thomas & Collier, 2012)

Language Ideologies: Evaluative perceptions of language and language practices closely related to power among social, economic and political contexts and that have real world consequences for their speakers (Fuller & Leeman, 2020).

Spanglish For the purpose of this research and to maintain the voice of the graduates themselves, the term Spanglish was used to describe graduates' use of the linguistic practice of translanguaging.

Translanguaging: A term used to describe the fluid language practices of multilinguals based on the idea of a single linguistic repertoire, while ignoring the socio-political categorization of named languages (Otheguy, García & Reid, 2015).

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States is home to over 50 million Spanish speakers, making it the second highest concentration in the world behind Mexico. In fact, there are more Spanish speakers in the United States than in countries such as Spain or Colombia, who have 47 and 48 million Spanish speakers, respectively (Instituto Cervantes, 2019). However, despite the fact that English has never officially been established as the national language of the United States, it has been accepted as the language of power and has been used as a tool to unite the country, as it continues to be the hallmark of being "American" (Flores, 2014; Morales & Rao, 2015). This belief represents one example of a wide-spread language ideology, which refers to an idea regarding language and language use that is closely related to power among social, economic and political contexts, and as a result have real life consequences for speakers of a given language (Leeman & Fuller, 2020). In the United States, language ideologies have promoted English hegemony, which refers to the promotion of English monolingualism. As a result, federal and state-level legislation has shifted the focus away from the development of heritage languages and towards the promotion of English language acquisition throughout the educational system (Johnson, 2010). Thus, the current instructional programs and educational policy in the U.S. work to convert heritage speakers into English speakers, while ignoring the benefits of heritage language maintenance (Lee & Wright, 2014).

Despite restrictive language policy and attacks on language rights throughout the country, dual language programs, which promote learning in two languages for both monolingual English speakers as well as heritage Spanish speakers, have emerged as "a

way of continuing to operate even a small modicum of professional bilingual activity in times of an increasingly bilingual U.S. reality but strict monolingual imposition" (Garcia, 2005, p. 604). Furthermore, of particular relevance to the current research, legislation within the state of Illinois has generally supported bilingual education, specifically additive programs such as dual language.

Nevertheless, the increasing popularity of dual language programs has predominantly been focused in "highly resourced communities," while areas with large numbers of Latinx students who speak Spanish as a heritage language have continued to prioritize the acquisition of English through transitional bilingual programs (Morales & Rao, 2015). As such, researchers have argued that even programs, such as dual language, which strive to promote diversity, bilingualism and biliteracy, and to support minority language maintenance and pluralism, privilege English dominant speakers, further contributing to the formation and proliferation of hegemonic language ideologies, as well as exacerbating existing inequalities among different groups. Thus, dual language programs represent a unique environment in which a variety of social, cultural, political and linguistic forces, including hegemonic language ideologies, compete with goals that foster bilingualism and biculturalism.

The dual language context is important to consider, as the bias towards the English language in the educational context has been found to further marginalize minoritized groups of students, even in settings that strive to promote a balance between English and the other languages of a given speech community (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017; Dascomb, 2019). As a result, children that grow up in multilingual contexts, in the United States in which there are linguistic power imbalances, learn to perceive the value

of their languages differently, creating a linguistic and cultural discontinuity between children's home and school contexts. Thus, children from minoritized groups may perceive that the language and culture they associate with are not valued. As they age, even within the context of dual language, these children may experience language shift to favor the use of English and develop increasingly more negative beliefs towards the minoritized language, and consequently, towards their bilingualism (Block, 2019; Gerena, 2010; Martínez-Roldán & Malavé, 2004; Sevinç & Backus, 2019). In turn, this discontinuity can result in a myriad of negative social, emotional, cognitive as well as academic consequences (Baker, 2011; Potowski, 2007; Sevinç & Backus, 2019). In fact, Wright and Baker (2017) argue that "real causes of underachievement tend to lie in relative social and economic deprivation and exclusion, a school which rejects the home language and culture of the child, and occasionally real learning difficulties" (p. 204).

While a great deal of research has focused on the advantages in academic achievement among students who participate in dual language programs (Thomas & Collier, 2002; De Jong, 2002; Howard, et al., 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Valentino & Reardon, 2015; Steele et al., 2017; Watzinger-Tharp et al., 2018), or the social processes of becoming bilingual (Reyes, 2006), less has been done concerning students' ideological formations regarding language as a result of participating in such programs. This is significant, as one could argue that students are affected by language ideologies as they are still forming ideas about their identity while they assimilate information from administrators, teachers, parents and other peers. Nevertheless, many studies have sought to investigate the language attitudes and ideologies of children through a third person perspective. Such studies have collected reports about children's

language beliefs from parents (Lambert & Taylor, 1996; King, 2000), educators, and administrators (Merritt, 2011), despite research that has demonstrated that children's attitudes do not always correlate with parental attitudes (Pérez-Leroux et al., 2011). This research explores children's own voices in relation to their language attitudes and ideologies.

The limited studies that have focused on language ideologies specifically within dual language have found that despite participation in the bilingual program, these students hold ideologies regarding standard language and language capital (Henderson, 2016). Even more limited is ethnographic research that looks at the experiences and perspectives of students that have graduated from dual language programs. Several researchers have attempted to look at the language trajectories and ideological formations of dual language graduates (Dworin, 2011; Granados, 2015, 2017; Lindholm-Leary, 2016; Whitmore & Crowell, 2005) and have found that dual language graduates generally hold positive attitudes towards their target language and the program, reporting benefits such as bilingualism and positive cross-cultural attitudes; yet questions remain regarding the dynamics of power, race, language and culture in the dual language program. An important question that has arisen from these studies is that of *who is best served by the dual language program?* As such, more research is needed to gain insight on dual language students' perceptions and experiences, especially after they have graduated from such programs. This is important to understand the lasting effects of the dual language program and what students value from such programs, while at the same time considering the benefits afforded to both Latinx and non-Latinx students. Furthermore, studies that have examined the experiences of dual language graduates are generally

centered around language attitudes or ideologies; few have focused on the complicated and sometimes conflicting relationship between the two.

The unique environment afforded by the dual language program, coupled with the restrictive language policies and mainstream hegemonic language ideologies, provide a complicated context in which children must navigate conflicting ideas about their language and identity. Thus, a critical examination of the language attitudes and ideologies among students who have participated in dual language immersion programs is necessary to develop a deeper understanding of the experience inside these types of programs and the implications for the education of minority language students. Thus, given the significance of attitudes and ideologies, this dissertation attempts to add to the literature about the language ideologies of dual language graduates in Illinois, a state which has been generally spared of overwhelmingly restrictive language policies in the educational context, in contrast with previous studies that have generally been situated in English-only states. This dissertation seeks to examine the competing forces of dominant ideologies and English hegemony, as well as an educational program that is designed to foster positive cross-cultural and linguistic attitudes, adding to the sparse literature on the language attitudes and ideologies of the graduates of a K-5 dual language program. Furthermore, this dissertation explores the language ideologies held by Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates, to add to the body of research that discusses the benefits afforded to each group of students as well as their ideological differences and self-perception of bilingualism and biliteracy as a result of having participated in the dual language program.

Purpose of the Study

One of the most common ways that language ideologies are identified is through the analysis of the outward expression of beliefs, or attitudes, in the form of statements, opinions, stereotypes, or other observable behavior (Oppenheim, 1982). Attitudes then refer to some sort of evaluative response or judgment linked to language-related concepts (Martinez, 2006; Garrett, 2010). Language attitudes ultimately provide insight to one's beliefs towards the speakers of a language. Language attitudes and ideologies have important implications in the contexts of language in terms of success and motivation, and additionally, may serve as a predictor of policy implementation, social and cultural identity, and ultimately, language maintenance and shift (Baker, 1992; Martinez, 2006; Garett, 2010).

This mixed-methods study seeks to explore the experiences and language ideologies of graduates of a dual language program in an elementary school in a suburb of Chicago, Illinois. Particularly, it compares how language ideologies towards bilingualism, English and Spanish as a heritage language are expressed and transformed by Latinx students and their non-Latinx peers. An awareness of the development of negative perceptions of Spanish as a heritage language, or bilingualism in general, and its potential effects on student achievement and outcomes may lead to more inclusive practices. In addition, the analysis of language ideologies can provide insight about unconscious beliefs that have important implications for a variety of stakeholders (Schieffelin et al., 1998). Thus, it was anticipated that this study would generate insights that would help inform research, instruction and pedagogical interventions.

As such, the research questions that guide this dissertation are the following:

1. What are the experiences of graduates of an elementary dual language program?

    1.a. To what extent do the experiences of dual language graduates differ between Latinx and non-Latinx students?

2. What are the language attitudes and ideologies of graduates of a dual language elementary program?

    2.a. To what extent do dual language graduates' language attitudes and ideologies differ between Latinx and non-Latinx students?

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study and a background of bilingual education in the United States including a definition of bilingual education and a description of the different program models, including that of dual language. Finally, the first chapter concludes with an overview of the current state of affairs of dual language in Illinois, as well as a discussion through the perspective of a critical lens that has been used in recent years to explain the shift in the original purpose of the dual language program. The second chapter provides a review of the relevant literature specifically related to language attitudes and ideologies. After defining language attitudes and ideologies, this chapter provides insight into the dominant language ideologies surrounding Spanish and bilingualism in the United States and their effect on the history of bilingual education including language policy and legislation. The final section of the chapter provides a review of previous research in the field of language attitudes and ideologies within the educational context with a focus on research that has been conducted within the dual language program setting. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methodology of the project, beginning with a detailed

description of the context of the study and the participants, including the procedures for participant selection. The third chapter also provides a description of the instruments and their modifications, followed by the data collection procedure, an explanation of how those methodologies address the research questions and finally, the process of analysis. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data including the results and an explanation of findings grouped by themes that emerged from the data. Finally, Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the findings as related to the research questions and previous research in the field, as well as conclusions based on the results of the study including the pedagogical implications, limitations and suggestions for future research.

Bilingual Education

Bilingual Education Definitions

All instructional programs designed for English learners share the common goal of the development of English language proficiency, yet all programs are not created equal. Thus, it is first important to acknowledge the distinction between what is meant by bilingual education and dual language immersion. This section provides an overview of bilingual education, followed by a description of the different program types, including that of dual language. Next, it provides a background on the history of bilingual education in the United States and concludes with an overview of the current state of affairs regarding dual language programs in the country.

While much of the literature today uses the terms dual language and bilingual education interchangeably, there are important differences that distinguish the two. Many scholars have understood any type of education involving bilingual children as bilingual

education. Thus, the bilingual education label has been used to describe programs that simply use the heritage language as a bridge to transition students to English, as well as to describe programs that make intentional use of a heritage language to promote bilingualism and biliteracy in two or more languages. Nevertheless, Baker (2006) argues that true bilingual education relies on the explicit use of two languages in instruction. In a more detailed definition, García (2011) explains that bilingual education refers to "any instance in which children's and teacher's communicative practices in school normally include the use of multiple multilingual practices that maximize learning efficacy and communication; and that, in so doing, foster and develop tolerance towards linguistic differences, as well as appreciation of languages and bilingual proficiency" (García, 2011, p. 5).

Thus, bilingual education is an umbrella term that encompasses a wide variety of instructional models of language teaching that vary according to several factors including: the language(s) taught, the amount of instruction in each language and the goals of the problem, which can range from teaching a foreign language, supporting a minoritized language or promoting multilingual development in one or more minoritized languages (Baker & Jones, 1998). Many researchers have attempted to classify bilingual education programs based on these different factors. For instance, one of the earliest classifications comes from Lambert (1974), who made a general distinction between additive and subtractive program models based on program outcomes. As their name would suggest, programs that are classified as additive bilingual programs, add a language to a learner's repertoire without negatively affecting the learner's heritage language (HL). Additive programs refer to "the form of bilingualism that results when

students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language" (Cummins, 2000, p. 37). In contrast, subtractive bilingual programs may use the students' heritage language to initially support instruction; however, it is used as a means to support students transitioning to the exclusive use of English, which completely replaces their home language.

Wright and Baker (2017) make a further distinction between bilingual education models, distinguishing between "weak," and "strong" forms of bilingual education. First, weak bilingual education programs use the term 'bilingual' not as a way to promote bilingualism, but rather to reference the target population, being bilingual children. Programs considered to be weak forms of bilingual education include: 1) transitional bilingual education; 2) mainstream with world language teaching; and 3) separatist. The objectives of these programs are to transition students from the use of their minoritized language(s) to the exclusive use of the majority language. In contrast, strong forms of bilingual education are designed to support bilingual students in their development of oral and written communication in two or more languages. Four examples of strong bilingual education programs include: 1) immersion programs, 2) two-way dual language programs (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), 3) maintenance or heritage language programs; and 4) mainstream bilingual programs. In strong forms of bilingual education both languages are used during instruction and neither of the languages supplants the other. This is to say that both languages hold equal status in the instructional setting.

Dual Language Education (DLE)

Based on the context of the current study, the focus of this overview centers on dual language education (DLE). This section provides a definition of DLE, a description of the different program types and trajectories of dual language programs and finally the outcomes associated with participation in a dual language program.

Dual language education is the umbrella term for instructional programs related to bilingual education that teach two or more languages through content and can be further identified with a variety of terms that include two-way bilingual, two-way immersion, two-way bilingual immersion, Spanish immersion, and developmental bilingual education (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). In contrast with traditional bilingual education programs, students in DLE programs receive content area instruction in both languages, as research has indicated that languages are learned best through content instruction as opposed to being the focus of instruction (Potowski, 2004). Dual language programs are designed with the goal of developing and preserving minority students' home language, while regarding it as a resource for learning. The dual language program model has gained popularity across the United States since its initiation in 1963 and has been "increasingly positively evaluated and funded in the USA" (Field, 2008, p. 84). Stele et al. (2017) attribute this growth, in part to the idea that "a program that yields improved reading in English, improved long-term exit rates from ELL status, and no apparent detriment to mathematics and science skills—all while promoting proficiency in two languages—seems difficult to criticize" (p. 303S).

While there are a number of variables that differentiate dual language programs including the minority language of instruction, the amount of instructional time in each

language, the proportion of students of different language backgrounds, how different languages are split up in terms of time or subject area, among others (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), the main goals of the instructional model remain the same. Dual language can be defined as any program that through the use of two languages, provides literacy and content instruction to all students, while promoting bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and sociocultural competence (Howard et al., 2007; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008).

DLE Program Types

Dual language programs in the United States encompass a variety of different instructional models for both linguistically homogeneous as well as linguistically heterogeneous groups of students. Thus, DLE programs can be divided into one-way and two-way immersion programs; the main difference between the two being the composition of students. Dual language programs that serve students from a similar home language include one-way immersion, developmental bilingual and one-way heritage language programs (Thomas & Collier, 2012). In a one-way immersion program, native English speakers learn academic content in both English and the minority language as a foreign language through an immersion program. In a developmental bilingual program, minoritized-language speaking students receive instruction in both English and the minoritized language before transitioning to English instruction. Finally, in a one-way heritage program, speakers of the heritage language receive instruction through their home language as well as English (Paradis et al., 2011; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

On the other hand, two-way programs employ a purposeful integration of English-dominant and target-language-dominant students. An effective two-way dual language

classroom consists of an equal distribution of minoritized language-dominant and English-dominant students, not classified as English Learners (EL), who receive content instruction in both the minority and majority language (Alanís & Rodriguez, 2008). The rationale behind this composition is that both groups of speakers have language models in order to aid proficiency development in each of the languages (Alanís & Rodriguez, 2008; Valdés, 1997). Thus, these programs are designed to benefit students both of the majoritized language, and of the minoritized language, also known as heritage language speakers (Palmer, 2007; Pérez, 2004). Instruction in both languages, allows minoritized language students to build their proficiency in their home language, as a way to contribute to the maintenance of their heritage language, while providing an opportunity for the English speakers "to learn a second language through immersion, with the added advantage of using the language with and learning about the culture from, target-language speakers" (Lindholm-Leary, 2001, p. 30). The goal is that both groups of students work to develop bilingual competency, academic skills and positive personal, as well as cross-cultural attitudes.

The two-way dual immersion program was the model used in the district where the current study was conducted and, according to Field (2008), is the most common type of dual language education in the United States, targeting "English (language majority) speakers and speakers of another (minority) language --most commonly Spanish" (p. 84). The majority of two-way dual language programs begin early, in kindergarten, and can vary in program model, implementing either a 50:50 or 90:10 model. These two models differ in the distribution of language used for instruction. In a 50:50 model, 50 percent of instructional time is in English, and 50 percent is in the minoritized language. In contrast,

in a 90:10 model, initially 90 percent of instruction is in the minoritized language and 10 percent of instruction is in English. These percentages shift as students advance throughout the grade levels. The amount of instructional time in the minoritized language decreases with each subsequent year until fifth or sixth grade, at which time instruction reaches the 50:50 model. The valorization of the minoritized language during the early years is used not only to provide extensive input in the target language, but in addition, some researchers have argued that it helps to increase the social status of minoritized language students (Arce, 2000; Merritt, 2011).

As a result, findings dating back to the inception of the dual language program have consistently demonstrated advantages in academic achievement among students who participate in dual language programs, especially but not limited to students classified as ELLs (Thomas & Collier, 2002; De Jong, 2002; Howard, et al., 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Valentino & Reardon, 2015; Stele et al., 2017; Watzinger-Tharp et al., 2018). In fact, research has shown that both English learners and native English-speaking students eventually obtain higher levels of academic achievement than their counterparts in monolingual English classrooms (Thomas & Collier, 2003). In addition, aside from the purely academic benefits, minoritized language students, who are often marginalized within schools, have the opportunity to serve as leaders in their classrooms, and exhibit a higher status than they might in mainstream English programs (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Thus, because of the deliberate student composition and goals to achieve only high levels of academic proficiency, but also positive attitudes towards language and culture, these dual language programs, with the belief in the additive value of the students' home language, provide an instruction model

that is attractive to families of minoritized language students who wish to maintain their home language and culture, as well as for families of monolingual English students who seek linguistic enrichment for their children (Palmer, 2009; Valdés, 1997).

Dual Language Programs after Elementary School

The majority of dual language programs are limited to the elementary school context. However, in some cases, students who participate in dual language programs at the elementary level have the opportunity to continue their studies in both languages into middle school and high school. Students may take Spanish as a heritage language (SHL) classes in high school, which provide learners with the opportunity to continue to build their bilingual language skills in an academic setting. These classes differ from traditional Spanish classes, as students come with a familiarity with and cultural ties to the language. The primary goals of SHL education are to provide a means for heritage language maintenance, to increase the bilingual range, including the acquisition of a prestige variety, promote a transfer of literacy skills from English to the heritage language, to foster positive attitudes towards the heritage language and its varieties and, to aid in the acquisition and development of cultural awareness and appreciation for cultural differences (Beaudrie, 2014; Valdés, 1995).

Nevertheless, dual language programs at the middle and secondary level are often very different from those at the elementary level (Bearse & De Jong, 2008). Furthermore, if such programs do not align with the goals of SHL courses, these programs can create conflict between language and literacy ideologies and practices that are inherent to immersion programs and during middle school, the dual language program "may become a transitional, even contested, site, as teaching may shift from one model of language and

literacy instruction to another, and as literacy learning becomes narrowed to a less diverse range of academic and social genres and tasks, in order to focus on the study of grammar and national literature, the traditional focus of the World Language class" (Merritt, 2011, p. 8). Thus, the current dissertation explores dual language graduates' experiences throughout elementary school, middle school and high school to gain an understanding of the transitional process described by Merritt, and how their language ideologies have shifted throughout their educational careers.

Language Policy and Bilingual Education in the United States

Legislation related to language has had important connections and implications in areas of immigration and education. Bilingual education programs are not a new concept in the United States, as the nation's first bilingual schools were created in 1839 in Cincinnati, Ohio, after the state adopted the first bilingual education law to allow the instruction of English and German (Anderson, 1971). A few years later in 1847, Louisiana enacted a similar policy for the instruction of French and English, followed by a similar provision in 1850 for Spanish and English instruction in the New Mexico Territory. By the end of the 19th century, a variety of languages other than English were taught across the country including languages such as Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Dutch, Polish, Italian, Czech and Cherokee (Ovando, 2003).

The immigration boom of the early 20th century led to changes in federal legislation, which targeted language and literacy. In 1906, The Nationality Act was passed that made English proficiency a requirement for naturalization. As nationalism grew in the United States during the first world war, the acceptance of bilingualism sharply decreased. Anti-German hysteria and questions about the loyalty of non-English

speakers led to the discontinuation of programs that were taught in languages other than English and the use of the German language was prohibited in public spaces, including in schools (Akkari & Loomis, 1998). Language policy was not isolated to the educational setting and once again extended to immigration legislation through the passage of the Immigration Act, which barred immigrants who were illiterate in any language that was passed in 1917 (de Jong, 2011). This legislation further strengthened the link between immigration and language that serves as a basis for several of the language ideologies that will be discussed in the preceding sections. In states such as Texas, Mexican American children were segregated, attending inferior schools and, in some cases, were discouraged from attending school. English-only instruction was strictly enforced, and children were punished for speaking their native language anywhere on school grounds. In 1919, official legislation was passed in the state of Texas which declared teaching languages other than English a criminal offense (Ovando, 2003). Despite the fact that state's attempts to ban the study of foreign languages was ruled as unconstitutional in 1923, laws that encouraged the promotion of English over other languages serve to illustrate the connection between nationalism and monolingualism and paved the way for the further marginalization of minority language students (Akkari & Loomis, 1998).

After World War II, a dramatic reduction in the foreign-born population led to a shift towards more inclusive language policies. Therefore, in the 1950s and 60s, schools began to invest in the education of English Language Learners (ELLs) in English-only classrooms, by adding English as a Second Language (ESL) support to address low rates of academic success and high drop-out rates. This support continued into the 1960s and

70s, as the federal government supported bilingual education, which consisted of teaching English learners in both their native language and in English.

It was also during this time that the first dual language programs emerged in the mid-1960s in Dade County Public Schools in Miami, Florida. The earliest documented two-way dual language program was at Coral Way Elementary School and was founded in 1963 by Cuban refugees who wanted their children to learn both English and Spanish, in preparation for their return to Cuba (Garcia & Otheguy, 1998). Shortly after, in the 1970s, schools in Washington, D.C., Chicago, Illinois and San Diego, California followed suit and implemented their own dual language programs.

In 1968, as the Civil Rights Movement gained momentum, the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) was passed (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act). While this act did not mandate bilingual education, it did formally address the needs of minoritized language students, providing financial incentives to the states that adopted bilingual education programs to aid students who spoke languages other than English. In addition, it declared that English as a Second Language (ESL) programs alone were insufficient and introduced alternative methods of bilingual education as an effective way to meet the needs of English learners (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). While it did not provide a specific program or methodology, it loosely defined a bilingual program as one that provided instruction in English as well as in a students' native language.

Further progress was made to advance bilingual education initiatives several years later, when in 1974, the Supreme Court recognized that the "sink or swim" approach to language was not effective and ruled through *Lau v, Nichols* in 1974, that identical programs for English and non-English Speaking students did not provide equal

educational opportunity and thus, provisions needed to be made so that non-English speakers could have access to the curriculum. Congress incorporated this finding in the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, which required appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede bi/multilingual students' equal participation in instruction (Haas, 2005).

Some scholars argue that it was at this point in U.S. history that bilingual education received the most federal support and the strongest infrastructure for program development (Flores & Garcia, 2017). Therefore, while bilingual education programs were "hard-fought and earned" to serve minoritized language students (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2020, p.2), these programs generally consisted of transitional models that provided early support in students' home language and were designed to 'transition' students into mainstream English instruction as quickly as possible (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Nevertheless, during the following years, the focus shifted from a more supportive view of bilingualism to an emphasis on the acquisition of English (Wiley, 2012). The BEA was reauthorized through the subsequent years (1974, 1978, 1984, 1988, 1994), each time allocating more funding towards English-only programs. In 1984, Title VII legislation was amended to give states more autonomy in terms of bilingual education implementation, including the option of using English as the sole language of instruction. In addition, it allowed some of the federal funding to go towards programs in which the heritage language was not used for instruction (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). Later, in 1985, the then Secretary of Education, William Bennett, expressed that bilingual education was failing and declared that programs focused on the instruction of heritage

languages were a detriment to English acquisition (Escamilla, 1989). This public rejection of bilingual education programs paved the way for the restrictive English-only policies that would follow.

The English-only movement gained momentum in the 1990s and 2000s and consequently affected views of bilingual education. Flores (2005) describes the 2000s as a decade in which Spanish speaking students were seen as having a “problem” because of their lack of English proficiency (p. 93). It was also during this time that the anti-bilingual referendum “English for the Children” gained attention across the country and was passed in three states including California in 1998 through Proposition 227 (California Education Code, Section (305-306), in Arizona in 2002 through Proposition 203 (Arizona Revised Statutes 15-751-755), and in Massachusetts in 2002 (Question 2, G.L. c. 71A), limiting the use of Spanish to teach and removing bilingual education programs in these states.

Shortly after, the BEA was amended once again and ultimately discontinued in 2002, when former President George W. Bush signed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (2001) into effect, replacing BEA with Title III the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act. The NCLB Act eliminated any reference to bilingual education in federal legislation and gave the federal government more of a role in holding schools accountable for maintaining academic progress (as identified through high stakes standardized testing) for all students, with a special focus on ensuring that schools boost the performance of certain groups of students (Klein, 2015). In other words, NCLB held English Learners to the same standards as their non-EL peers without adequate preparation or support in their home language, despite finding

that English learners who first learn to read in their native language, or simultaneously with a second language, demonstrate higher levels of reading achievement in English than students who do not have the opportunity to learn to read in their native language (Martinez-Wenzl et al., 2012).

The passage of NCLB that removed the word "bilingualism" from the legislation, paved the way for further anti-bilingual language policies including the transition of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA), which promoted bilingual education, to the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA), which provided "national leadership to help ensure that English Learners and immigrant students attain English proficiency and achieve academic success" (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). A further example is the renaming of the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education (NCBE) to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA), which shifted the focus from bilingual education to English acquisition. The aforementioned policies are only two examples of language policies that fail to promote the acquisition of languages other than English, impacting language programs at elementary and secondary schools, as well as at the postsecondary level (Wiley, 2012; Spolsky, 2011). Nearly fourteen years later, in 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), replaced NCLB and provided more flexibility in terms of classification and assessment of English learners at a state level. Nevertheless, it did little to address bilingual education for minoritized language students.

Current State of Affairs Regarding Dual Language in the U.S.

Despite the findings that additive programs of bilingual education, such as that of dual language, promote high levels of academic achievement in two languages and

sociocultural competence (Howard et al., 2018), the most common form of bilingual education in the United States has traditionally been the transitional model. Nevertheless, in recent years, dual language programs have grown in popularity (Wilson, 2011). According to recent data, there are now more than 3,600 programs in 44 states (American Councils Research Center [ARC], 2021). Furthermore, 80% of the dual language programs use Spanish and English as their two languages of instruction (ARC, 2021).

Bilingual Education in Illinois

Despite the attacks on bilingual education throughout the country, the state of Illinois has demonstrated a consistent history of support for bilingual education programs (Morales & Rao, 2015). In fact, Illinois is one of the few states that requires some type of native language accommodations. For example, since 1973 Illinois legislation has mandated that schools with 20 or more students who have been identified as emergent bilinguals who speak the same language must provide some type of bilingual education program, and dual language programs can be used to fulfil this requirement (U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition [OELA], 2015). Currently, "Section 105 ILSC 5/14C-3 requires that one of two types of programs be provided for all PK-12 ELs to help them become proficient in English" (Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), 2020, p. 3). Nevertheless, the focus continues to be on the acquisition of English, and as described in the previous section, the transitional bilingual education model (TBE) is considered to be a weak bilingual education program, given that English is promoted and supplants the students' heritage language (Palmer, 2011). Yet, the transitional model of bilingual education continues to be the most common form

of bilingual education in the state with 655 of the 852 school districts in Illinois employing some type of transitional bilingual program (ISBE, 2020).

The dual language program model has gained increasing popularity across the United States and now includes more than 3,600 programs in 44 states (American Councils Research Center [ARC], 2021). Furthermore, 80% of the dual language programs use Spanish and English as their two languages of instruction (ARC, 2021). However, despite their increasing popularity and positive outcomes associated with two-way dual language programs, only around 5 percent of ELs in Illinois are served by such programs (ISBE, 2020). According to a recent canvas of the number of dual language programs during the 2021-22 school year, Illinois reported 52 dual language immersion programs (ARC, 2021).

However, the implementation of dual language programs, specifically in Illinois, reflects issues of access and equity, which are influenced by monoglossic language ideologies and cultural hegemony (Morales & Rao, 2015). Cultural hegemony refers to the "system of ideas and social practices that helps maintain the domination of corporate and upper-class interests over those of the rest of the population" (Sehr, 1997, p. 17). Therefore, some researchers argue that while the statewide trend to increase bilingualism is generally promising, the increase in the popularity of dual language programs is directly related to the interests of English-speaking, primarily White, middle-class families (Morales & Maravilla, 2020, p. 1), and as such, newer dual language programs are being established mainly in White, middle-class communities (Morales & Rao, 2015). As a result, even in a state where there is a well-intentioned policy to promote bilingualism, language ideology can reinforce historical inequities and contribute to

inequitable practices that privilege dominant groups (Morales & Rao, 2015). Therefore, the current research seeks to address language ideologies, among graduates of a dual language program within a context that appears to follow the trend explained by Morales and Rao (2015), to explore and compare the experiences and language ideologies held by both Latinx and non-Latinx students.

Summary

This section introduced the current study and a background of bilingual education in the United States. In the current research, bilingual education is defined as any instructional program that is designed for English learners with the goal of developing students' English language proficiency. Dual language programs, which represent a form of strong bilingual education models were discussed, and as relevant to the current research, a 50:50, two-way dual language program is defined as an instruction model in which 50 percent of the student population are from English dominant homes and 50 percent from minoritized-language homes, and that has 50 percent of the instructional time in English, and 50 percent in the minoritized language. However, despite positive academic and social benefits of the dual language program model, these programs only serve around 5% of the EL population in Illinois (ISBE, 2020). In addition, the equity related to dual language programs has been questioned, especially as newer programs are being established mainly in White, middle-class communities (Morales & Rao, 2015).

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review provides an overview of the concepts of attitudes and ideologies related to languages. Next, language ideologies related to monolingualism and standardization are discussed as well as their connections with nationalism and racialization of speakers, respectively. This is followed by a description of how such ideologies are manifested at the societal and institutional levels in the United States and their implications for the education of bi/multilingual children. Finally, this chapter presents a discussion of findings from studies on language attitudes and ideologies within dual language and their implications for the present study.

Language Attitudes

Language attitudes and ideologies are interrelated and have been studied within the fields of anthropology, linguistics and education. McGuire (1989) describes that attitudes locate objects of thought on one or more dimensions of judgment. Thus, in a study of language attitudes, the favorable or unfavorable feelings are attached in some way to language. For example, words, names, accents, dialects or entire languages can evoke emotional reactions (Portolés Falomir, 2015). As such, language attitudes are found at the individual level and can be expressed through some sort of evaluative response through processes such as opinions, beliefs, emotions and stereotypes (Garrett, 2010), and have the potential to unmask language ideologies that are related to larger social discourses.

Evidence of social attitudes towards language have been found to emerge as early as five years of age (Rosenthal, 1974), as young children demonstrate more positive

attitudes towards speakers of their own variety. This suggests that children's attitudes may initially depend on more of an egocentric judgment rating in which children give higher ratings to those that they perceive as being like them, as opposed to making judgements based on specific geographic or sociocultural knowledge (McCullough et al., 2019). However, children's language attitudes are not fixed constructs, nor do they occur in a vacuum. Instead, they are dynamic and variable, with the ability to fluctuate as children assimilate new information over time and across social situations, including specific political, ideological and cultural contexts (Cho et al., 2004; Garrett, 2010; Lee, 2002; Oller & Eilers, 2002). As a result, children's beliefs may be assimilated or rejected through their home and school experiences and discourses with different individuals, such as parents or teachers (Roldán & Malavé, 2004). Furthermore, children can acquire misconceptions about language which can lead to the formation of negative attitudes about language or language varieties (Henderson, 2016).

