

October 2021

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICIES IN A DUAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Eirini Pitidou
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pitidou, Eirini, "LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICIES IN A DUAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM" (2021). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 2303.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/24369939> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/2303

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

University of Massachusetts Amherst

ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Doctoral Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICIES IN A DUAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Eirini Pitidou

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

**LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICIES IN A
DUAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM**

A Dissertation Presented

by

EIRINI PITIDOU

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

September 2021

College of Education

© Copyright by Eirini Pitidou 2021

All Rights Reserved

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICIES IN A DUAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

A Dissertation Presented

by

EIRINI PITIDOU

Approved as to style and content by:

DocuSigned by:


238ACEA928E742E...

Ysaaca D. Axelrod, Chair

DocuSigned by:

57504CB177E0415...

Denise Ives, Member

DocuSigned by:

9C168880E02D474...

Eleni Christofa, Member

DocuSigned by:

60F1DE588C084FD...

Laura Valdiviezo, Member

Ezekiel Kimball
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
College of Education

DEDICATION

To my beloved husband, friend, and forever inspiration.

For my two wonderful children.

Simo, Thomas, and Evie, you are my life
and the reason I am here now.

Loving you and growing with you will always be
by far the biggest accomplishment of my life.

To my parents and my parents-in law.

Your multilevel support through the years
will never be taken for granted.

I am forever indebted to your unconditional love.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of a PhD degree is undoubtedly one of the biggest accomplishments in a person's life and certainly a grand academic and professional milestone. The journey through the doctoral years, have not only helped me grow as a graduate student to a novice researcher, but also went hand in hand with my journey through other fields of my life that helped me grow as an individual as well. Being able to write the acknowledgements section of this dissertation, is the realization of the support, encouragement and true love by a group of people who helped me make a dream come true.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor and mentor Dr. Ysaaca Axelrod for her continuous help, invaluable feedback, guidance, and encouragement throughout the years of my studies. Her being available when I needed her support had affected tremendously the process of my work. Her calm presence, deep knowledge and thoughtful counselling were not only limited to the academic field, but she was also there as a friend and mentor.

I would also like to thank my wonderful committee members, Dr. Denise Ives, Dr. Laura Valdiviezo and Dr. Eleni Christofa, for their guidance, feedback, suggestions and enlightenment throughout the course of my study. I couldn't be happier they have been part of this endeavor consistently supporting my thesis in the most positive and fruitful way and helping me develop and advance as a researcher.

The completion of this milestone degree and life changing experience in my life will always circle around my beloved husband and kids to whom it is also heartily dedicated. It was Simos who first encouraged me to apply for a PhD because he believed

it was the right thing for me. It was him who kept lifting me up all the times I felt that the process was too overwhelming. It was him who believed in my strengths and abilities and the one to help them chase my dream and reach my true potential. It was him who would take care of everything else around the house so I would keep focused on my goal and complete my mission. He was there not only as a wonderful husband and father to our children but also as my closest friend and best life partner I could ever dream of. I love you and I thank you for choosing me to ride the roads of life alongside you. Finally, I also would like to thank my two wonderful children, Thomas and Evie for their patience and understanding when I was not always available to play with them because I had too much work or I was too tired. I truly hope that the PhD journey will serve as an example and a role model to them to never stop pursuing their dreams at any age no matter the circumstances be it a pandemic or any other life crisis.

I owe a loving and heartwarming thank you to my parents Voula and Anestis for always encouraging me to fearlessly explore the world, spread my wings and expand my horizons mentally and spiritually. I thank them for always believing in me, being there for me even from miles away and for instilling the light and thirst for knowledge, languages and overall life paideia from a very young age. To my parents-in law, Efi and Thomas, I owe a huge thank you from the bottom of my heart for supporting my endeavor even when it was only an idea at first. They were always there for me loving me unconditionally like a second pair of parents I was lucky to gain later in my life and be able to count on them through every step of the way. To my father-in-law Thomas, I thank him for his mentorship on the importance of academia and for encouraging me to experience the gifts and joys it brings. I thank all of them for flying to us the next day

whenever I needed their help and bringing with them all their love and motherly and fatherly wisdom, our little family needed at times. I am forever indebted to their love and support.

I would also like to acknowledge the support and love of my little village of people who were always there when my family and I needed them. I am truly thankful to the community of friends and neighbors for being our extended family and support system all these years. Particularly, I would like to warmly thank my close friends Eleni and Eric for their true love, compassion, help and presence, guidance and for making us feel welcome when we moved to this town. You are the family we were longing to have in this new country.

Lastly, I would like to thank all my participants in this study for their availability, time and adjustments to zoom interviews and for the wonderful conversations we had. I feel lucky to be a part of this community of people and feel honored that my children will attend the neighborhood school where this study took place and learn alongside the group of educators and administrators, I had the joy to interview. I learnt so much through all of you and you completed my dissertation in the most rewarding way.

ABSTRACT

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICIES IN A DUAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

SEPTEMBER 2021

EIRINI PITIDOU, B. A. ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI

M.A., KING'S COLLEGE

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Ysaaca Axelrod

Dual language programs have been considered by many scholars as the epitome of bilingual education models as they promise bilingual competence, academic success and cultural awareness for both majority and minority language students attending the program. Research has shown that they also tend to promote equity and establish social justice among all students, and students have reported improved self-esteem and bilingual pride among other benefits. The three guiding principles or pillars of dual language education are bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism. Recently, critical consciousness has been proposed as the 4th pillar as an establishment of the promotion of social justice and equity within the dual language classroom. This case study explores the language ideologies of six school officials and four families directly involved with the implementation of a newly established dual language program in a town in Massachusetts.

The semi-structured in-depth qualitative interviews with the school's principal, assistant principal, ELL coordinator, superintended and two first grade teachers in the focal program and the voices of four parents whose children attend the first grade in this

program, highlight the notion of critical consciousness and how it manifests in their decision-making regarding choice of schooling and school practices. The findings show that there is strong sense of social justice and equity practices both in the school setting but also in the town community that is prevalent in the participants values, beliefs and attitudes. However, the findings also revealed a conceptual mismatch regarding notions of privilege between school officials and attending families, which suggests that the inclusion of critical consciousness should become a more visible aspect of the program and eventually be considered as an integral part of the dual language curriculum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
CHAPTER I –INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
A brief introduction to dual-language programs	4
Background of the Problem.....	9
Statement of the problem.....	19
Rationale and Significance of Study	22
Statement of Purpose and Research Questions	24
Researcher Positionality	25
Theoretical Framework	27
Language Policy and Planning (LPP).....	30
Language Ideologies as additional conceptual framework.....	36
Summary.....	37
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW	39
A Detailed Overview of Bilingual Education History and Memorable	
Language Policies in the United States	39
Introduction	39
The Past	41
The Permissive period (1700’s-1800’s)	41
The Restrictive Period (1880’s-1960’s)	44
Meyer vs. Nebraska	45
Brown vs. Board of Education	46
The Cuban Revolution and Coral Way Elementary	47
The Opportunist Period (1960’s – 1980’s).....	47
The Civil Rights Act (Title VI) and The Bilingual Education Act (Title	
VII)	48
Lau Vs. Nichols	50
The Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) and the <i>Lau</i> Remedies.....	51
Bilingual Education Models	52
Monolingual Education Programs	53
Bilingual Education Programs.....	54
Castañeda vs. Pickard	56
The Present	57
The Dismissive Period (1980’s – Present)	57
English as Official Language	58

Demographics of Bilingual Children.....	59
Proposition 227.....	60
Proposition 203.....	60
Question 2 and Amendment 31	61
No Child Left Behind (NCLB).....	61
Recent Developments	64
Historical Developments and Language Policies in the State of Massachusetts	67
General Observations	67
Question 2 – English for the Children.....	68
Question 2 Restrictions and Specific Waivers	71
Districts Resisting Implementation of Question 2 Restrictions	72
LOOK Act – Language Opportunities for Our Kids	74
Critical Consciousness: Towards a more equitable future in Dual Language Education	76
The 4 th Pillar of Dual-Language Model of Bilingual Education	76
Definition and Components of Critical Consciousness.....	77
Continuously Interrogating Power	78
Historicizing Schools.....	79
Critical Listening	80
Engaging with Discomfort	81
Summary.....	82
 CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY	 84
Introduction	84
Study Design	86
Qualitative Research Methods.....	86
Case Study	87
COVID-19	89
Context of Study.....	90
Participants	93
Pilot Study	95
Data Collection Methods.....	96
Interviews	96
Data Collection Timeline	98
Data Analysis.....	99
Trustworthiness	101
Limitations.....	102
Summary.....	103
 CHAPTER 4 – FINDINGS	 104
Introduction	104
Research question one: What are the language ideologies of parents who have chosen this dual-language program for their children?.....	105