As a result, children in diglossic contexts demonstrate more favorable attitudes towards the language that is associated with higher socioeconomic status as opposed to the heritage languages (Bokhorst-Heng & Caleon, 2009; Shameem 2004), which aligns with the values of the dominant society. Therefore, while younger children have initially been found to have generally positive attitudes towards their heritage language, language-minority students may develop increasingly more negative attitudes towards foreign languages, their heritage language and consequently towards bilingualism, as they get older (Sharp et. al, 1973; Baker, 1992; Hoare, 2000; Oller & Eilers, 2002; Cho, et al., 2004).

Language Ideologies

Unlike the study of language attitudes, which has generally been situated within the field of social psychology, language ideologies have been centered in the fields of anthropology and sociology (King, 2000; Leeman, 2012). Furthermore, unlike attitudes, which are at the individual level, language ideologies are related to larger social discourses, describing the connection between individuals and society (Gal, 2006). Language ideologies involve aspects of identity, culture and power, which serve to promote and legitimize the status of specific groups (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). This section summarizes the main definitions of language ideology, while exploring the key differences between language attitudes and ideologies. Furthermore, the reflection and reproduction of some of the dominant language ideologies within the United States are discussed, centering on their effect on the educational context.

Language ideologies can be defined as abstract systems of thought related to language, such as specific languages or varieties, as well as linguistic behavior, such as language practices, which affect speakers' language choices and the interpretation of different communicative interactions (Fuller & Leeman, 2020; Lippi-Green, 1997). In other words, a language ideology represents the association of a language or language variety or way of speaking with a specific cultural group. Leeman (2012) explains:

> language ideologies mediate between language and broader social structures, and they are intertwined with ideologies about other social phenomena, such as gender, socioeconomic status, race and nation, as well as with beliefs about the people who speak given languages or varieties or who engage in specific language practices (p. 45).

Similarly, Silverstein (1979) explains that language ideologies are "articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language and use" (p. 193). Therefore, like

language attitudes, language ideologies have a much wider scope than language itself that can encompass beliefs about traditions and customs, gender, race, socioeconomic status, etc. (Leeman, 2012), which in turn can affect the treatment of individuals within different groups (Fuller & Leeman, 2020).

As a result, language ideologies may be expressed as idealized beliefs, evaluations or judgments about appropriate or correct language use as well as opinions about the individuals or groups who do not conform to such expectations (Hornberger & McKay, 2010). For example, language ideologies can include notions of *correct* language use, and can also set forth expectations of how certain people *should* speak in different contexts and ideas about ethnic group membership based on one's ability to speak a given language, which are then used as a tool to mark social difference and inequalities among speakers (Achugar, 2008; Beaudrie & Fairclough, 2012). The connection of language ideologies to issues of power is one of the key elements that differentiate them from attitudes. For example, Kroskrity (2004) posits that ideologies are seen as interests, whether social, political or economic, of different groups of people and can be used to accomplish certain functions within a given speech community. This means that language ideologies involve complex social phenomena that include diverse social groups, social classes and institutions within the context of power relations and the fight for cultural and economic resources at the broader societal level.

Another important aspect of language ideologies refers to the variability in the level of a speaker's conscious awareness of such ideologies. This is to say that individuals may not always be aware of the ideologies they hold and that members of a group can demonstrate differing levels of awareness regarding local language ideologies.

For instance, while some members may explicitly express their language ideologies, others may only unconsciously demonstrate such ideologies through practice. For example, while a teacher may express positive attitudes towards students' language varieties, their classroom language practices may reflect monoglossic language ideologies that disfavors language variation and discourages the use of language practices that do not align with a "standard" variety. In many cases, actual language use may be inconsistent with expressed language ideologies and can result in the expression of contradictory language ideologies (McGroarty, 2010; Roldán & Malavé, 2004). Furthermore, the more a language ideology is accepted within a specific context, the more likely it is to undergo normatization, which describes a "hegemonic pattern in which the ideological claims are perceived as 'normal' ways of thinking and acting" (Blommart, 1999, pp. 10-11).

In this case, hegemony refers to aspects of power that are achieved through naturalized notions about language that have come to be accepted among all social groups, whether or not these groups benefit from the proliferation of hegemonic ideologies (Fuller, 2015). Thus, the acceptance of mainstream ideologies perpetuates almost invisible, "common sense" beliefs about language and discourse (Blackledge, 2000; McGroarty, 2010), which is why hegemonic language ideologies are difficult to recognize and go unchallenged, even among populations that are subordinated by such ideologies (Fairclough, 2013; Kroskrity, 2004).

Thus, language ideologies are situated within the context of society and can be formed, affirmed, reproduced, or changed by societal power dynamics through social practices and institutional discourse at local, national and global levels (Blackledge &

Pavlenko, 2002; Chang-Bacon, 2021; Irvine et al., 2009). As a result, language ideologies have effects on people not only through individual interactions, but also at the state and national level through language policy, such as bilingual education offerings and program types (Fuller & Leeman, 2020).

Language Ideologies in the U.S.

In the United States, language ideologies paint the country as a monolingual setting and position other languages and bilingualism as a threat to national unity. This section provides examples of monolingual ideologies and standard language ideologies within the context of the United States, and a description of how they affect educational institutions through policy and practices.

Monolingual Ideologies

Monolingual ideologies are those that promote specific language practices as idealized, which in the United States are typically associated with English monolingualism and linguistic practices that align with white, middle-class speakers (Alim, 2004; Chang-Bacon, 2021). Furthermore, monolingual language ideologies become notions of common sense, simultaneously disadvantaging speakers that do not adhere to this norm. Monolingual ideologies contribute to the racialization of speakers and, as a result can contribute to the marginalization of minoritized students who do not adhere to these monolingual norms.

Monolingualism Related to Nationalism. For centuries, languages have been linked to a people, yet the association of language with a particular nation is a more recent phenomenon that is of particular importance in a world population that is increasingly heterogeneous and as bi/multilingualism represents a social phenomenon that is much more

common on a global scale than monolingualism (Ricento, 2005). The creation of a common, "standard language" became necessary in the global sense when nations began to emerge, yet as some researchers argue, linguistic nationalism is not about communication, but rather includes questions of "power, status politics and ideology" (Blackledge, 2000, p. 30).

Despite its long history in the United States, the Spanish language has been seen as a threat to national unity, an ideology that is endorsed and perpetuated by the idea that minoritized languages are in competition with English. This competition can result in language panic among mainstream English speakers, which describes a fear that English will lose its position of power (Hill, 2001). Therefore, in an attempt to defend English, under the guise of nationalism, dominant groups, such as white, monolingual English speakers, spread language ideologies that assert monolingualism as the norm and promote English as the natural language of choice in the United States. As a result, in a country in which about 40 million people speak Spanish at home, making it the second most spoken language in the country (Pew Research Center, 2018), language diversity is depicted as a problem and monolingualism as the norm (Achugar, 2008; Chang-Bacon, 2021; Achugar & Oteíza, 2009; Ricento, 2005).

These ideologies, such as the one nation-one language ideology, stipulate that there is only one valid language choice in the country, and that other languages are 'foreign.' This ideology is demonstrated with notions such as one must speak English to be American, and that English is "the only acceptable language use of loyal and true U.S. citizens" (García & Torres, 2009, p.184). As a result, these ideologies propagate negative ideas not only about languages other than English, but also about particular groups of

people such as ethnic minorities or immigrant populations, for instance, portraying immigrants to the U.S. as unable or unwilling to speak English (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). For example, Leeman (2012, p. 44) argues that such ideologies paint minoritized languages as being unpatriotic as they associate multilingualism with "cognitive confusion, intergroup conflict and a lack of national cohesiveness." Similarly, beliefs that immigrants should just "learn English" and the belief that newcomers "refuse" to do so, perpetuate the dominant ideology in the United States that English is quick and easy to learn, and that lack of English ability is a deliberate refusal to assimilate to the culture of the United States (Leeman, 2012).

Consequently, those that speak a language other than English, despite being bilingual, are considered to be less competent than their monolingual English-speaker counterparts and any unwillingness to abandon other languages is considered "un-American." Additionally, the ideology that views the English language as easy to learn and necessary for being American promotes the view of minoritized language speakers from a deficit perspective in terms of their abilities to develop the majority language, leading to further discrimination (Blackledge, 2000; García & Torres, 2009; Ricento, 2005). As a result, underlying ideologies of monolingualism can have a negative effect on speakers and contribute to social justice issues.

Standardized Language Ideologies

The Western concept of languages and varieties ignores the notion that a language is a practice in a specific place and time and instead, relies on the assimilationist belief that views languages as uniform and invariable systems that exist in idealized forms (Milroy, 2001; Pennycook, 2001). This rigid notion of languages leads to the creation of

a "standard language," which is promoted through monoglossic ideologies (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). A "standard language" is one that is perceived as a uniform, neutral and free of regionalisms (Leeman, 2012). As such, monoglossic ideologies that promote this "standard" can include beliefs about particular languages or varieties, as well as the learning and use of such languages, and about the relationship between language and intelligence.

Furthermore, while each speech community constructs ideas about language to satisfy their own interests and to support their own linguistic practices, ideas about "standard" or "correct" language usage specifically advantage speakers of preferred varieties (Leeman, 2012). As a result, the idealized language or variety, which is associated with speakers of higher socioeconomic status, becomes the standard and unmarked choice to which all other languages or varieties are compared (Lippi-Green, 2012). Thus, through this standard language ideology, certain ways of speaking are interpreted as "better" than others, and as this idealized variety is continuously reinforced, the use of anything other than what is considered the "standard" is considered unnatural, illogical, illegitimate and sloppy. Furthermore, this ideology promotes a neutral form of language that is presented as being equally attainable to all, which does not consider the unequal power relations reflected as a result of these beliefs (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). As a result, the standard language ideology leads to a rationalization for the subordination of the languages or varieties, and consequently the people who speak the varieties that do not adhere to this "standard" (Achugar, 2008; Fuller & Leeman, 2020; Lippi-Green, 1997; Milroy, 2001).

Standardized Language and the Racialization of Speakers. Motha (2014) compares the discourse regarding the standard language ideology to colonialism and racism. To this end, Rosa and Flores (2017) use the term "raciolinguistic ideologies" to describe the hegemonic perspectives that serve to connect normative perspectives on language use to historical and contemporary co-naturalizations of race and language. In other words, one of the foci of raciolinguistics is to explore how racial or ethnic identities are imposed onto speakers of a language based on the use of specific language practices (Alim, 2016).

Raciolinguistic ideologies frame the ways that linguistic practices of racialized populations are subject to increased scrutiny and are systematically stigmatized regardless of the extent to which these practices might seem to adhere to standardized norms (Flores & Rosa, 2017; Rosa, 2018). Rosa (2016) refers to this perspective as "languagelessness," which positions the linguistic practices of racialized bilingual speakers as deficient in both of their languages. For example, a listener might have the expectation that a speaker from a minoritized racial group will use linguistic forms labeled as 'broken' or 'uneducated' when speaking English (Tsai et al., 2021). The racialization of minoritized speakers proliferates ideas about idealized linguistic practices, which has different consequences for different racial or ethnic groups.

As a result, raciolinguistic ideologies can have an influence on minoritized students' access to and success in bilingual education (Cervantes-Soon, 2014). For example, these ideologies lead to the stigmatization of different language varieties among bilingual students, which further disadvantages speakers of 'nonstandard' varieties, including heritage Spanish-speaking students, as their linguistic knowledge is not viewed

as an asset, but instead as a hindrance to their learning (Menken & Kleyn, 2010; Rosa & Flores, 2015), and promotes inequality, even in programs that support bilingual learners (Garcia, 2017).

Language Ideologies in the Educational Context

Language ideologies play a large role in the status of bilingual education in the United States and are at the center of decisions surrounding educational policy specifically relating to the programs that are offered (or not) in schools across the country to support bi/multilingual students. Furthermore, the effects of these ideologies filter down to the local level, affecting student outcomes within individual schools. For instance, Alim (2007) posits that schools are sites of "ideological combat" (p. 163), as they are involved in the formation, affirmation, reproduction or change of ideologies through social practices and institutional discourse (González, 2001). Research that has focused on ideologies within social institutions, specifically within the educational context, have evaluated curriculum materials (Apple, 1990), teacher preparation and practices (Henderson, 2017; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017), literacies (Martínez-Roldán & Malavé, 2004) and language (González, 2001; Razfar, 2005).

Monolingual Ideologies and Nationalism in Education

Public stances on multilingualism within the United States have varied across time and context, and as Griego-Jones (1994, p. 5) argues, "American history has swung back and forth between attacking languages other than English and ignoring them." Yet, despite this discordance, hegemonic ideologies of English monolingualism have a long-standing history of being used by policymakers as a tool for using language for social control under the guise of uniting the country (Flores, 2014; Wiley & Wright, 2004). For

example, Lo Bianco (2010) argues that language policy and planning "is a situated activity whose specific history and local circumstances influence what is regarded as a language problem and whose political dynamics determine which language problems are given policy treatment" (p. 152). As a result, nationalistic movements, together with the immigration boom of the early 20th century led to a series of repressive language policies focused on Americanization and assimilation of non-English speakers in the country.

Behind the initiatives that target language as a way to unite the country lie monoglossic ideologies, such as the one nation-one language ideology. These ideologies influence legislation, and specifically influence the implementation of educational initiatives that promote restrictive language policies and disadvantage language minoritized students (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). Examples in the United States include changes in federal educational legislation, such as the Bilingual Education Act, which was created initially to address the needs of bi/multilingual children, but through its various reauthorizations, led to shifts away from the promotion of bilingualism and the development of heritage languages, towards a focus on English language acquisition (Wiley, 2012). This led to further initiatives and to the perpetuation of the notion that only English literacy is valuable in the U.S. and that schools need to "fix" multilingualism through English-only education. The English-only movement gained momentum and was adopted in several states, including Massachusetts, California and Arizona (Howard, et al., 2003; Johnson, 2010; Slavkov, 2017). As such**,** English-only policies date back several decades in some states; and today, have permeated the country, with more than 30 states employing some type of English-only policy (Lillie & Moore,

2014). Thus, contributing to an increase in assimilationist ideologies, including that of English monolingualism (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Rosa, 2016).

Educational policies in the U.S., such as the English-only movement that use language as a symbol of national unity and promote English as the natural choice, affect access to education in languages other than English and contribute, not only to the abandonment of heritage languages, but also to the positionality of minoritized language speakers as outsiders (Achugar, 2008). For instance, many public schools do not offer courses in languages other than English until high school, resulting in a lack of exposure to other languages and cultures and, for some students, an impediment to the development of their heritage language and access to bilingualism and the social, cognitive and economic advantages that it offers (Tse, 2001).

Furthermore, even in areas that do provide bilingual education options, the hegemonic ideologies that position languages other than English as un-American, are spread among not only monolingual English speakers, but also among speakers of minoritized languages. This may result in the proliferation of the myth that maintenance of the minoritized language interferes with English acquisition, and in turn, can result in parents or caregivers abandoning the heritage language at home in favor of English (Zentella, 1997). Within educational institutions, the promotion of English as the universal academic language that is an integral part of the identity of an ideal, educated American citizen, undermines Spanish-speaking students' bilingual development and sense of identity in favor of the acquisition of English and cultural assimilation (Díaz-Rico, 2004; Flores, 2013); a notion that only serves to benefit the values of the dominant English-speaking population.

Standard Language and Raciolinguistic Ideologies in Education

Hegemonic ideologies, such as the standard language ideology, are of specific importance to the education context, as they result in the validation of certain linguistic forms for institutional uses, while "non-standard" forms of language, including Spanglish, are stigmatized and deemed inappropriate or unprofessional (Fuller & Leeman, 2020).

This means that when schools send the message that there is only one "correct" way of speaking a language, students whose speech does not adhere to this norm interpret their way of speaking as "bad," or "not real language," which translates to negative feelings about their identities, families and communities (Fuller & Leeman, 2020; Herrera-Rocha, 2019). Therefore, it is possible that in both bilingual and monolingual educational contexts, certain language varieties and practices are positioned as appropriate for the academic settings, while at the same time, othering practices index students of color (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

One of the ways that the "standard" language is upheld and enforced in the educational context is through testing policy. While standardized tests are generally positioned as objective measures, they scrutinizingly define the language aspects and linguistic varieties that students should know to be successful, which has led to the marginalization of racial, ethnic and linguistic minoritized students (Menken, 2008). For example, due to dominant testing policy, students labeled as English learners are disproportionately labeled as under-performing and deficient, which has negative effects on their achievement. The testing policy set forth by NCLB requires assessment in English yet does not require proficiency in a student's heritage language, which

propagates the idea that only English is important in education. Furthermore, even in testing situations that measure students' knowledge in their heritage language, tests are translated from English into the standardized variety of another language, which not only excludes students who speak a "non-standard" variety, but also is not aligned with the fluid nature of bilingual language use or with the dynamic sociolinguistic context of the country (Garcia & Meneken, 2006). As a result, the content and language used on these standardized tests are filtered down into classroom instruction and teacher practices, further perpetuating standardized language ideologies and widening the achievement gap of minoritized students.

Language Ideologies and Identity

Given that language ideologies are related to other belief systems, they play an important role in the formation of identity. Furthermore, they are linked with sociocultural factors, and as a result, members of the same social group, such as certain ethnic, racial or linguistic groups, may form diverse and sometimes contradictory ideological groups, given that not all members of a group use and value language in the same way (Gal, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004; Roldán & Malavé, 2004).

First, identity is a multifaceted concept that is contextually negotiated, shaped and revised, which means that speakers are constantly receiving feedback that encourages them to maintain or reject identities (Hornberger & Wang, 2008). Individuals can assume specific identities or ascribe identities to others through language (Leeman, 2012). For example, an individual's identity can be authenticated or deauthenticated based on associations made about a given language (Helmer, 2013).

Next, linguistic differences are linked with different sociocultural experiences through the construction of ideologies, and as Leeman (2012, p. 46) explains, connects specific linguistic forms to specific sociocultural features." This means that a speakers' experiences in and perceptions of the different social contexts in which they operate shapes their construction of their language ideologies. As such, a speaker's linguistic choices may be linked to a broader social context that may include their experience with learning a language, their linguistic competence, the different interactional contexts in which they participate or have participated and the power or influence of the members of their speech community (Volk & Angelova, 2007). This means that a dominant ideology may not be accepted by all members of a given group, and instead these members may actively resist it.

Summary

Language ideologies are built on the basis of language attitudes and then are utilized to achieve certain socio-political goals, with real world consequences (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). For example, language has been linked with nationalism in the United States which has, and continues to have, effects on speakers of languages other than English. These ideologies that promote monolingualism are proliferated at the national and local contexts, including within schools and individual classrooms. As such, the promotion of English as the only acceptable language of society and of schooling, while positioning bilingualism as a threat to national unity, fosters an environment that is not only monolingual, but also anti-bilingual (Lippi-Green, 2004; Suárez, 2002). Therefore, hegemonic ideologies of language reach far beyond the facets of language alone and can

jeopardize the transmission of minority languages to subsequent generations (King & Fogle, 2008; Roldán & Malavé, 2004).

Language Attitudes in Dual Language Education

Aside from the academic benefits of dual language discussed previously, results from studies on the language attitudes of students who participate in dual language programs consistently demonstrate that students have positive attitudes toward their target language of study and towards the dual language program in general among students across age groups, including in high school (de Jong & Bearse, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2003; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001), middle school (Lindholm-Leary & Ferrante, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2005; Block, 2011) and elementary school (Calderon & Minaya-Rowe, 2003; Gerena, 2010; Potowski, 2007). In addition, participation in dual language programs has been associated with increased academic confidence, minority language maintenance, as well as cross-cultural awareness and friendships among students (Feiner & Howard, 2014; Lindholm-Leary, 2016).

In their comparison of the language attitudes of second-grade students enrolled in a Spanish immersion program with the attitudes of their grade level peers in a monolingual classroom setting, Bamford and Mizokawa (1989) found that students learning a foreign language had more positive attitudes towards the target language than students who were not learning another language in the classroom. Similarly, Block and Vidaurre (2019) completed a comparative study of 81 Latinx students in first grade dual language classes in California, through which they sought to examine dual language students' attitudes as compared to those of their peers in mainstream English classes. Through an analysis of responses regarding students' beliefs about different activities

done in Spanish, researchers found that students identified as both English language learners and non-English language learners from dual language classrooms demonstrated more positive attitudes towards language and multiculturalism than their peers enrolled in the mainstream English classes.

Similarly, de Jong and Howard (2009) found that two-way dual language programs help dismantle stereotypes and encourage students to develop positive attitudes towards both languages and their speakers, in comparison with mainstream English classes, as well as programs that aim to support minority language students by separating them into linguistically homogeneous groups for a majority of the school day. These results mirror findings that students that participate in dual language programs hold positive attitudes towards speakers of their target language (Lindholm Leary, 2016), develop positive cross-cultural attitudes (Feinauer & Howard, 2014) and are more likely to form cross-cultural friendships (Cazabon et al., 1993; Cazabon et al., 1998) than students that do not. Further research has corroborated these findings, adding that the openness to cross-cultural friendships among dual language students was a result of explicit efforts made through these programs to promote positive interdependence (Christian et al., 1997; Lindholm-Leary, 1994).

Participation in a dual language program has also been shown to have an important impact on heritage language maintenance. For instance, Block and Vidarre (2019) found that among Spanish-speaking families, children who participated in dual language programs demonstrated increased interest and use of Spanish at home when compared to children who participated in monolingual English classes. Similarly, Octavio (2018) reported that Spanish heritage speakers that did not participate in the dual

language program reported only using Spanish "at home or when they 'have' to" (p. 153), because they were communicating with someone who does not speak English. These findings demonstrate that students who participated in a Spanish-English dual language program had a higher interest in the Spanish language and continued to use their home language for a wider variety of purposes, resulting in greater levels of language maintenance when compared to their peers who did not participate in dual language.

While research has revealed that students generally demonstrate positive attitudes towards the dual language program and their languages and its speakers and cultures, it is unclear to what extent the dual language program succeeds in inhibiting the effect of hegemonic English ideologies to which the students are exposed.

The complexity of ideologies is evidenced by the conflicting and sometimes contradictory nature of students' attitudes and actual language use (Babino & Stewart, 2017; Henderson, 2016; Potowski, 2002). For instance, through Potowski's (2002) observations of peer interactions among fifth grade students in a dual language program in Chicago, she found that while students had a positive attitude towards learning and using Spanish, English was generally considered by students to have more social capital and thus, was the language of choice in areas where there is no specific language designation.

Similarly, Babino and Stewart (2017) present an example of the complexity regarding language attitudes and actual language use in their mixed-methods study on the "investments" of 63 initial Spanish-Speaking English language learners in a one-way dual language program. Through the analysis of interview and survey data from fifth grade dual language students about their attitudes towards their languages in both

academic and social domains, researchers yielded results similar to those of other studies which demonstrate that despite participation in a program that aims to foster bilingualism and biliteracy, students show trends of English language preference both in social as well as academic contexts. Furthermore, while students indicated that they were highly invested in their bilingualism and demonstrated positive attitudes towards Spanish, generally viewing it as important, they also indicated a general consensus that English was the more prestigious of the two languages, associating it with being American, and leading to more opportunities for success. Of specific importance in this investigation was that despite the very few native English speaker students in the class, students expressed a preference for English for both academic and social functions, indicating the prevalence of hegemony of English even within predominantly Spanish-speaking communities.

These findings suggest a disconnect between students' attitudes and their underlying ideologies regarding the importance of English. Therefore, the current research seeks to connect students' attitudes to their underlying ideologies to get a more complete picture of the complex interactions in the dual language program. As such, it is important to consider both the attitudinal outcomes of students in dual language as well as the impact of language ideologies in different aspects of dual language. The next section explores the role of ideologies in dual language.

Language Ideologies in Dual Language

While dual language programs have generally been offered as a way to resist English hegemony and counteract the harmful deficit perspectives of bilingualism, they are not immune to the effects of the dominant ideologies of the broader society.

Researchers have explored language ideologies in various facets of dual language including program design and implementation, teacher beliefs and practices, and student outcomes.

Ideologies in Dual Language Program Design and Implementation

First, regarding the implementation of the dual language, researchers such as Cervantes-Soon et. al (2020, p.3) argue that factors such as English hegemony, the interests and power of English-speaking families, an overemphasis on accountability, a whitestream curriculum and pedagogy, and raciolinguistic ideologies have contributed to unequal outcomes and experiences for students and their families in dual language programs. One example, situated at the level of program planning is the "programmatic gentrification" of newer dual language programs that are being implemented to privilege equality over equity in dual language (Freire and Delavan, 2021). For example, through their critical analysis of state policy documents related to dual language programs, Freire and Delvan (2021) describe the "fiftyfication" of dual language programs, which refers to the promotion of the 50:50 model and emphasizes the equal allocation of languages over the more equitable option. Their findings demonstrate that policy documents in six states contained contradictory information, while reinforcing English hegemony, privileging English-dominant students, and in some cases misrepresented relevant research to unethically rationalize the 50:50 model. As a result, newer dual language programs are positioned as enrichment programs to serve white, middle-class families as a way to separate the dual language program from the, often times, highly politicized bilingual education programs that have historically held little prestige in mainstream society and

are frequently associated with remedial education for minoritized language students (Cervantes-Soon, et. al, 2020; Flores & García, 2017).

Furthermore, some researchers argue that the goals and assessment practices in dual language programs are informed by hegemonic language ideologies that marginalize the students that these programs were designed to support. For example, the strict separation of languages in some dual language programs proliferate an English-only ideology that discourages the mixing of languages and contradicts the additive goals of the program (Henderson & Palmer, 2015). While proponents of a strict separation of languages argue that it is necessary to provide a space to develop the minoritized language, yet some researchers have found that this separation was only enforced during English instruction (Henderson & Palmer, 2015), which sends conflicting messages to students and leads to the promotion of English. In addition, Flores et al. (2021) found that raciolinguistic ideologies such as the idealized speaker ideology, influenced student assessment data and led to discourses of languagelessness to describe bilingual Latinx students as lacking proficiency in both English and Spanish.

Ideologies in Teacher's Perceptions and Classroom Practices

One of the factors that has important implications for language policy at the classroom level are the ideologies held by teachers (Henderson, 2020), given that within classrooms teachers serve as the language policy makers (McCarty, 2011). The way in which classroom teachers plan lessons and manage classroom interactions are heavily influenced by not only external authorities, but also by their own ideologies (Stritikus, 2001). In addition, teachers within a dual language program are faced with a variety of additional decisions regarding language, for example accepting or rejecting the use of one

language or another and deciding to what degree languages should be separated during interactions (Martínez et al., 2015). As such, teachers have demonstrated complicated and conflicting ideological beliefs with regard to their support for bilingual programs, classroom practices and perceptions of students.

Henderson (2017) found that in their classrooms, teachers' language ideologies, along with local language policy influenced their classroom practices. As a result, teachers may unconsciously implement policies that reflect broader social ideologies. As a result, while teachers may articulate support for bilingualism and bilingual education programs, they may adopt dominant ideologies about minority languages or varieties, which can result in teaching practices that reflect a prioritization of monolingual or standardized language practices and the belief that bilingual programs are putting their minoritized students at a disadvantage. For example, Henderson (2020) studied the articulated language ideologies among dual language teachers in southern Texas across the dimensions of status, variation, and the role of language and found the coexistence of dominant as well as counter-hegemonic ideologies. Thus, while teachers generally reflected pluralist discourse in which they attributed higher status to bilingualism when compared with monolingualism, and supported the normalization of language variation, they also subscribed to beliefs of English as having superior status and the need for students to speak "correct" language varieties. Henderson (2020) concluded that teachers demonstrated pluralist ideologies, while at the same time expressing negative views about language variation, demonstrating evidence of ideologies of linguistic purism and standardization.

In another example, Palmer (2011), who studied the ideologies held by bilingual teachers, uncovered that although these teachers reported that bilingual education was a tool that could be used to achieve bilingualism, they also expressed notions that bilingual education offered a way to transition students to a monolingual practice. In other words, the hegemonic ideologies that promote monolingualism in English were perpetuated within the school and the surrounding community to the point that teachers believed that restrictive policies are actually in the best interest of students.

Ideologies also impact teachers' perceptions of students, as previous research has indicated that teachers do, in fact, make judgements about students based on the language varieties that they speak (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2011). These judgements may conflict with teachers’ expressed attitudes and lead to a negative evaluation of linguistic practices as well as negative attitudes about the students themselves, affecting academic performance.

For example, teachers’ ideologies regarding the linguistic practice of code-switching, common among bilinguals, was found to be contextually variable and conflicting, while contradictory to actual language use (Henderson & Palmer, 2016; Leeman, 2012). Henderson and Palmer (2016) found that bilingual teachers expressed negative attitudes towards the use of code-switching among their students, yet the teachers’ actual language use relied on code-switching for a variety of purposes throughout the day. As a result, students were exposed to both deficit and pluralistic perspectives regarding their language use. Therefore, the authors argue that despite her attempts to dissuade her students from the use of code-switching, students continued this practice as the teacher’s own expression of linguistic pluralism had a stronger influence

than her articulated rejection. Furthermore, teacher ideologies towards code-switching are variable, given that within the context of the language classroom, some instructors may view code-switching as an indication of laziness or as a sign of deficiency in terms of linguistic knowledge, while others embrace the practice, viewing it as a sign of advanced bilingualism and linguistic creativity (Leeman, 2012).

Language Ideologies and Student Outcomes

Finally, the effect of the hegemony of English, on affective variables, specifically among children who participate in dual language classrooms, has gained attention among researchers, given the unique design and goals of such programs. Studies that have examined language ideologies in dual language programs have explored themes such as: 1) the relationship between language ideologies and students' identity, 2) hegemonic English ideologies and their effect on language use, and 3) standardized language ideologies and the racialization of dual language students.

Language Ideologies and Student Identity

In programs such as dual language, in which students receive instruction in both languages, one might assume that these programs are immune to the effects of dominant monoglossic ideologies. However, the growing body of research concerned with the ideologies of dual language students has demonstrated that language ideologies of the broader society have important implications on students' identity formation, specifically influencing how students identify themselves, and others, as learners and users of two languages (Dworin, 2011; Fitts, 2006; González, 2005; López, 2011; Reyes, 2006).

For example, in López's (2011) study on the emerging language ideologies of first grade dual language students, this researcher found that the young students were not

only in the process of building their identities and relationships as bilinguals, but at the same time, were developing ideologies about language and its users. Furthermore, in some instances students reproduced dominant ideologies, while in other instances they resisted them.

Due to the fact that students in these programs consistently receive competing information in regard to the hegemonic views of language and the dominance of English in the wider society of the United States, Moll et al., (2001) argue that dominant language ideologies in the U.S. towards Spanish have a strong connection to language minority children's attitudes, beliefs and practices regarding languages. They state:

> It is unfortunately the case that some children internalize the negative societal attitudes toward Spanish, toward bilingualism, and toward their ethnic groups, regardless of teachers' efforts. There is, in fact, a long tradition in this country of degrading in schools anything that is not Anglo-Saxon, what Spring (1994) calls the "deculturalization" process of schooling". (p. 439)

As a result, children's negative views of languages and their speakers can influence their own identities. For example, in Roldán and Malavé's (2004) case study to explore the language ideologies in a two-way dual language program in Arizona, researchers found that Steve, their first-grade participant, had developed the notion that Spanish speakers lack intelligence. Despite coming from a Spanish-speaking household and his participation in a dual language program, Steve was hesitant to speak Spanish at school because of the ideologies he had formed regarding speakers of Spanish. These results demonstrate how even dual language programs are not immune to the effects of the values and ideologies of the dominant society and, as Roldán and Malavé conclude,

"young children from Hispanic or Latino families in the USA are developing negative ideas about Spanish speakers, even when these students attend schools with bilingual or language maintenance programs" (p. 156).

English Hegemonic ideologies and Language Use

Researchers have found that even in contexts in which English and Spanish language and literacy are supported at school, children are still influenced by the overall negative and restrictive hegemonic ideologies of mainstream society that privilege the English language (González, 2005; Potowski, 2004). As demonstrated in the previous section, many dual language researchers report that English is the primary language of students in their daily interactions (Babino & Stewart, 2017; Flores et al., 2021; Octavio, 2018; Potowski, 2002; Volk & Angelova, 2007) and studies on language ideologies in dual language classrooms have found that the dominance of, and preference for the English language increases throughout the grades. For example, through the use of surveys and focus groups, Bearse and de Jong (2008) found that Latinx and non-Latinx students enrolled at the secondary level of a K-12 dual language program were aware of the shift in preference for English over Spanish as well as the decrease in the perceived equity of the two languages during the later years of the program. The preference for English in dual language classrooms is well documented and has been evidenced through the increasing amount of English that is used during "Spanish time" (Potowski, 2004, 2007), or time that should be allocated to Spanish instruction (Ballinger & Lyster, 2011; Palmer, 2009), and has been observed as early as kindergarten (DePalma, 2010) and first and second grades (Volk & Angelova, 2007; Gerena, 2010).

For example, to explore the hegemonic influence of English in a bilingual context, Volk and Angelova (2007) completed a qualitative study among first graders enrolled in a dual language program to examine young students' ideologies about language. Researchers found that patterns in children's language choices were influenced by context as well as the role of the dominant language ideology that privileges English within the school context. For example, they noted the tendency of English speakers to struggle to find value in learning Spanish and often complained about speaking Spanish during the designated Spanish time, whereas ELs undoubtedly spoke English during the designated English time. In addition, they noted a special example of a recently arrived EL who would do her best to accommodate the English speakers by speaking to them in English, during a time in which students were expected to communicate in Spanish. Researchers observed that while children's language ideologies were just beginning to evolve, the young students understood a general urgency to speak English in order to do well in school.

Gerena (2010) also cited findings that the emergence of preference for English over the heritage language appears early in elementary school. In an analysis of first and second grade elementary students' attitudes towards their languages, this researcher found decreasingly positive views towards the minority language. Both English and Spanish-dominant students in the second-grade dual language class perceived reading in Spanish as a valuable skill in order to be a "good student," to a significantly less degree than their first-grade peers. The author attributes the differing language preferences from first to second grade to the hegemonic forces of English. These findings demonstrate

Valdés' (2004) argument that even at a young age, children feel pressure to use English, sometimes to the extent that it completely replaces their heritage language.

Therefore, the difficulty of maintaining a balance between English and the minority language, even in dual language classrooms can be difficult due to the dominant ideology that privileges English, both in and out of the classroom (Block & Vidaurre, 2019). Furthermore, despite explicit efforts within schools, societal influences can impact students' beliefs about language and bilingualism.

Additionally, in recent study looking at the beliefs of second grade dual language students, Hamman-Ortiz (2020) found an important difference regarding the bilingual experiences of Latinx and non-Latinx students in terms of how they understood bilingualism either as necessary or as a way to enhance their options for the future. Results indicated that among Latinx students who came from homes in which Spanish was spoken, bilingualism was seen as a normal phenomenon. In contrast, White students who came from homes in which English was spoken, learning Spanish was like having a 'secret language' that made them feel exceptional.

Furthermore, Octavio (2018) found differences in the way that Latinx Spanish heritage speakers and their non-Latinx peers regarded their bilingualism. She found that native English-speaking peers perceive language as capital, as they identified that becoming bilingual would help them to get smarter or get a better job. On the other hand, Spanish heritage speakers related their bilingualism more to their identity and as a way to communicate with their families. A finding similar to Bearse and de Jong (2008) who found that Anglo students reported language as capital as they indicated that speaking Spanish would help them with future job opportunities, whereas Latinx students valued

economic benefits of speaking Spanish, but also emphasized connections to culture and family.

Standard language ideologies and Racialization of Dual Language Students

Henderson (2016) provides an example of how students in dual language are not spared from the impact of the hegemonic position of English, as well as the ideology of standard language. In her study of fifth grade dual language students, Henderson (2016) reported that while students were aware of language variation and generally agreed that it should exist, they also demonstrated an overwhelming preference for a formal, school-based language, concluding that students as young as ten viewed English as the "correct" language in the school context and that bilingual students shared similar prescriptive language beliefs when compared to their monolingual peers. Furthermore, similar to Leeman's (2012) reports of instructor ideologies, Octavio (2018) compared the language ideologies of young Spanish heritage speakers (SHS) and their native English-speaking peers in dual language and mainstream English classroom finding a discontinuity between the ideologies of the students. For example, within bilingual schools, the native English-speaking peers perceived translanguaging as a "linguistic impurity in need of correction" (p. 150), whereas the Spanish heritage speakers interpreted this practice as a natural part of communication within their families and their communities.

Due to the close link between standard language ideologies and the racialization of speakers, recent studies have focused on raciolinguistic ideologies within dual language classrooms. Chaparro (2019) found raciolinguistic ideologies, linking ways of speaking to a racialized person, among kindergartners in a two-way dual language program. In her study, one kindergarten student, Santiago, refused to speak Spanish,

explaining that he is not a "Spanish boy," thus making the connection between speaking Spanish with a certain identity with which he did not want to identify. This racialization of Spanish speakers resulted in a rejection of a cultural identity as well as a refusal to speak the language, and ultimately led to his discontinuation of the dual language program. Furthermore, in the same kindergarten class, raciolinguistic ideologies contributed to positioning of a non-Latinx student as the "expert" of the class, while at the same time contributed to the invisibility of the emerging bilingualism of one Latinx student.

Perspectives, Attitudes and Ideologies of Dual Language Graduates

Much less research has focused on the experiences and language beliefs of students who have graduated from a dual language program at the elementary level. Studies that have investigated the long-term outcomes of former dual language students demonstrate similar findings that include a variety of positive academic, linguistic and social outcomes, including language maintenance, and the opportunity to meet new people, help others and advance in their careers (Dworin, 2011; Granados, 2015; Lee, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2003, 2016; Newcomer, 2020; Whitmore & Crowell, 2005). These same studies demonstrate that students report seeing the benefits of being bilingual and generally report positive attitudes towards participation in the program, believing that their participation in a bilingual program enhanced their educational experience.

In their study of secondary students' perceptions of participation in a dual language program, Bearse and de Jong (2008), found that students reported the most enjoyment in elementary school at which time each of the languages was given equal time, when compared with middle school and high school when students felt that their

language opportunities diminished significantly with the diminished coursework offered in Spanish.

Lindholm-Leary (2016) offers an extensive study on the perspectives of 788 fifth to eighth grade students across Spanish/English and Mandarin/English dual language programs across 11 different schools regarding their bilingualism and participation in the dual language program. Findings indicate that students enjoy having participated in the dual language program, demonstrate positive attitudes towards the target language and its speakers, and report having developed proficiency in both of their languages, describing themselves as being bilingual. While it is clear that students generally agreed that bilingualism is important, language proficiency was also identified as a variable that can affect students' perceptions. For example, Lindholm Leary (2016) identified a correlation between students' language proficiency and their ratings of bilingualism, finding that students who self-rated themselves as more proficient also demonstrated higher ratings of bilingualism, as well as more positive attitudes, and social, affective and cognitive advantages. Notwithstanding, it was also indicated that despite students' reports of a wide range of abilities in the target language, as well as positive attitudes and the belief that bilingualism is important, almost half of the participants were not comfortable speaking the target language in public.

Similarly, Granados (2015) found that bilingual adult graduates of a K-8 dual language program in Tucson, Arizona reported that all but one of the participants were equally or more bilingual than they were during their time in the dual language program. Despite these findings, these former dual language students reported speaking Spanish only 22% of the time in their communities of practice. These findings point to the

potential influence of the inequality between the target and majority languages on students' actual language use and the potential role of participants' ideological beliefs regarding language.

Another factor that has been found to influence students' language beliefs is that of identity. For example, Dworin (2011) investigated the experiences of graduates of a two-way, K-12 Spanish/English dual language program in Southern California. Results from semi-structured interviews with five former students indicated that all students considered themselves bilingual and biliterate in both of their languages, yet their social positions and identities were shaped by, and influenced their attitudes, beliefs and use of their languages.

Similarly, in a recent study, Newcomer (2020) investigated the perspectives of seven high school students who graduated from a K-8 dual language program in Arizona, regarding their elementary school experience as well as their identities as bilingual and bicultural individuals. Results indicated that students felt their participation in the dual language program helped them to maintain their cultural identity, and that without a strong bilingual school environment, it would have been difficult to maintain their Spanish.

Ideologies of DL Graduates

To further explore dual language graduates' beliefs about their languages as related to their identities, Granados (2017) completed a qualitative study to examine the elementary school experiences of adult K-5 dual language graduates and how these experiences shaped the former dual language students' current ideologies regarding language and literacy. Dual language graduates' language ideologies were categorized

into four themes including Spanish-as-Normalized, Spanish-as-Special, Spanish-as-Undesirable and Spanish-as-Resource.

First, the Spanish-as-Normalized ideology was used to describe the view of language as an everyday social practice and the normalization of receiving instruction in two languages. In contrast, the Spanish-as-Special ideology was used to refer to the idea that a student's bilingual and biliterate proficiency makes them feel 'special' when compared with their monolingual peers. Findings highlighted important differences in the bilingual experiences of Latinx and non-Latinx students. For example, the Spanish-as Normalized Ideology, was more common among the Latinx students, as it mirrored the language practices of these students' homes, whereas the Spanish-as-Special Ideology was only found among non-Hispanic, Euro-American students, who explain that because their parents did not speak Spanish, their bilingual abilities made them feel that they had a unique ability. The Spanish-as-Undesirable ideology was used to describe the stigmatization of language that was held by some students who showed resistance to the use of Spanish from a young age. Granados (2017) found a correlation between socioeconomic status and the Spanish as undesirable ideology, as students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds were more likely to demonstrate a resistance to speaking Spanish. Finally, the Spanish-as-Resource ideology was used to describe bilingualism and use of Spanish as social, cultural, economic and literacy capital. Granados (2017) reported that many graduates described how their languages facilitated communication and connections with others and building relationships.This ideology was used to describe how the use of Spanish facilitated social and cultural opportunities, provided

economic advantages and contributed to academic gains, thus contributing to the graduates' broader ideologies of bilingualism as a positive and valuable resource.

Granados' (2017) findings reflect a trend to discuss students' experiences in dual language and their perceptions of bilingualism that center on the differences afforded to students who come from English or Spanish speaking homes. As such, some researchers have argued that language acquisition is seen differently for heritage Spanish-speaking students and English-speaking students (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Flores, 2016; Hamman-Ortiz, 2020). While the interest in the question of different outcomes among Latinx and non-Latinx students has gained popularity in recent years, it is not new. For example, in her cautionary note regarding dual language programs, that were designed to counter the elite bilingual education programs that aimed to solely benefit the language-majority children, Valdés (1997) argues that although these programs have the potential to promote diversity and to support minority language maintenance and pluralism, they may also work to primarily serve to benefit the English monolingual children.

Since then, researchers have shown conflicting results. Some research has raised questions about the issue of the potentially unequal benefits of the dual language program for Latinx students and their non-Latinx classmates (e.g., Edelsky, 2006, Hamman-Ortiz, 2020), confirming Valdés' statement. For example, Dworin (2011) found that many of the Latinx students discontinued the dual language program after elementary school, suggesting that Latinx students benefit the least from the program.

On the other hand, studies such as that of Lindholm-Leary (2003), which explored high school students' self-rated language proficiency and attitudes regarding bilingualism and their dual language experience, have found that despite their low socioeconomic

status, Hispanic students demonstrated the greatest benefit from their participation in the dual language program. Thus, there is a need for additional research that examines student's experiences in bilingual education programs at the K-12 level in order to understand student outcomes and consequences of such programs, as well as to address some of the issues regarding language minority students.

With the growing number of dual language programs across the country, it is critical to gain insight into the attitudes and ideologies of students to help understand and inform pedagogical practices and program outcomes. This review of the literature provides evidence of the prevalence and effect of hegemonic ideologies, even in contexts in which students' bilingualism is purported as a benefit. The findings point to several gaps in the literature. First, minimal research has been conducted regarding the attitudes and ideologies of graduates of an elementary dual language program. This is significant given that the language ideologies of these students, having completed the dual language program, have been influenced by the unique setting of the program, throughout their educational trajectories. Next, many studies that have looked specifically at the language ideologies of dual language graduates have been situated in a state with some type of English-only policy.

Previous findings bring into question the extent to which dual language programs are able to counter the hegemonic influence of English, the connection between language ideologies and identity, how young children's beliefs change throughout participation in such programs, and more importantly, how these beliefs are manifested among Latinx and non-Latinx students. As such, the current dissertation seeks to examine the experiences and language ideologies of dual language graduates in a state with a more

pluralistic view of language education. The connection between language ideologies and graduates' identities as bilinguals, as well as their language practices are explored. Graduates' ideologies are examined across social contexts, as they recount their experiences not only at school, but also at home and within their communities. Furthermore, students are asked about their experiences in elementary, middle and high school as a way to examine patterns of their ideological beliefs in a variety of social contexts across time, comparing the beliefs of Latinx Spanish heritage speakers and their non-Latinx peers.

Summary

The second chapter provided a review of the relevant literature specifically related to the fields of language attitudes and ideologies. Language attitudes, which are found at the individual level, describe the favorable or unfavorable feelings attached to words, names, accents, dialects or entire languages (Portolés Falomir, 2015). Attitudes are expressed through evaluative responses such as opinions, beliefs, emotions and stereotypes (Garrett, 2010), and have the potential to unmask language ideologies that are related to larger social discourses. While related, language ideologies are related to larger social discourses, and use identity, culture and power to promote and legitimize the status of specific groups based on their language use (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). Thus, language ideologies link language use with factors such as traditions and customs, gender, race, socioeconomic status, etc. (Leeman, 2012), which has real life consequences for speakers and can affect the treatment of individuals within different groups (Fuller & Leeman, 2020). Next, this chapter discussed some of the dominant language ideologies within the United States including monolingual ideologies, standard language ideologies and

raciolinguistic ideologies, and the effects of each on the educational context. Finally, previous research on language attitudes and ideologies in dual language has revealed that students who participate in dual language programs generally have positive attitudes toward the program and their languages, yet some research has indicated important differences among Latinx and non-Latinx students with regard to their language ideologies and equitable treatment within dual language programs.

As language learning is always mediated by language ideologies, it is important to consider the implications of these ideologies on the educational context (Achugar & Pessoa, 2009). The dual language setting provides a unique context in which a multitude of social forces converge and may influence students' ideologies regarding their languages or varieties. Therefore, as overt language attitudes can be used to reveal some of the underlying language ideologies present in the broader community, this dissertation is designed to explore dual language graduates' attitudes towards their languages, participation in the dual language program and language practices, as a way to uncover their underlying language ideologies, while drawing connections to mainstream ideologies present at the societal level. Furthermore, dual language graduates' beliefs about "correct" language usage and "common sense" notions about their languages are explored in order to examine the link between ideology and students' identity. Furthermore, the current research explores whose linguistic interests are represented in the dual language program and to what extent these ideas advantage specific speakers. Due to the student composition of the dual language classroom, the current project takes into consideration raciolinguistic ideologies. This ideological linking of language and race is important, as the racialization of minoritized groups based on language can lead to

deficit views of Latinx students. Thus, to understand the role of raciolinguistic ideologies in the context of the current study and consequences regarding racialization of dual language students, it was necessary to take into account how race and socioeconomic status affected dual language graduates' experiences in their elementary school dual language program and their beliefs about their languages. As such, comparisons were made between Latinx and non-Latinx students in terms of their evaluation of and experiences in the dual language program, their beliefs about each of their languages and bilingualism, as well as their current language practices.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The current study is a mixed-method study that explores the experiences, and language attitudes and ideologies of students who have completed a dual language program (Spanish-English) during elementary school. First, the research questions are presented in alignment with the focus of the study. Next, this chapter provides an overview of the context in which the study takes place, including important demographic information of the state and specific school district, as well as the design of the dual language program in which graduates participated. This section is followed by a description of the participants including demographic information and inclusion criteria. Next, the design of the study is described in detail, and includes the instruments, which consist of both the survey and interview measures, special considerations regarding the adaptation of the instruments and the procedure used for data collection. The final section includes the different methods of both quantitative and qualitative analysis used.

Furthermore, in order to explore the contradictory nature of ideologies, the current study uses two forms of data collection with both qualitative and quantitative aspects to identify areas in which dual language graduates may express mixed beliefs about their languages and experiences. For example, while students are asked explicitly about their ideological beliefs through a survey, their ideologies are examined a second time through an interview, in which they are asked to freely discuss their experiences, allowing for the identification of underlying ideological beliefs in a less direct way.

Research Questions

1. What are the experiences of graduates of an elementary dual language program?

    1.a. To what extent do the experiences of dual language graduates differ between Latinx and non-Latinx students?

2. What are the language attitudes and ideologies of graduates of a dual language elementary program?

    2.a. To what extent do dual language graduates' language attitudes and ideologies differ between Latinx and non-Latinx students?

Context

The state of Illinois is located in the Midwest region of the United States of America and has an estimated population of 12.67 million people (U.S. Census Bureau). As of the 2019-20 school year, there were 261,454 English learners enrolled in Illinois public schools across 852 districts in the state (ISBE, 2020). There were 172 distinct languages spoken by ELs in the state, and Spanish was the most common language, spoken by 72% of the ELs in the state. Benson School District (a pseudonym) is a public school district in a mid-sized Chicago suburb with a total of eight elementary schools, two middle schools and one high school. At the time of the current study, the student population of the district was 59% White, 1.7% Black, 18.3% Hispanic, 16.7% Asian and 0.3% American Indian. Additionally, 18.8% of students in the district are classified as low income.

Benson Dual Language Program

Students who participated in the dual language program came from two main areas, denominated as Town A and Town B, with distinct socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, which are described in Table 1.

Table 1

District Socioeconomic and Demographic Information

Town	Total Population	Mean Household Income	Racial/Ethnic Demographics				
			White	Black	Hispanic/ Latinx	Asian	Other
Town A	27,111	$202,730	82%	1%	3%	12%	2%
Town B	36,494	$85,082	32%	9%	50%	8%	1%

As of the year 2019 the total estimated population of Town A was 27,111 people with a racial/ethnic origin described as 82% White, 1% Black and 3% Hispanic or Latinx, 12% Asian and 2% Other. As of the same year, the median household income of people living in Town A was $202,730. In contrast, Town B was 36,494 people with a racial/ethnic origin described as 32% White, 9% Black and 50% Hispanic or Latinx, 8% Asian and 1% Other. As of the same year, the median household income of people living in Town B was $85,082.

This contextual information is important as the dual language program population included a mix of students from both towns and the unique characteristics of each help to provide background of student experiences. It is also important to consider that the dual language program existed as a strand within the school, similar to most elementary school

dual language programs in the United States (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2021). The program was divided among three of the eight elementary schools in the district and each year two grade levels of dual language were hosted at each school. This means that every two years the dual language program is initiated in one of the three schools. Students attended the same school for the duration of the program, yet teachers would rotate schools depending on their grade level. For example, one year School X would have the kindergarten and first grade, School Y would host second and third grades, and School Z would host fourth and fifth grade dual language. Then, in subsequent years, teachers from one grade level would rotate schools, resulting in kindergarten and fifth grade at School X, first and second grades at School Y and third and fourth grades at School Z.

The district describes its K-5 dual language program format as a two-way immersion, 90:10 model with half of the student population described as native English speakers and 50% as native Spanish speakers. Beginning in kindergarten, the instructional day taught 80% in Spanish and 20% in English. Each subsequent year, instruction in Spanish decreases by 10%, while instruction in English increases by 10% until reaching 50% of instruction in each language by third grade. In kindergarten through second grade students have one bilingual teacher and a bilingual teacher's aide. Starting in second grade, students begin receiving literacy instruction in English, meaning that in the intermediate grades students may have two teachers, one of whom is English dominant and the other Spanish dominant. At the time that the students of the current study attended the dual language program, they had one bilingual classroom teacher that taught all subject areas from kindergarten to fourth grade. In fifth grade, students switched classes between two teachers, only one of whom was bilingual. The language

allocation by grade in the Benson School District dual language program is outlined in Table 2.

Starting in middle school (sixth grade), students have the option to continue the dual language track in the form of a Spanish enrichment program. As a part of this program, students have the option to take two Spanish courses that include Spanish language arts and history. At the high school level, students who have participated in dual language have the opportunity to take three Spanish for bilinguals courses.

Participants in the current study came from two different schools. Between the schools, the student population was 62.7% White, 1.25% Black, 17.5% Hispanic, 15.45% Asian, and 0.2% American Indian. The average number of ELs between the schools was 13.8%. Additionally, 16.5% of the students were considered low-income.

Table 2

Description of Benson School District Dual Language Model

Grade Level	% Spanish Curriculum	% English Curriculum
Kindergarten	80%	20%
1st Grade	80%	20%
2nd Grade	80%	20%
3rd Grade	70%	30%
4th Grade	60%	40%
5th Grade	50%	50%

Participants

Participants were contacted through existing relationships to the researcher and the data is based on a total of 24 former students in the aforementioned district. Students were selected on the basis that they had participated in the dual language program. I then

relied on the participants' social networks as a way to expand the study and increase research participation.

All participants began the dual language in either kindergarten or first grade and had completed the dual language track through eighth grade. Furthermore, all participants had completed, or were enrolled at the time of data collection, in the dual language courses in high school, which consisted of Spanish for heritage speakers courses.

All participants were between the ages of 14 and 23 years old at the time of data collection. I use the terms Latinx Spanish heritage speakers and non-Latinx students to distinguish between the students whose home language is Spanish and those whose home language is English. Among the 24 participants, 10 were self-identified as Latinx, three of whom were female and seven of whom were male, and 14 were considered non-Latinx, seven of whom were female and five of whom were male. Participants were between 14 and 23 years of age with an average age of 16.36 years. All Latinx participants reported speaking Spanish at home. In addition, two non-Latinx female participants reported speaking Polish at home. Participant information of those that completed the questionnaire are further outlined in Table 3.

Table 3

Participant information

(*N*= *24*)							
Sex		Age (yrs.)	Ethnicity		Home Language		
Male	Female	*M* (*SD*)	Latinx	Non-Latinx	English	Spanish	Other
11	13	16.36 (2.11)	11	14	12	8	2

Furthermore, as part of the data collection, participants had the opportunity to complete an interview in addition to the questionnaire. Fifteen participants volunteered to complete the interview. Among the participants who completed the interview, 7 were male and 8 were female. The information of participants that volunteered to do the interview are detailed below in Table 4.

Table 4

Interviewee information

Participant (pseudonym)	Age	Sex	Residence	Home Language	Latinx/non-Latinx	School
Samuel	14	M	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	X
Eva	17	F	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	Y
Oscar	14	M	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	X
Juan	15	M	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	X
Elena	16	F	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	Y
Damian	16	M	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	Y
Roberto	15	M	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	X
Bruno	16	M	Town B	Spanish	Latinx	Y
Carrie	17	F	Town A	English	non-Latinx	Y
Yesenia	16	F	Town A	Polish	non-Latinx	X
Camryn	21	F	Town A	English	non-Latinx	X
Daisy	14	F	Town A	English	non-Latinx	X
Mark	16	M	Town B	English	non-Latinx	X
Samantha	17	F	Town A	English	non-Latinx	Y

Research Design

This study explored language attitudes and ideologies through two tasks: questionnaires and interviews. First, Oppenheim (1992) explains that measuring language attitudes consists of placing "a person's attitude on the straight line or linear continuum in such a way that it can be described as mildly positive, strongly negative and so on" (p. 175). In order to achieve this goal, research in the field of language attitudes has traditionally used two different methods to elicit attitudes: direct measurement and indirect measurement. Direct measurement of language attitudes involves, as its name would imply, direct questions, in the form of either written questionnaires or oral interviews, which asks participants to explicitly state their opinions about the aspects of one or more languages. The direct approach focuses on people's beliefs and utilizes methods, such as interviews, to ask questions about a participants' evaluation of a language, their language preference, and reasons for learning a particular language. Direct methods may also involve an evaluation of the social groups who use a particular language or variety, self-reported language use, the desirability of bilingualism and bilingual education, and opinions concerning language policies (Ryan et al., 1982; Giles & Johnson, 1987). In the current study, the use of a questionnaire will be used as a direct method.

In contrast, indirect methods of measuring language attitudes are designed to keep the subject from the awareness that language attitudes are being investigated and seeks to elicit attitudes that are offered subconsciously (Kristiansen, 2020). For example, indirect questions would be asked about a participant's language experiences without being informed that the interviews or questionnaires are specifically targeted towards language

attitudes or bilingualism. Thus, McGroarty (2010) stresses the importance of using both qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate ideologies. The current study adapts the guidelines used by Labov (1984) for conducting a sociolinguistic interview, in which a graphic network of themes to be covered in the interview is created ahead of time. For this research, these themes included questions that elicited participants' experiences, opinions, feelings, beliefs, etc. As such, the interview began with questions, but then freely followed participants' ideas (Kristiansen, 2020).

Furthermore, Saldaña (2016, p. 135) argues that the use of Likert scales alone to collect and measure participants' attitudes represent a linear continuum of response as opposed to a three-dimensional view, which allows for "diverse responses and varying levels of depth." Thus, the current study will employ the use of a mixed-method approach to gather both quantitative and qualitative data in order to achieve triangulation of data and thus, a more in-depth understanding of the research findings, as well as to increase the trustworthiness of the collected information. Triangulation of data is necessary due to the complexity of the research on language attitudes (Djigunovic, 2012).

Instruments

This study focused on data collection from two tasks including student questionnaires and student interviews. For the first task, participants completed a questionnaire through Qualtrics (see Appendix A). All participants were presented with an assent form at the beginning of the survey. The questionnaire contained open-ended questions, close-ended questions and Likert-style rating items. It was divided into two main parts including a background section, which sought to gather data about students' demographic information; and an attitudes measure in which participants completed a

modified Likert-style survey section to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with written statements. The survey components and design are further outlined in Table 5. Survey statements were adapted from Granados' (2017) work.

Table 5

Survey components and design

Section	Theme	Sample Question	Data Type
1	Demographic information	Which town did you live in during elementary school?	Nominal scale
2	Program/Language Attitudes and Beliefs	I am glad that I participated in the dual language program	Likert (Ordinal scale)

The first part of the survey consisted of mostly close-ended questions with the option for students to elaborate their responses. Questions in this section asked about students' self-reported demographic information, home language and where they lived during elementary school, to gain insight into factors related to their socioeconomic status. The graduates were asked about which language they spoke at home, which language they felt more comfortable in when beginning school and presently. Finally, they were asked about when they began and finished the dual language program. This section included one open ended question that asked participants to explain their parents' motivations for placing them in the program.

The second section of the questionnaire, which elicited participant responses regarding their attitudes and beliefs regarding English, Spanish and bilingualism, as well as their participation in the dual language program, contained 30 total statements. The statements were divided into three blocks and were grouped by themes. The first block of attitude statements included six items about participants' perceived bilingualism and

beliefs about their participation in a dual language program. One example item in this section was: *I am glad that I participated in the dual language program*. The next block contained 12 items related to language in the school context and the standardization of language. One example item from this block was: *The Spanish I use at school is better than the Spanish I use with my friends/family.* Finally, the third block of attitude related statements contained 12 items related to monolingualism and the value of being bilingual. One example item from the third block was: *Knowing Spanish isn't really important once you graduate.*

Next, audio-recorded, semi-structured interviews were used as the second task, based on findings that young students were eager to share their experiences with language and bilingualism through interviews (López, 2011). Individual interviews with participants served to elicit participant beliefs about each of their languages and bilingualism in general. More specifically, these interviews were used as a way to gather further information about their questionnaire responses, clear up any discrepancies within the questionnaire responses and discuss their experiences in the dual language program in more detail. The interview guide was created with 21 questions that were consistent among all participants but allowed for questions that explored areas of interest that came about during the interview or as a result of participants' individual questionnaire responses. The interview questions were based off of Granados' (2017) previous work on the language ideologies of dual language program graduates and included questions such as: "Why did your parents choose to have you participate in the dual language program?" "What was one of your best memories from elementary school?" and "How did your

perspective of being bilingual/biliterate change when you went from elementary school to middle school?”

Instrument Modifications

The questionnaire task was modified based on the research on children’s use of Likert scales that has indicated that when presented with the both 3-point and 5-point Likert scales, older children tend to respond with the uncertain or neutral category more frequently (Mellor & Moore, 2014). Thus, the Likert-style scale for the current study was created with six scale points, eliminating the neutral category, due to findings that the respondents’ selection of the neutral category does not always correspond with true opinion neutrality and therefore cannot be considered as an equidistant transition point between the agree and disagree categories (Sturgis et al. 2014). Therefore, the Likert-style tasks used the descriptors: *1=strongly disagree*, *2=disagree*, *3=disagree a little*, *4=*a*gree a little*, *5=agree* and *6=strongly agree*. Additionally, these labels were based on Gerena’s (2010) recommendation that scale values should account for an equal number of positive (yes) and negative (no) choices.

Procedure

Data collection took place during the 2021-2022 academic year. For the first task, a pilot of the survey was done, and changes were made to address misunderstandings and ambiguity of questions. Once the survey was ready for distribution, survey links were emailed to parents with whom the researcher had an existing relationship, along with parental consent forms (see Appendix C). Parents who spoke Spanish were provided with a consent form in Spanish (see Appendix D). Upon providing consent for their child to participate in the research, parents were asked to forward the survey link to their child. In

the case that the child was over the age of 18, the graduate was able to provide consent and was provided with a separate consent form (see Appendix E). The survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. The final section of the survey prompted the students to enter their contact information to consent to participate in an individual interview. Interested participants were contacted at a later date via email to set a time to meet via Zoom.

Each interview began with an informal conversation with the participant and each participant was asked in which language they preferred to complete the interview, starting in English. The questions came from the interview protocol (see Appendix B) to maintain consistency among the interviews. Nevertheless, further questions were used to prompt participants to give more information about specific topics they brought up and to ask for clarification. Cues such as “tell me more about…”, “what do you mean by…?”, “can you give me an example of…?” or “can you explain…?” were used to elicit additional information. Interviews took place outside of the school day, during a time that was arranged around the individual schedule of each participant and lasted around 30-45 minutes. Each interview was audio recorded and then transcribed verbatim to preserve the authenticity of the participants’ responses.

Analysis

Questionnaire and interview data were uploaded to a secure, password-protected online storage system. During analysis, participants’ names were changed, and each was assigned a pseudonym for the rest of the investigation to preserve their anonymity. The only information that remained attached to each participant was their age, sex, ethnicity and home language.

The questionnaire data were analyzed using a mixed methods approach and included quantitative information, including descriptive statistics from the Likert-scale survey questions as well as qualitative commentary. The survey items directed at measuring participants' attitudes were grouped into four categories relating to: 1) the dual language program experience, 2) monolingualism, 3) standardized and school-based language and 4) the value of bilingualism. Survey responses were coded numerically from 0 to 5. Next, means and standard deviations were calculated for each survey item, as well as percentage of agreement among all participants. To calculate percentage of agreement, participant responses that were coded as 3 or above ("agree a little", "agree" and "strongly agree") were calculated as being in agreement with a given statement, whereas responses coded from 0 to 2 ("disagree a little", "disagree" and "strongly disagree") were calculated as being in disagreement with a given statement. Furthermore, weighted means were used to pair verbal descriptions each mean to describe participants' agreement with a given statement. Table 6 shows the weighted means and verbal descriptions. To address group differences among Latinx and non-Latinx participants, the means and standard deviations of responses of each survey item were calculated separately for each group. Next, p-values were calculated with an independent sample *t*-test using an ordinal scale to determine significance. Finally, group differences were compared using Cohen's d to determine the effect size of each measure. Unless otherwise noted, a p-value of less than 0.05 is considered significant.