Linguistic background and language (s) spoken at home	106
Bilingualism/biculturalism/biliteracy	107
Reasons for enrollment in the program	109
Expectations and benefits from the program.....	111
Language and academic benefits.....	111
Cultural Benefits.....	112
Language as resource	113
Overall feelings about the program	114
Concerns about the program.....	115
Familiarity with the program before enrollment	116
Child’s feelings about the program	117
COVID-19	118
Parental involvement in children’s learning.....	120
Attitudes toward Spanish language	121
Summary of findings on parents’ language ideologies	123
Research question two: What are the language ideologies of the administrators, school officials and teachers who are involved in the creation and implementation of the dual-language program?	124
a. How are these reflected in the structure of the program?.....	124
Teachers’ professional background and experience with bilingual education.....	127
Reasons for the creation of the DL program	128
Orchard Hill Elementary to host the DL program.....	129
Setting up the program	131
Challenges in setting up the program	133
Benefits of DL education.....	134
Culture in DL program	136
Administrators	136
Teachers.....	137
Positive ideologies across school – Strong bond and teamwork under a social justice framework.....	138
Administrators	138
Teachers.....	140
COVID-19	142
Administrators	142
Teachers.....	142
Future plans, development and promotion of the program	144
Administrators	144
Promotion of the program	145
Teachers.....	146
Summary of findings on school officials’ language ideologies	147
Research question three: Do families and administrators see critical consciousness as an integral part of the DL program?	148
b. How does this manifest in their engagement in the program? For families, in the choice of schooling? For	

administrators, in the programming and implementation of curricular practices?.....	148
Parents/Guardians.....	149
Critical consciousness in the dual language classroom.....	151
Critical consciousness and the history of bilingual education.....	153
Choice of schooling and similar programs in the area	156
Bilingualism as a privilege	158
Administrators	160
Critical consciousness in the dual language classroom.....	162
Critical consciousness and the history of bilingual education.....	165
Bilingualism as a privilege and the role of the school.....	166
Teachers.....	171
Critical consciousness in the classroom	171
Critical consciousness and the history of bilingual education.....	173
Summary of participants' language ideologies on critical consciousness.....	175
Summary.....	175
 CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	 177
Introduction	177
Summary of Study.....	177
Note of the researcher on selection of data and participants	179
Discussion of the Most important Findings.....	181
Strict separation of languages.....	181
Culture in the DL classroom.....	183
Bilingualism as a privilege	184
A program for the “well-educated”	185
Cultural competence	188
Location of the program	190
Language as an enrichment tool - A ‘useful’ ‘foreign’ language for the ‘smart’ kids	192
General discussion.....	198
Implications for practice.....	200
Historicizing schools	200
Bilingual staff hiring and training	204
Integrating Spanish speaking students from other towns into the program.....	206
Effectiveness of enrollment policy	207
Other implications – Administrators’ plans for the future	208
Implications for future research.....	210
Longitudinal study.....	210
Students’ language ideologies	211
Limitations.....	212
Concluding reflections.....	213
 APPENDIX A	 217

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (PARENTS/GUARDIANS).....	217
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (ADMINISTRATORS).....	219
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (TEACHERS)	222
APPENDIX B	225
Teachers/Administrators Consent Form for DocuSign	225
Parent Consent Form for DocuSign	230
APPENDIX C	235
INVITATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY	235
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	237

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Participants, Pseudonyms and language (s) spoken	91
Table 2. Participants, Pseudonyms and language (s) spoken	95
Table 3. Parent/Guardians Pseudonyms	105
Table 4. Administrators' pseudonyms.....	125
Table 5. List of participants.....	149

CHAPTER I –INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The United States of America is also known as the ‘nation of immigrants’, a title the country has reasonably earned since it has been a receiver of large immigrant populations for centuries from countries around the world. Ironically however, and despite the characterization, the country has had a rather “uncomfortable relationship with its immigrants and their languages” through the years (Gandara and Escamilla, 2016, p. 2). As a result of massive immigration especially in the 19th Century, a large influx of new languages also prevailed in the US, constantly altering the linguistic environment throughout the country. To address the needs of this linguistically diverse population, bilingual education has a long history and tradition alongside traditional US schooling (Bybee et. al, 2014). One of the most common contemporary misconceptions is that bilingual education is a fairly recent phenomenon (Baker and Wright, 2017) when even as early as 1839, bilingual German-English education was implemented in Ohio and French-English bilingual education was offered in Louisiana in 1847 (Gandara and Escamilla, 2016).

Bilingual education both as a topic of discussion and an object of attitude, holds a very special spot in the American mind and soul (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990). The odds both for language and bilingual education were most of the times not good and they were heavily affected by the historical events during the course of the years. The policies implemented by each of the federal administration often to the disadvantage of the minoritized populations, heavily affected bilingual education too. Relevant bilingual education policies through history were the products of politics, economy, ideologies or

the size of the immigrant population of that time and were ranging from being tolerant and supportive to being ignorant or suppressive, according to each government in charge (Gandara and Escamilla, 2016). Menken and Solorza (2014) use the metaphor of a pendulum to describe how different language education policies in the United States have treated minority groups with “alternating restriction and tolerance” (p. 97, thus shaping the ideological social context of each time and peoples’ attitudes towards bilingual education.

The fact that English has never been recognized and declared as the official language of the country has created more tension and confusion than benefit, distorting the public opinion over the issue on what language should be taught in schools leading to numerous failed legislative fights in establishing it as “official” (Bybee et al., 2014). In 1981, California Senator Hayakawa proposed the English Language Amendment to establish English as the official language in the US for fear that a lot of bilingual education schooling will cause ethnic division (Bybee et al., 2014; Crawford, 2004). Even though the proposition never passed, it actually served its purpose in causing political and ideological division with 23 states adopting “some form of “Official English” legislation” (Bybee et al., 2014, p. 141). In the minds of most Americans, it established the idea that bilingual education programs should exist for the purposes of teaching English to minority populations rather than educating students in two languages and therefore promoting bilingualism and biliteracy (Gandara and Escamilla, 2016).

To a great extent, “speaking and using exclusively English has become inextricably associated with an American identity” (Palmer et.al, 2017, p.450; Ricento, 2000). Therefore, it is important to view and consider bilingual education alongside the

study of language ideologies and politics of schooling in order to fully understand and interpret its complexities. It is ultimately the beliefs, attitudes and values that shape the bilingual education field, determine how language programs are implemented in schools and connect language with the broader societal issues (Gort, 2017). The role of language ideologies should not be undermined but rather be considered inseparable from the context of bilingual education both in its policy planning and also in its actual implementation.

As a result of policies supporting or hindering language education, a considerable amount of bilingual education programs with different names and purposes emerged through the years in order to serve their districts' language needs. A very popular classification of these programs falls under one of the three Orientations in Language Planning as proposed by Ruiz (1984): a) the language as a problem orientation viewing bilingualism from a deficit point of view. Restrictive policies like English-Only, and transitional bilingual education programs (TBE), English as a second language (ESL) belong to this category b) the language as right orientation produced maintenance or heritage language programs, stemming from the affirmation of Civil Rights and c) the language as resource which views language as an asset and a privilege for social national and international diplomacy and mobility and includes dual-language immersion programs often met with different names such as Dual Language Programs (DLP), Dual Language (DL), Dual Language Immersion (DLI) or Two-Way Immersion (TWI).

The scope of this dissertation is centered around Ruiz's (1984) last orientation which views language teaching and learning as a resource and particularly around a dual-language program which was recently launched in a small town in Western

Massachusetts. Through the exploration of the language ideologies of key people directly involved in the enactment of the program (parents, teachers and administrators) this case study seeks to understand how Massachusetts language policies around bilingual education in general and dual-language programs in particular are put into practice. Lastly, it also sheds light on how these programs adhere to the principles of equal opportunities for all which is at the core of this bilingual education model's philosophy.

A brief introduction to dual-language programs

Dual-language or dual-immersion programs are language enrichment programs which help students achieve proficiency in their first language and high levels of proficiency in their second language (Warhol and Mayer, 2012). Such programs have existed in the United states as early as the 19th century and since then, a number of different types or models have been developed in order to address various student populations (De Jong, 2016). Research has shown that both language majority and minority students usually succeed in these programs, therefore promoting equality, positive multicultural behaviors and attitudes, closing the achievement gap for English language learners (Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Collier and Thomas, 2004, Warhol and Mayer, 2012; Baker & Wright, 2017), and increasing high school graduation and college enrollment (Cervantes-Soon, 2014). They are considered a fair model of bilingual programs with regards to issues of social justice and equality between language minority and language majority students. Students are reported to have improved self-esteem and a sense of bilingual pride and parents observe their children's enjoyment while they are also more involved in their learning (De La Garza et al, 2015).

The most groundbreaking results of the “astounding effectiveness” of the dual-language programs came from two nationally acknowledged scholars Wayne Thomas and Virginia Collier who conducted longitudinal studies throughout the country comparing the effectiveness on student performance, of dual-language or two-way immersion programs as they prefer to call them, with other bilingual education programs. Their studies which lasted for more than twenty years, included a very large sample (almost two million student records analyzed) in 23 large and small districts across 15 states. They compared different types and models of bilingual education and offered a wholistic view and evaluation of the programs both on an academic, social and personal perspective (Collier and Thomas, 2004). Their results were remarkable as they revealed that dual-language programs offer a win-win advantage for all students regardless of their ethnicity, race, socioeconomic background or language and students exceeded their peers in other programs in literacy and math scores (Thomas and Collier, 2009; Collier and Thomas, 2004; Cervantes-Soon, 2014). This fact alone, raised this language program model at the top of bilingual education ladder and gave dual-language programs its distinctive and superior title.