Table 6

Weighted means and verbal descriptions

Weighted Mean	Verbal Description
0.00-0.82	Strongly disagree
0.83-1.65	Disagree
1.66-2.48	Somewhat disagree
2.49-3.31	Somewhat agree
3.32-4.14	Agree
4.15-5.00	Strongly agree

To explore the qualitative data related to participants' attitudes related to dual language and accounts of their experiences in the program, interview transcriptions and notes were uploaded to HyperResearch, a computer software program that allows for qualitative analysis. HyperResearch was used to code the data and thematic analysis (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003) was used to summarize the most common codes for further analysis.

Initial coding (Charmaz, 2014) using inductive analysis was used to analyze transcriptions. According to Thomas (2006), inductive analysis "refers to approaches that primarily use detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, themes, or a model through interpretations made from the raw data by an evaluator or researcher" (p. 237). Interview data was coded in two cycles. First, In Vivo coding was used during the first round of coding. In Vivo coding refers to the extraction of codes using the words of the participants themselves and is used in qualitative studies in order to "prioritize and honor participants' voice" (Saldaña, 2016, p. 106). During the first cycle, the data was coded

without a predetermined theme, meaning that codes were constructed during the coding process. Text segments related to students' experiences at school, as well as their beliefs about language and bilingualism were highlighted and codes were formed verbatim. Next, Pattern Coding was used during the second cycle of coding, to organize codes identified in the first round into related categories, or themes. As such, a total of thirteen categories were used to group codes. These categories were then divided among two themes guided by research questions: (a) Graduates' Experiences and Attitudes Related to the Dual Language Program, and (b) Language Attitudes and Ideologies of Dual Language Graduates.

Statement of Positionality

A variety of factors including race, gender, bilingualism, social class an educational level had important influences in who I, as the researcher had access to, and thus participated in this research, in addition to how participants interacted with me. My identity as a bilingual researcher and former teacher of dual language influenced access to and rapport with dual language graduates and their families. I have been a dual language educator and taught in 50:50 two-way immersion programs such as the program in the Benson School District. Therefore, my point of view was from the location of a person involved with dual language programs. Additionally, while my perception of school dynamics was informed by students' recounts of their own experiences, I was a teacher figure for the dual language graduates, which may have influenced the way that these students told their stories. Finally, this research presents the language ideologies of dual language graduates as interpreted through my own lens, as related to the experiences of graduates that I had contact with and with whose parents I had contact and rapport to

be able to receive consent for their children to participate in this research. I did not undertake this research to validate any theoretical stance related to dual language education.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In general, the dual language graduates consider themselves to be bilingual and have positive attitudes towards their bilingualism and participation in a dual language program. While students shared similar perspectives about their perceived language proficiency and beliefs about learning in two languages, differing patterns emerged between Latinx and non-Latinx students in terms of their bilingual experiences and language related ideologies. The following section is organized thematically and discusses the findings related to each of the research questions and is divided into two main sections: (a) graduates' experiences and attitudes related to the dual language program and (b) graduates' language attitudes and ideologies. Each section is then further divided into relevant themes, which are explored in detail first, through a description of dual language graduates' attitudes, including relevant quantitative survey data, and then, followed by a discussion of relevant qualitative findings.

Graduates' Experiences and Attitudes Related to the Dual Language Program

To address the research questions regarding dual language graduates' attitudes and experiences that dual language graduates hold regarding their participation in the dual language program, means and standard deviations were calculated from relevant survey statements. Means and standard deviations, as well as group differences for survey items can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

Independent t-test Results of Dual Language Experiences

Survey Item	All	Latinx	Non-Latinx	Group Differences	
.				t (22)	Cohen's d
I am glad I participated in the dual language program	4.29 (1.37)	4.90 (0.32)	3.86 (1.65)	.064	0.81
I am bilingual.	4.08 (1.77)	4.70 (0.68)	3.64 (1.27)	.026*	0.114
I felt supported in learning in two languages in the dual language program.	4.13 (0.99)	4.60 (0.52)	3.79 (1.12)	.045*	0.88
Participating in the dual language program helped me learn about other cultures.	4.38 (1.06)	4.60 (0.69)	4.21 (1.25)	.389	0.36
Learning two languages has given me the confidence to do well in school.	3.75 (1.60)	4.70 (0.68)	3.07 (1.73)	.010*	1.17

Results indicate that as a group, graduates agreed that they were glad to have participated in the dual language program, according to the survey data (*M*=4.29, *SD*=1.37). An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine group differences between Latinx and non-Latinx students. Results of this test were not significant (*t*(22)=1.95, *p*=.064). However, while examining percent agreement, 100% of Latinx students reported that they were some degree glad to have participated in the dual language program, only 79% of non-Latinx students reported the same.

Furthermore, participants' experiences were categorized into eight main themes including (a) the Opportunity to Learn in Two Languages; (b) Feeling Supported at School; (c) Creating a Dual Language Family, (d) Not Starting from Zero: Bilingualism as Equitable in Dual Language; (e) Awareness and Appreciation of Cultural Differences;

(f) Linguistic Labeling of Dual Language Students; (g) Hegemony of English in Dual Language; and (h) Middle School as a Transitional Site.

Opportunity to Learn in Two Languages

One of the most common responses from participants regarding their positive experiences in the dual language program was the fact that they were able to become bilingual, as 90% of participants believe that they are, to some degree, bilingual. In addition, 88% of graduates also generally reported feeling supported in learning two languages through the dual language program. To identify students' beliefs regarding their experiences in learning in two languages, means and standard deviations were calculated for the statements: *I am bilingual,* and *I felt supported in learning in two languages in the dual language program.*

First, results indicate that as a group, dual language graduates generally agreed that they were bilingual (M=4.08, SD=1.18). In order to compare the responses of Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates regarding being bilingual, an independent sample t-test was conducted. This test was found to be statistically significant with regard to students reporting that they are bilingual ($t(22)$=2.38, p=.026). These results indicate that the Latinx graduates reported that they were bilingual (M=4.70, SD=0.68) to a greater degree than their non-Latinx peers (M=3.64, SD=1.27). Results also indicated a strong effect size (d=.99) according to Cohen's d.

Next, dual language graduates generally agreed that they felt supported in learning in two languages in the dual language program (M=4.13, SD=0.99). Results from an independent sample t-test to identify group differences between Latinx and non-Latinx students demonstrates statistical significance with regard to students feeling

supported in the dual language program ($t(22)=2.13$, $p=.045$). These results indicate that the Latinx graduates reported feeling more supported in learning two languages ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.52$) than their non-Latinx peers ($M=3.79$, $SD=1.12$). Results also indicated a strong effect size ($d=.83$) according to Cohen's d.

During interviews, students discussed the advantage that the dual language program gave them in terms of being bilingual and allowing them to communicate with others. Both Latinx and non-Latinx students generally agreed that the dual language program was what allowed them to become bilingual and biliterate in English and Spanish and indicated that learning or maintaining their Spanish would have been difficult had they not participated in the dual language program.

[1] *Being in dual language, I don't know, it was nice learning things in Spanish and English. It pushed me harder to speak more Spanish.* -Eva (Latinx)

[2] *It's just like crazy [that] I started from like that young, and I can, like, read, write and speak fluently now.* -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[3] *I definitely do not think I'd be able to speak as good as I can now, or read, or write, because my friends who started taking Spanish in sixth grade, do not know how to speak Spanish (laughs).* -Yesenia (Non-Latinx)

The statements in excerpts [1], [2] and [3] all demonstrate how these students believed that the dual language program helped them to become more bilingual. Although bilingualism was a normal linguistic practice for some Latinx students, such as Eva, as they spoke both English and Spanish at home, the dual language program provided an opportunity to build skills in Spanish and help to maintain their heritage language. Non-Latinx students, who did not speak Spanish at home, compared their elementary school dual language experiences with their experiences in middle and high school, citing advantages that the dual language program provided them, comparing their

experiences to those of their peers who had not participated in the program. For example, Carrie describes how she thinks it's "crazy" that she can read, write and speak fluently in Spanish. Furthermore, in excerpt [3], Yesenia compares her experiences with those of their peers. For instance, she attributed her ability to read, write and speak in Spanish to her participation in the dual language program, comparing her knowledge of Spanish with that of her friends that started to learn Spanish as a foreign language in middle school. In this way, Yesenia demonstrates her confidence in speaking Spanish and indicates her belief that learning Spanish in elementary school gave her an advantage over her friends who began taking Spanish courses in middle school.

Creating a Dual Language Family: Interpersonal Relationships

Dual language graduates generally reported feeling supported at school. They characterize the dual language community as a "family," and indicate a strong connection to their teachers and peers within the program. Both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates explain that they were able to form a diverse group of long-lasting friends from a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds because of the program. The mention of close-knit friendships came up in all interviews (*n*=15).

[4] *It felt good building, like, this family with the dual language kids.* -Eva (Latinx)

[5] *So, all of us, become very tight knit very quickly and it's just like we all have all of us like 100% of the time, and it was kind of just, like, you go from kindergarten to fifth grade, like, you all grow up with each other, so you're not only forced to be friends, but it's like you're also kind of a family, in a sense.* -Samantha (Non-Latinx)

[6] *Honestly, I really liked the friends that I made.* -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[7] *I feel like the group that I grew up with, you know, speaking to them now, I feel like, one, I have a connection with them because I've known them for so long, but you know [...] I don't feel like I would have that deeper connection with them if I*

hadn't gone [to the dual language program] because again, I just feel like there was such like, a bond in the dual language program. I feel like, you know, we were we were obviously all learning together, every day, but like learning a whole nother language together and learning from our peers, who already spoke, Spanish and, you know, learning from peers who didn't, and it was kind of this like these multiple vines that kind of just grew up together into one weave almost like that still kind of stays. -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[8] *I feel like I got to meet a lot more people because I was doing this program, then I could have if I was if I wasn't.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[9] *I liked having friends that you can relate to a lot more with, because having, like, Spanish speaking friends, or friends that live close to me really help build good relationships. Especially it's like we were in the same classroom most of the day and I think that just helped build a lot of relationships and, like, really good social skills.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[10] *I was very happy to, like, grow up with my classmates that I had because literally everyone's from different cultures and backgrounds, which is like, very cool.* - Yesenia (Non-Latinx)

[11] *I also really liked the group of people that I was with. I think a lot of the kids that do the dual language, they were just definitely all very different. like there's a mix of people, mix of races...but I think that definitely was a really cool experience. I definitely branched out with being friends with people of all different backgrounds, but I feel like the dual language definitely helps allow that to happen, I would say.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

When asked about the best part of the dual language program, Eva responded in excerpt [4] that it was like a "family." Samantha, in excerpt [5] also mentioned that the dual language was similar to a family because of the amount of time the students in dual language spent together and the fact that there were only two dual language classes among two grade levels within the school. Similarly, Carrie, Samuel, Yesenia, Camryn and Mark also felt that the dual language program allowed them to make close friendships. Mark and Samantha explained that because of the small number of students that participated in the dual program at each school, they were able to get to know their friends on a deeper level that would not be possible if they had not participated in the

program. For example, Mark expressed that participation in the dual language program allowed him to create deep friendships that he specifically attributed to the experience of learning in two languages. Bruno also indicated that the dual language program helped him to make close friends and build social skills. For Bruno, the most significant part of the dual language program was getting to have friends that he related to and that were also native Spanish speakers.

In excerpts [8], [10] and [11]. Students make specific mention of the ability to meet people that are different from them because of the dual language program. For example, Samuel and Yesenia indicated that the program allowed them to make friends with those that come from backgrounds different than their own, whom they felt they may not have normally been friends with had they not participated in the program. For Yesenia, the best part of the dual language program was the ability to have a diverse group of friends. Similarly, Camryn explains how the dual language classes were very diverse, which allowed her to "branch out" and become friends with a more diverse group of people. Thus, dual language graduates strongly value the friendships made through the dual language program. Some students valued being able to make friends with a diverse group of people, while one Latinx student recalls the importance of having people that he can relate to in his class.

Not Starting from Zero: Bilingualism as Equitable in Dual Language

During interviews, dual language graduates reported how their teachers influenced their elementary school experience and that their teacher's bilingualism created an equitable experience for students, as they were able to communicate in their home language with their teachers. All graduates reported a close connection to their

elementary teachers. Of significance is the finding that students appreciated and preferred that their teachers be bilingual. Both Latin and non-Latinx participants describe how their teachers' bilingualism was important to them throughout elementary school.

[12] *I liked that the teachers did speak Spanish, but then they also spoke English so that like you know when you're like a little kid and kind of like scared and not sure what you're talking about you can like talk to them in English and they, like, knew what you're talking about.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[13] *I feel like the teachers, because it was a lot easier to communicate with them, knowing that they spoke both Spanish and English, especially because I felt I feel like if I was in a classroom or like even later in middle school where I didn't have a teacher who spoke Spanish or, for example, when I was like, in extended math in middle school and the first year I didn't understand any of the vocabulary, so I was way behind, even though I should have known how to do the math, I just didn't know any vocab. So, I feel like just having a teacher that spoke, the same language really helped and then not having one was like, just a worse experience, you could say.* -Bruno(Latinx)

[14] *I feel like I would be even more nervous because I would be like I would be starting from zero in a way and then in dual language I wasn't starting at zero because I could talk to the teachers in Spanish and they could try to explain to me in Spanish. -Eliza* (Latinx)

In excepts [12], [13] and [14], graduates talk about how their teachers formed an important part of their dual language experience. It was of specific importance that their teachers were bilingual. For example, Camryn expresses how, for her, it was important that while she was learning Spanish, she had a teacher that could also speak to her in her native language, English. Bruno also appreciated that his teachers were bilingual. He explains that how in middle school, when his teachers only spoke English, he felt as if he was behind and being unable to communicate in Spanish with his teachers resulted in a worse experience for him. Similarly, Eliza explains how if she had not participated in the dual language program and had a bilingual teacher, she would feel nervous at school. She explained how the dual language program provided her an advantage and made it so that

she was not "starting at zero," but instead, because of her Spanish was provided an equitable classroom experience.

Awareness and Appreciation of Cultural Differences

Similar to the findings from the previous section, among the positive effects of participating in the dual language program mentioned by participants was the awareness and appreciation of other cultures. To identify students' overall beliefs regarding the connection between dual language and learning about other cultures, means and standard deviations were calculated for the statement: *Participating in the dual language program helped me learn about other cultures.* Results indicate that as a group, dual language graduates agreed that the dual language program helped them learn about other cultures (M=4.38, SD=1.06). An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the responses of Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates. This test did not reach statistical significance ($t(22)=.878$, $p=.389$), which indicates that both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates equally agree that their participation in the dual language program allowed them to learn about other cultures.

Additionally, survey data revealed that 95% of graduates indicated that they felt that participation in the dual language program allowed them to learn about other cultures and 93% of participants ($n=14$) made explicit mention of the cultural awareness that they gained from having participated in the program in their interviews. For example, when asked about what they enjoyed in the dual language program both Latinx and non-Latinx students cited learning about culture as one of the most important takeaways.

[15] *Being in the dual language program really helped me learn about different cultures.* -Eva (Latinx)

[16] *I think I have a lot more appreciation for, like, the Spanish culture than I would have if I wasn't in the dual language.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[17] *[The dual language program] it's not just a Spanish class, it's, you know, kids who are diving in headfirst into a whole nother culture for five days a week, eight hours a day and interacting hands on, you know, face to face with peers, who come from a different background and a different culture and kind of meshing the two. It was way more than just a Spanish class because, like Spanish classes, the beginner level Spanish classes, for the people who just started taking Spanish, whether it be in high school or middle school, like, they have the cute little parties and presentations and whatever and 'hey, you know, let's learn a little bit about the culture' and whatever, but, not that it feels like fake, but it feels almost like, this is not nearly-- you're not even close to what it's like.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[18] *Dual language lets you participate in more, like, my Hispanic heritage and learn more about the culture.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[19] *[The dual language program] kind of helped me, like, find out new things about my culture and everything.* -Damian (Latinx)

[20] *[The program] helped me connect a lot more to my culture and Latin American culture, which I feel like has been really important, well it's really important to people who feel close to that or that want to, like, relate more to their own culture and especially being able to do that and then present it to other people.* -Bruno (Latinx)

In excepts [15], [16] and [17], graduates discuss how the dual language program helped them to learn about other cultures. Similarly, three Latinx students such as Samuel, Bruno and Damian, talk about how their participation in the dual language program helped them to learn more about and connect with their own culture. Mark acknowledges the importance of culture in the dual language program, comparing the cultural content taught in the dual language program to what students typically learn in world language classes in middle school or high school. He indicates that despite "cute little parties and presentations" about cultural topics, they do not get into the depth of the culture that the dual language program offered, which indicates that he would not have the same level of understanding or appreciation for the culture had he not participated in

the dual language program. In general, non-Latinx participants cite learning about other cultures as a benefit of dual language and Latinx participants refer to learning about their own culture through the dual language program.

Isolation, Divisions and Rivalry: Disadvantages of Dual Language

Despite generally positive attitudes, the dual language graduates express conflicting ideas regarding the sense of community they felt during elementary school. The small, intimate nature of the dual language cohort proved to have somewhat negative effects on students' educational experiences, as participants describe disadvantages related to othering, divisions and rivalry with the monolingual English classes. As such, one of the salient features described by all participants is the use of Spanish as an othering trait. For example, while students describe a variety of initial thoughts towards their participation in dual language, Caroline, who was a part of the second class of dual language when the district began its implementation, specifically remembers feeling "different" and described feelings of discomfort when trying to explain the program to others. She remembers students from other classes referring to the program as "weird" and goes on to explain how this had an effect on her ability to fit in among her peers. All participants mentioned some sort of division between the students in the dual language classes and students in the monolingual English classes in elementary school. In some instances, graduates indicated that the binary nature of the dual language classes and mainstream English classes created a sense of rivalry between the two groups.

[21] *It was like kind of, I think, like, secluded.* It was like the English and the others. *There was a lot less dual language kids than there were other like in the normal [classes].* -Samuel (Latinx)

[22] *What I remember is we definitely were secluded from the other kids that were in our grade.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[23] *I do remember it being a bit, like, segregated I would say in a way. We were a bit more closed off in elementary school too, like, the other kids kind of… I just feel like there was kind of like a language barrier in a way. Like, I could speak English and communicate well with them, it's just that it wasn't the exact same because we didn't share the same experiences as them.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[24] *I never felt connected with the rest of the school. So, I think there might have been some unspoken division between the two groups, and we never really fraternized with the English kids.* -Daisy (Non-Latinx)

[25] *I, like, felt left out, because I mean it was just our class with dual language and, like, I guess, when I was that age, I just wanted to be like the others so that's what I felt. It was where I felt left out, because there was more classes in English. So, like, I wish there were more classes that taught more Spanish. Like in middle school where everyone would take a language so you wouldn't feel as left out for just taking a language.* -Elena (Latinx)

[26] *All of us were, like, the dual language kids. There was, I don't know, there was always like, a separation between the dual language kids and, just like the English kids or whatever. Also, cuz on my bus there was not one person in dual language, who rode my bus, so I would just, like, talk to them after school, like 'oh, what did you do today?' and we did, like, completely different things. I was, like, that's kind of annoying but like it's okay.* -Samantha (Non-Latinx)

[27] *We were kind of, like, separated and I think one of the main reasons was, I guess, that they [the kids in the monolingual English classes] would think that we talk about them, just because they didn't understand what we were saying.* -Damian (Latinx)

In excerpts [21], [23] and [24]. graduates described a sense of isolation or seclusion due to the small group of dual language students that existed as a strand within the school. Samuel describes that at his school it was the "English and the others" when referring to the students in the monolingual classes and in the dual language program. He also references the monolingual English classes as the "normal" classes. Daisy specifically explains that as a dual language student, she never felt connected with the rest of the school. She also indicated an "unspoken division" between the students in the

dual language and the students in the monolingual English classes, as they never really spent much time together. Similarly, in excerpts [26] and [27]. Samantha and Damian describe a separation between the dual language classes and the monolingual English classes. Samantha recalls not being able to share experiences with other students on her bus, as she was the only one who was in a dual language class. Furthermore, when describing why the two classes were separated, Damian explained that he felt it was because the students who were not in the dual language classes felt that the dual language students were always talking badly about them in Spanish, as they were unable to understand the language.

Thus, despite generally positive experiences within the program, many students felt isolated from the larger school community. In addition, as a result of the division between the dual language classes and monolingual English classes, some graduates indicated that they felt a sense of competition with the students outside of the dual language program.

[28] *There was a weird, like, rivalry almost between the dual language program and the regular academic program. It was the weirdest thing because there was no reason to be but, like, for some reason, because we weren't learning together every day, and we weren't interacting with each other every day… but I feel like, I don't know it was just weird like, 'oh that's the dual language group and that's the English group', and they didn't really like mesh much.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[29] *I wouldn't say that we really did [get along with kids in the monolingual English classes] ... It was kind of a rivalry, at times, honestly.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[30] *I remember like during recess we wouldn't really hang out with the other kids, and we would play soccer where it was dual language versus non-dual language, and it was like a consistent thing. We did every single day, and I think that might have actually been pretty damaging, how some people grew up like just knowing or like feeling that they have to be separated from people that are not like them.*- Bruno (Latinx)

[31] *I do remember that there would be fights between, like, I obviously wouldn't get in the fights, but there would be fights between both sides, like sides in a way, because one side like we were learning both languages, and they would just speak English, so there would be like fights that would go on about it. Not, like, fistfights or anything, just verbal fights.* -Elena (Latinx)

[32] *Like specifically, I know that there had been fights between kids from dual language and, like, kids from the English classes. They happened pretty frequently, just kind of like, going back and forth. Nothing ever got, like, super bad, though. It was always just kind of picking on each other. Sure, like we would both make fun of each other.* -Samantha (Non-Latinx)

In excepts [28 –32], Mark, Samuel, Bruno, Elena and Samantha describe a rivalry between the students in the dual language classes and the students in the monolingual English classes, with Mark admitting that there was really no reason for it. Bruno talks about the negative effects of the separation between the dual language students and the students not in dual language, indicating how damaging it can be for children to feel like they have to be separated from those that are not like them. Similarly, Elena and Samantha speak about how the students in the dual language classes and the students in the monolingual English classes would get into frequent fights. Elena clarifies that students from both "sides" got into verbal fights, using the term sides to refer to the students in dual language and the students in the monolingual English classes.

Linguistic Labeling and Racialization of Dual Language Students: The Spanish Kids

Students report being labeled based on their language use within the school. Graduates generally referred to themselves as the "Dual Language Kids," yet, seven of the interviewed participants vividly remember their experience being called the "Spanish Kids," a term ascribed to them by the students in the mainstream English classes. Both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates remember their classification as "Spanish Kids" based

on their participation in the dual language program, yet there were nuances found within the group.

[33] *I do remember that we would say the English kids and the Spanish kids.* -Daisy (Non-Latinx)

[34] *That's how we organized each other, you're either an English kid or you're a Spanish kid.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[35] *We'd go out to recess, and they'd be like 'oh, the Spanish kids,' the Spanish kids they'd call us, and then, like they'd just be the English kids. It was like two different groups.* -Yesenia (Non-Latinx)

[36] *The kids who weren't in dual language called us the 'Spanish kids.'* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[37] *Recuerdo que nos decían los Spanish Kids.* -Oscar (Latinx)

[38] *Well yeah, I do remember like they would say that we're the Spanish kids because we speak Spanish and they're only, like, they only speak English.* -Roberto (Latinx)

[39] *When I would hear, they [students not in dual language] would refer to all of us as Spanish kids.* -Elena (Latinx)

In excerpts [33-39], dual language graduates Daisy, Samuel, Yesenia, Mark, Oscar, Roberto and Elena specifically recall the term "Spanish Kids," that was used to describe the students in dual language. Daisy and Samuel report using the term to refer to themselves, while referring to the students who were not a part of dual language as the "English Kids." However, Yesenia, Mark, Oscar, Roberto and Elena remember being called the "Spanish kids" by the students who were not in the dual language program and did not mention referring to themselves as the "Spanish Kids." Many graduates were unable to think of a reason for this division. Other graduates reported that linguistic differences accounted for the "Spanish Kids" label and some participants referenced race as being related to the division between students in the two programs.

[40] *They [students not in dual language] said those kind of things and whatnot, but I feel like it wasn't the kids, you know, I mean I feel like that's just what's taught because, like 'okay they speak Spanish they are Spanish; they are this this culture, and that is not me, so that is what they are'... and all the difference they just know is 'okay, they speak a different language and we hear that and we see that a lot of them look different,' so they're just like 'we're kind of apart from that'. I feel like that was just taught to them, and that's all they knew, so I feel like that's what they said because they didn't know how to name it.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[41] *I don't know why they called us the Spanish kids, maybe because they saw we looked, like, different than them because we're like learning Spanish, but I don't know, maybe they're also jealous they knew only one language, maybe I don't know.* -Elena (Latinx)

[42] *There was some names that we had. It might have just been like dual language kids and the white kids, so I think that was it. But the thing is not everyone was white over there, so I don't know what that had to do with, but there was something.* -Samantha (Non-Latinx)

In excerpts [40-42], Mark, Elena and Samantha all reported linguistic as well as physical differences as the rationale for the label "Spanish Kids." Mark and Elena mention that they felt they were referred to as the Spanish Kids based on the fact that people in the dual language classes "looked different." For example, when asked to further explain the interactions Mark [40] attempted to explain that the term "Spanish kids" was not necessarily meant as a derogatory term, but instead was due to the fact that the other students lacked a term to be able to describe students who spoke another language and had a different physical appearance. Elena [41] also presumed that the students in the monolingual English classes called them the Spanish Kids because the students in dual language "looked different than them." On the other hand, Samantha [42] specifically mentions the division between the "dual language kids" and the "white kids," questioning the validity of this term, as "not everyone was white over there." In this way, she acknowledges that there were students of different racial backgrounds in the

monolingual English classes, yet the general consensus among her peers was that those students were the "white kids."

Linguistic Assimilation in Dual Language

Dual language graduates explain that their bilingualism evolved throughout the program, allowing them to achieve high levels of bilingualism. Nevertheless, when describing their actual language use in elementary school, both Latinx and non-Latinx participants indicate a tendency to speak English, either as a preference, or in the case of Latinx, heritage Spanish speakers, as an act of accommodation for their English dominant peers. The graduates also describe that their teachers tried to promote the use of Spanish in the classroom.

When participants were asked about their perception of the language use during their elementary years, they indicated a variety of home languages and comfort levels upon entering elementary school. This demonstrates how students formed a linguistically diverse group upon entering the dual language program in kindergarten.

[43] *I feel like kindergarten and first grade was a lot of, like, you know, if that's the language you spoke at home that's what you spoke, and you would communicate with the others, and it would kind of even itself out, but I feel like by the time second and third grade rolled around we all knew enough of the opposite language [...] it was just whatever the occasion was, if it was in the classroom or whatever, we would just you know just pick one it just you know, whatever a lot of the times, it would be a mix match like one sentence would be in English and one would be in Spanish.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[44] *There was a lot more English kids in [the program], so I feel like it was better. They [the 'English' kids] had better English than Spanish, but there were some kids I think that had better Spanish.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[45] *I think I was better friends with a lot of the native Spanish speaking kids, so maybe they made me speak more. I think I mostly spoke in English to them.* – Daisy (Non-Latinx)

[46] *I was still, like, learning, so it was just easier to speak in English. And it's not like they [Spanish heritage speaking peers] didn't understand. They definitely understood me, like, they knew their English too.* -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[47] *At first, like, in kindergarten to, like, second grade I strictly spoke Spanish basically, I didn't really like speaking much English, but then after that I kind of had to adapt and then I just decided to put a bit more effort into speaking English and then now it's basically my first language. I know that I didn't speak as much in Spanish, and I felt like that was really only like a classroom thing, and I feel like I if I did focus more on my Spanish, I would be a lot more fluent than I am today, so it was like a drawback, but at the same time, I feel like it was just a bit beneficial being able to like just pick and choose. But like with friends and like outside of the classroom it was a bit more English because I feel like it just seemed a bit easier or, like, I would be able to communicate with a lot more people if I spoke in English, rather than speaking in Spanish.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[48] *Era más fuerte en el español, pero hablábamos más en inglés. Y en recess y en lunch, en el lonche, allí todavía hablábamos más inglés que español. Me recuerdo porque los niños con quien me juntaba y todos ellos hablaban más inglés que español.* -Juan (Latinx)

[49] *I would have friends who knew Spanish, and I would just want to talk to them in Spanish, and in other classes no one really knew Spanish and might be, like, singled out, so I was just kind of forced to talk in English.* -Damian (Latinx)

[50] *Si la persona hablaba el español como bien bien, entonces hablamos en español, pero con los que no sabían hablar el español bien, pues hablamos inglés. Cuando salimos al recreo y al lonche hablamos en inglés más que en español.* -Oscar (Latinx)

When speaking about the language use in the elementary dual language classroom, Mark [43] remembered that in the first year or so of the program, students tended to solely speak their home language in the classroom. However, he then describes a shift to the use of a mixture of Spanish and English in the classroom to accomplish a variety of tasks. Nevertheless, in the later grades, despite participants' bilingual abilities, many explain how they resorted to speaking English at school.

In excerpts [44], [45] and [46], three non-Latinx students, Camryn, Daisy and Carrie all report speaking mostly English at school. When asked about classroom

language practices, Camryn [44] indicated that English dominated within the school context, due to the unequal composition of students in the dual language program, coming from English speaking homes. She describes how it was “better” that there were more students who spoke English, to accommodate her own language practices. Similarly, Carrie [46] talked about her own motivations for speaking mostly in English, as she was not comfortable in her Spanish and was still learning. Furthermore, Carrie describes how “they”, when referring to the students who came from Spanish speaking homes, were able to understand English as justification for language practices that privilege the use of English. Daisy explains that while she was mostly friends with the native Spanish speakers, who may have motivated her to speak more in Spanish, she resorted to speaking mostly in English to them.

Like Mark, Bruno [47] talks about how students were able to “pick and choose” their languages in the classroom based on their linguistic resources. Nevertheless, Bruno recalls speaking more in English in the classroom and during lunch and recess, as it was “easier” and allowed him to communicate with more people. Upon clarification, Bruno indicated that it was easier in the sense that other students understood him, as he, himself, was more comfortable speaking Spanish. Bruno indicates having to put in more effort and adapt to speaking more English, to the extent that it is now “basically his first language.” Similar to Bruno’s experience, in excerpts [48], [49] and [50], three other Latinx students, Juan, Damian and Oscar, describe how despite feeling more comfortable in Spanish they used English to accommodate their peers who spoke mostly English. Damian specifically indicated that despite his desire to speak in Spanish to his friends, he chose to speak in English to avoid singling out any students who only spoke English.

Additionally, Oscar indicates that he only spoke Spanish with students that spoke Spanish well. When asked who these students were, he explains that they were other students that came from Spanish speaking homes.

Evidence of the dominance of English in the dual language classroom also appeared when graduates recalled how in elementary school, their teachers became frustrated with them when they spoke in English during Spanish instruction, as they struggled to maintain balance between English and Spanish. None of the participants, including those that reported stronger levels of Spanish proficiency, indicated that their teachers reminded them to speak in English during time dedicated to English instruction, which demonstrates the natural nature of speaking English in the classroom and that students understood the expectation to speak English during "English time."