Traditionally, dual-languages programs are found in neighborhood schools and towns with low socioeconomic status in order to help with the integration of historically minoritized populations in the local communities and provide enrichment for them in their mother tongue and ultimately boost their academic success (Lucido and Montague, 2008). In fact, targeted location of new established dual-language programs, was one of the educational requirements for the Annual Yearly Progress of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2002 (Lucido and Montague, 2008). If implemented correctly, especially

by the teachers, and according to the four tenets of critical consciousness that Alfaro and Hernández (2016) propose, they could offer powerful learning and education based on social justice and equity for all. These four tenets, IPAE for short, are: a) ideological clarity, b) pedagogical perspective and clarity c) access for all and d) equitable spaces (Alfaro and Hernández, 2016). What is more, apart from the academic and cultural profits DL programs offer to students, they also profit schools. By succeeding academically, schools receive better ranking in high stakes testing, dropout rates decline, attendance and school completion rises, and the cost of program implementation is lower than in other language programs (De La Garza et al, 2015).

Garcia (2009) posits dual-language programs in a category of bilingual education models that she calls dynamic and is distinct from the traditional additive, subtractive or recursive models. In the dynamic model of bilingual education, the prevalent language ideologies are heteroglossic or pluralistic, as opposed to monoglossic or monolingual. The first to introduce the theoretical concept of heteroglossia was the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) through which he identified the diversity of linguistic practices in societies. More specifically, Bakhtin (1981) recognized the coexistence of different language forms and acknowledged the presence of various languages; thus, he recognized a language plurality. On a social level, Bakhtin (1981) criticized those who viewed language as a closed system and considered notions such as ‘standard’ or ‘unified’ language as another form of centralized power and suppression. He also believed that heteroglossia is the norm and that conformity to ‘standard’ use of language is a characteristic of the more privileged or of the elite (Bakhtin, 1981).

Chang-Bacon (2020) describes monolingual ideologies as a type of ideologies through which a particular group of language practices become idealized. Monolingual ideologies “delimit what is considered as permissible within a given language, as certain dialectal features are framed as deviations from an idealized, standard form of the language (Chang- Bacon, 2020, p. 4 emphasis in the original; Delpit and Dowdy, 2008). In other words, if English is considered a standard language, according to monolingual ideologies, any deviation from English, whether it is a different dialect or a different language, is considered not standard and not conforming to the norms (Pennycook, 2007). Monolingual language ideologies are then socially constructed ideas or beliefs of what language practices should look like in a nation or society rather of what they actually are, like in the diverse context of US (Chang-Bacon, 2020; DeJong, 2008).

Therefore, monolingual ideologies construct a hierarchical reality that certain languages which are considered standard, are superior to others and speakers of them as linguistically superior to others who do not speak them (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Achugar, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996; Chang-Bacon, 2020). DL programs in contrast, embrace heteroglossic ideologies which is the opposite of monoglossic, meaning that all languages and language varieties should be accepted and treated as equal, with none being superior to another (Garcia, 2005, 2009). There are several terms used to refer to this heteroglossic model of bilingual education (two-way dual language, two-way immersion, bilingual immersion, developmental bilingual education or poly-directional) although dual-language or dual-immersion seem to have prevailed (Baker and Wright, 2017; Garcia 2009; De Jong, 2016).

In 2016, the Center of Applied Linguistics (CAL) counted 450 dual-language programs in more than 700 schools in ten states in the US with the number continuously growing over the years especially after the reverse of anti-bilingual laws in California and Massachusetts in 2016 and 2017 respectively (Baker and Wright, 2017). In Massachusetts in particular, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) counted 16 dual-language programs in public and charter schools in 2016, mostly centered around Boston area (Center for Applied Linguistics). In western Massachusetts, which is the focal area of this study, the number of dual-language programs is significantly smaller but still existent with new programs launching after the passing of LOOK Act in November 2017, opening a new window of hope for bilingual education in the State.

Traditional dual-language programs in the US are divided into two categories known as the 50:50 model with instruction divided equally in both languages throughout the grades and the 90:10 model where 90% of the instruction is in the minority language in kindergarten subtracting 10% in every additional grade until they reach the 50:50 ratio around the 6th grade. No matter what model a school follows, similar practices and guidelines should be implemented throughout the school in order to serve the program's purposes. These practices as developed and discussed by Baker and Wright (2017) are the following: a) the school's two taught languages should be of equal status, b) the overall school ethos and ideology should be bilingual, c) instruction for language arts should be in both languages, d) the majority of staff should be bilingual and e) the overall length of the program should not be less than five years. Perhaps the most important factor that makes these programs so distinctive and promising is that they integrate and mix English dominant and Spanish dominant students in the same classroom so they must meet the

diverse needs of their populations (Cervantes-Soon, 2014). This way, students feel that a DL classroom is a safe place for them to learn and avoid the stigmatization that was associated with being bilingual student in programs of the past (Hernandez, 2017).

In this positive and fruitful environment, it seems that students can flourish, and bilingualism can offer its benefits to its fullest. For many language researchers, dual-language programs are considered to be the epitome of bilingual education both academically and socially serving the purposes of democracy and diversity of the United States. As Ovando (2003) puts it, there is one simple dichotomy of two paths one can take regarding bilingual education; either the “language-affirming path” of dual-language programs, or the monoglossic English only one (p. 18). However, Cervantes-Soon (2014) advises researchers in the field that a certain amount of criticism should be used while examining dual-language programs overall effectiveness and that if too much focus is placed on just the benefits of bilingualism and biliteracy for higher academic achievement as DL promises, we may risk to “blur critical issues of equity that would continue to disadvantage” minority students “despite well-intended efforts” (p. 64). For this reason, a discussion about the other, more problematic side of the DL programs is essential in order to understand and address the content of this research study.

Background of the Problem

Dual-language programs are rising in numbers and popularity around the United States in the past few years with firm supporters advocating on their “astounding effectiveness” (Collier and Thomas, 2004) and their “rich promise” (Lindholm-Leary, 2005) both for majority and minority language students (Juárez, 2008, Cervantes-Soon, 2014). Dual-language programs are distinct and, in a way, superior when compared to

other bilingual education programs over the years for several reasons. Administrators and school officials promote the benefits of bilingualism and biliteracy and incorporate such programs into their school curriculum, while parents feel that their kids benefit both from learning an additional language or from honoring and maintaining their heritage language while they are also succeeding academically in English. Additionally, the way that these programs are structured, how classrooms are organized with mixed student populations and the cultural aspect involved in teaching, is generally acknowledged as providing a safe and equitable learning place for all (Pimentel et al, 2008).

Despite all these benefits, there is increasing evidence that dual-language programs are not living up to their ideal (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017). Over the years, they received criticism as being reserved for the ‘gifted, talented’ and privileged students and not the non-privileged populations that they historically served and they were created for in the first place (Valdés et al, 2016). In order to better understand the nature of criticism of DL programs we can view it as two directions of the same line in U.S. language education: a) foreign language education, usually associated in serving those who already have English privilege and b) bilingual education which is historically associated with providing services to those whose English is not their first language and therefore lack English privilege (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2016).

What Thomas and Collier (2009, 2010) did not address in their great review and evaluation of DL programs, are issues of power relations among students from diverse backgrounds compared to their white native-English counterparts. In fact, African American native-English speakers or classified Limited English Proficient (LEP) speakers scored significantly low compared in the participatory student groups

(Cervantes-Soon, 2014) and the DL model continues to disregard inequalities and hegemonic forces that transnational youth still experience within bilingual education contexts (Flores, 2016). A simple and broader categorization of these inequalities comes from Cervantes-Soon et al (2017) who group them into three areas: a) the broader sociopolitical context (ideologies, policies), b) the DL teachers' orientations, preparation and personal background and c) the classroom context (pedagogy, student relations) (p. 404).

A first attempt to approach dual-language programs with a critical scope, was made by Guadalupe Valdéz as early as 1997 with her seminal article titled as “cautionary note” about the actual effectiveness of the goals of these programs, whom they are targeted to and who do they actually serve. Her observations and conclusions, while published over twenty years ago, are still true in school settings after all these years. For example, she stresses the importance of hiring trained bilingual educators for teaching in DL programs because they understand the complexity in cultural and linguistic nature of emerging bilinguals and promote the academic success for minority students whereas foreign language teachers tend to mostly focus on the acquisition of language proficiency for mainstream (white) children (Valdés, 1997). These groups of teachers, according to Valdés, can work together but, in their core, they would serve different student groups needs who represent also different social group needs: the white, mainstream American families and the Mexican American families in her research. She also alerts the readers to the importance of the factor of intergroup relations meaning that the socioeconomic status of the families of all students should not be taken for granted but should be treated with extra caution since unequal social treatment within student interactions would also lead to

unequal treatment in academic interactions. She notes that “for minority children, the acquisition of English is expected but for mainstream children the acquisition of a non-English language is enthusiastically applauded. Children are aware of these differences” (Valdés, 1997, p.417). Teachers and all stakeholders directly involved in DL programs should also be aware and constantly alert on issues of power and intergroup relations among students, which is usually not talked about or left unattended. Valdés (1997) cautions that when white mainstream anglophones students get one more ‘tool’ in their already great deal of qualifications, that of Spanish language, they become even more powerful in the socioeconomic ladder, ‘stealing’ in a way the sometimes only ‘weapon’ Spanish students have in order to rise in the same ladder and succeed socially and financially.