[51] *Our teachers always told us to speak Spanish and it was like time to speak Spanish and then they would get mad if we spoke English when it was Spanish speaking time.* – Eva (Latinx)

[52] *Yo me recuerdo que mi maestra de quinto, ella cómo era la maestra de español, cuando hablamos inglés, como que nos regañaba, diciendo que hablemos español, como era la clase de español.* -Oscar (Latinx)

[53] *It just feels weird speaking in, like, Spanish to someone who also speaks English as their first language. So obviously you're going to want to speak, the one [language] that you're faster at and that sounds better to you. So, they [the teachers] always recognized when we had our little chit chats with our friends and then they tried to break it off, and, like, help us speak Spanish.* – Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[54] *Like well, mostly it was during Spanish, like, the teachers didn't really like us speaking English, but during English they didn't mind if we spoke Spanish, I think it was because, like, even though we were in English, we were still practicing our Spanish.* -Roberto (Latinx)

[55] *Todavía lo hacen [comentar en el uso del inglés]. Por ejemplo, si hablas en inglés la maestra te ignora y no es por que te ignora es por que quiere que le digas, está pidiendo que lo digas en español.* -Juan (Latinx)

[56] *Sometimes I'll talk in English, and we'll get in trouble for speaking English, or switching both languages and she'll [my teacher will] be like wait, ¿que dijistes? because she wants us to improve our Spanish. She wants us to be good at Spanish, and not just speak whatever.* -Elena (Latinx)

In excerpts [51-56], Eva, Oscar, Carrie, Roberto, Juan and Elena all described the struggle of their teachers to get the students to speak in Spanish during Spanish instruction, which demonstrates the pervasive nature of English in the classroom. Roberto [54] specifically indicated that while the teachers would make comments about the use of English during Spanish instruction, they would not do the same when students spoke Spanish during English instruction, because they were glad that the students were practicing their Spanish. Carrie [53] justifies her use of English in the classroom as it was "weird" to talk to other English speakers in a language other than English. Although she indicated that all students generally preferred speaking the language they can speak faster and that sounds better to them, she described in her previous comment that English dominated classroom interactions and that it was justified, because the students who spoke more Spanish, "still understood" when she spoke in English. Carrie describes how her teachers would recognize when she and her friends would have "little chit chats" in English and her teachers would redirect them to speak in Spanish. In excerpts [55] and [56], Juan and Elena specifically talk about their experiences in middle school Spanish classes. Juan described how in middle school, his Spanish teachers ignore students when they speak in English, clarifying that it is not because they ignore you, but instead because they want students to repeat themselves in Spanish. Similarly, Elena reported that when she or her classmates speak in English in her Spanish class, the teacher will ask "*¿qué dijistes?'* as a way to get students to repeat themselves, only using Spanish. Elena

explains that this strategy is used to help students improve their Spanish and “not just speak whatever.”

Middle School as a Transitional Site

Participants indicated that they experienced dramatic shifts in their bilingualism and enjoyment with the program after elementary school, as all interviewed participants indicated a general disappointment with the decreasing amount of Spanish used for instruction as they advanced through the program. This means that graduates reported enjoying the program less during middle school, as their teachers spoke less in Spanish.

As such, participants indicated negative feelings towards the perceived equity of the two languages throughout the progression of the program. mirroring Bearse and de Jong’s (2008) findings that secondary dual language students are aware of the shift in preference for English over Spanish in the later years of the program. In the current research, this shift was most marked in the transition from elementary school to middle school. For example, when explaining their language beliefs throughout their school years, all students (*n=15*) indicated that the transition to middle school was the most difficult for them and it was at that point when they saw a dramatic decrease in the amount of Spanish used during instruction.

[57] *It went from learning multiple subjects in Spanish, and then, once I went to middle school, classes were in English, except for my history class and my Spanish class and then, once I went to high school, I only had one class that we spoke Spanish in, so I had to get used to speaking English.* -Eva (Latinx)

[58] *En middle school solo hablamos español en [la clase de] español y en estudios sociales y ya.* -Juan (Latinx)

[59] *But in middle school all the other classes, except those two, it would be pure English, so we wouldn't hear any Spanish at all.* -Roberto (Latinx)

[60] *I think that it's a lot different because it was mostly half a day, and then we went to, like, a 40-minute class period, so it was a big change. Now I wish it was a little bit longer because I do still feel like I'm not as strong in Spanish, so, like, if I did have more time, I would definitely be able to improve more.* -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[61] *Your whole day was mostly Spanish because it was dual language and then towards the middle school I had more English classes and Spanish. Spanish wasn't really my top priority in a way. It [Spanish] was like my primary language and English was my secondary, but as time went on English started to get a little more as my primary.* -Damian (Latinx)

[62] *I used to be pretty confident in my Spanish, but then I feel like in middle school I didn't speak Spanish for so long that it became like unnatural so, then I couldn't really, like, form quick sentences and like I have like short pauses between sentences. Then like seventh grade is like when I kind of changed to mostly English.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[63] *I don't know, I mean, I remember it being kind of disappointing. I didn't really have any other feelings towards that I just you know, this is the way it is, and I can't really do anything about it, but I mean it was kind of disappointing because it was almost like something I had been growing for, like, six years and then just kind of you know, now only paying attention to it for a little bit. [It's] like having a pet, or like, a baby that you raised and now only paying a little bit of attention to it. It was just hard, like, I had to find other times to practice and keep up with it, and, you know, read things in Spanish or watch things in Spanish, or whatever, so I don't know it was kind of disappointing. I mean, like I said, I didn't really think anything more because it's the way it has to be, but it was like I had to abandon that more.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

In excerpts [57-63], Eva, Juan, Roberto, Carrie, Damian and Mark all describe their perceptions of a dramatic shift to mostly English starting in middle school. These students explain how they went from having around half of their academic subjects in Spanish to only two courses in Spanish beginning in middle school. Additionally, Carrie, Damian and Samuel indicated that the transition to middle school was a detriment to their Spanish. For example, in excerpt [60], Carrie mentioned that the shift away from Spanish had implications for her literacy skills in Spanish. Similarly, Latinx students Damian and Samuel report that their confidence and proficiency in Spanish decreased, and as Damian

explains in excerpt [61], his primary language went from Spanish to English, due to his primary use of English at school. Participants attribute their English dominance to the language shift in middle school. When asked about how their feelings towards their languages changed from elementary school to middle school, many students report that they were saddened by the change. In excerpt [62], Samuel describes how his confidence in speaking Spanish changed drastically as speaking Spanish became "unnatural" to him beginning in middle school. Similarly, in excerpt [63], Mark describes his perception of the shift to English in middle school demonstrate the negative emotions he had when thinking about abandoning the Spanish language. Mark related his Spanish to a pet that he cared for on a daily basis, only to be forced to later limit his time caring for in middle school.

The Sixth Grade Shift: Dual Language as a Problem

The theme of dual language as a problem was described by participants during their first year of middle school. During participants' transition to middle school, they report the problems they faced to having participated in the dual language program, which as a result influenced their attitudes towards Spanish.

[64] *In one of the later years, I was, like, confused sometimes. I was, like, 'I know this in Spanish, I don't know this in English,' so that was the most confusing year just because the shift in elementary school, but then, when I got to middle school, I was confused a lot, because I was like I know everything that you're talking about in Spanish. Like sixth grade was pretty difficult because it just went from, like, fully Spanish to like pretty much English, so that was pretty difficult. The sixth-grade shift was probably the hardest part.* -Samantha (Non-Latinx)

[65] *La peor parte del dual language fue cuando cambiaron las destas [materias] de español al inglés, fue cuando se me confundió.* -Oscar (Latinx)

[66] *Like the subjects that we would learn in Spanish, we kind of didn't learn in English, so we kind of just stuck with like, for example, math in Spanish we're just*

stuck with that and, like we weren't taught in English, so as long as we went into middle school, it was kind of a little harder, because we didn't know what we were doing. -Roberto (Latinx)

[67] *In middle school, I felt like I had to work a lot more than the other kids because I didn't completely understand English because it wasn't my first language. So, although there were a bunch of, like, benefits of just keeping my language and being able to speak it fluently now, I felt like it was a bit harder, and it was like it was just a bigger learning curve in general. I feel like I was just put at a disadvantage sort of because I didn't just have to, like, learn what was being taught, but now it was strictly in English.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[68] *My perspective of being bilingual changed in middle school kinda because the subjects that I would learn in Spanish, right now, I remember thinking, like, why didn't I just learn all of this in English? Because now, it's like, different. Learning these things in English and I learned them in Spanish. It was harder, but eventually I got used to it.* -Eva (Latinx)

In the previous excerpts, Oscar, Roberto, Samantha, Bruno and Eva, describe how their elementary dual language experience had a negative impact on their transition to middle school. They describe having a harder time adjusting to the content that they had learned in Spanish in elementary school when they learned similar content in English in middle school. For example, Oscar [65] and Samantha [64] explained that the worst part of dual language was in middle school when their classes were in English, as it was at that point that they became the most confused. Samantha refers to the shift to "pretty much English" as the hardest part of the dual language program. Similarly, Roberto [66] reported confusion in his transition to middle school. He explains "we didn't know what we were doing" in middle school as he specifically mentioned math taught in English being more difficult after having only taken math in Spanish up until then. Bruno [67] also mentioned that he had a bigger learning curve in general, as compared to the students that had not learned academic content in two languages in elementary school, which ultimately put him at a disadvantage. Bruno explained that in middle school he was not

only responsible for learning the academic content, but also the new vocabulary that went along with it in English, as he had only learned the concepts in Spanish. Finally, according to Eva [68], this transition changed her perspective of being bilingual.

It was also during the middle school transition that some students began to realize the value of their bilingualism and their participation in the dual language program. For example, even those students that initially expressed somewhat negative feelings about learning in two languages expressed disappointment with the lack of courses offered in Spanish in middle school. Samuel speaks about his shifting perceptions of Spanish in middle school.

[69] *In middle school we got more into, like, how you can take speaking Spanish to benefit yourself and we started talking about how you can use it for jobs and to interact with more people, so then I just, like, changed my whole opinion of learning a new language, so I became more interested in it.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[70] *I thought that it was a lot more beneficial, because now that I'm in high school and thinking about college more so.* -Bruno (Latinx)

In excerpts [69] and [70], Samuel and Bruno describe how their attitude toward Spanish became more positive in middle school. For example, Samuel describes his attitudes towards Spanish as more negative in elementary school, citing a lack of understanding of why it was necessary to learn the language. Then, while he was unable to pinpoint the exact reason for the changes in his beliefs regarding the value of bilingualism, he specifically remembers middle school as a turning point in terms of realizing the utilitarian use of Spanish, despite his family's use of Spanish at home and the desire of his parents to use and maintain the language. Similarly, Bruno indicates that he found his bilingualism to be more beneficial in middle school, and since starting high school as he has started to think more about college.

Dual Language Graduates' Language Attitudes and Ideologies

To address the second research question of the language attitudes and ideologies of dual language participants' experiences were categorized into three main categories including (a) monolingual language ideologies; (b) standardized language ideologies; and (c) pluralistic language ideologies. This section explores how dual language graduates' experiences have shaped their language attitudes and ideologies. Thus, each of these categories is further divided into related themes and are described using both quantitative and qualitative data. Means and standard deviations for relevant survey items are outlined in Table 8.

Table 8

Independent t-test Results of Language Attitudes

Survey Item	All	Latinx	Non-Latinx	Group Differences	
.				t (22)	Cohen's d
Schools should teach kids in the language they speak at home.	3.54 (1.25)	3.70 (1.49)	3.43 (1.09)	0.61	0.21
All kids should learn English at school.	3.79 (0.78)	3.70 (0.83)	3.70 (0.83)	0.64	-0.20
English is more normal than other languages.	2.33 (1.55)	2.70 (1.42)	2.07 (1.63)	0.34	0.41
Knowing English helps someone be American.	2.58 (1.44)	2.60 (1.08)	2.57 (1.64)	0.96	0.20
There is a correct form of language that you typically learn at school.	2.33 (1.09)	2.60 (0.97)	2.14 (1.17)	0.32	0.40
School teaches you the correct language.	3.38 (1.01)	3.60 (1.08)	3.21 (0.98)	0.37	0.38

There's only one form of Spanish that should be used at school	1.88 (1.26)	2.60 (1.43)	1.36 (1.34)	0.04*	0.42
There’s only one form of English that should be used at school	1.92 (1.53)	3.0 (1.49)	1.14 (1.03)	.002*	1.50
You need to learn a language at school to be really good at it.	1.75 (1.34)	2.0 (1.05)	1.64 (1.08)	0.47	0.31
The Spanish I use at school is different than the Spanish I use with my friends or family.	2.58 (1.41)	3.60 (1.17)	1.86 (1.10)	.001*	1.54
The Spanish I use at school is better than the Spanish I use with my friends or family.	3.0 (1.14)	2.80 (1.32)	3.14 (1.03)	0.48	-0.30
Using two languages to complete a task is not as good as using only one.	1.67 (1.24)	2.0 (1.05)	1.43 (1.34)	0.33	0.46
Mixing languages is not as good as using only one at a time.	1.50 (1.25)	1.80 (1.55)	1.29 (0.99)	0.28	0.41
People who speak Spanglish are not as smart as those that speak only English or Spanish.	1.80 (1.15)	2.63 (0.92)	1.25 (0.97)	.005	1.45
You have to know the grammar of a language to speak it well.	3.25 (1.45)	3.30 (1.25)	3.21 (1.62)	0.89	0.06
You have to be smarter to write a language than to speak it.	2.00 (1.29)	2.5 (1.43)	1.64 (1.08)	0.109	1.24

Monolingual Language Ideologies

Through the analysis of survey data and students' narratives, dual language graduates demonstrate somewhat conflicting ideas regarding monolingualism that were represented differently among Latinx and non-Latinx students. Students' attitudes demonstrated both alignment with and rejection of English monolingualism as the norm. Findings indicate that students were generally aware of the dominance of and preference for the English language, not only in the educational context, but also within the wider societal context. In many cases, while students demonstrated positive attitudes towards bilingualism, they also accepted English monolingualism as normal. Graduates also discussed instances in which having participated in the dual language program presented them with a problem. The three themes that were categorized as relating to monolingual ideologies were: (a) Sin el español todo sería en puro inglés, inglés, inglés: Monolingualism as the Norm; (b) 'English isn't American, well kind of': One Nation-One Language Ideology; and (c) Spanish as Undesirable.

Sin el español todo sería en puro inglés, inglés, inglés: Monolingualism as the Norm

First, as a whole, graduates simultaneously agreed with the statements that schools should teach kids in the language they speak at home (M=3.54, SD= 1.25) and that all kids should learn English at school (M=3.79, SD= 0.78). An independent sample t-test that was used to determine group differences was not found to be significant.

Despite the graduates' belief that bilingualism and the ability to communicate in more than one language were some of the main benefits of participation in the dual language program, graduates demonstrate an underlying acceptance of English monolingualism as the norm in the country and the educational context. For example,

they indicate that they would not have been able to, or in some cases, even interested in learning Spanish had they not participated in the program.

[71] *Si no estuviéramos en dual language, todo el elementary sería en puro inglés, inglés, inglés.* -Juan (Latinx)

[72] *I think if I didn't take Spanish in elementary school, I wouldn't even bother learning the language.* -Samuel(Latinx)

In excerpt [71], Juan acknowledges that had he not participated in the dual language program, his elementary experience would have been completely in English, indicating his acceptance of English as *the* language of school. Similarly, in excerpt [72], Samuel indicated that he "wouldn't have bothered learning Spanish" had he not participated in the dual language program, even though Spanish was the language used in his home, demonstrating his complacency with the monolingual norm. Furthermore, as seen in the previous section on language use in the classroom, in excerpt [47], Bruno mentions that although he did not like to speak in English in kindergarten, he was forced to "adapt," indicating his acceptance that one must adapt to the language of the school to be successful, which was in this case, English.

Some participants, such as Yesenia and Samuel demonstrate the monolingualism as the norm ideology, when describing the composition of the dual language classes. For example, in the previous section, Samuel uses the term "normal" when referring to the monolingual English classes, associating "normal" with English speaking. Similarly, Yesenia described, "I mean we were, like, bullied by the other kids in the English classes, we would call them the normal kids." For Yesenia, the term "normal kids" is used to describe the students in the monolingual English classes, further demonstrating her association of "normal" to speaking only English. Both Yesenia and Samuel's

denomination of the students in the monolingual English classes as the “normal kids” demonstrates the association of English as the unmarked language choice of not only the school context, but also the larger societal context, which reflects a deeper monolingual language ideology that favors the use of English.

Furthermore, the monolingualism as the norm ideology is seen among students’ previous attitudes towards language shift in middle school. For example, as seen in Mark’s previous quote about the increased use of English in middle school, he mentions that this was just “the way it has to be,” which demonstrates his awareness of the dominance of English, specifically in the school context and associated perception of language shift as something out of his control. Similarly, Eva was not surprised by the shift to English in middle school, explaining, “I feel like it's something that you expect to happen since everything's in English.” In this way, participants accept English as the language of instruction as something that is expected and of which they have no control.

‘English isn’t American, well kind of’: One Nation-One Language

According to survey data, as a group, students tend to disagree with the idea that English is more normal than other languages (M=2.33, SD=1.55) and only slightly agreed that knowing English helps someone to be American (M=2.58, SD=1.44). To examine group differences, independent sample t-tests were conducted for each of the items, yet results did not reach significance. As such, results indicate that both Latinx and non-Latinx students generally disagreed that English is more normal than other languages and slightly disagreed that knowing English helps someone to be American.

These survey results conflict with what students reported in their interviews. For example, in the previous section, when discussing the divisions between the dual

language classes and the monolingual classes, several students, like Samuel and Yesenia, referred to the monolingual English classes as “normal” and the students as the “normal kids,” whereas the dual language students were the “other kids.” This demonstrates how while graduates did not explicitly agree that English was more normal than other languages, they used the word “normal” to discuss English monolingualism in other contexts.

Furthermore, despite graduates' beliefs that English was not necessary for someone to be American, graduates linked English with the country in different ways through their interviews. Some demonstrated their awareness or acceptance of the monolingual ideology of one nation-one language by associating speaking Spanish with immigrants and being foreign.

[73] *People do think English is the official language in this country, I mean I don't have anything against it, or don't like that other people are speaking Spanish instead of English in a public place. I feel like there are a lot of immigrants here who come in here and speak multiple languages. I feel like if they can speak another language, and not speak English good, I mean I feel like there shouldn't be an issue.* -Elena (Latinx)

[74] *It felt like cool in a way because it was like just like having something different and, like, you think of immigrants and how they have like their different language that they can speak to their parents with.* – Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[75] *By like having Spanish it gives us, like, another language so if we were in a foreign country or something you could, like speak to someone.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

In excerpt [73], Elena acknowledges that people perceive English as the official language in the United States and expresses that she “doesn’t have anything against” others speaking languages other than English. At the same time, Elena equates not only multilingualism with immigrants, but also lacking English proficiency. Carrie’s explanation in excerpt [74] demonstrates the contradictory nature of students’

monolingual ideologies. According to the survey data, non-Latinx graduates generally rejected the idea that knowing English is necessary for being American; however, when speaking about how it feels good to be able to speak another language, Carrie associates Spanish with "immigrants," referring to it as "their language." Similarly, Camryn, in excerpt [75], explains that knowing Spanish is important to "speak to someone" if one were to travel to a foreign country, ignoring the fact that 41 million people speak Spanish in the United States. Both Carrie and Camryn demonstrate the one nation-one language ideology, as they associate English as the only valid language choice of the United States, while positioning other languages as foreign. In addition, it demonstrates how they racialize speakers of Spanish, by associating speaking Spanish with immigrants.

Spanish as Undesirable

When students were asked about their perceptions of the negative aspects of participation in the dual language program, many did not easily come up with an answer. However, through analysis, it became clear that students demonstrated ideologies that associated learning in two languages as problematic. Thus, the Spanish-as-Undesirable Ideology describes the stigmatization of the Spanish language. This ideology was represented in a variety of ways including the resistance to speak or use the language and participants' perceptions of the negative impact that Spanish had on their English proficiency.

Resistance to use Spanish. One of the ways that the Spanish-as-Undesirable Ideology was manifested was through some students' resistance to learning or speaking Spanish, despite in some cases, using Spanish at home to communicate with their family members. Students demonstrated a resistance to learning Spanish at school as well as

using it outside of school. Furthermore, for specific students, the resistance to using Spanish resulted in discontinuation of the dual language program.

First, both Latinx and non-Latinx students demonstrated some sort of resistance to the dual language program or the use of Spanish during their elementary school years, yet this resistance was manifested differently within the two groups of graduates.

[76] *My mom will talk to me in Spanish, to get me to talk to her in Spanish, but I usually respond in English [...] I always thought it was a little useless to learn a second language if I'm using English all the time. I wouldn't say [Spanish is] useless, it's just like how people see math today, like 'when am I going to need this?'* -Samuel (Latinx)

[77] *In elementary school I, like, couldn't see why I needed two languages, but now that I'm going into, like, my career, I see how much it's really going to help me.* -Elena (Latinx)

[78] *I was like I really don't want to. like, learn another language. I kind of thought of it as like Why do I have to do this? But I think it's like unique looking back on it now.* – Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[79] *I felt like I couldn't do it well enough, and I didn't want to use those skills with anyone outside of school. And when my family would try and get me to speak in Spanish, cause like they wanted to see, I would just refuse cause I was embarrassed and I just, I don't know, I was a fourth grader.* -Daisy (Non-Latinx)

In excerpt [76], Samuel, a Latinx heritage Spanish speaker, reports that he did not see the value in learning Spanish and that he refused to speak it, despite Spanish being the language of his home. Similarly, in excerpt [77], Elena demonstrated some resistance to participating in the dual language program early on as she admits that she couldn't see why she needed two languages, despite it being the primary language in which she communicated with her parents. Samuel and Elena were the only Latinx students who admitted that they felt that learning Spanish at school was useless and questioned why

they would need this skill. This finding is interesting as Spanish is the language spoken by their families.

Similarly, in excerpts [78] and [79], Carrie and Daisy both express their resistance to learning Spanish at the elementary level saying they did not really want to learn another language but explains how her parents did not really give them a choice. Some Non-Latinx students, such as Daisy, represented their resistance to speak Spanish outside of the classroom differently. For example, explaining how their parents would want them to speak in Spanish to show what they were learning in school, and in this case, they refused to do so, due to feelings of embarrassment. In some cases, the resistance to use Spanish manifested as the result of a loss of interest in the program and the view of Spanish as a less attractive language of study. For example, two Latinx students discussed their desire to pursue French instead of Spanish in high school. In addition, Daisy, who discontinued the dual language program after elementary school, explains how she felt about having to take Spanish as a foreign language class in high school, stating: "I don't want to learn Spanish, I just do it because I have to… It's just not as cool. I'd rather learn like Japanese or like Russian, or Latin maybe Greek." Daisy justified her discontinuation of the dual language program, explaining that Spanish was a less cool option when related to other languages, a feeling that she explains came from having to learn Spanish in her elementary years. These examples demonstrate a difference in how the Spanish language was interpreted differently for the Latinx and non-Latinx students.

Dual Language as Problem. Frequently, the Spanish-as-Undesirable Ideology was expressed in relation to participants' perceived proficiency in English, which led to

the creation of a separate code of *Dual Language as Problem*. Both Latinx and non-Latinx students expressed the idea at one point or another they felt that having participated in the dual language program provided them with a disadvantage. For example, some students described how having learned two languages in elementary school made it difficult for them later on as they began learning the same subjects in English. Eva expressed her disappointment with the program when she entered middle school, as she explains: "I remember thinking, like, I wish I learned all of this in English because now it's different: learning these things in English and I learned them in Spanish." Instead of feeling proud of her bilingualism, Eva felt at a disadvantage in the English dominant setting. In other cases, students made more explicit mention of their proficiency in English being affected by having participated in the dual language program.

[80] *I feel like my English wasn't up to par with the other kids. I still make simple spelling mistakes that I feel like I should know easily by now.* -Lucas (Non-Latinx)

[81] *My writing skills [in English] aren't where I feel like they should be, I think that my communication skills with writing could be stronger if I wasn't in the dual language program.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[82] *Si no estuviéramos en el dual language, diría que por poquitos le entendería más al inglés por desde chiquito estar aprendiéndolo y no el español.* -Juan (Latinx)

Excerpts [80-82] demonstrate some of the ways that the dual language graduates, like Camryn, Lucas and Juan, viewed their bilingualism as a disadvantage, through the Spanish as a problem lens, when comparing their language abilities to those of their monolingual English-speaking peers. For example, in excerpt [80], Lucas describes feeling that his bilingualism affected his spelling in English, whereas Camryn believed that the dual language program put her at a disadvantage in terms of her academic

English skills, specifically in the area of writing. Additionally, Juan, a Latinx student explains in excerpt [82], that he thought that he would have better comprehension in English had he not participated in the program.

In another instance, Mark makes a distinction in his observation of the language proficiency of students who came from Spanish-speaking households and those that did not, explaining:

[83] The kids who did not speak Spanish at home would be in this program, they would learn Spanish and then, you know, they would practice speaking Spanish and they would lose English a little bit. Later, what I saw in middle school was like, those kids who knew more Spanish than English and learned Spanish quicker, then they struggled in English. Then they would start to slack off in the Spanish classes in middle school and then they just couldn't talk either [language]. Like, they struggled in both languages and they kind of had half of each. And it was kind of odd, like I didn't even know that was possible, like, you know, they struggled speaking Spanish and they struggled in the Spanish classes and then like, with English grammar and writing, they didn't know how to like, spell words or, you know, how to use correct grammar, and it was interesting to me like, they ended up-- with me like, I ended up learning two languages fluently two languages, but they kind of learned half of each. -Mark (Non-Latinx)

In excerpt [83], Mark explains how in elementary school, when instruction was mostly in English, students from English speaking homes lost some of their English. However, he mentioned that those students who spoke Spanish at home would struggle in English, when instruction shifted towards a greater use of English in middle school. He describes how these students struggled in both languages and had only ‘half’ of each language. In this sense, Mark attributed being unable to spell words or use correct grammar in English as a result of these students’ bilingualism.

It should be noted that although participants cite disadvantages of being in the dual language program when speaking of their English proficiency, they rated themselves relatively high on the self-proficiency measures in the areas of reading, writing, speaking

and listening in English. Furthermore, participants generally rate themselves lower on Spanish proficiency measures when compared to the same measures in English; however, make no mention of their Spanish skills not being where they "should be".

Standardized Language Attitudes and Ideologies

Dual language graduates also expressed conflicting beliefs regarding standardized or correct language forms and the role that school played in the development of such forms. The five themes that were categorized as relating to standardized language attitudes and ideologies were: (a) There's not a Correct Form of Language, just a Right one; (b) Speaking 'Actual Spanish': Graduates' Language Use at Home and School; (c) Doing Spanglish: 'I Know it's Pretty Bad, but it just Happens'; (d) 'Grammar Sucks, but without it, I'd Sound Kinda Dumb'; and (e) Writing Shows what you Know.

There's not a Correct form of Language, just a Right one

According to quantitative data, dual language graduates generally slightly disagree that there was a correct language that one typically learns at school (*M*= 2.33, *SD*=1.09). Results from an independent sample t-test that was used to explore group differences did not reach statistical significance. This means that all graduates disagreed generally disagreed that there is a correct form of language, typically associated with school.

Nevertheless, qualitative data demonstrate participants' conflicting attitudes related to a correct language and also indicated evidence of an underlying standardized language ideology.

[84] I wouldn't say correct or incorrect, I'd just say there's like a universal way of speaking Spanish where, like, everyone will understand it, but then some people I guess expand on that and that's what makes new words. I feel like the Spanish

they teach in school is, like, a normal Spanish and then they just kind of leave it up to the students to interpret the way they want to interpret it. -Samuel (Latinx)

[85] *I think more about variety versus just one being, like, the correct one. Okay, but also, that being said, that probably makes it a little bit more challenging since there's all these different types of Spanish that some would be considered like the grammar would be right, but then [in] another variety it would not be right, so I think that definitely it's a bit tricky because I wouldn't consider there's like one Spanish, like, right above another.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[86] *With the dual language, like, they would teach us enough so that was, like, we learned how to speak [Spanish] right and also write it.* -Roberto (Latinx)

The responses shown in excerpts [84-86] demonstrate how, as consistent with the findings in the survey data, Samuel and Camryn reject the terms "correct" and "incorrect" to describe language. However, at the same time, Samuel makes reference to a "universal" Spanish, clarifying that at school, they teach a "normal" Spanish, which refers to his belief in a standard Spanish. Samuel goes on to explain how some people depart from this standard Spanish and "make up words" that "aren't actually Spanish." Samuel's comments demonstrate somewhat conflicting ideas about the existence of a correct language, as he does not use the words "correct" and "incorrect" when speaking about language but does agree that there exists a "normal" Spanish and what he identifies as "not actual Spanish."

In a related fashion, in excerpt [85], Camryn initially rejects the idea of a correct form of Spanish, preferring instead the term "variety;" however, she then contemplates the issue of grammar indicating that there is potentially a correct grammar that in some Spanish varieties "would be right," whereas in others "it would not be right." As a result, Camryn shows her conflicting ideas about a correct form of language concerning its grammar. Finally, Roberto explains that the dual language program teaches how to speak

Spanish "right," indicating his belief that there is also an incorrect way to speak the language.

Speaking 'Actual Spanish': Graduates' Language use at Home and School

To identify students' beliefs related to the connection of correct language use and schooling, means and standard deviations were calculated for four statements including: (a) *There's only one form of English that should be used at school*; (b) *There's only one form of Spanish that should be used at school*; (c) *School teaches you the correct language;* and (d) *You need to learn a language at school to be really good at it.*

First, as a group, students disagreed (M=1.92, SD=1.53) with the idea that there is one correct form of English that should be used at school. Group differences, as identified through an independent sample t-test were found to be significant among Latinx and non-Latinx participants regarding the belief that there is only one form of English that should be used at school ($t(22)$=3.62, p=<.001). Therefore, while non-Latinx students rejected the idea of a correct form of English (M=1.14, SD=1.03), Latinx students generally *agreed* (M=3.0, SD=1.49) that there is a single form of English that is appropriate for school. Results also indicated a strong effect size (d=1.24) according to Cohen's d.

Similarly, as a group, students disagreed (M=1.88, SD=1.48) with the idea that there is one correct form of Spanish that should be used at school. Group differences, as identified through an independent sample t-test were found to be significant among Latinx and non-Latinx participants regarding the belief that there is only one form of Spanish that should be used at school ($t(22)$=2.18, p=.04). Therefore, while both Latinx and non-Latinx students generally disagreed that there is a correct form of Spanish used at school, Latinx agreed to a greater degree that there is only one form of Spanish

appropriate for school (*M*=2.60, *SD*=1.43), than their non-Latinx peers (*M*=1.36, *SD*=1.63). Results also indicated a strong effect size (*d*=1.38) according to Cohen's d.

Despite graduates' disagreement that there is only one form of English or Spanish that should be taught at school, results demonstrate that dual language graduates generally agreed that schools taught the correct language (*M*=3.38, *SD*=1.01). Results from an independent sample t-test that was used to explore group differences between Latinx and non-Latinx students did not reach statistical significance ($t(22)=.916$, $p=.37$).

However, while dual language graduates generally agreed that schools teach the correct language, they disagreed that learning a language in school was necessary to speak it well (*M*=1.75, *SD*=1.39). Results from an independent sample *t*-test to identify group differences between Latinx and non-Latinx students did not reach statistical significance ($t(22)=.737$, $p=.469$). These results indicate that both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates disagreed that one needs to learn a language at school to be good at it.

Finally, as a group, dual language graduates generally disagree with the the idea that one must learn a language at school to be good at it (*M*=1.75, *SD*=1.39). The results of an independent sample t-test used to compare group means among Latinx and non-Latinx students did not reach statistical significance.

Therefore, based on quantitative data, as a group, students reject the idea that there is only one form of English or Spanish that should be used at school, yet agree that schools teach the correct language. Group differences were found significant among Latinx and non-Latinx participants, with Latinx students generally disagreeing less with the existence of a single form of Spanish to be used at school (*M*=2.60, *SD*=1.43), while

agreeing that there is a single form of English that should be used at school (*M*=3.0, *SD*=1.49).

The theme of 'Speaking Actual Spanish' had specific implications for Latinx students, as the conflicting attitudes of the graduates regarding correct language use and differences between their home and school language was amplified among Latinx students when they compared the Spanish they use with their friends and family to the Spanish they learned at school. Means and standard deviations were calculated for two statements related to the difference between participants home and school Spanish, which included: (a) *The Spanish I use at school is different than the Spanish I use with my friends or family;* and (b) *The Spanish I use at school is better than the Spanish I use with my friends or family.*

Results demonstrate that Latinx dual language graduates generally agree that the Spanish they use at home is *different* that the Spanish they learn at school (*M*=3.60, *SD*=1.17), yet only slightly agree that the Spanish they learn at school is *better* than the Spanish they speak at home (*M*=2.80, *SD*=1.32).