After the publication of Valdés (1997) first direct criticism on dual-language programs, a number of studies and researchers followed with their own observations and conclusions, raising more awareness on the fact that while they are in fact an additive, fair and resourceful model of bilingual education, underlying policies and interests continue to play a significant role in their actual implementation, mostly to the benefit of the majority white English speaking learners. The problem is far deeper than merely the implementation of the guidelines of the model and lies in the ideologies circulated among policy makers, school officials, teachers, students and parents; everyone directly involved in the process in the enactment of a DL program.

Rosa and Flores (2015) discuss language ideologies that center around language in connection with issues of race, ethnicity and cultural background referring to them as raciolinguistic ideologies, a term that would be vastly used throughout this dissertation.

Hernandez (2017) notes that “no matter how progressive or transformative a program model may be, it cannot be extracted from the current high-stakes educational-reform model we continue to function under” and it would be irresponsible if not dangerous to believe that a bilingual program’s philosophy or nature “can replace the hard work of engaging the raciolinguistic ideologies at the implementation level” (p. 149).

The characterization of DL programs as enrichment language programs for all, has also been given a negative connotation from researchers in the field and has been associated with “gifted”, “talented” (Valdés et al, 2016; Cervantes-Soon, 2014) or “elit” or “boutique” education for the few, more privileged ones (Flores and Garcia, 2017). In US public schools in order to be consider “gifted” is by historical definition to not be an English language learner (ELL), and to go a bit further not to be of any Mexican origin (Juárez, 2008). The location of the new launched programs has slowly started shifting from poor immigrant neighborhood to affluent white ones (Flores and Garcia, 2017; Flores and Rosa, 2015) in an attempt to attract “supporters of the dominant group, including conservative legislators” and thus, reifying a neoliberal ideology which does not consider equity and social justice issues (Cervantes-Soon, 2014, p. 70). Research during the last years has shown that there has been an inequitable distribution of DL program around the nation, meaning that they appeared mostly in white middle or upper-class communities than in Latino ones (Morales and Rao, 2015). Districts which traditionally needed bilingual education to support the learning needs of their rising immigrant populations, were ‘losing’ the opportunity to launch a promising dual-language program to more affluent districts and neighborhoods. In order to reflect their whitestream families’ desires for access to elite bilingualism, the schools advocated for

them to bring a DL program in their school and advertise it to them while making little effort to educate and recruit Spanish-speaking families for whom this program was initially developed (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017).

Valdés et al (2016) talk about a metaphorical gentrification of DL education meaning that there is “an influx of more privileged inhabitants into a ghettoized neighborhood while less privileged residents are priced or pushed out” (p.604). In a study they conducted in Utah, a predominantly white (80%) conservative state, the researchers found out that “privileged families are those primarily being invited to join DL programs, and they are poised to outnumber DL’s traditional clientele and thus dilute DL’s equity effects” (Valdés et al, 2016, p. 604). Similarly, in another study in Illinois, a state with relatively progressive policies about language, DL programs are mostly found in white, middle-class and English dominant communities leaving Spanish dominant lower socioeconomic communities to deal with old-fashioned subtractive models of bilingual education (Morales and Rao, 2015).

In some states, like North Carolina with a long history of bilingual education, DL education has been included in the broader, prestigious umbrella of World Language Education (WLE), a fancier term associated with the elite benefits of bilingualism as an additional benefit to ‘elite’ white families who would like to add to their education of their already privileged children. Cervantes-Soon (2014) argues that this categorization should be seen critically as it could represent an attempt to shift the focus away of all the burden of the past political conflict that bilingual education carries and the struggles for a more equitable education it represents, and ‘sanitize’ it into a more neutral and prestigious program more attractive to the powerful groups.

Teachers or other school officials involved with the program are also caught up in this vicious cycle because even if they want to advance equity and support the rights of minority students, they also feel the pressure to serve and prioritize the needs of the group that hired them (Cervantes-Soon, 2014). Trained local and Latinx bilingual educators with a cultural background on the additional language, lose their jobs to international teachers who come from European, more prestigious countries and appear more attractive to the dominant group but have little understanding of the complex racial US territory and its challenges and lack the ethnic background that connects them to minority populations (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017; Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Flores, 2016; Valdés, 2002 -in Soon). In a very strong and extreme critique, DL programs have also been characterized as the “Epcot Center of foreign language curriculum” for the majority students who can see foreign language in action with “live specimens” (Petrovic, 2005, p. 406 – in Cervantes-Soon).

Flores and Garcia (2017) while reviewing the history of bilingual education and the rights of immigrant and minority populations, in connection to their own personal experiences as language learners in different periods of time, criticized the functionality and purpose of dual-language programs in the form they have taken through the years and view it as a product of political orientations of each federal government. Their criticism lies between two extremes in the history of dual-language education; from segregated basement spaces where minority students would receive education in their mother tongue, separated from the majority students, sometimes in different isolated classrooms or basements of the schools, to the their ‘boutique’ form focused on “selling bilingualism to powerful consumers” (Flores and Garcia, 2017, p. 15). In their view, dual-language

programs, try to overcome social inequalities of the past by incorporating language-minority and majority students in the same classroom which also means mixing together their social and cultural backgrounds in an attempt to provide equal opportunities to all.

However, according to Flores and Garcia (2017) this mixing along and the move from “basements to boutiques” is a minimal effort towards a much larger and complicated social issue reflecting US society which views minoritized communities as second-class status. Dual-language programs will again fail to address issues of class and power characterizing US society, just like previous bilingual programs have failed to do that in the past, if society as a whole does not change their views towards minoritized populations. In fact, too much “emphasis on inclusion, cultural pluralism and linguistic tolerance” may indeed bring the opposite result and lead to “exclusion, cultural hegemony and linguistic intolerance” because DL programs (re)define the students’ cultural and social differences as resources and therefore highlight the historical exclusion of the past when they were considered anything but resources (Juárez, 2008, p. 234). Lastly, dual-language teachers, regardless of their good intentions and liberal beliefs, “can do little to challenge the vast inequities that exist between low-income Latinx students and their white middle-class counterparts in the broader society” if the overall racial structures and attitudes do not change to their core, not just within these language programs (Flores and Garcia, 2017, p. 16).

Another important point of criticism for dual-language programs is that they strictly separating languages during ‘English time’ and ‘Spanish time’ as the ‘correct’ form of promoting bilingualism. This view stems from the French immersion programs in Canada after which DL programs are modelled from (Flores and Garcia, 2017). However,

the sociopolitical context around language education in Canada and in the US is completely different and copying a program in a different country without taking into account other political parameters, could cause confusion. For Flores and Garcia (2017) there is a big difference between “*teaching children bilingually* and *teaching in two languages*” (emphasis in the original, p. 25); with the former allowing for the occurrence of dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging, or the future of bilingual education, whereas the latter goes back to more traditional and ‘stiff’ models of bilingual education (Garcia, 2009² in Flores and Garcia, 2017). Additionally, the strict separation of languages may at times be difficult for teachers to enact and may find it artificial since the reality of their students’ needs is different. But more importantly it can be misleading since it can promote monoglossic ideologies of bilingualism as being ‘pure’ only when it is not ‘mixed’, therefore not allowing space for translanguage practices which according to recent studies is the essence of bilingualism (Garcia, 2009; Garcia, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017).

Lastly, strict language separation has also been found to favor and support the ‘standard’ uses of language as form of correction, encouraging then the dichotomy and stigmatization of standard and non-standard forms of language. That is, Spanish-speaking students are (over) corrected according to ‘standard’ English language standards, while their white English-speaking counterparts are usually the ones to interrupt and correct rather being corrected, acknowledging then a type of white superiority (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017; Palmer, 2008).

By reviewing the literature that views dual-language programs from a critical stance, it becomes clear that there is a problematic side to this undoubtedly overall

enrichment model of bilingual education. Valdés et al (2016) argue that despite all the benefits DL programs, like other bilingual models of the past, “cannot escape asymmetrical power dimensions” (p. 621, Valdés, 1997). Asymmetry in this context, means lack of balance, fairness, social justice and equality in a bilingual education setting as opposed to symmetry which is the presence of all the above and the goals of DL programs (Amrein and Peña, 2000). Similarly, DL programs are no panacea and “any bilingual program that attempts to address linguistic issues without also addressing issues of status and power will not fully succeed to its mission” (Fitts, 2006, p. 340 in Juárez, 2008). This research study assumes that a level of asymmetry of some kind will be present in any DL program, including the focal newly launched DL program in Orchard Hill. Throughout the study and by examining the language ideologies circulated among school officials and parents about the program, I will identify and analyze any beliefs or attitudes concerning the themes of fairness and equality for all students.

In conclusion to this critical approach to dual-language education, the newer critiques from contemporary scholars, build on Valdés’ original critiques, into an updated version and according to today’s standards and social norms. Even if their criticism may vary at some points, what they all share in common is that they “decry the abandonment of equitable education for minoritized students and the increased focus on bilingualism for economic interests and global human capital” (Flores and Garcia, 2017, p. 26). In the next section, the problem statement of this study is presented as it emerges after the discussion of the background of the problem.

Statement of the problem

Language ideologies of a particular group of people within a society or a smaller community like a school or a language program, can reflect a larger sociopolitical context embedded in the different policies including language education, and shape how people think and act towards languages in general (Beth, 2017). Gort (2017) argues that “bilingual education and bilingualism cannot be understood in all their complexities without the role of language ideologies and politics” (p, 67). Lastly, ideologies about language not only carry sociopolitical power but in the context of US carry racial power as well. Since this study is focusing on issues of fairness and equity which are almost always connected with race, the lens of raciolinguistics ideologies introduced by Flores and Rosa (2015) will be mostly used when looking into the attitudes and beliefs of the participants.