Qualitative data indicate differences between the descriptions that Spanish Latinx participants provide for the Spanish they speak outside of the school context with their friends or family and the Spanish they learn at school. These graduates indicate a general tendency to describe the Spanish they use at home as "common Spanish," "less formal," and frequently linking it to the use of Spanglish.

[87] *With my parents I use more, like, common Spanish, but then, my friends, usually I guess you could say use, like, slang: words that aren't actually Spanish, or like kind of made-up words. I don't really know, just like, I know it's not actual Spanish.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[88] *The Spanish we learn at school is more like formal Spanish and then the Spanish we use at home is like using slang and things.* -Eva (Latinx)

[89] *I mean I don't speak fluently. I have some Spanish in me. But it's not like I guess the right way to speak Spanish, like, I guess I picked it up from what I've learned at my house, not actual Spanish from school, so my grammar isn't really the best and some of the words that I say is more, like, slang Spanish.* -Damian (Latinx)

[90] *I mean the Spanish in schools, a bit more, like, I guess scholarly, like, advanced and a bit more formal. Because at home, and, like, when I've gone to Mexico, it's a lot more, like, just casual and conversational rather than, like, being super precise with all these grammar rules and having like correct words because there's like a lot of, like, slang that's used and that I use, and that isn't really taught in school.* -Bruno (Latinx)

In excerpts [87-90], Samuel, Eva, Damian and Bruno all indicate that the Spanish they speak at home is different from the Spanish they learn at school. For example, in excerpt [87], Samuel positions the variety of Spanish he uses outside of the school context as invalid, when compared to the Spanish taught at school, describing it as "not actual Spanish." Similarly, when asked to compare the Spanish she speaks at school to the Spanish she speaks at home, Eva's description of her family's use of Spanish in excerpt [88] as "slang" and her laughing at her admission of using Spanglish, demonstrates her belief that the Spanish used at school is a more valid option.

In excerpt [89], Damian also makes a distinction between the Spanish he speaks and the Spanish that he is taught in school. He explains that in contrast to the Spanish he is taught at school, his use of Spanish isn't fluent, his grammar "isn't really the best" and that he uses "slang Spanish." He also associates the Spanish learned at school as "actual" Spanish. Similarly, in excerpt [90], Bruno makes the distinction between the Spanish spoken in schools and the Spanish he uses with his family and on his trips to Mexico. He uses the words "scholarly," "advanced," "formal" and "precise" to describe the Spanish

used in schools, relating it to the use of “correct words” and “grammar rules.” Conversely, Bruno describes the Spanish he uses at home as “casual,” “conversational,” and characterized by the use of “slang.” His comparison indicates his belief that there is a correct form of language that is characteristic of the variety used at school.

Doing Spanglish: ‘I know it’s Pretty Bad, but it just, like, Happens’

To measure participants’ attitudes towards the use of Spanglish, means and standard deviations were calculated for three survey statements including: (a) *Using two languages to complete a task is not as good as using only one*; (b) *Mixing languages is not as good as using only one at a time*; and (c) *People who speak Spanglish aren’t as smart as those that speak either English or Spanish.*

Results indicate that as a group, dual language graduates generally disagreed that using two languages to complete a task is not as good as using a single language ($M=1.67$, $SD=1.24$), that mixing languages is not as good as using only one ($M=1.50$, $SD=1.25$), and that people who speak Spanglish are not as smart as those that speak English and Spanish without using Spanglish ($M=1.80$,$SD=1.15$). To compare the responses of Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates regarding the use of Spanglish, independent sample t-tests were conducted for each of the statements. Only one result for people that use Spanglish are not as smart as those that do not was found to be statistically significant ($t(22)=2.98$, $p=.007$). These results indicate that the Latinx graduates slightly agreed that people who speak Spanglish are less intelligent than those that do not ($M=2.60$, $SD=.84$), while their non-Latinx peers did not believe that people who speak Spanglish are less intelligent than those that do not ($M=1.43$, $SD=1.02$). Results also indicated a strong effect size ($d=1.45$) according to Cohen’s d.

Through interviews, students discussed their use of Spanglish and findings indicate that Latinx participants tended to evaluate their use of Spanglish negatively.

[91] *I use Spanglish sometimes. I try not to use it, because I know it's, like, pretty bad, but it just, like, happens subconsciously, where I start switching languages and it doesn't really matter what language I'm speaking.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[92] *Then also sometimes I, like, use Spanglish (laughs) when I'm talking. I didn't learn that at school. I just [use Spanglish] talking to my friends though, other than that I would know not to use it [...] because we're, like, learning Spanish so it just makes sense not to use it.* -Eva (Latinx)

[93] *I feel like I do Spanglish, like, I do, I'm not saying I don't. I feel like I do it a lot when I'm presenting, I usually do when I'm nervous about something, so I will use both languages, and it is a habit, I am trying to get rid of cuz I want to improve my Spanish and I feel like improving my Spanish and an obstacle, I need to overcome is to not do Spanglish.* -Elena (Latinx)

The quotes from excerpts [91-93] demonstrate how the Latinx students, Bruno, Eva and Elena express their negative attitudes towards their own use of Spanglish. In excerpt [92], Eva explains that the use of Spanglish is not appropriate in all contexts. For example, she explains she uses Spanglish at school, but justifies her use stating that she will exclusively use Spanglish when speaking with her friends. This further demonstrates how she associates the use of Spanglish as incorrect and inappropriate, which signals her belief in the existence of a correct Spanish. Elena also reluctantly admits to using Spanglish in excerpt [93] saying, "I do Spanglish, I'm not saying I don't." Elena talks about how the use of Spanglish is a bad habit that she is trying to break, as she sees it as an obstacle to her improving her Spanish.

When asked specifically about the Spanish that students used at school and any comments they got on their use of Spanglish, these same students make mention of their teachers' dislike of "slang" or "Spanglish," which can be seen in excerpts [94] and [95].

Conversely, none of the non-Latinx students made specific mention of their teachers reprimanding them for the use of Spanglish.

[94] *Our teachers would, like, do lessons teaching us not to use slang or Spanglish, so we wouldn't use them.* -Eva (Latinx)

[95] *I was called out on it by my teacher in middle school for speaking Spanglish, cuz they like to speak, like, the traditional way.* -Samuel (Latinx)

In the previous excerpts, Eva and Samuel explain how their teachers discouraged the use of Spanglish, and as Samuel recalls, not speaking "traditional Spanish." These reports could indicate the monoglossic language ideologies held the teachers that were then transmitted to these dual language graduates.

'Grammar Sucks, but Without it I'd Sound Kind of Dumb'

Another theme regarding standardized and correct language use was that of grammar. To measure participants' attitudes towards the necessity of grammatical knowledge to know a language, means and standard deviations were calculated for the survey statement: You have to know the grammar of a language to speak it well. Results indicate that as a group, dual language graduates generally agreed that one needs to know the grammar of a language to speak it well (M=3.25, SD=1.45). An independent sample t-test to compare the responses of Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates regarding being bilingual, indicated no significant difference between groups. These results indicate that both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates equally agreed that grammar was an important part of the language learning process and that it was necessary to be able to speak a language.

Formal grammar instruction was also found to be an important topic for graduates, as it was present in all student interviews and, for many students, generated

negative attitudes. Nevertheless, the importance of grammar to "know" or communicate in a language or the role of formal grammar instruction in the classroom were areas in which the dual language graduates demonstrated conflicting beliefs.

Grammar came up as a recurrent theme in interviews and was directly tied to beginning fifth grade. According to all students, fifth grade was when they started to "learn grammar." The introduction of formal grammar instruction was tied to a myriad of negative emotions among the graduates.

[96] *I remember one of the hard parts was the grammar for me and we tried in, like, fifth grade to, like, learn it, and that was a part that I really disliked. I was like, 'why do I have to do this because it's so hard I don't understand'.* -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[97] *Grammar is hard. I don't like it. I didn't get enough support with it. We started conjugating in fifth grade. But it sucked so…*-Daisy (Non-Latinx)

[98] *At first it [learning Spanish] was pretty cool and then it got more and more complicated so then again it became less and less cool.* -Samuel (Latinx)

[99] *Sí, específicamente cuando nos tocaba aprender el español, cuando nos tocaba esa materia, si estaba difícil por que fue en quinto cuando empezamos a aprender gramática y usar las palabras en nuestras oraciones como el pretérito, como que yo sí lo sabía, pero como que al mismo tiempo que te lo enseñaban, como que te lo enredaban.* -Juan (Latinx)

In excerpt [96], Carrie explains her view of grammar as an isolated concept, separate from the language, saying that she tried to "learn it: in fifth grade. She questioned the role or importance of grammar, as she was able to communicate in Spanish, explaining that grammar was hard. Similarly, in excerpt [97], Daisy indicated her negative attitude regarding grammar instruction, explaining that it "sucked," while some students, such as Samuel, indicated that the introduction of grammar made learning the language less interesting, as seen in excerpt [98]. Finally, excerpt [99] shows Juan's

agreement that formal grammar instruction was difficult. Juan indicated that he already was able to use some of the grammar topics but having to learn the rules regarding their usage made it more confusing to him. The degree to which grammar was important for communication in a language and its role in language instruction was not universal among students.

[100] *[...] that was just nouns, like animals and colors. Grammar is hard. I don't like it. I would probably be able to communicate [without grammar] if I tried, but I would probably just sound kind of dumb.* -Daisy (Non-Latinx)

[101] *La gramática es importante porque si no pones acentos en ciertas palabras, pos se pronuncia todo mal.* -Oscar (Latinx)

In excerpt [100], Daisy compared her fluency in elementary school to her knowledge now. She said that she had a great range of vocabulary and knew her "nouns, animals and colors." However, while Daisy agreed that she would still be able to communicate in Spanish without continuing to learn the grammar, she said she would sound "kind of dumb" if she tried to communicate in Spanish because she is not good at conjugating. Juan disagreed with needing to know the grammar of a language but emphasized the importance of writing with correct grammar to be able to show what one knows in a language. As seen in excerpt [101], Oscar was the only Latinx participant to explicitly say that learning grammar was important. He gives the example of not writing accent marks on words, saying that without accentuation, one pronounces everything wrong.

The focus on grammar in language classes was also a shock for students who did not continue the dual language program after elementary school. For example, Camryn decided to pursue the Spanish classes geared towards Spanish as a foreign language in

middle school and high school, as opposed to the Spanish as a heritage language courses. There, she was able to see a stark difference between how she learned a language in elementary school through the dual language program and how Spanish is typically taught at the high school level. She argued that grammar should not be the focus of language instruction, as it deters students from wanting to learn a language and does not necessarily facilitate communication.

[102] I feel like language programs shouldn't stress as much the importance of like grammar and like conjugating as much as they do, because I think that does deter a lot of students from wanting to learn a language because, I know in middle school and high school, a lot of my friends that weren't in the dual language program would drop so easily or drop, like, once their requirements were done. They're like 'okay alright, I'm done with the language,' because I just feel like there's just so much more of a stress on that versus like vocab and really like, speaking with as many people as you can so that you can get that experience and practice talking so that you can communicate and then get your fluency up. I think that would definitely help language programs because I think there's just too much of an emphasis on the grammar and conjugation when sometimes natives don't even know the grammar themselves. -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

In excerpt [102], Camryn demonstrates her belief that less of a focus on grammar and conjugation of verbs would improve foreign language learning and that a focus in this area is responsible for students' hesitation to learn a language. Instead, Camryn positions vocabulary and fluency as indicators of skills necessary for communication. Furthermore, Camryn's comment about "natives" not even knowing the grammar provides a justification for why grammar is not essential to be able to use a language.

Writing Shows what you Know

To explore participants' attitudes regarding writing as it relates to notions of standardized language, means and standard deviations were calculated for the survey statements: (a) Someone who can write a language is more intelligent than someone who

can speak a language; and (b) You need to be more intelligent to write a language than to speak it. First, results indicate that as a group, dual language graduates generally disagreed that someone who can write a language is more intelligent (M=1.88, SD=1.26) and that one must be more intelligent to learn to write a language (M=2.00, SD=1.29). In order to compare the responses of Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates in terms of their belief that someone who can write a language is more intelligent than someone who can speak a language, an independent sample t-test was conducted. This test did not reach statistical significance, which means that both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates equally believed that writing a language was not associated with being more intelligent. Next, the independent t-test used to calculate group differences regarding the belief that one must be more intelligent to write a language than to speak it, was also not found to reach significance. This means that both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates believed that one needs to be more intelligent to read a language than to write it. Finally, dual language graduates were asked about their literacy practices through interviews, several students made mention of writing as being more standardized than speaking.

[103] De hablar, yo pienso que las personas que sí sabe, sabe, sabe hablar porque las palabras les salen naturalmente, pero cuando van a escribir es otra cosa porque allí van otras cosas como usar específicas palabras. Porque cuando hablan unas palabras, yo escucho, y también he dicho también unas palabras… unas palabras que son donde, donde es una palabra y eso se sabe, pero la mayoría de la gente dice 'onde' como sin la d, y yo la he escuchado y lo mismo lo digo también, y cuando lo escribe, no lo escribirías sin la d. En la manera que se dice está mal porque, pos, así no va la palabra. -Juan (Latinx)

[104] En la escritura es más enseñar lo que sabes, para que otros vean. -Oscar (Latinx)

In excerpt [103], Juan makes a distinction between oral and written language. He explains how when speaking, the words just come out of a speaker who knows how to

speak well, whereas it is a little more complicated in writing, as one needs to use specific words. He also gives the example of the word *donde* and how among his friends and family he hears and says *onde.* Juan explains that saying *donde* without the *d* is "bad" because that is not the way the word is written. Therefore, Juan differentiates that a word may be spoken "wrong" if it does not align with the way the word is written, thus indicating that there is a standard written language that is more correct when compared to spoken language. Similarly, while Oscar rejected the idea that someone who can write and speak a language is more intelligent than someone that can only speak a language, he also indicated, in excerpt [104], that being able to write allows one to show what they know so that "others can see." In this sense, he attributes writing to be a better expression of knowledge than speaking. Both Juan and Oscar allude to the notion that writing a language is a more standardized process that is not as "natural" as speaking.

Pluralistic Language Attitudes and Ideologies?

Dual language graduates also expressed conflicting attitudes regarding standardized or correct language forms and the role that school played in the development of such forms. The three themes that were categorized as relating to standardized language ideologies were: (a) Bilingualism as the Norm; (b) Spanish as Special (for Some); and (c) Spanish as Resource.

Bilingualism as the Norm

Findings demonstrate how dual language graduates express the Bilingualism as the Norm Ideology, which in this context describes the use of multiple languages as an everyday social practice and the normalization of being instructed in two languages. This section differentiates the experiences of Latinx and non-Latinx students through the

exploration of two themes relating to the Bilingualism as the Norm Ideology which include (a) 'That's just how School was'; and (b) Mirroring Students' Home Language Practices.

'That's just how School was'. Many graduates expressed how they were very young when they started the dual language program, and as such, learned to associate school with learning in two languages. The idea of 'that's just how school was' describes the normalization of being instructed in two languages. Thus, in this sense, being bilingual and learning in two languages at school was not seen as something out of the ordinary for some dual language graduates. Despite being aware of the fact that not all students participated in the dual language program, and learned all their academic subjects in only English, both Latinx and non-Latinx graduates report that they never really thought twice about school language practices as this is "just how it was."

The normalization of bilingualism was not limited to the participants that spoke Spanish at home with their families, as both Latinx and non-Latinx students reported this sentiment. For example, when asked about how it felt to learn in two languages and to be bilingual Mark described that he never thought twice about being able to communicate in two languages, as it was something he had done since kindergarten.

[105] There were multiple times when I was little where that's all I knew because I was learning that every single day, and when the opportunity was there, I would speak Spanish and it was just natural. I mean just because it was like the way that school was, and this is, you know the way it's set up. It really wasn't like a standout thing, it was just that's the way that school is, I mean, I learn two languages, and you know that's just it said and done, like there really was no thought of it growing up. -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[106] When I was, like, in elementary school if someone was, like, surprised that I could speak Spanish I was kind of, like, 'yeah, what about it? It's a normal thing' and everyone's like surprised and I expect that, when I was younger since the

environment that I was in it was a normal thing. I think, specifically in, like, our class because everyone was speaking Spanish and English, like all the time, so all of us were going to speak Spanish, like 'yeah okay that's normal in here.' - Samantha (Non-Latinx)

[107} *A lot of kids are bilingual. It just feels like all the other kids know more than one language, so it just feels, like, normal.* -Damian (Latinx)

In excerpts [105] and [106], non-Latinx students, Mark and Samantha, describe how speaking Spanish was normal for them, as it was the way that school was. Mark describes how learning in two languages was not a "standout" thing. Similar to Mark, Samantha recalls that in elementary school, she questioned why others were surprised that she spoke Spanish, as for her it was something that she did normally because of the dual language program. Damian also spoke about his language practices at home in excerpt [107], and while Spanish was a normal linguistic practice for him, when he was asked how it felt to be bilingual, he explained how a lot of other students know more than one language, which made him feel that his bilingualism was normal. Thus, his association of Spanish as normal because of other students being bilingual relates to the other graduates' beliefs of bilingualism as normal because "that's how school is."

Mirroring of students' Home Language Practices. Some graduates discussed their ideas about bilingualism and the use of Spanish as a "normal" activity given that they spoke in both languages at home or in their communities, outside of the school context. Therefore, these students did not feel a difference in their elementary school classrooms or that the dual language program necessarily had an effect on their beliefs regarding bilingualism.

[108] *My parents speak Spanish so it's something that, it's like, normal for you to speak Spanish and English.* – Eva (Latinx)

[109] *Before, I never really, like, noticed I was bilingual, I guess, I would switch… I really, like, just thought it was normal because at school, like, I would switch languages and then, when I would go home, I would speak Spanish to my dad and I would speak English to my mom, so, like, it was like something normal.* -Elena (Latinx)

[110] *Every day, five days a week, eight hours a day was all pretty much all Spanish. People spoke Spanish, people were teaching us Spanish, you know, I'm learning every subject in Spanish, and then I would go home and there would be more and more Spanish, like, when I stepped out of my house.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

In excerpts [108-110], dual language graduates explain the normalcy of speaking two languages. In excerpt [108], Eva describes speaking Spanish as something natural to her, as her parents spoke Spanish. Eva indicated that participation in the dual language program did not have an influence on her current perceptions of her bilingualism, due to the normalized view of using both Spanish and English at home. Similarly, in excerpt [109], Elena reported that she never really noticed that she was bilingual because it was natural for her to switch between languages at home and at school. When speaking about his use of language outside of school, Mark explains, in excerpt [110], that he was immersed in Spanish every time he stepped out of his house. Therefore, unlike the previous theme of language use not mirroring graduates' home language practices, all but one of the students that reported feeling that the use of Spanish at home mirrored their home language practices was Latinx. Interestingly, one non-Latinx participant, Mark, who was also the only non-Latinx participant that resided in Town B, expressed that the use of Spanish was something that he saw reflected outside of school, not in his household, but in his community.

Spanish as Special (For Some)

The Spanish-as-Special ideology (Granados, 2017), also referred to as bilingual exceptionalism (Hamman-Ortiz, 2020), describes the graduates' belief that their bilingualism is something special or extraordinary**.** Dual language graduates demonstrated this ideology in their interviews when responding to the questions of their perceptions about being able to speak, read and write in two languages and how it felt to learn in two languages in elementary school.

Both Latinx and non-Latinx participants indicated feelings of pride when being able to use their two languages in school, because they were aware that not all of their peers had the same experiences, Latinx and non-Latinx participants reported differing perceptions when related to viewing their use of Spanish as a unique ability.

This section differentiates the experiences of Latinx and non-Latinx students through the exploration of three themes relating to the Spanish as Special Ideology and included: (a) The use of Spanish that did not Mirror Students' Home Language Practices; (b) 'Two is Better than one': Bilingualism as superior; and (c) Raciolinguistic Ideologies: Differential Bilingualism.

Use of Spanish that did not Mirror Students' Home Language Practices. On the contrary to the Spanish as normalized ideology as it mirrored Latinx students' home language practices, the use of Spanish that did not mirror students' home language practices was expressed exclusively by non-Latinx students. These students felt special to be able to demonstrate a unique skill, in this case the use of a language that their parents and relatives were unfamiliar with.

[111] It felt like cool in a way, because it was like just like having something different and, like, you think of immigrants and how they have like their different language that they can speak to their parents with, and I mean my parents don't know Spanish but it's like, just a cool thing to know you can speak another language to someone else who can also speak it, even though it's not your first language. - Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[112] It like made me feel, I guess, a little special just because it like it's like another characteristic that like makes you, like, unique. -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[113] [People's comments] were more like, 'that's impressive. Okay, and how to do that if your parents clearly don't speak Spanish?' So, I kind of knew, like, this is something a little different than what usually occurs, but at the same time, it was kind of just natural, like, why are you so impressed, of course, it's just something I do, and I practice. -Mark (Non-Latinx)

In excerpt [111], Carrie related being able to speak Spanish with immigrants who can use another language to communicate with their families. She demonstrated the Spanish-as-Special ideology by explaining how the use of Spanish was something that deviated from her own family's home language practices. Similarly, in excerpt [113], Mark, who also described his use of Spanish as natural for him, demonstrated the Spanish-as-Special ideology as he related Spanish to issues of race and the fact that his parents do not speak the language. Mark describes conflicting beliefs about being bilingual in the sense that he knew that it was "something a little different than usually occurs," but at the same time considered it something natural for him.

Two is better than one: Bilingualism as Superior. In contrast, a theme that was found among both Latinx and non-Latinx students was that two languages are better than one. This theme included graduates' reference to their ability to speak Spanish as something that made them better than others, specifically when comparing themselves to their monolingual peers or other students who had not participated in the dual language program.

[114] *The dual language program was a big step up from some of my peers, and I think it gave me an advantage in the world around me to be able to kind of understand what's going on in a whole nother world and be able to communicate in two worlds almost.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[115] *I thought it was like, really cool being able to communicate in more than one language and, like, yeah, I guess like in elementary school all you really do is, like, compare yourself to other kids because you don't really like learn any better ways to just be a better person, you know, so I just felt like better than the other kids you could say.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[116] *I thought that was pretty cool. At first, I was like, my parents just put me in this to get me to understand and speak it [Spanish] more, but as time went on, I kind of thought it was cool because not many people know two languages. Maybe they're trying to get into it, as they get older, but it gets a lot harder, and at a young age it's easier to learn, but I thought it was pretty cool to learn how to do all that in a different language and I felt, like, better than everyone else.* -Damian (Latinx)

In excerpts [114-116], Mark, Bruno and Damian discuss how knowing Spanish made them feel superior to their monolingual peers. For example, in excerpt [114], Mark explained that he felt his experience in the dual language program "was a big step up" when compared to his peers that did not participate in the dual language program. Similarly, Bruno reluctantly admits, in excerpt [115], that because as an elementary student "you don't know any better," he compared himself to others and reports feeling better than "the other kids." Therefore, these findings indicate that while some Latinx students interpret their bilingualism as normal, and report not feeling any different from their peers who are also studying another language, they simultaneously demonstrate how their bilingualism sets them apart from their peers.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies: Differential Bilingualism. Raciolinguistic ideologies were identified through participant responses regarding comments they have received from others on the use of their languages, and specifically their use of Spanish. Latinx and non-Latinx participants shared differing reports of such comments.

[117] *You know, like that it's not common, like, a little white kid to speak Spanish when his parents don't. It shocked people. [...] I remember, I was at a restaurant once when my mom and the waiter tipped me $5 because I spoke to him and Spanish or like, when I was like, seven the ice cream truck came around my neighborhood and I spoke to him and Spanish and I bought an ice cream and he gave me another one for free, just because I spoke to him in Spanish he's like, 'keep practicing because that's valuable'.* -Mark (Non-Latinx)

[118] *I got comments pretty frequently when I was abroad, I think, also just the fact that I'm like a blonde I just don't look like someone that would speak Spanish kind of throws people off they're like, 'oh wow like you could speak Spanish,' so that's definitely, like, I've gotten that a lot.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[119] *I feel people are surprised when I speak Spanish and it's mostly to do with the way that I look; again, whiter than snow, and they hear me speak Spanish, and I'd say relatively well.* – Samantha (Non-Latinx)

In excerpt [117], Mark explains how others were impressed with his ability to speak in another language due to two factors: the fact that he is white and that his parents do not speak the language. Mark's labeling of speaking Spanish as uncommon for a "white kid" demonstrates his underlying raciolinguistic ideologies, specifically in his association of being white with not speaking Spanish. Furthermore, Mark describes how other Spanish speakers would praise him for speaking Spanish. He also describes benefits of bilingualism within his community, such as earning tips or getting an extra ice cream, something that was not mentioned by any of the non-Latinx students that lived in the same community. In excerpt [119], Samantha also relates others' surprise with her Spanish speaking with her being "whiter than snow." Like Mark and Samantha, Camryn talks about how she gets frequent comments on her Spanish use and relates other's surprise to her being blonde, thus demonstrating her association of Spanish with people with certain physical characteristics. Thus, only non-Latinx participants reported receiving compliments affirming their bilingualism and their ability to speak Spanish.

In contrast, the recognition and positive evaluation of bilingualism did not come up as frequently in the Latinx graduates' responses. Instead, when asked about comments they received about their language use, Latinx students generally cited examples that align with the bilingualism as a problem ideology and views of their Spanish from a deficit perspective.

[120] Sometimes I make up words because I forget what to say, so people point that out. -Samuel (Latinx)

[121] Yeah, I have gotten comments, from my mom. She says that I need to speak more Spanish since I speak, like, mostly English, so it's kind of like going away. -Eva (Latinx)

[122] When I'm with my grandma or my mom and whenever I talk to them in Spanish, they kind of point it out [my Spanglish] and they tell me like that's not a real word and they give me the exact word for it. -Damian (Latinx)

[123] At work I have gotten comments that my Spanish, like, it isn't good, like, the way I say things, but the only thing I do tell them is that's how I was taught to speak Spanish. – Elena (Latinx)

[124] I get told that I like…, like, I speak Spanish really well. Especially, like, at school. I know that, like, I definitely participate a lot, and my Spanish class it's one of the classes that I feel most comfortable in. -Bruno (Latinx)

In excerpts [120-124], Latinx students, Samuel, Eva, Damian and Elena all speak about how the only comment they have gotten regarding their language use are negative comments about their Spanish proficiency. For example, Eva reports that her mom frequently reprimands her for speaking "Spanglish," whereas for Samuel and Damian, their family members comment on their use of "made up words," and "not real words," which they also use to refer to the use of Spanglish. Similarly, Elena reported getting comments at work about her Spanish not being "good," as shown in excerpt [123]. In contrast, in excerpt [124], Bruno reported that while he typically receives negative

comments for his use of Spanglish, he is told, typically at school, that he speaks Spanish well. He is the only Latinx participant that indicated he was praised for his use of Spanish. Thus, while non-Latinx students only report receiving comments praising their bilingualism, four of five Latinx students report only criticism of their deficient Spanish language use.

Bilingualism as Resource

Dual language graduates valued their bilingualism for a variety of reasons including being able to communicate with others and their families. Two salient themes regarding language as a resource emerged from interview data that included: (a) Spanish as a Secret Language; and (b) Bilingualism to feel Smarter at School. Both Latinx and non-Latinx students demonstrated each of these ideologies, yet more commonly Latinx students referenced the value of their Spanish to be able to communicate with others in a "secret language," whereas their non-Latinx peers described more academic advantages in terms of looking smarter at school.

Secret Language

Graduates described the use of Spanish as a secret language to use around others who did not speak the language. For Latinx students, this meant that they could talk to one another at school without their monolingual teachers being able to understand. On the other hand, non-Latinx participants described instances in which they could use the language at home, so that their parents were unable to understand.

[125] Sometimes I'll like, say little things with my sisters here just because we both understand what it means like will say things about my mom and she has no idea I'd like little moments like those. -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[126] *I'm definitely at home, like at school, sometimes when I'm with friends and like an environment where like we're not really supposed to be talking in general, but, like, we talked in Spanish, or we were like saying something that we don't want others to hear or know about, so we talked in Spanish, instead of English.* -Bruno (Latinx)

[127] *And it was in a way like a way to communicate for us cuz like not a lot of other people speak Spanish, so we took that as an advantage and used it like talk to each other, and them not knowing we're saying.* -Samuel (Latinx)

In excerpts [125-127], dual language graduates, Carrie, Bruno and Samuel describe how the use of Spanish acts, in some instances as a secret language for them. For example, in excerpt [125], Carrie describes how she sometimes uses Spanish at home with her sister, who also participated in the dual language program, as a way to communicate information so that her monolingual mother does not understand. Similarly, Bruno and Samuel report using Spanish during middle school with their friends as a way to communicate information without their monolingual teachers or peers being able to understand.

Feeling smarter in school

Within the Bilingualism as Resource Ideology, graduates' responses demonstrated a pattern of feeling that their bilingualism allowed them academic advantages, for example in terms of "looking smarter," in their Spanish classes. As similar to the previous theme regarding the use of Spanish as a practice that did not mirror students' home language practices, this pattern was found mostly among non-Latinx participants, but was also found with one Latinx student who did not continue the dual language program in high school.

[128] *I got to look really smart in Spanish 1, but that's about it.* -Daisy (Non-Latinx)

[129] *When I think of myself, I don't think of, like, a smart person, so when I think that I'm in the AP Spanish speakers class, it's just, like, weird for me to hear.* -Carrie (Non-Latinx)

[130] *It's definitely cool when people ask you what classes you're in and you say, 'oh I'm in this class, because I've been taking Spanish this long.* -Yesenia (Non-Latinx)

[131] *I think once middle school hit I could definitely see a difference in the value of the program versus when I was in elementary school...because that was when students could actually start taking Spanish classes so once they started taking it [Spanish] and then saw, like, how much more we [dual language graduates] knew than them as cool, because then also, they were just like coming up to us to ask for help and we're like, 'oh yeah, like, I know that. I can help you with that,' which was super cool.* -Camryn (Non-Latinx)

[132] *Yeah so, I realized, it was a lot harder for nonnative Spanish speaking kids, I mean like in general, even in elementary school, but now it's a lot more present because we would have like a test specifically on grammar and because I already, like, I would speak at home and like not at school, I already knew some of the rules on some of the tests. Like even now, I hardly even have to study, because it's already something that I have known basically all my life.* -Bruno (Latinx)

Excerpts [128], [129], [130] and [131] demonstrate how the non-Latinx graduates, Daisy, Carrie, Yesenia and Camryn saw their bilingualism as something special that differentiated them from other students who had not participated in the dual language program. They described how their bilingualism afforded them academic opportunities that they would not have otherwise had and that their bilingual abilities were recognized and appreciated by others. For example, in excerpt [128], Daisy indicated that, for her, the best part of having participated in the dual language program was that she got to look smart in high school when she took Spanish classes. Similarly, Carrie expressed that her participation in the dual language program allowed her to take advanced classes that she thought was exceptional as she does not consider herself "a smart person". Yesenia also attributed being in her advanced Spanish class to having been in the dual language

program in elementary school. Next, as demonstrated in excerpt [131], Camryn described not truly seeing the value of her bilingualism until middle school, when she compared her knowledge to that of the students who did not participate in the dual language program. Finally, Latinx graduate, Bruno, indicated that being bilingual provides him with an advantage in terms of academic achievement, specifically on Spanish grammar tests. Bruno explains that because he is familiar with Spanish grammar he “hardly even has to study.”

Summary

The findings from this research demonstrate that in general dual language graduates have positive attitudes towards their participation in the dual language program and of their languages. They consider themselves bilingual and indicate that participation in the program allowed them to become bilingual and, for some Latinx students to maintain their bilingualism. One of the main negative effects of participation in the dual language program as reported by graduates was the separation of the dual program from the larger school community. Students reported feeling isolated, which led to the Dual language graduates also demonstrate conflicting ideologies regarding their languages.

recount how the structure of the dual language program led them to feel isolated from their peers and had a negative impact on their educational experience at the elementary level. Furthermore, dual language graduates also demonstrated conflicting underlying language ideologies, specifically regarding the validity of Spanish spoken among the families of the Latinx students. Graduates’ evaluation of their own language use and attitudes about language demonstrated the effect of the ideology of differential

bilingualism that was prevalent in students' conversations and language related experiences.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study explored the experiences and language ideologies of dual language graduates. Using ideology as a field of inquiry, students' attitudes about their languages and bilingualism, as well as their experiences in dual language were explored and connected to language ideologies. Much research focuses on language attitudes or language ideologies, yet in the current research, language attitudes and ideologies were studied together to paint a more complete picture in terms of the experiences of young bilingual students as they navigate through processes of language acquisition and identity formation. Thus, the current research used the language attitudes as expressed by dual language graduates as they recounted their experiences to unmask underlying language ideologies that have broader social consequences for these students. For example, identifying the attitudes and ideologies of students who have graduated from a dual language program has the potential, as Leeman (2012) argues, to "challenge dominant hierarchies and suggest directions for a more socially responsible pedagogy" (p.44). Findings from the current research align with previous findings regarding the experiences and language ideologies among elementary school dual language graduates regarding bilingualism and the value of their languages (Dworn, 2011; Granados, 2017; Newcomer, 2020), yet in some instances there is less delineation between the ideologies held by Latinx and non-Latinx students as compared to these studies. The current study demonstrates that dual language graduates have positive attitudes towards their participation in the dual language program and of their languages. Latinx students demonstrated more positive attitudes towards participation in the program and felt that

dual language helped them utilize their existing linguistic repertoire when starting elementary school. Furthermore, graduates recount how the structure of the dual language program led them to feel isolated from their peers and had a negative impact on their educational experience at the elementary level. Furthermore, dual language graduates also demonstrated conflicting underlying language ideologies, specifically regarding the validity of Spanish spoken among the families of the Latinx students. Graduates' evaluation of their own language use and attitudes about language demonstrated the effect of the ideology of differential bilingualism that was prevalent in students' conversations and language related experiences. This section will first explore graduates' language attitudes and then will discuss the underlying language ideologies related to graduates' expressed attitudes.

Dual Language Graduates Language Attitudes

Similar to related studies, graduates report generally positive attitudes towards their languages and the dual language program in general (Dworn, 2011; Granados, 2017; Newcomer, 2020). Furthermore, many students report benefits of participating in the dual language program, including learning about other cultures, becoming bilingual and creating close friendships within the program. Students were able to form close friendships through the program and generally felt supported at school, characterizing the dual language community as a "family," which is consistent with similar studies on the perceptions of dual language graduates (de Jong et al., 2020; Newcomer, 2020).

Furthermore, dual language graduates all held generally positive views regarding their participation in the dual language program. Of significance is the finding that all (*n=10*) Latinx students strongly agreed with being glad they had participated in the

program, which may have implications, specifically for the heritage Spanish speaking students in terms of the positive effects of the dual language program for this group in terms of heritage language maintenance.

Additionally, one of the most important outcomes of participation in the dual language program according to the graduates was their ability to become bilingual. Graduates attributed their bilingualism to their participation in the dual language program (Newcomer, 2020), and all but two non-Latinx students indicated that they felt they were bilingual and bicultural. Students' continued use of Spanish after graduation from the dual language program, as Dworin (2011) argues, offers empirical support for students' ongoing commitment to Spanish and English after participating in the dual language program, which is significant given the hegemony of English in the United States.

Another important finding related to dual language graduates' recounts of their elementary dual language experience was the role of bilingual teachers. Both Latinx and non-Latinx students appreciated that their teachers could communicate in both languages. Of particular importance for Latinx students was that the use of Spanish in the classroom with their teachers and during instruction allowed them to take advantage of their existing linguistic repertoire and "not start from zero," as they were able to speak the language they were most comfortable in during classroom instruction. Thus, the current research supports findings related to the importance of allowing bilingual students ample opportunities to use and develop their native languages along with English (Menken & Kleyn, 2010).

Students' reports of being physically isolated and segregated within the dual language program represent what Freire and Alemán (2021) refer to as "two schools

within a school," when referring to the a dual language strand within a school. The isolation described by students in the current research are also similar to Lille et al.'s (2010) research on the implementation of a state mandated program for minoritized language students in Arizona. While Lille et al. (2010) did not specifically look at dual language education, researchers warn about the consequences of linguistic segregation in the educational context, that include a social stigmatization recognized by both students identified as ELs and "regular students" (p. 34). This comparison is significant given that unlike the current study, Lillie et al.'s (2010) study is situated in a state with a restrictive English-only policy. As such, even in a program designed to foster pluralistic views of language and culture, dual language programs are also subject to social stigmatization within their schools.

Middle School: The Contested Site of Transition and the Sixth Grade Shift

Another area in which students demonstrated negative attitudes towards their participation in the dual language program was during their transition to middle school. Participants cite middle school as a turning point in the program, as the amount of instruction in Spanish decreases significantly, which mirrors Bearse and de Jong's (2008) findings that secondary dual language students are aware of the shift in preference for English over Spanish in the later years of the program. Furthermore, the difficult transition to middle school was brought up in all participant interviews, which indicates that it is an area of importance for both Latinx and non-Latinx dual language graduates. In addition, due to the close-knit nature of the dual language program in elementary school, during which time students participated with the same peers from kindergarten to fifth grade, middle school was a time in which students became more disengaged and felt

a stronger sense of not belonging (de Jong et al., 2020). The findings regarding students' middle school experiences also confirm what Merritt (2011) described as middle school becoming, for many dual language students, a transitional and "contested site" in which they shift from one model of literacy instruction to another to mirror the focus of the traditional world language classes, including a focus on grammar. The current research uses the term *The Sixth Grade Shift* to refer to elementary school dual language graduates' conflicting beliefs about bilingualism due to the shift from half of their instruction in Spanish to only two periods a day in their first year of middle school. The Sixth Grade Shift was described as a difficult transition during which students report becoming increasingly confused, less motivated to learn Spanish and reported feelings of regret for having participated in the dual language program, which guided them toward a Bilingualism as Problem Ideology.

Nevertheless, similar to other studies that examine the language beliefs of dual language graduates, many students in the current research report not fully appreciating their ability to read, write and speak in two languages in elementary school. This study confirms that with the shifting literacy practices during the middle school years, many students began to appreciate the usefulness of being bilingual and that in general, students expressed disappointment with the language shift and decreased use of Spanish (Granados, 2017).

Language Ideologies of Dual Language Graduates

Due to the divisions between the dual language strand and monolingual English classes, students were divided linguistically and labeled based on their language use. This research demonstrates how the term "Spanish Kids" was used as a way to label dual

language students, separating them from the students in the monolingual English classes, and in some instances, as a way to *racialize* graduates based on their participation in the dual language program. In other instances, non-Latinx dual language graduates racialized their peers or other speakers of Spanish. The linguistic labeling of students as the "Spanish Kids," represents a "monoglossic framing of bilingualism" (Hamman-Ortiz, 2019, p. 401). This dichotomous label that positioned dual language students as the Spanish kids, and monolingual English-speaking students as the English kids, did not consider students' full linguistic repertoire nor their dynamic bilingualism as they progressed through the program.

Next, the racialization of the students through their labeling as "Spanish Kids" had different consequences for students of different racial and linguistic backgrounds. The term "Spanish kids" provides a racialization of speakers through labeling of speakers according to "perceived or actual language dominance" (Chaparro, 2019, p.3). For example, Mark perceived that the students in the monolingual English program used this term to refer to the students in the dual language classes due to the higher percentage of Latinx students in the dual language cohort. This may demonstrate raciolinguistic ideologies as held by students who did not participate in dual language. Raciolinguistic ideologies refer to the hegemonic perspectives that serve to connect normative language practices with race (Rosa & Flores, 2017). However, Mark's admission that he felt the term stemmed from the race of the Latinx students potentially demonstrates his own racialization of speakers, as he links the labeling of "Spanish Kids" with the Latinx students. In an indirect way, he accepts this term, but does not feel that it applies to him. On the other hand, Yesenia, a non-Latinx person of color accepted the term "Spanish

Kids” and consequently used the term “normal kids” to refer to the monolingual English-speaking students.

As a result, this racialization had different consequences for students of different racial backgrounds. Thus, while Mark, a white, non-Latinx student was unbothered by the term, and defended it use, explaining that it came about from a general lack of knowledge on the part of the monolingual English-speaking students as it was “just taught to them,” for Yesenia, the use of the term “Spanish Kids" was seen as an act of bullying. The way in which these students described the labeling as “Spanish Kids” is an area which should be explored further. Although Yesenia is not Latinx, her negative reaction potentially demonstrates how students of color are more negatively affected by these terms.

In addition, the use of the term “normal kids” to refer to the students in the monolingual English classes points to the prevalence of monolingual ideologies that portray English as the natural choice of the school and of the society. As such, conflicting monoglossic language ideologies such as one nation-one language and standard language ideologies were found among both Latinx and non-Latinx students, yet were manifested in slightly different ways, and resulted in the racialization of dual language students.

Monolingual Ideologies

Both Latinx and non-Latinx students demonstrated underlying monolingual ideologies that link speaking English to being American (Henderson, 2016), as both groups related the use of Spanish to immigrants in their interviews. This example also shows the importance of multiple methods of data collection that include both direct and indirect methods, when exploring language ideologies, as participants tended to reject the

more overt expression of monolingual ideologies on the survey data but provided more insight into their language beliefs through the interview process.

Additionally, it should be noted that while both groups of students agreed that schools should teach students in the language they speak at home, it is not definitive if these findings demonstrate a monolingual ideology or reject it. For example, the high agreement with this statement may be indicative of the English-only ideology, which considers English as essential in the educational context, although it is unclear whether the English-speaking students pictured their own linguistic situation when reading the question or if they considered the statement in regard to their peers who do not speak English at home. On the other hand, it is possible that the high agreement with this statement by heritage Spanish speaking Latinx students, demonstrates their belief that Spanish should be taught at school.

Nevertheless, as described in the previous section, the feelings of isolation that students experienced in the dual language program led to the construction and proliferation of monoglossic language ideologies. For example, students referred to the monolingual English-speaking students as the "normal kids," demonstrating how they viewed monolingual English as the language choice of not only the school community, but also of the larger societal context.

Standardized Language Ideologies: The Role of (Appropriate) Spanish at School

In general, graduates' attitudes towards the notion of correct language, writing, Spanglish and grammar demonstrate somewhat conflicting standardized language ideologies. As a group, students disagreed with the idea that there is a correct form of language that one learns at school or that only one form of English or Spanish should be

used at school. However, of significance is the finding that Latinx graduates agree to a greater extent with a single correct form of language, when compared to their non-Latinx peers, indicating a slightly higher acceptance of language variation among the non-Latinx students. In this case, it is unclear if non-Latinx are more accepting of language variation or if they are generally unaware of the stigma associated with different varieties of Spanish, including the use of Spanglish. Henderson (2021) provides one explanation for this in that English speakers, whose linguistic variety aligns more closely to the so-called standard, may not perceive linguistic variation in their native language, and thus be unaware of variation in their L2, and consequently the stigma associated with the failure to adhere to this standard.

For instance, similar to Garcia's (2009) research, certain linguistic tools such as translanguaging were seen as an asset in some instances or, among some speakers, while it was simultaneously perceived as a detriment to language in another context or among other speakers. For example, findings from the current study demonstrate how non-Latinx students such as Camryn, Mark and Carrie, openly admit to using Spanglish as a way to communicate, justifying that it was a linguistic tool they used while they were still learning the language. Conversely, Latinx students such as Samuel, Bruno, Damian and Eva are reluctant to admit they use Spanglish and report that their parents and teachers reprimand them for speaking Spanglish, or as Samuel explains, "not actual Spanish".

As a result, findings regarding students' descriptions of their language use is closely related to Spanish as Special ideology (Granados, 2017) and the idea of differential bilingualism, a term used to describe the symbolic value of Spanish as separate from the language and instead, the value of bilingualism depends on the context

and speaker (Aparicio, 1998), and supports the latter hypothesis, that non-Latinx students are unaware and unaffected by the stigma associated with "non-standard" varieties of Spanish and thus, have a higher acceptance of "deviant" linguistic practices.

Spanish as Special Ideology

The way that the linguistic practices of Latinx and non-Latinx participants were perceived by others also contributed to this distinction and was closely tied to the Spanish as Special Ideology (Granados, 2017). Although this ideology was found among both groups of students, it was more prominent among non-Latinx participants, which directly aligns with findings that "white, English dominant students may be praised for attaining an idealized form of bilingualism, whereas students of color who grew up speaking multiple languages are not afforded the same level of recognition" (Chang-Bacon, 2021, p. 2). For example, a commonality among non-Latinx students was that they frequently cited examples of how others would comment positively on their use of the two languages, whereas Latinx students only cited criticisms of their non-standard Spanish use. Only one Latinx student reported having received a complement on his Spanish, after first citing how he was often told that he speaks "incorrectly" at times. Students were bombarded with similar messages at school, specifically in middle school, as all Latinx students report that teachers discouraged the use of Spanglish and code-switching across contexts, sometimes ignoring them if they did not speak entirely in Spanish. This may indicate a more explicit standardized language ideology among middle school teachers and consequently shows a devaluation of the dynamic practices of bi/multilingual students.

This difference in the recognition of participants' bilingualism as well as the value and purpose of Spanglish, represents an example of how for Latinx students, Spanglish is not seen as an innovative language practice, but instead as a detriment to their bilingualism. One of the consequences of standardized language ideologies relates to the racialization of speakers. As such, findings from this research expose how graduates experience and demonstrate raciolinguistic ideologies, as it is through the racialization of speakers, that both Latinx and non-Latinx students describe their experiences with idealized language ideologies (Chang-Bacon, 2020), exceptional bilingualism (Granados, 2017; Hamman-Ortiz, 2020) and differential bilingualism (Aparecio, 1998). For example, due to the racialization of Latinx graduates, their Spanish language skills were positioned as inferior and problematic, while at the same time the Spanish of their white, non-Latinx peers was praised by others, despite not conforming to 'standard' language norms (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Another example in which the differential bilingualism is represented by the dual language graduates themselves was through Mark's comment about Latinx students learning only half of each language. Mark cited how when instruction shifted towards a greater use of English in middle school, students from Spanish speaking homes would struggle in English and "slack off in Spanish classes", leading to not really knowing either language. He goes on to explain how while he ended up learning two languages fluently, his peers who came from Spanish speaking homes ended up learning "half of each". This demonstrates a clear example of Mark's own perceived bilingual exceptionalism, as he discredits the bilingualism of his Latinx peers. His comments also point to the raciolinguistic ideology that Rosa (2016) describes as languagelessness,

which suggests that Latinxs are not fully proficient in either of their languages. These notions of standard language use, together with the Spanish as Special ideology, differential bilingualism and idealized language ideologies, raise the question of *to whom* is *Spanish 'special'?* They also contribute to the "invisibility" of Latinx students in the language classroom, while positioning L2 learners as experts (Chaparro, 2019).

An additional area in which graduates demonstrated conflicting beliefs regarding standardized language practices was grammar. Latinx students tended to disagree more with the necessity of knowing the grammar of a language when compared with their non-Latinx peers. One explanation for this is Latinx students' practice with successfully communicating in Spanish at home before beginning their formal study of the language. Students like Juan and Bruno mention that they already knew the grammar because they had been learning it at home, which in Bruno's case made it so that he "didn't even have to study" for grammar tests, as demonstrated in excerpt [132]. However, while students generally do not feel that grammar is necessary to know a language, their interview responses demonstrate conflicting ideas, as they express that without certain grammar constructs, they would use the language "wrong." Latinx students such as Juan, Samuel and Oscar brought up grammar as being important to "show what you know", speak "traditional Spanish" and to avoid "pronouncing everything bad." Additionally, Damian and Bruno's comparison of the Spanish they learn at home as inferior because it does not align with specific grammar rules (see excerpt [90]), demonstrates not only how these Latinx graduates believe that there are correct and incorrect ways of using language, but also indicates that they view their home language variety as inferior. Therefore, while graduates generally reject the idea of a correct language, they express notions of incorrect

ways of using language, describing how their use of certain linguistic features deviated from the norms of the ‘standard’ and viewing their home varieties as deficient when compared to the Spanish that they learn at school, a variety that some consider to be “actual Spanish.” These attitudes reflect an acceptance of an underlying standardized language ideology, which promotes ideas of “correct,” “standard” or “neutral” language use (Lippi-Green, 2004).

A further finding regarding grammar was that both Latinx and Non-Latinx participants generally believed that grammar was a new topic that was introduced to them in middle school and, in some cases, are unaware that they have been using grammar to successfully communicate in both of their languages since kindergarten. For example, only Juan and Bruno mentioned to some degree that they already knew some of the grammatical concepts that were being introduced formally. Thus, the graduates’ ideas about grammar as an isolated topic raises questions about how their funds of knowledge are valued beginning with formal grammar instruction in the later grades.

Spanish as a Problem Ideology

Mark’s comments about the participation in the dual language program as a detriment to some students' acquisition of both languages, as seen in excerpt [83], also relates to the Spanish as Problem ideology (Ruiz, 1984), which describes the stigmatization of the Spanish language, and in this research, is expanded to a Dual Language as Undesirable ideology to refer to the perceived problems or disadvantages associated with having participated in the dual language program in elementary school. This ideology was also found among both Latinx and non-Latinx students, but served, in

some cases, as a justification for discontinuing the dual language program in middle school for the latter group.

Many students across groups demonstrate the Spanish-as-problem ideology in terms of their proficiency in English, as illustrated previously in participants' comments about not being where they "should" be in regard to certain skills in English, because of their bilingualism and having participated in the dual language program. Furthermore, students like Eva, who mentioned that she had trouble adjusting to middle school because she had learned all subjects in Spanish up until that point, viewed her bilingualism as a disadvantage in the monolingual context. Given that students were not specifically asked about the effect that their participation in the dual language program had on their English language skills, it is unclear if other students felt the same in this regard. Future research should consider students' views on their language proficiency in both English and Spanish related to their participation in the dual language program.

In some cases, the Spanish as Problem ideology served as a justification for leaving the dual language program. For the non-Latinx students, the view of Spanish as a less attractive language of study represents a certain linguistic privilege in which students have the opportunity to disconnect themselves from the language and, in some instances, pursue a language of study which they found to be more aligned with their interests. On the other hand, Latinx students demonstrated familial and cultural connections to the language, making it harder to cut ties with their use of Spanish. Furthermore, the decision to discontinue their instruction in Spanish would affect Latinx students to a greater degree when compared with those that did not have those same ties to the language.

Spanish as Resource Ideology

Despite some significant differences in the way graduates interpreted their bilingualism, all graduates mentioned that their bilingual abilities provided them different opportunities and thus was referred to as the Spanish as Resource Ideology (Granados, 2017). The expression of this ideology differed among Latinx and non-Latinx students in several ways. First, both Latinx and non-Latinx students perceived their Spanish as a tool to interact with a wider range of people, and specifically for Latinx students, Spanish was a tool to communicate with their families. In addition, both Latinx and non-Latinx students described their use of Spanish as a "secret language," similar to Hamman-Ortiz's (2020) findings regarding bilingual exceptionalism. Unlike Hamman-Ortiz (2020), this research classifies the use of Spanish as a 'secret language' under the Spanish as a Resource Ideology, as it was found among both Latinx and non-Latinx students. While Hamman-Ortiz (2020) only found discourse related to feeling special about being bilingual among non-Latinx students, the current study found that both Latinx and non-Latinx students indicated that they felt special as, "not everyone speaks two languages." Finally, a characteristic of the Spanish as Resource Ideology that was unique to non-Latinx students was that they perceived their use of Spanish as a tool to "look smarter" (see excerpt [128]) or advance academically. This advantage is tied to differential bilingualism, predominantly non-Latinx students cited that their bilingualism allowed them academic advantages.

Spanish as Normalized Ideology: Conflicting Views of Language Use within the Program

Despite their awareness of the prevalence of English, both groups of students considered to some extent that their bilingualism was natural for them. However, the

perpetuation of monolingual ideologies created a complicated situation for the dual language graduates, who expressed a disconnect between their bilingualism and their actual language use during elementary school. For example, while all students indicated that they were able to communicate in both of their languages, they tended to use more English in their classroom interactions. Specifically, Latinx students who reported speaking more Spanish and expresses greater comfort in speaking Spanish, reported that they chose to speak more English with their peers to facilitate understanding for the dominant English speakers.

Findings from this research confirm Granados' (2017) findings of the Spanish as Normalized ideology, which describes language as an everyday social practice and the normalization of being instructed in two languages. Unlike Granados' (2017) findings that the Spanish as Normalized ideology was found solely among Latinx students, in the current research this ideology was found among both Latinx and non-Latinx students and thus, in an attempt to differentiate the experiences of both groups of students, this research further makes the distinction within the Spanish as Normalized ideology to include: 1) Spanish as normal: Mirroring of students' home language practices; and 2) 'That's just how it was': Bilingualism as Normal.

Similar to Granados' (2017) findings, for Latinx students, the use of Spanish mirrored their home language practices, which made speaking two languages at school a normal linguistic practice for Latinx students. Findings from this research demonstrate how one non-Latinx participant, Mark, who lived in a predominantly Latinx community mentioned in excerpt [110], that the use of Spanish was normal for him in and out of the classroom, as he saw it represented in his community and was surrounded by it every

time he left his house. Thus, although his parents did not speak Spanish, his community was a strong indicator of his attitude towards his bilingualism.

On the other hand, the 'That's just how school was' represents, in this research, a *Bilingual Schooling as Normalized* ideology that is used specifically to describe the normalization of bilingualism at school for these dual language graduates. This ideology was demonstrated by many students, as it was "just how it was" in regard to schooling practices. In this sense, both Latinx and non-Latinx students' bilingualism was seen as a normal practice within the school setting. In some instances, several non-Latinx students described that this normalization of bilingualism extended to contexts outside of the school setting, and as young children, they were confused by others' reactions to their bilingualism because that's "all they knew." Despite in some cases dual language graduates reporting their awareness that not everyone spoke Spanish, they never questioned their ability to switch between their two languages during elementary school.

Although some participants (both Latinx and non-Latinx) initially viewed their bilingualism as normal, it was also through others' perceptions of their bilingualism that some participants began to shift from a view of Spanish as Normalized to Spanish as Special. Results from this research demonstrate the fluid nature of language ideologies across time and contexts and mirror Granados' (2017) findings of students' shift between ideologies. Findings from the current research indicate shifts from a Spanish as Normalized Ideology to a Spanish as Special Ideology, or Spanish as Resource Ideology, as well as the finding that none of the students who initially reported a resistance to speaking Spanish as young children still demonstrate the Spanish as Undesirable ideology.

Language Use in the Dual Language Program

This study exemplifies the tendency to favor English dominant students with regard to discourse and classroom practices that has been documented by many researchers (Cervantes-Soon, 2017; Chaparro, 2019; Volk & Angelova). Specifically, it is significant to note the divergent attitudes the dual language graduates hold with respect to the norms regarding classroom language use. On one hand, Latinx students such as Bruno, Juan and Oscar, indicate that although they preferred Spanish and that it was easier for them to communicate in Spanish, they resorted to speaking more English at school, as their English-speaking peers would be able to understand them better. Furthermore, other Latinx students, such as Elena and Damian, who also reported being dominant in Spanish, indicated not wanting to speak in Spanish to avoid making their English-dominant peers uncomfortable. However, in the case of Carrie, a non-Latinx student, she reported speaking her native language, as that's what was most comfortable for her. Interestingly, while she also indicated that *all* students "obviously" preferred to speak in the language they were most comfortable in, the English dominance in the classroom was justified, as it "wasn't as if the [students who were more comfortable in Spanish] couldn't understand." These examples align with Volk and Angelova's (2007) findings that within dual language classroom dynamics, Spanish speakers tend to accommodate their English-speaking peers to a greater extent.

These findings are of special significance for some Spanish heritage students who, despite indicating a preference for and greater mastery of Spanish, tended to use English to facilitate their English-speaking peers, similar to other findings in dual language settings (Chaparro, 2019; Potowski, 2002). In addition, in the case of Carrie, while she

recognizes that students generally feel more secure speaking their dominant language, she also defends the use of only English, *her* home language, to accommodate her and her other English dominant peers' level of comfort. These findings indicate conflicting beliefs and demonstrate that some non-Latinx students may *expect* that students speak in English, despite these students' Spanish language dominance. The dominance of English was also evident in participants' reports that during their elementary years, students reported only being reprimanded during their Spanish instruction, not to use English. This contrasts Henderson and Palmer's (2016) findings that language separation was only enforced during English instruction.

As such, while many students felt that Spanish instruction was a natural part of their academic career from an early age and indicated using a mix of languages in the classroom, students' reports of actual language use within the classroom confirm that despite their bilingual abilities, students generally demonstrated a preference for speaking English, as has been found in similar research (e.g., Lindholm-Leary, 2016; Babino & Stewart, 2017). The dominance of English in the classroom was exemplified by students' recounts of teachers' repeated attempts to get students to adhere to the use of Spanish during Spanish instruction.

Therefore, despite the natural nature of schooling in two languages reported by dual language graduates, due to the dominant ideology that privileges English, both in and out of the classroom, it is difficult to maintain a balance between English and the minoritized language, even in the dual language classroom (Block & Vidaurre, 2019). Furthermore, it is not clear to what extent the struggle to achieve a balance between English and Spanish was due to the model of dual language program as a strand within

the larger school. For example, Palmer (2010) attributed the challenge of maintaining a balance between languages in a dual language strand to the English-dominant environment, in which teachers and staff outside of the dual language program were uninformed or uninterested in the issues relating to bi/multilingual education. As similar to Palmer's (2010) study, despite the diverse composition of the dual language classes, students in the current study had little to no interaction with students outside of the program and lacked the opportunity to engage with the wide range of students within the larger school community. Therefore, the issues of isolation of dual language students and equality between languages raises questions about the equity of the dual language program for all students involved.

Other issues of equity that should be explored further relate to the composition of the dual language student population. For example, Camryn's comments about it being better that there were more English dominant students in the dual language program, because this way she felt more comfortable in the classroom, raises questions regarding the equity of the program for students. This also points to the gentrification of the dual language program, as it is promoted as being one which includes an equal number of students from Spanish speaking homes and English-speaking homes.

Pedagogical Implications

Findings from the current research lend themselves to several pedagogical implications, including the design and implementation of the dual language program itself. Based on the findings of this research dual language programs should take into consideration (a) the design and implementation of the dual language strand; (b) bilingual teachers; (c) sociolinguistically informed pedagogical practices; (d) students' transition to

middle school; and (e) the valuation of dual language students' existing linguistic repertoires.

First, the findings that dual language graduates report feeling isolated from the rest of their school, align with Alemán and Freire's (2021) warning that dual language programs implemented as strands within non-dual language schools can create tensions and divisiveness. As such, the current findings point to the detrimental effect of operating a dual language track as an isolated program within a general monolingual English school, as students frequently felt as if they were not completely integrated within the school. Therefore, it is imperative to consider this challenge when planning and implementing dual language programs. Schools must make explicit efforts to avoid framing language-minoritized students from a deficit perspective within the English dominant context of the school, while they build connections with the community, including an explicit attempt to include Latinx families in the education of their children. Furthermore, ensuring unity in schools with dual language programs is critical as it has been shown to influence job satisfaction and thus, retention of qualified bilingual teachers in these programs (Alemán & Freire, 2021).

Similarly, this research highlights the importance of qualified bilingual teachers, not only for students' academic achievement, but also for issues related to students' identities. For example, both Latinx and non-Latinx students appreciated that their teachers could communicate in both of their languages, a skill that contributed to them feeling supported in the classroom. Thus, the current research supports findings related to the importance of allowing bilingual students ample opportunities to use and develop their native languages along with English (Menken & Kleyn, 2010) as well as the need

for qualified bilingual teachers that are able to connect with minoritized students. Therefore, districts should emphasize the importance of recruiting and retaining bilingual teachers and continue to provide training opportunities to address current issues related to dual language education, including ideologies within dual language programs that have negative impacts on students.

In terms of instruction, pedagogical practices should consider knowledge brought to the classroom by students' lived experiences instead of relying on instruction to "fix" students' perceived lack of academic language, specifically among racialized populations (Flores, 2020). As such, instruction should center around translanguaging pedagogy (García, 2009; García et al., 2017), which views "mixing" of languages as an authentic way for bilinguals to communicate. In this sense, teachers should be challenged to examine their own language ideologies to determine the true meaning of bilingualism, in order to provide their students with opportunities to engage meaningfully with content and interacting with students' shifting languaguing practices (García et al., 2021).

Furthermore, critical language awareness instruction has been found to improve language attitudes of bilingual students (Henderson Hudgens, 2016; Henderson & Hackman, 2021). Dual language program directors should consider age-appropriate strategies for the implementation of Critical Language Awareness (CLA) in dual language classrooms to discuss important topics such as language variation, social justice and identity (see Henderson & Hackman, 2021). Such practices have the potential to combat harmful language ideologies, not only among students, but also among teachers. Furthermore, equipping students with the language necessary to empower them as competent bilinguals and to assert their agency not only within the school, but also within

the larger, English dominant context, is essential for their success (Palmer, 2007). Dual language programs need to address inequities within education as a way to identify and confront such inequalities, which is one of the tenants of the CLA approach. Thus, by viewing instruction through the lenses of translanguaging and CLA, these dual language graduates can begin to perceive their language practices “not as deviations from a monoglossic norm, but as those of full human beings who – like all human beings – make meaning by drawing from complex, interrelated linguistic-semiotic and multimodal repertoires grounded in deeply valued cultural-historical roots (García et al., 2021, p. 19).”

Next, all students described a dramatic shift in the amount of Spanish used in middle school. As such, districts who wish to implement some type of dual language program in middle school should carefully consider how its implementation affects dual language students who are accustomed to learning certain academic subjects in Spanish. Course implementation requires careful planning should be done strategically, providing a variety of supports to dual language students, including bilingual teachers, staff and guidance counselors. As such, additional considerations should be made to alternate between subjects and material taught in both languages to avoid any perceived disadvantage of students when they transition to middle school. Graduates also indicated an interest in expanding the variety of curricular and extracurricular options in Spanish. At the elementary level, teachers should be trained on how to promote metalinguistic awareness among students as well as implement the use of translanguaging and bridging academic content between the languages. More explicit attention paid to the transfer of literacy skills, including vocabulary for academic subjects taught in a given language,

may provide students with the confidence in later grades of dual language when the language allocation across content areas is altered. Teaching students to recognize patterns across languages and subjects may help them from being discouraged for not having learned a specific topic in one language or another, and instead encourage them to make use of their full linguistic repertoire to make sense of material.

In addition, across all interviews, graduates described the prescriptive language ideologies, specifically in middle school, indicating their teachers had a rigid view of language and that their classes were primarily grammar based. Like high school and elementary school, middle school programs geared toward dual language students must be aligned with the goals for teaching Spanish as a heritage language (SHL) not only for content considerations, but also affective considerations (Beaudrie et al., 2014). For example, participants' reports that they were reprimanded for using Spanglish in middle school, demonstrates standard language ideologies held by the instructors at that level, as well as an unawareness of basic principles when teaching Spanish heritage speakers. For example, Fairclough and Beaudrie (2016) explain that teachers of SHL students must be acquainted with the linguistic practices of their HL students, such as code-switching, and the affective implications of correction of such practices, as well as teachers' own ideological positions regarding these language practices. As such, the findings of the current research have pedagogical implications in terms of valuing dual language students' language practices that may not align with a perceived "standard" Spanish and the affective implications on students. Teachers should also receive explicit training on how their classroom practices, guided by their own ideologies can impact student achievement. Furthermore, there should be explicit collaboration between elementary and

middle school dual language teachers to ensure that students' needs are being met. Teachers should meet yearly to discuss student goals and progress and collaborate to discuss best practices when working with students who did not participate in the "traditional" schooling experience.