Since language and raciolinguistic ideologies like all ideologies are social constructs, acknowledging them, detecting them, understanding and analyzing them can equip us with a powerful tool to use them effectively to transform social structures and bring social change. Language ideologies are a great analytical tool, a ‘weapon’ because they can both help detect a social problem by analyzing them and can also help circulate beliefs about social change and transformation by spreading them anew. In this case, if we understand how language ideologies are used implicitly or explicitly in order to discriminate students because of their language heritage, we can deconstruct them and turn them into a powerful force of change.

DL programs are inclusive, they integrate minority and majority students, but where is this integration and inclusion leading them and us? If mere integration and

inclusion happens without acknowledging and interpreting that certain language and raciolinguistic ideologies of discrimination exist, even on the subconscious level, then will we just continue walking into a path of continuous affirmation rather than transformation of social injustice in bilingual programs, schools or in society in general? (Juárez, 2008, Frazer, 1995 in Juárez).

This study will focus on exploring, collecting and analyzing the language ideologies of the members of a newly formed DL program in Western MA. Orchard Hill Elementary is one of the three public elementary schools in the suburban focal town which is located centrally near the town center. It is thought to serve neighborhoods which are considered more advantageous (MassLive, 2019). The 2016- 2017 school reports show a good deal of diversity both racial and socioeconomic among its students. The elementary school serves K-6 grades and it has a total of 335 enrolled students. Following a chronological itinerary as portrayed through the local media, school website records and the superintendent presentations, the opening of a dual-language program in the public-school system in this town, constitutes a groundbreaking event as bilingual education was nonexistent in the town in more than twenty years (Daily Hampshire Gazette, 2018; All News Press Release, 2019; Mass; The Massachusetts Daily Collegian, 2019).

A reason for this could be that the State was under the restrictive Question 2 policy that did not allow for the operation of bilingual programs, a law recently overturned by the passage of LOOK Act in 2017. Orchard Hill's DL program was introduced to the public as a proposed addition to the school's curriculum in Spring 2018 and was welcomed with enthusiasm by the community. In September 2019, it officially

opened its doors to the first students starting at the kindergarten level. Although there is not a clear association of the opening of the DL in 2019 with the passage of LOOK Act in late 2017, it is assumed that there is a connection to it. However, despite the bilingual ban of Question 2, certain bilingual enrichment programs like dual-language models, were allowed to operate given that the district provides proof that it is needed for the population of its schools (Gort, 2017). This study, will also seek to understand the reasons why such a program did not exist before 2019, given that it was allowed, and if there is an immediate connection with the passage of LOOK Act.

The study will focus on two groups of members of the community, the district administration and teachers and the families. On the district level, this study will include the principals, superintendent, ELL coordinator and teachers of a DL language program in its second year of operation in a small middle-class town in Western Massachusetts. These are the key people in the implementation and smooth operation of the DL program starting from policy and planning level (superintendent) to design level (principals, ELL coordinator and superintendent) to actually carrying out the curriculum in the classroom (teachers). Being aware of their individual language ideologies implicit or explicit, it will be easier to understand how these are enacted in a language program which primarily promotes equality for all. On the families' level, parents' ideologies will also be explored in order to understand the reasons behind their decision to enroll their children in this DL program and what expectations they have upon completion of it. Parental participation and involvement in school operations and communication of thoughts, attitudes and beliefs are an invaluable parameter to consider when exploring the dynamics of a school program.

Rationale and Significance of Study

The rationale for this study, can be split into three main reasons. First, although there is a vast array of studies on DL programs' effectiveness, academic achievement and promotion of bilingualism, there is limited research on exploration of ideologies related to issues of fairness and social equality; how the social dimension is circulated and talked about in the school domains (Amrein and Peña, 2000, Juárez, 2008, Hernandez, 2017). There is even less research on raciolinguistic ideologies with a minimal number of studies emerging only in the past few years. This study adds to the work related to the 'cautionary notes' of scholars in the field dealing with matters of race in equity-based programs like DL, by looking at the ideologies that are consciously or subconsciously communicated among members directly involved in it. Bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism are already considered three pillars of DL philosophy and goals and are practiced through the DL curriculum. What makes it distinct from similar previous studies is that it will focus on a "fourth pillar" of DL model philosophy, that of critical consciousness, which was only very recently proposed by Palmer et al (2019).

Second, the Western Massachusetts town where this program is implemented has not had any type of bilingual education program in its public-school district for many years, let alone a dual-language program. The only option of a two-way immersion model in the area is a Chinese immersion school founded in 2007 and located in a nearby town. However, this is a charter school and therefore is subject to different regulations from public education. The only similar public-school program is located in a town about 40 minutes away, founded in 2014, which implements Spanish and English languages as languages of instruction.

Part of the reason why such a program was not launched before 2019 is that Massachusetts was under Question 2 bill voted in 2002, which prohibited bilingual education in the State. This law was overturned by the passing of LOOK Act in 2017 which allowed for bilingual education again. However, even under the restrictive Question 2, there was a small window of opportunity for dual-language programs to exist under certain circumstances (Gort et al, 2008; DeJong et al, 2005). During Question 2 era, different districts made different decisions regarding the implementation of language programs for the state, adhering to the law guidelines (Gort et al, 2008). This study will seek to understand the implication of why the focal town did not use this window of opportunity to launch a DL program before as already mentioned. In other words, it will attempt to understand whether the opening of the new DL program has a connection with the passage of LOOK Act, or it is coincidental.

Third, after a long hiatus from bilingual education in the district, the focal DL is in its infancy, currently being in its second year of operation. Exploring a language program ideologically in its very initial stages is an excellent opportunity to investigate how it operates within the larger sociopolitical context, what goals it sets for the future, what changes it brings, what challenges and concerns it address and how it aligns with the social justice commitments the DL philosophy has.

Last but not least, the factor of the ongoing pandemic should also not be neglected. It was not expected and therefore not part of the planning and preparation of the program, but it has certainly affected all school operations including language programs. This fact alone, adds a level of novelty in the field and it changes interestingly the overall functionality and effectiveness of the program on multiple layers. An

exploration on how the district and the school in particular, are handling these new emerging issues around matters of social justice and equality are also new factors added to the significance of this study.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

Given the underlying goals of equity and inclusion in DL programs, as well as the critiques of the enactment of DL programs, the purpose of this study is to explore and analyze the language ideologies of school officials, teachers, administrators and parents immediately involved in a local newly launched DL program in a town in Western Massachusetts. The goal is to learn more about the participants' language ideologies, to provide an insight into issues of social justice and equality, and also touch upon notions of race, whiteness and language dominance within a DL program.

By thoroughly analyzing beliefs and attitudes towards the goals of cultural and linguistic pluralism and equal opportunities for all students that DL programs are committed to offer, I will learn more about participants ideas of being “critically aware or conscious” of these social issues and if they are, what actions they take to address them. The “fourth pillar” of critical consciousness as proposed by Palmer et al (2019) will be of center focus in detecting their participants understanding of the concept. In addition, I will explore and ‘measure’ the symmetry or asymmetry (Amrein and Peña, 2000) of social justice and equity principles that DL philosophy and theory is based on, as circulated through language ideologies. In other words, are the pluralism and inclusive philosophy of DL programs successfully delivered and communicated among its immediate stakeholders? What messages are sent, how are they interpreted and enacted and how are they spread though beliefs and attitudes?

There are three overarching research questions guiding this dissertation. They are viewed as the umbrella questions and sub questions. As the research progresses, more sub questions could be added. The research questions are as follows:

1. *What are the language ideologies of parents who have chosen this dual-language program for their children?*
2. *What are the language ideologies of the administrators, school officials and teachers who are involved in the creation and implementation of the dual-language program?*
 - a) *How are these reflected in the structure of the program?*
3. *Do families and administrators see critical consciousness as an integral part of the DL program?*
 - b) *How does this manifest in their engagement in the program? For families, in their choice of schooling? For administrators, in the programming and implementation of curricular practices?*

Researcher Positionality

In any type of research, but particularly in qualitative studies dealing with social theories and issues like this one, the guiding light of the study as well as the interpretation of the findings are necessarily and unavoidably shaped by the researcher's positionality and personal stance. In Valdés et al (2016) words, "research bias does not come from having a position, but rather from not acknowledging one" (p. 608). In addition, any researcher involved in critical studies, including critical language policy, should also include a "self-reflective examination of their relationship with the 'Others' who are the focus of research" especially in studies in social justice and power relations, when a level

of criticality is necessary in order to raise awareness (Johnson, 2016, p. 107). Having said that, I intent to approach participants and this study as openly as possible but being alerted to observe and report findings that raise concerns with regards to issues of equality and fairness around the goals and implementation of the DL program and the language or raciolinguistic ideologies surrounding it.

This duality of my positionality, listening and at the same time approaching the issue critically, stems from my own language and social background which ultimately had led to the formation of my identity as a person and as an educational researcher. First, in terms of my linguistic approach or positionality, I am not a Spanish speaker which is the target language in this program, but I am a (becoming) bilingual speaker in Greek and English, raising two bilingual children in the US. Greek language, however, is one among many, languages in the US that does not carry the stigma or the historical burden that Spanish language carries and therefore, I as a bilingual speaker have never experienced any type of inequality in my social interactions. In other words, I do not have an English privilege, but I also do not have an ELL stigma. I have not participated in a DL or other sort of bilingual education program, but I have received foreign language education in more than two languages as a child, teenager and adult in Greece, the United Kingdom and Finland.