Despite these implications, it is necessary to acknowledge that any dual language program in the United States operates within the English dominant society and is affected by the hegemonic and monoglossic forces outside of the school walls. Thus, teachers need to address their own biases and reflect on how their ideologies effect their teaching, while at the same time prepare students to face the realities of the dominant society by giving them the tools they need to be resilient and empowered bi/multilingual individuals.

Limitations

Several limitations affect the generalizability of this study to other contexts. Findings from questionnaire and interview data are analyzed under the assumption that participants shared truthful responses regarding their attitudes and experiences. One of the limitations of the study, as some researchers have argued, is that the use of direct methods to elicit beliefs about language may not reveal unconscious attitudes and participants may base their answers on researcher's expectations (Gallois, et al., 2007). Furthermore, due to the fluid nature of attitudes, the data collected represented participants' beliefs at the particular moment in time in which the interview was conducted. As such, it is impossible to say if and how participants' beliefs will change in the future.

Additionally, there were no observations completed, nor were interviews conducted with other stakeholders of the dual language program, which would have allowed for the triangulation of the data. Based on findings, ideologies of participants' parents are an indicator of graduates' own language ideologies. As such, parent interviews in conjunction with student interviews would provide a more complete picture of graduates' ideological formations. Furthermore, when speaking about topics such as language ideologies as related to actual language use (Potowski, 2002), this research depended solely upon participant responses and perceptions of language use, specifically from their elementary school years. As such, observations also would provide a more reliable measure of actual language use in the classroom. Furthermore, based on the findings that many Latinx students had negative attitudes towards their use of Spanglish, for example, it is possible that students from Spanish speaking homes are more aware of the stigma associated with so-called "Spanglish" because of their parents. Therefore, it would be important to consider parental attitudes and ideologies in conjunction with graduates' views.

Dividing students into Latinx and non-Latinx participants to compare language ideologies also has its caveats. Because race and ethnicity are separate, but related concepts, it is difficult to generalize findings based on two clear cut groups of Latinx and non-Latinx participants. For example, ideologies specifically related to race affect students from different racial backgrounds, independently of their ethnicity and vice versa. It is also important to consider backgrounds within groups as, for example, Latinx students from different racial, ethnic or linguistic backgrounds have very different experiences.

Finally, while this study seeks to compare the attitudes and ideologies of a range of students who have participated in a dual language program, the findings from this research will be limited to the context of the school district in which the study was conducted. Generalizations on the findings cannot necessarily be applied to other school districts within the state or in other states. Furthermore, the results of the study explore the language attitudes and ideologies of students who participated in a dual language program that existed as a strand within their school. This is important to consider as it is impossible to say how the student experience within a dual language school would differ. Nevertheless, findings may be transferable to similar dual immersion settings. Despite these limitations, this study provides an insight into the experiences of elementary level dual language graduates and raises issues regarding program outcomes for students.

Summary

Dual language graduates reported positive attitudes towards the dual language program and their bilingualism, indicating that some of their salient experiences were becoming bilingual, building a family with their peers and learning about culture. Graduates cite disadvantages including a sense of linguistic and physical segregation due to the organization of the dual language program as a strand within the school. Despite positive attitudes towards their bilingualism and participation in dual language, graduates reported a dominance of English in interactions at school, with the general trend being that non-Latinx students speaking English to accommodate their own linguistic insecurities and Latinx students speaking English to accommodate their English dominant peers.

Dual language graduates demonstrated language ideologies related to monolingualism, standard language and linguistic pluralism. Nevertheless, the expression of such ideologies and consequences for Latinx and non-Latinx students differed. Graduates also expressed conflicting ideologies, generally rejecting monolingual ideologies, while also indicating an acceptance of monolingualism as the norm. For example, both Latinx and non-Latinx students indicated that speaking English does not link someone to being American, while at the same time referring to Spanish speakers as "immigrants" to the country. Additionally, both Latinx and non-Latinx generally rejected the idea that there is a correct language, yet students revealed their acceptance of the standardized language ideology, as they alluded to a "universal" Spanish and described how their use of certain linguistic features deviated from standardized norms. Latinx participants' descriptions of their home language variety as inferior and "not actual Spanish," conflicted with their expressed attitudes about their not being a correct or incorrect way of using language. Differences were found between the evaluation of specific linguistic tools, such as Spanglish, which was of specific significance for Latinx participants and aligns with ideologies such as differential bilingualism.

Finally, the results of this study have important implications for dual language program design, as the separate strand within a school should be reevaluated, or explicit attention should be made to better incorporate students in dual language within the school. Findings also indicate that middle school was an integral part of bilingual students' experiences and that students need to be provided with additional supports during their transition from elementary to middle school within dual language. Furthermore, middle school language teachers should be prepared to teach dual language

students and heritage speakers, whose needs differ from those that are learning a second language for the first time in middle school.

REFERENCES

Achugar, M. (2008). Counter-hegemonic language practices and ideologies: Creating a new space and value for Spanish in Southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context, 5*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.5.1.02ach

Achugar, M., & Pessoa, S. (2009). Power, history and place: Language attitudes towards Spanish in a bilingual academic community in Southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context, 6*(2), 199–223. https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.6.2.03ach

Achugar, M., & Oteíza, T. (2009). "In whatever language people feel comfortable": conflicting language ideologies in the US Southwest border. *De Gruyter Mouton, 29*(4), 371-391. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2009.020

Akkari, A., & Loomis, C. (1998). Toward a New Understanding of Language Minority Students' Experiences with Bilingual Education in the United States. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique applique*, *67*, 31-59.

Alanis, I., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(4), 305-319. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802143378

Alemán, E., Freire, J. A., McKinney, A., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2017). School–university–community pathways to higher education: Teacher perceptions, school culture and partnership building. *The Urban Review*, *49*(5), 852-873. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2021.1942325

Alim, H. S. (2004). Hearing what's not said and missing what is: Black language in white public space. *Intercultural discourse and communication: The essential readings*, *8*, 180-197. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758434.ch12

Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., & Ball, A. F. (2016). Introducing raciolinguistics. *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*, 1-30.

Anderson, N. H. (1971). Integration theory and attitude change. *Psychological review*, *78*(3), 171.

Aparicio, F. R. (1998). Whose Spanish, Whose Language, Whose Power?: Testifying to Differential Bilingualism. *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures*, *12*, 5-25.

Babino, A. (2017). Same program, distinctive development: Exploring the biliteracy trajectories of two dual language schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *40*(2), 169-186. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1307290

Babino, A., & Steward, M. A. (2017). "I like English better" Latinx dual language student investments in Spanish, English, and bilingualism. *The Journal of Latinxs & Education, 16*(1), 18–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2016.1179186

Baker, C. (2006). Psycho-Sociological Analysis in Language Policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method* (pp. 210-228). Blackwell.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual matters.

Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (Eds.). (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.

Ballinger, S., & Lyster, R. (2011). Student and teacher oral language use in a two-way Spanish/English immersion school. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 289–306. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811401151

Bearse, C., & de Jong, E. (2008). Cultural and linguistic investment: Adolescents in a secondary two-way immersion program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(3), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680802174817

Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A. (2012). *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Georgetown University Press.

Beaudrie, S. M., Ducar, C., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage language teaching: Research and practice*. McGraw-Hill Education Create.

Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Estudios de sociolingüística*, *1*(2), 25-45.

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2002). Ideologies of language in multilingual contexts. *Multilingua*, *21*(2/3), 121-326.

Block, N. (2011). The impact of two-way dual immersion programs on initially English-dominant Latinx students' attitudes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *34*, 125–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.598059

Block, N. (2012). Perceived impact of two-way dual immersion programs on Latinx students' relationships in their families and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(2), 235–257.
http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.620079

Block, N. C. (2007). *Dual immersion programs in predominantly Latinx schools.* Claremont Graduate University.

Block, N., & Vidaurre, L. (2019). Comparing attitudes of first-grade dual language immersion versus mainstream English students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *42*(2), 129-149. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1604452

Blommaert, J. (Ed.). (2010). *Language ideological debates* (Vol. 2). Walter de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110808049

Bokhorst-Heng, W. D., & Caleon, I. S. (2009). The language attitudes of bilingual youth in multilingual Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *30*(3), 235-251. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630802510121

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(1), 64-82. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893267

Cervantes-Soon, C., Gambrell, J., Kasun, G. S., Sun, W., Freire, J. A., & Dorner, L. M. (2021). "Everybody wants a choice" in dual language education of el Nuevo Sur: Whiteness as the gloss for everybody in media discourses of multilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *20*(6), 394-410. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1753201

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*(1), 403-427.

Chang-Bacon, C. K. (2021). Monolingual Language Ideologies and the Idealized Speaker: The "New Bilingualism" Meets the "Old" Educational Inequities. *Teachers College Record*, *123*(1), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812112300106

Chaparro, S. E. (2019). But mom! I'm not a Spanish boy: Raciolinguistic socialization in a two-way immersion bilingual program. *Linguistics and Education*, *50*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.01.003

Combs, M. C., & Nicholas, S. E. (2012). The effect of Arizona language policies on Arizona Indigenous students. *Language Policy*, *11*(1), 101-118. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9230-7

Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K., & Carranza, I. (1997). *Profiles in two-way immersion education.* Delta Systems.

Cho, G., Shin, F., & Krashen, S. (2004). What Do We Know about Heritage Languages? What Do We Need to Know about Them?. *Multicultural Education*, *11*(4), 23-26.

Dascomb, A. (2019). Language education policy in developing nations from colonization to postcolonialism. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *7*(1), 16-26.

De Jong, E. J. (2002). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*, 65–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2002.10668699

De Jong, E., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalizing linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*, 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802149531

de Jong, E., & Bearse, C. I. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High-school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian & T. Williams Fortune (Eds.)*, Immersion Education: Practices, Policies, Possibilities* (pp. 104–122). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847694041-009

DePalma, R. (2010). *Language use in the two-way classroom: Lessons from a Spanish-English bilingual kindergarten.* Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847693020

Dewaele, J. M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2019). The predictive power of multicultural personality traits, learner and teacher variables on foreign language enjoyment and anxiety. In M. Sato & S. Loewen (Eds.), *Evidence-based second language pedagogy* (pp. 263-286). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351190558-12

Dworin, J. (2011). Listening to Graduates of a K-12 Bilingual Program: Language Ideologies and Literacy Practices of Former Bilingual Students. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, *5*, 104-126.

Edelsky, C. (2006). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617965

Feinauer, E., & Howard, E. R. (2014). Attending to the third goal: Cross-cultural competence and identity development in two-way immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 2*(2), 257–272. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.2.07fei

Field, R. F. (2008). Identity, community and power in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, (pp. 77-89). Bilingual Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_117

Flores, N. (2014). Creating republican machines: Language governmentality in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, *25*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.11.001

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149-171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory Into Practice*, *59*(1), 22-31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411

Freeman, R. D. (1998). *Bilingual education and social change* (Vol. 14). Multilingual Matters.

Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2017). Educator language ideologies and a top-down dual language program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *20*(6), 704-721. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1071776

Freire, J. A., & Alemán Jr, E. (2021). “Two schools within a school”: Elitism, divisiveness, and intra-racial gentrification in a dual language strand. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *44*(2), 249-269. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2021.1942325

Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2021). The fiftyfication of dual language education: One-size-fits-all language allocation’s “equality” and “practicality” eclipsing a history of equity. *Language Policy*, *20*(3), 351-381. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-021-09579-z

García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, *89*(4), 601-605.

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.

García, O. (2017). Problematizing linguistic integration of migrants: The role of translanguaging and language teachers. *The Linguistic integration of adult migrants/L’intégration linguistique des migrants adultes. Some lessons from research/Les enseignments de la recherche*, 11-26. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110477498-005

García, O., Flores, N., & Spotti, M. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of language and society*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.001.0001

García, O., & Torres, R. (2009). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of US Latinas/os. In *Handbook of latinos and education* (pp. 208-219). Routledge.

Gerena, L. (2010). Student attitudes toward biliteracy in a dual immersion program. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 10*(1), 55–78.

Granados, N. R. (2015). Dual language graduates' participation in bilingual and biliterate communities of practice across time and space. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *38*(1), 45-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2015.1017031

Granados, N. R. (2017). Mobilities of language and literacy ideologies: Dual language graduates' bilingualism and biliteracy. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *49*(2), 210-239. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16686143

Hamman-Ortiz, L. (2019). Troubling the "two" in two-way bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *42*(4), 387-407. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1686441

Hamman-Ortiz, L. (2020). Becoming bilingual in two-way immersion: patterns of investment in a second-grade classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1783637

Henderson, M. H. (2016). Prescriptive language attitudes in a dual language elementary school. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, *1*, 1-1. https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v1i0.3699

Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education*, *42*, 21-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.08.003

Henderson, M. H., & Hackman, A. (2021). Critical Language Awareness in the K-12 Bilingual Classroom. *Heritage Language Teaching: Critical Language Awareness Perspectives for Research and Pedagogy* (pp. 196-211). Routledge.

Hill, J. (2001). The racializing function of language panics. *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement*, *2*, 245-267.

Howard, E. R., & Sugarman, J. (2007). *Realizing the vision of two-way immersion: Fostering effective programs and classrooms.* Delta Publishing Co.

Irvine, J. T., Gal, S., & Kroskrity, P. V. (2009). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (402-434). Wiley Blackwell.

Kroskrity, P. (2004). *Language Ideologies. In A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology, edited by Alessandro Duranti*. Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996522

Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(1), 61-79. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902780706

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

King, K. (2000). Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(3), 167-184.

Kristiansen, T. (2020). Methods in language-attitudes research. *Handbook of Pragmatics: 23rd Annual Installment*, *23*(3).

Lambert, W. E. (1974). A Canadian experiment in the development of bilingual competence. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *31*(2), 108-116.

Lambert, W. E., & Taylor, D. M. (1996). Language in the lives of ethnic minorities: Cuban American families in Miami. *Applied linguistics*, *17*(4), 477-500.

Lee, J. S., & Wright, W. E. (2014). The rediscovery of heritage and community language education in the United States. *Review of Research in Education*, *38*(1), 137-165. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X13507546

Leung, G., Uchikoshi, Y., & Tong, R. (2018). "Learning Cantonese will help us": Elementary school students' perceptions of dual language education. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*, (3), 238-252. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1483978

Lillie, K. E., Markos, A., Estrella, A., Nguyen, T., Trifiro, A., Arias, M. B., & Pérez, K. (2010). Policy in Practice: The Implementation of Structured English Immersion in Arizona. *Civil rights project/Proyecto derechos civiles*.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education.* Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*(1), 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902777546

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* (p. 157–179). Information Age Publishing.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Howard, E. R. (2008). Language development and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. *Bilingual education and Bilingualism*, *66*, 177. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690371-012

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016). Students' perceptions of bilingualism in Spanish and Mandarin dual language programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118671

Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in heritage language learning. *Language culture and curriculum*, *15*(2), 117-133. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310208666638

Leeman, J. (2012). Investigating language ideologies in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 43–59). Georgetown University Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an Accent: language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States.* Routledge.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802

Lo Bianco, J. (2001). *What is the problem? A study of official English.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692849-008

Lo Bianco, J. (2010). Language Policy and Planning. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.)*, Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 143-176). Multilingual Matters.

Lozano, R. (2019). An American Language: The History of Spanish in the United States. *Spanish in Context, 16*(2), 314–321. https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.00040.guz

Martínez, G. A. (2006). *Mexican Americans and language: del dicho al hecho.* University of Arizona Press.

Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(1), 26-42. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.977712

Martinez-Wenzl, M., Pérez, K. C., & Gándara, P. (2012). Is Arizona's approach to educating its ELs superior to other forms of instruction?. *Teachers College Record*, *114*(9), 1-32.

Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind*. Multilingual Matters.

McCullough, E. A., Clopper, C. G., & Wagner, L. (2019). The development of regional dialect locality judgments and language attitudes across the life span. *Child development*, *90*(4), 1080-1096. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12984

McGuire, W. J. (1989). The structure of individual attitudes and attitude systems. *Attitude structure and function*, 37-69.

Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(4), 399-417. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903370143

Merritt, S. (2011). *Conflicting ideologies about using and learning Spanish across the school years: From two-way immersion to world language pedagogy*. University of California, Berkeley.

Mihaljevic Djigunovic, J. (2012). Attitudes and motivation in early foreign language learning. *Ceps Journal*, *2*(3), 55-74. https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.347

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, *5*(4), 530-555. https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.347

Moll, L. C., Saez, R., & Dworin, J. (2001). Exploring biliteracy: Two student case examples of writing as a social practice. *The Elementary school journal*, *101*(4), 435-449. https://doi.org/10.1086/499680

Morales, P. Z., & Maravilla, J. V. (2020). The problems and possibilities of interest convergence in a dual language school. In *Dual Language Education in the US* (pp. 85-96). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569377

Morales, P. Z., & Rao, A. (2015). How ideology and cultural capital shape the distribution of Illinois' bilingual education programs. *Teachers College Record*.

Morren López, M. (2012). Children's language ideologies in a first-grade dual-language class. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *12*(2), 176-201. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798411417077

Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. Teachers College Press. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.4.31.1456

Nardy, A., Chevrot, J.P., & Barbu, S. (2013). The acquisition of sociolinguistic variation: Looking back and thinking ahead. *Linguistics, 51*, 255 – 284. https://doi.org.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/10.1515/ling-2013-0011

Newcomer, S. N. (2020). “Who we are today”: Latinx youth perspectives on the possibilities of being bilingual and bicultural. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *19*(3), 193-207. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1655426

Octavio, C. (2018). *Hispanic Children Thrown into Limbo: Language Ideologies of Spanish Heritage Speakers and Their English Peers* (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University).

Oppenheim, B. (1982). An exercise in attitude measurement. S*ocial psychology* (pp. 38-56). Palgrave.

Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual research journal*, *27*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589

Palmer, D. (2007). A dual immersion strand program in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an English-dominant context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 10(6), 752–768. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb397.0

Palmer, D. (2009). Middle-class English Speakers in a two-way immersion bilingual classroom: “Everybody should be listening to jonathan right now”. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 177–202. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00164.x

Palmer, D. (2011). The discourse of transition: Teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *5*(2), 103-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2011.594019

Palmer, D. K., & Henderson, K. I. (2016). Dual language bilingual education placement practices: Educator discourses about emergent bilingual students in two program types. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 17-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2015.1118668

Pérez, B. (2004). Language, literacy, and biliteracy. *Sociocultural contexts of language and literacy* (pp. 37-68). Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Routledge.

Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*, 75–101. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.2004.88.issue-1

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school.* Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599453

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. https://doi:10.1207/s1532771xjle0302_3

Razfar, A. (2005). Language ideologies in practice: Repair and classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, *16*(4), 404-424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2006.04.001

Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language as resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the USA. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *9*(3), 348-368. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00296.x

Reyes, S. A. (2001). Two-way bilingual immersion programs: Toward a more inclusive agenda in bilingual education. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 14*(4), 13–21.

Reyes, A. (2006). Reculturing principals as leaders for cultural and linguistic diversity. *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policies, and practices*, 145-165.

Ricento, T. (Ed). (2006). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method.* Blackwell.

Rosa, J. D. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *26*(2), 162-183. https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12116

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in society*, *46*(5), 621-647. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562

Rosenthal, H. P. (1974). A characterization of Banach spaces containing l1. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *71*(6), 2411-2413.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal,* 8(2), 15- 34.

Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (Vol. 16). Oxford University Press.

Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of dual-language immersion programs on student achievement: Evidence from lottery data. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(1), 282S-306S. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216634463

Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Sage Publications.

Sehr, D. T. (1997). *Education for public democracy*. Suny Press.

Sevinç, Y., & Backus, A. (2017). Anxiety, language use and linguistic competence in an immigrant context: a vicious circle?. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(3), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1306021

Spring, J. (1994). *The American school 1642-1993*. McGraw Hill College.

Stewner-Manzanares, G. (1988). The Bilingual Education Act: Twenty Years Later. New Focus, Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, Number 6. *New focus*.

Stritikus, T. T. (2001). From personal to political: Proposition 227, literacy instruction, and the individual qualities of teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *4*(5), 291-309. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050108667734

Spolsky, B. (1989). Conditions for second language learning. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (Eds.). (2009). Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences. SAGE Publications.

Spolsky, B. (2011). Ferguson and fishman: Sociolinguistics and the sociology of language. *The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics*, 11-24. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200957.n1

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. *UC Berkeley: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence*.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world.* Dual Language Education of New Mexico/Fuente Press.

Tsai, A., Straka, B., & Gaither, S. (2021). Mixed-heritage individuals' encounters with raciolinguistic ideologies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1904964

U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. (2015). *Dual Language Education Programs: Current State Policies and Practices*, Washington, D.C.

Valdes, G. (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: A Special Case of Bias.* Ablex.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391-430.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage languages students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource (pp. 37–77). *Center for Applied Linguistics/Delta Systems.*

Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *The Modern Language Journal, 79(*3), 299-328.

Valdés, G. (2004). Between support and marginalisation: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(2/3), 102–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050408667804

Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *The Urban Review*, *48*(4), 601-627. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-016-0370-0

Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of four instructional programs designed to serve English learners: Variation by ethnicity and initial English proficiency. *Educational* Eval*uation and Policy Analysis*, *37*(4), 612-637. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373715573310

Volk, D., & Angelova, M. (2007). Language ideology and the mediation of language choice in peer interactions in a dual-language first grade. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education,* 6(3), 177-199. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450701454205

Watzinger-Tharp, J., Swenson, K., & Mayne, Z. (2018). Academic achievement of students in dual language immersion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(8), 913-928.

Whitmore, K. F., & Crowell, C. G. (2005). Bilingual education students reflect on their language education: Reinventing a classroom 10 years later. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *49*(4), 270-285. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1214675

Wright, W. E., & Baker, C. (2017). Key concepts in bilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 65-79.

Wiley, T. G. (2007). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the US context. *Bilingual education and bilingualism*, *61*, 89.

Wiley, T. G. (2012). A brief history and assessment of language rights in the United States. In *Language policies in education* (pp. 73-102). Routledge.

Wiley, T. G., & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(S1), 48-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12303

Wiley, T. G., & Wright, W. E. (2004). Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the "age of accountability". *Educational Policy*, *18*(1), 142-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904803260030

Woolard, K. A. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. A.

Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-47). Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire Items

1. What is your name?

2. What is your gender?

   ___ male ___ female ___ other

3. What grade are you in?

4. How old are you?

5. How do you identify?

   ___ Latinx ___ non-Latinx

6. When did you start the dual language program?

   __ kindergarten __ first grade __ second grade __ after second grade

7. ` During elementary school, where did you live?

   __ Town A __ Town B __ other (please specify)

8. What language do you speak at home?

9. Think back to when you started elementary school. What language were you most comfortable in then?

9. What language are you most comfortable in **now**?

10. Do you think you are more, less or equally bilingual than you were in elementary school?

11. **Instructions:** For the following section, indicate to what extent to agree or disagree with the following statements (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=somewhat disagree, 4=somewhat agree, 5= agree, 6=strongly agree)

I am glad I participated in the dual language program
Participating in the dual language program helped me learn about other cultures
Learning two languages have given me confidence to do well in school
All kids should participate in dual language programs
Schools should teach students in their home language
Learning two languages at school can cause problems

The Spanish I use with my friends and family is different than the Spanish I use at school
You need to learn a language at school to be good at it
School teaches you the correct language
There's only one form of Spanish that should be used at school
There's only one form of English that should be used at school
You have to know the grammar of a language to speak it well
You have to be smarter to write a language than to speak it
Someone who can write a language is more intelligent than someone who can speak it

Knowing English helps someone be American
English is more normal than other languages
Knowing Spanish isn't really important once you graduate
Mixing languages is not as good as only using one
People who Speak Spanglish are not as intelligent as those that speak English or Spanish
Using two languages to complete a task is not as good as using only one

12. Is there anything else you want to add about your dual language experience?

13. Would you like to participate in a short interview with me? If so, please provide your email.

]

APPENDIX B

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

ADAPTED FROM GRANADOS (2017)

1. What language do you want to be interviewed in?
2. Tell me about yourself.
3. Tell me about your "language identity".
4. Why did your parents choose to send you to the dual language program?
5. What was the school environment like?
6. What are some of your memories of elementary school?
7. What was the best part of the dual language program?
8. What was the worst part of the dual language program?
9. How did your classmates influence your language or bilingualism?
10. How did your teachers influence your language or bilingualism?
11. Tell me about your language use in elementary school.
12. Did any experience(s) stand out to you during your time in elementary school?
13. How did your perspective of being bilingual/biliterate change when you went from elementary school to middle school?
14. Think back to your time in elementary school. How did you feel about being able to read, write and speak in two languages? Has that changed since then? How?
15. Did you prefer one language over another? Why do you think that was?
16. Have you ever gotten a comment on how you speak Spanish?
17. What is high school like?
18. Are you taking language courses?
19. How did your perspective of being bilingual/biliterate changed when you went from middle school to high school?
20. When do you use Spanish now?

21. Do you think you are more, less or equally bilingual that you were in elementary school? Why?
22. How much of a role do you think that participation in the dual language program influenced how you feel about Spanish and English today?
23. What would you change about the dual language program?
24. Would you send your child to a dual language school? Why or why not?

APPENDIX C

PARENTAL INVITATION AND CONSENT

Dear Parent:

I am a Spanish Linguistics PhD student at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to examine dual language graduates' experiences and their beliefs regarding language and bilingualism. Because your child participated in the dual language program, he/she is invited to participate in this study. Your child's participation will involve an online survey about their language beliefs and experiences in the dual program. The survey will take roughly 10 minutes to complete. They will also be invited to participate in an individual interview via Zoom in which they will be asked questions about their language use, as well as questions to follow up with their responses from the questionnaire. The interview will last about 45 minutes. Your child's participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to have your child participate or to withdraw your child from the study at any time, it will not affect him/her in any way. Students will be asked to indicate their name on the survey to connect them to their interviews but will be assigned a pseudonym as soon as this connection is made. Due to the nature of focus groups, complete confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The results of the study may be published, but your child's name will not be used and there will be no identifying information that will link responses to your child. Your child's participation can help inform and improve bilingual education for bi/multilingual children. There are no foreseeable risks to your child's participation.

I would like to audio record these interviews for my own use only and I will be the only one with access to them. Confidentiality will be maintained through de-identifying data as soon as they are collected. All data will be stored on my password-protected computer. Your child's responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your child's name/identifying information will not be used or shared with others.

If you have any questions concerning this study or your child's participation, please contact the research team by emailing Ashley Lenz (alenz1@asu.edu) or call (773) 680-9497, or Sara Beaudrie (sara.beaudrie@asu.edu)

Sincerely,
Ashley Lenz and Sara Beaudrie

Please complete the section below and return to me via email.

- I give my child permission to participate.

By signing below, you give consent for your child ___________________ (Your child's name) to participate in the above study.

______________________ ______________________ ___________

____

Signature	Printed Name	Date

If you have questions about your child's rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel your child has been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

APPENDIX D

PARENTAL INVITATION AND CONSENT (SPANISH)

Queridos padres de familia:
Soy una estudiante de doctorado en lingüística española en la Universidad Estatal de Arizona. Estoy realizando un estudio de investigación para examinar las experiencias de los graduados de los programas de dual language y sus creencias con respecto al idioma y el bilingüismo. Debido a que su hijo/a participó en el programa dual, está invitado/a a participar en este estudio.

La participación de su hijo/a incluirá un cuestionario en línea sobre su uso del idioma, creencias y experiencias en el programa de dual language. También se le invitará a participar en una entrevista individual a través de Zoom, en la que se le harán preguntas sobre el uso del idioma y sus creencias, así como preguntas para dar seguimiento a las respuestas del cuestionario. La entrevista individual durará unos 45 minutos. La participación de su hijo/a en este estudio es voluntaria. Si decide que no quiere que su hijo/a participe o si decide retirar a su hijo/a del estudio en cualquier momento, no le afectará de ninguna manera. Es posible que se publiquen los resultados del estudio de investigación, pero no se utilizará el nombre de su hijo/a y no habrá información de identificación que conecte su hijo/a con sus respuestas. No hay riesgos previsibles en la participación de su hijo/a.

Me gustaría grabar el audio de estas entrevistas, pero seré la única persona con acceso a las grabaciones. Las entrevistas no se grabarán sin su permiso. Se asignará un código a su hijo/a tan pronto como se recopilen los datos para mantener su confidencialidad. Todos los datos se almacenarán en servidores protegidos con contraseña. Las respuestas de su hijo/a serán confidenciales. Los resultados de este estudio se pueden utilizar en informes, presentaciones o publicaciones, pero no se utilizará el nombre de su hijo/a.

Por favor complete este formulario y envíamelo por correo.
❏ Doy mi consentimiento para que mi hijo/a participe.

Doy mi consentimiento para que mi hijo/a __________________ (nombre de su hijo/a) participe en este proyecto.

______________________ ___________________
Firma Fecha

Si tiene alguna pregunta sobre este estudio, favor de enviarme un correo (alenz1@asu.edu) o Sara Beaudrie (sara.beaudrie@asu.edu).

Si tiene alguna pregunta sobre los derechos de su hijo/a como participante en esta investigación, o si siente que su hijo/a ha sido puesto en riesgo, puede comunicarse con el Presidente de la Junta de Revisión Institucional de Sujetos Humanos, a través de la Oficina de Integridad de la Investigación y Assurance, al (480) 965-6788.

Atentamente,
Ashley Lenz

APPENDIX E

STUDENT CONSENT

I am a Spanish Linguistics PhD student in the Department of International Letters and Cultures at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to examine dual language graduates' experiences and their beliefs regarding language and bilingualism.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve an online survey that will take approximately 10 minutes and participation in an individual interview or focus group via Zoom in which you will be asked questions about your current language use, as well as questions to follow up with your survey responses. The interview will last about 30 minutes and focus groups around 45 minutes. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop participation at any time.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty.
Although there is no benefit to you possible your participation can help inform and improve bilingual education for bi/multilingual children. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Your responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used. De-identified data collected as a part of the current study will not be shared with others; however, due to the nature of focus groups, complete confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

I would like to audio record these interviews for my own use only and I will be the only one with access to them. Confidentiality will be maintained through de-identifying data as soon as they are collected. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be recorded; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know.

If you have any questions concerning this study or your child's participation, please email the research team (alenz1@asu.edu) or call (773) 680-9497 or Dr. Sara Beaudrie at sara.beaudrie@asu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788. Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.
By signing below, you are agreeing to be part of the study.

Name:
Signature: Date:

APPENDIX F

IRB APPROVAL

APPROVAL: EXPEDITED REVIEW

Sara Beaudrie
CLAS-H: International Letters and Cultures, School of (SILC)
480/965-1110
Sara.Beaudrie@asu.edu

Dear Sara Beaudrie:

On 11/17/2021 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Talking with the “Spanish Kids”: Language Ideologies and Experiences of Dual Language Graduates in Illinois
Investigator:	Sara Beaudrie
IRB ID:	STUDY00014853
Category of review:	
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• 18+ Consent Form.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Dual Language Graduates Ideologies IRB Materials-2.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Lenz_IRB DL Graduates.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • Parental Consent, Category: Consent Form; • Parental Invitation/Consent, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Student Assent Form-2.pdf, Category: Consent Form;

The IRB approved the protocol from 11/17/2021 to 11/16/2022 inclusive. Three weeks before 11/16/2022 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review application and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 11/16/2022 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the "Documents" tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

REMINDER - All in-person interactions with human subjects require the completion of the ASU Daily Health Check by the ASU members prior to the interaction and the use of face coverings by researchers, research teams and research participants during the interaction. These requirements will minimize risk, protect health and support a safe research environment. These requirements apply both on- and off-campus.

The above change is effective as of July 29th 2021 until further notice and replaces all previously published guidance. Thank you for your continued commitment to ensuring a healthy and productive ASU community.

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Ashley Lenz