Second, in terms of social status approach, I have never experienced poverty, I identify as a white middle class international individual who has moved to the United States as an adult who raises a family in a middle class neighborhood in what could be considered an affluent academic town in Western Massachusetts. Never in my life have I experienced any kind of social, racial, or wealth discrimination. Third, in terms of my

professional positionality, I have taught English as a foreign language to young children, teenagers and adults in Greece and the UK but I have not taught English as a foreign language in the US. Lastly, although my profession was a language teacher, I have not worked in a bilingual education program before.

I believe, that the joint positionalities that compose my identity as an individual, make me aware of my privileges and allow me to commit to this work being aware and conscious of my potential biases. As a researcher, the more I delved into the literature of bilingual education in this country and since I have always been concerned with issues of social justice, equity and politics, I have developed my very own language ideologies. Since I cannot avoid them, I acknowledge I have them, and by receiving feedback from others I will also be able to better understand the areas I cannot clearly see.

Theoretical Framework

This study is framed within the (critical) policy and planning principals while language ideologies will be used as a conceptual framework, as additional lenses throughout. Underlying these frameworks is a social justice framework, guided by the belief that education should be fair and provide equal opportunities to all. Using the policy lenses in research “helps us better understand and explain what is at stake in controversies involving language concerns” about the concepts of equality and inequality (Ricento, 2006, p. 7). Since this study will focus on revealing issues surrounding equality notions emerging from participants’ language ideologies, this lens could provide better insight.

Also, regarding the ‘critical’ component of the framework, Tollefson (2002) argues that researchers in studies involved with the implementation of language policies,

should “develop the ability to critically “read” language policies” and understand how these policies are enacted as being “the natural condition of social systems” (emphasis in the original, p. 4). In addition, a critical perspective explores how language policies could have an effect on the “lives of individuals and groups who often have little influence over the policymaking process” for example in the case of a language policy as implemented in a school language program and the people directly involved in it such as administrators and parents (Tollefson, 2002, p. 4). Lastly, Tollefson (2002) also agrees with Ricento (2006) that a policy lens, let alone a critical policy one looks more into the links between language policies and any type of inequalities, involving class, region, and/or ethnicity/nationality.

As far as the language ideologies conceptual framework is concerned, this study explores language policies within a larger theoretical context by examining participants beliefs in “social contexts that inform policy” like that of Orchard Hill Elementary (Chang-Bacon, 2020, p. 3; Young and Diem, 2017 in Bacon). Chang-Bacon (2020) notes that research related with the implementation of language policies also examines how these policies are interpreted by individual actors or groups, such as the administrators, teachers and parents directly involved with the DL program. By interpreting and analyzing the key participants’ or “policy agents” language ideologies, we can highlight the ways that the policies are “put into action” (Johnson, 2011, p. 269) and understand how the participants’ ideas work both “*with and against*” policies in certain contexts (Chang-Bacon, 2020, p. 5, italics in the original). Lastly, Chang-Bacon (2020) stresses the importance of the role of district policy, administration, and teachers’ ideological stances, as they are key to the enactment of policies in language education.

The field of Language Policy and Planning (LPP) had received significant attention in the 90s', but it was criticized of focusing mostly on linguistic details of the planning of curriculum and needed a 'social push', a link to social theories in order to move forward and contribute to social change (Cooper, 1989, in Hornberger, frameworks (2006). That link to social studies can be explained through the work of scholars who view language as a social action where speakers of a language are social actors who "enact social roles as well as relations of power and control"; thus shedding light on the ideological aspects that are reproduced through linguistics practices rather than focusing on the linguistic forms themselves (Wei and Moyer, 2008, p. 21).

Throughout this study, language is viewed as a form of social point of view and LPP as an essential parameter and factor for social change. Garcia (2009) explicitly argues that "language is truly a social notion that cannot be defined without its reference to its speakers and the context in which it is used" (p. 25). Thus, language here, is not just seen as a tool for effective linguistic communication but a way to ideologize social and political structures one of which being education and particularly language education (Beth, 2017). Politics, therefore, are inseparable from any discussion of something so central to human society as language (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996).

Johnson (2010), (citing Foucault (1972, 1976, 1982)), states that critical language policy stems from social theory and everyday discourses among people; therefore, language policies reflect in a way discourses groups of people have about education in general and language education in particular. Language policy reflects different social relationships in different contexts (Warhol and Mayer, 2012). In order to show their similar but also distinct nature of language policy and planning (LPP) and language

ideologies, I will provide frameworks for both of them, always keeping their intertwining conceptual connection as a standpoint for my overall line of argument. Starting with some key references to language policy and planning, I will refer to Ruiz's (1984) orientations in language planning ending with a framework of language ideologies as constructors of power and creators of policies.

Language Policy and Planning (LPP)

LPP activities existed long before language policy and language planning made their appearance as a distinct area of inquiry; however, the terms *language policy* and *language planning* emerged in the 1960s, leading to what later has been renamed to LPP research (Tollefson and Pérez Millans, 2018). The field of language policy and planning has received a significant attention in the last 40 years due to its interdisciplinary nature. Researchers from various academic fields including linguistics, education, policy studies, political science, law, history and sociology entered the field from a different standpoint contributing to its development and scope of inquiry (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996). It is also multilayered, as it involves agents from different areas of work in order to be fulfilled, including policy makers, language planners, school administrators and language teachers (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996). LPP was not always considered as a unified, integrated, field. It first took the shape of language planning as part of sociolinguistic studies and got expanded as a field through the studies of a Norwegian linguist Einar Haugen (Lo Bianco, 2010). Although as a field it dealt greatly with the national language planning for education, it was criticized as being problematic in many areas (Lo Bianco, 2010), being overly descriptive and linguistic in nature, too positivistic and technocratic, too linear and straightforward and lacking the sociopolitical context in which languages

are planned in different parts of the world (Ricento, 2000; Johnson, 2009; Johnson, 2016). In other words, it lacked the political and ideological aspects that are essential when planning a language or a bilingual education program where the focus should be society as a whole and not just individual decisions about a language curriculum to be taught.

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, in spite of the common belief, the United States has never had an official language and the lack of it has resulted in “constant debates and changes over public use of language and language rights” (Warhol and Mayer, 2012). As a result, various language ideologies have existed over time, changing according to current historical events and lacking consistency and stability (Ovando, 2003). This inconsistency of a unified set of language ideologies in their turn created an imbalance and lack of a unified national language policy and the emergence of symbolic politics of language affecting various language groups in terms of language pedagogy (Crawford, 2004; Ovando, 2003; Warhol and Mayer, 2012). Beth (2017) argues that “although policies may be designed with the stated goal of addressing inequities in educational opportunity for linguistically marginalized students, the form they take may contain hidden biases and work against that goal” (p.233) and ‘police’ language by creating a legitimate way of social discrimination.

The most popular and widely cited definition for language planning was developed by Cooper who argued that “language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure or functional allocation of their language codes” (Cooper, 1989, p. 45; Goundar, 2017). Although language policy and planning are considered as a unit in the past years, it was sometimes

considered in the past that planning was following policy as its byproduct (Tollefson and Pérez Millans, 2018). No matter if language planning precedes or follows language policy, they both need each other in order to be successful in social settings and more particularly in language classrooms (Cooper, 1989).

In 1994, Hornberger proposed an integrative framework on LPP which identified two language planning approaches, policy planning (on form) and cultivation planning (on function) and three types – status, acquisition and corpus planning (Hornberger, 1994; Ricento and Hornberger, 1996). She argued that an integrated LLP designation is more useful because it reminds us how “inextricably connected language planning and language policy are” with the one subsuming or needing the other in order to achieve social change (Hornberger, 2006, p. 25); language planning precedes and sets the foundations for social reform but it is only with the use of a relevant language policy that it can be put into action. Therefore, a unified framework offers a better understanding of the complexities of policy and planning and offers and how these contribute to social reform.

Although, the integrated framework of LLP was widely used, scholars, including Hornberger herself noted that it was “neutral with regards to political direction” (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996, p. 405) and she proposed anew an edited form of it in conjunction with Ruiz’s (1984) orientations in languages planning which supplied the necessary critical tone missing from her framework. This way LLP was able to “provide at least, richer descriptions of how language functions within broader sociocultural contexts and why particular policies may help to maintain the status quo with its attendant structural social inequalities (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996, p. 408).

Language policies of the past usually lacked the necessary criticality to address issues of political and ideological nature and they were characterized as mostly positivist and individualistic rather than focusing on the more social and vast political forces and they needed the necessary addition of p (Johnson, 2009; Johnson, 2017). The first ‘critical’ characterization of LPP was first stressed by Ruiz’s (1984) famous and groundbreaking article *Orientations in language planning* as briefly discussed previously, in which he identified three major approaches policy makers adhere to when they create policies about language. Ruiz (1984) defined these three basic perspectives as “*a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society*” (p. 16, emphasis in original). Gort (2017) notes that any person involved in language planning (policy makers) or the implementation of a language policy in schools (teachers and administrators) they may consciously or unconsciously embed these ideological perspectives in their practices.

The ***language as a problem*** orientation focuses on transition and assimilation to mainstream language and society and views multilingualism as a negative aspect, as a problem in need of ‘fixing’ in order to achieve social and political cohesion. English-Only policies and transitional bilingual education programs (TBE), English as a second language (ESL) belong to this category with ESL prevailing in the United States for many years. The ***language as right*** orientation focuses on the maintenance of heritage language and identity stemming from the affirmation of Civil rights. It emerged in the 1960-1970’s and viewed linguistic right as a human right that bears no discrimination. Bilingual education programs like language revitalization for indigenous languages or programs aiming to provide equal opportunities, fall under this orientation. Lastly, **the**

language as resource orientation focuses on language development, enrichment, cultural democracy, pluralism and social autonomy. This orientation shifts the view from language as a problem to language as an asset, a privilege and multilingualism as a benefit for social national and international diplomacy and mobility. Dual-language or immersion programs are developed within this orientation (Ruiz, 1984; Gort et. al, 2008; Warhol and Mayer, 2012, Gort, 2017).

In accordance with and influenced by Ruiz's orientations, Garcia (2009) makes a more general statement about the idea of bilingualism as expressed through education offering some food for thought for educators, policy makers, parents and learners. She states that: "bilingualism is considered a *problem* when educating powerless minority children in isolation", "a *privilege for enrichment* when educating the elite", "a *right* when educating language-minority students" and a *recourse* when "educating students in integrated and mixed classrooms" with equally language minority and majority students, and when "educating bilingually *all* students in a given region or state" (Garcia, 2009, p. 122).

Tollefson (1991) with his seminal piece *Planning language, planning inequality*, showed that language policies work promoting some preferred languages while at the same time they marginalize others and cause inequality. It is only through understanding the relationships among language, power and inequality that we would be truly able to understand how language performs and acts within the society (Tollefson, 1991). Similar to this work, Ovando (2003) argues that although the United States has a long history of immigration and language diversity, "European languages were more likely than others to be treated with respect and their speakers to be accommodated in schooling and

government services” (p. 2). It was this particular monograph that according to Johnson (2017) “formed conceptualization of what the ‘critical’ in critical language policy research might look like” (p. 106).

Ricento (2000), takes a chronological approach, where he identifies three different chronological periods or phases in language policy and planning through time, roughly lasting two decades each. These periods reflect and are typified by sociopolitical events through which LPP research emerged and was conducted (Hornberger, 2006). The first period is located in the 1960-1970’s and is known as the classic language planning phase. It constitutes the early work in the field, with the classic approach to language planning, viewed primarily from a linguistic point of view and focuses on morphology, grammar and syntax of the language lessons to be planned. The second, also known as the intermediary phase questions previous frameworks (Johnson, 2016). This period takes place in the 1970-1980’s where the previous frameworks failed and new, more sociocultural focused ones emerge paving the way for social change. The first two periods were characterized as being overly optimistic and ideologically neutral with an “evolving awareness of the potential negative effects” that current language policies could have (Hornberger, 2006, p. 27). The third and most recent period which he calls “New world order” takes place in the 1980-present and promotes more critical approaches and takes ideologies, and issues of power and inequality into account and is highly sociopolitical in nature (Ricento, 2000; Johnson, 2016; Goundar, 2017). In this study, I will focus on Ricento’s third phase of LPP to take a more critical stance in exploring language ideologies related to the recent opening of the dual-language program at Orchard Hill Elementary.

Language Ideologies as additional conceptual framework

Language ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979, p.193). These sets of beliefs are formed, structured, reinforced and developed through the use of language and therefore construe a new ‘version of the world’ (Hodge and Kress, 1993, p. 9; Martinez – Roldan & Malave, 2004). All ideologies including language ones, are rooted in a person’s social position, history and experience and operate as internal values and personal attitudes (Tollefson, 2007; Gort, 2017). Ideologies about language are not necessarily conscious, planned or deliberate but they can be implicit; they can be the habitual choices of people referring to a particular linguistic and cultural context (Woolard, 2008; Shi, 2015) and can be explicitly stated and/or revealed in practice (Kroskrity, 2004). When they are linked to language policies they inevitably carry ideas of power, they are a social construct can therefore be rooted in a person’s social position consciously or unconsciously and ultimately affect how people are valued and treated in different speech communities (Woolard, 1998; Palmer, 2011; Gallo et al, 2014).

Ruiz’s (1984) greatly influential work on LPP orientations not only offered a critical approach to LPP but also foregrounded a growing interest in language ideologies among scholars with an increased attention to studies about people’s attitudes and beliefs about language in connection with race and culture (Hornberger, 2006). It became more obvious that language ideologies are interchangeably connected with research about language policy, and language programs based on these policies because they also refer to social groups who share some beliefs and attitudes (positive or negative) about them usually in the same sociopolitical context. “Understanding ways policy approaches to

language are grounded in ideologies about language means being attentive to how cultural conceptions of language create a particular social order” (Beth, 2017, p. 233) that may or may not discriminate particular linguistic groups over others.

The cultural perspective or ‘cultural responsiveness’ in connection to bilingual education is important because it not only affects the formation of appropriate pedagogies, but it is also part of the political struggle against linguistic discrimination (Valdiviezo & Nieto, 2017). But because of the sociopolitical power bilingual education has in addition to just being a pedagogical tool, it is essential to view it as a complex system which requires the coexistence of the significant notions of language ideologies, culture and society, individual and group identification, social class and status, language politics and of course language use (Ovando, 2003; Warhol and Mayer, 2012).

With regards to dual language programs in particular, as research has shown, not equal weight is attributed to both languages, favoring usually the dominant one which is also the preferred for use in and out of classroom contexts (Warhol and Mayer, 2012). Ovando (2003) also shares the same view within a much stronger argument claiming that “such antipathy toward strong forms of bilingual education, is rooted in nativistic and melting pot ideologies that tend to demonize the ‘other’” (p.14). The role of language ideologies in language policy research is crucial and understanding how these are implemented into educational contexts such as Orchard Hill’s DLP can demonstrate the ways that the program serves the purposes of equity and language growth.

Summary

This chapter offers an introduction to the theme and scope of this dissertation revolving around language ideologies of stakeholders and parents in a newly launched

suburban elementary dual language program in Western Massachusetts. By briefly reviewing the relevant literature on the benefits of dual-language programs and including issues and critiques raised around the not so obvious drawbacks, I set the context in which this research study will take place. By acknowledging that bilingual education has a long tradition in the nation which is mostly notoriously associated with issues of race and language dominance, even in the most promising models like DL programs, this research study will try to offer a response to a number of critical points raised through the past years. By utilizing the LPP lens, the exploration and interpretation of the language ideologies of the participants will be analyzed and discussed to reveal whether there is ‘symmetry or asymmetry’ related to issues of social justice in the focal dual-language program. In Chapter 2, a more extensive review of the literature is offered, including a chronological exploration of bilingual education policies and ideologies and how they changed through the years shaping today’s language education picture.

CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

A Detailed Overview of Bilingual Education History and Memorable Language Policies in the United States

Introduction

The long history of colonization and immigration in the United States brought significant changes in the sociopolitical climate of those times and over the years. One of the social fields affected was schooling and more specifically language education due to the large numbers of immigrants and foreign populations. Often times, bilingual education history goes hand in hand with the history of immigration in US as it is heavily affected by policies targeted to immigrant populations (Padilla, 1990; Garcia, 2009). Those in favor of bilingual education were usually the immigrants themselves who valued this education because it connected them to their heritage and was a form of breaking away from the Americanism (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990). Those who were against it, saw it as an “unnecessary coddling and spoiling of new immigrants, eroding the strength of the English language-an important symbol of American unity” (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990, p. 27). Bilingual education has historical roots as early as the beginning of the 19th century in communities all over the United States (Bybee et al, 2014). Schools have, “often become the battleground for larger societal struggles, particularly in a rapidly changing United States, where what it means to be American is being redefined by a large influx of new immigrants”, bilingual education has become highly politicized (Menken and Solorza, 2014, p. 105).

While there is a belief that bilingual education leads to biliteracy and bilingualism, in the context of US, the goal has been to use students’ native languages to

teach English to immigrants and therefore the vast majority of the bilingual education of the past has focused on that (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). In the rest of the world bilingualism has been a sign of the educated and cosmopolitan elite, in the history of the United States, it has been viewed for centuries as a sign of weakness and lower socioeconomic status, and a reason for being marginalized (Padilla, 1990; Krashen, 1999).

It has been accepted by the overwhelming majority of scholars in the field of Language Policy that any discussion of bilingual education programs should be framed within a broader sociopolitical and educational context (Bybee et al, 2014; Mora et al, 2001). Consequently, language policies of different periods of time should also be studied and discussed alongside bilingual education as they reflect decisions made by different federal governments reflecting wider ideologies and attitudes on critical issues of each time. These ideologies include language, immigration, culture and diversity. Therefore, any related research can be considered as a powerful magnifying glass and analysis tool on potential issues of power and marginalization in educational contexts (Menken and Solorza, 2014). Leibowitz (2015) said that, “language or second language, is not a tool that can oppress or liberate us; it is not a tool that can enrich or impoverish us. Rather, it is, the medium which we liberate or oppress, or enrich or impoverish each other” (p.47).

In the following section, I will take a deep dive into the history of bilingual education in the US grounds, reviewing and discussing the ways in which the languages of the minorities and immigrant populations have shaped the political battlefield through the years and served as a tool for oppressing or liberating people in an everlasting changing mode according to each government. In this dissertation, I will divide the

chronological periods of bilingual education history into two large categories of the *Past* (from 1700s – 1990s) and *Present* following Garcia's (2009) broad categorization, in alliance with the work of Ovando (2003) who breaks down these two categories into four smaller periods of time: a) the *Permissive Period* (1700s-1880s), b) the *Restrictive Period* (1880s-1960s), c) the *Opportunist Period* (1960s-1980s), and d) the *Dismissive Period* (1980s-Present). During each period, the most important language policies and events which shaped the ideological and sociopolitical structure of bilingual education in the nation will be discussed, leading to the current situation and contemporary bilingual programs.

The Past

The Permissive period (1700's-1800's)

Long before the big wave of European immigration which brought along new populations, their languages, cultures, religions and ideologies, 250-1000 Indigenous languages were spoken in the land that is currently the U.S. (Ovando, 2003). Adding to this, the varieties of Spanish language coming from Mexico and Central and South America along with the African languages of the slaves, the linguistic diversity of America was rich and complex from early on (Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009). European colonizers also left their stigma with German language prevailing central US, especially in Pennsylvania; Benjamin Franklin was quoted to say in 1751 that the State “in a few years would become a German colony” (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016, p. 2). Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska and Colorado were other German speaking states, Scandinavian languages were met in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, North

and South Dakota, Nebraska and Washington, Dutch in Michigan, Polish and Italian in Wisconsin, Czech in Texas, French in Louisiana and Spanish in the Southwest (Ovando, 2003). In the first ever census in 1790 (excluding African and Native American slaves), 25% of the population spoke a language other than English (Garcia, 2009).

Most states with populations speaking a LOTE (Language Other Than English) provided some sort of non-English instruction in their schools and with some using exclusively the communities' home language as the medium of instruction and some states even passed laws that authorized bilingual education (Garcia, 2009; Ovando, 2003). Local districts and towns had the liberty to tax parents the tuition to fund and support local language schools, teachers were recruited from the community and the school language was also the language of the community (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990). By the 1800s, German bilingual schools flourished especially in the Midwest (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016) and other languages followed shortly after.

This period is characterized by a fair amount of tolerance towards linguistic diversity and LOTEs were also considered and used for trading, scouting, teaching, religion and diplomacy in order to serve economic and territorial expansion goals (Garcia, 2009). However, not all languages were treated with the same amount of tolerance. When European languages, especially German and French, were usually more accepted, respected and tolerated as a financial tool for growth, Native American languages were considered barbaric and in need of 'Americanization' and 'civilization' (Ovando, 2003). Following their genocide in the 1860s, their population decreased from about 2 million to 250,000 Native Americans, with their languages disappearing as well (Garcia, 2009). The 1867 Congress decided that the differences in their languages

constituted 2/3 of the problem, and therefore should be contained and restrained from schooling (Garcia, 2009). Enslaved African languages that prevailed the country after the end of Civil War in 1865 were also excluded from schooling but were still spoken in communities (Garcia, 2009).

Spanish language had also an unequal treatment in different locations of the country and was going through many ups and downs according to different local regulations. Most Spanish-speaking populations were found in the Southwest and California. In 1850 when California was declared a State, all laws and regulations were to be published both in English and Spanish and schools could use both languages. However, five years later in 1855, English was declared as the only language of instruction in schools and law (Garcia, 2009). Although the elite Spanish-teaching tradition focused on the reading of the literature of Spain and was established in universities and advanced studies, there was not the same attitude towards the speaking of Spanish by Mexicans or people from Latin American (Garcia, 2009). Garcia (2009) mentions that there was an ideology of ‘voluntary’ and ‘involuntary’ minorities at that time and overall, Spanish language had “a much more difficult time gaining acceptance than German did” (p. 163).

Ovando (2003) argues that the tolerant or dismissive attitude could also be interpreted as “benign neglect” keeping in mind that “19th century education was not set up to actively promote bilingualism. Rather, a policy of linguistic assimilation without coercion seemed to prevail” (p. 4). The potential for controversy over language policy was present from the early stages, it was just in a *benign* condition which was triggered in

the next period as a result of xenophobia towards the new immigration wave as described in the next chronological period or the Restrictive Period (Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009).

The Restrictive Period (1880's-1960's)

In the 1880s, several bilingual education programs had spread around US in an attempt to provide their foreign populations with meaningful school instruction in their home language. Despite all the rich linguistic and cultural environment, U.S. founders always envisioned a country with a unified history, traditions and language (Ovando, 2003) and soon the overall tolerance turned into restriction. By 1870, the country was hit by an economic recession and policies favoring immigrants, including language policies, were overturned (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016).

Between 1890-1930 about 16 million immigrants mostly European immigrants entered the United States with Germans comprising the 15% of all immigrants, followed by Irish and northern Europeans and later Eastern and Southern Europeans to follow, whereas in Western America, Chinese and Japanese immigration continued until it was excluded in 1882 and repealed after many decades in 1943 following the 1924 Immigration Act which barred all non-white immigration except for those of African descent (Garcia, 2009). In the late 19th century the appearance of the 'Common School' or public school and compulsory education flourished with the main purpose to 'Americanize' "new immigrants" into their new life promoting therefore an assimilation ideology (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990 p. 28; Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014). The new "common language of instruction" was seen as a way to "represent American society and provide a measure of assimilation" (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990 p. 29). At the same time, missionary schools appeared in an attempt to civilize the "old immigrants" (Malakoff and

Hakuta, 1990 p. 28) and the overall fear of new incoming European ideologies, cultures and languages (xenophobia) led to the nationwide establishment of English-Only assimilationist ideologies and regulations, in order to control the massive immigration populations and assimilate them into a unified cultural and linguistic mold (Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014).

The new Naturalization Act of 1906 required that all new naturalized Americans must be able to speak English spreading even more the English-Only restrictions with the Bureau of Naturalization sponsoring bill and federal funds to States for the teaching of English in public schools (Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009, Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). By 1923, 34 states had dictated exclusively English-Only instruction in all public and private schools (Kloss, 1977/1998; Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). The end of World War I caused a general anti-German hostility that pushed US more towards a monolingual assimilationist ideology and English-Only laws, with the majority of English-German schools shutting down and ultimately bilingual education being completely abandoned (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009; Bybee et al, 2014; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016).

Meyer vs. Nebraska

The English-Only instruction in 1920's in all schools were the onset of the notorious sink-or-swim method, also known as submersion, that schools enacted to assimilate their students. The overall public belief was that it was up to the students, not the schools, if they failed to become literate in English and succeed academically and blame students for their own failure (Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014). In 1923, a Nebraska parochial teacher was convicted for teaching reading in German to a ten-year

old child (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Tollefson, 2002) leading the case to the Supreme Court, known as the *Meyer vs. Nebraska* case. Although the local Nebraska regulations prohibited the teaching of any subject in a language other than English, the Supreme Court's decision was in favor of the teacher declaring that Nebraska's prohibition was unconstitutional on the basis of the 14th Amendment protecting the Civil Rights of American citizens (Tollefson, 2002; Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). This is a very significant court case in the history of US bilingual education because it "asserted the rights of language minority communities to protection under the constitution" (Garcia, 2009, p. 166). Following *Meyer vs. Nebraska's* court decision the English-Only "instruction laws were either repealed or ignored" and although it was a win over the state's power to impose laws, it also established the ideology that the "United States is an English-speaking country" and schools can require the use of English language (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990, p. 30).

Brown vs. Board of Education

The 1930s economic depression and the end of the massive immigration to the country, the end of World War II which created negative feelings targeted now towards Japanese and Chinese Americans and the segregation of Mexican Americans into 'Mexican schools' or 'Mexican rooms' in the southwest, brought further attacks to bilingual education by spreading English-Only ideologies to a greater extent (Garcia, 2009; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016, p. 3). However, in 1954 another Supreme Court decision known as *Brown vs. Board of Education* declared the segregation of schools as unconstitutional, paving the way to a new era of the declaration of Civil Rights in the following decade (Garcia, 2009).

The Cuban Revolution and Coral Way Elementary

Another ray of hope and liberation of bilingual education appeared also with the initiation of the Cuban Revolution in 1959, when Cuban refugees moved to Florida awaiting the Revolution to come to an end so they could return home. In the meantime and in anticipation of their return, Cuban parents did not want their kids to be deprived of their language and culture and with the help of federal aid, well trained teachers and parental support, as well as “low level of racism toward these predominantly light-skinned Cubans”, the first Dual-Language program was established in the Coral Way Elementary School in 1963 (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003, p. 7; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). It was the first program which incorporated Spanish dominant students with English speaking students in the same classrooms and the success of the program was so big, that it quickly started spreading locally and nationwide first using Spanish and English as languages of instruction, but then more languages started to appear (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990) The launch of Coral Way’s bilingual program was considered as the stepping stone for the rebirth of bilingual education in the US bringing along new liberties in language education in the new Opportunist Period starting in the 1960s.

The Opportunist Period (1960’s – 1980’s)

Some scholars split the history of bilingual education into the pre-World War I era and the post- 1960 era which for many indicate the rebirth of bilingual education after several years of restrictions where minority language students left to sink-or-swim in the mainstream classrooms (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Hakuta, 1986; Ovando, 2003). Along with the success of the Coral Way Elementary program came the launch of

Sputnik by the former Soviet Union in 1957 which proved that apart from math and science, languages were essential to compete with them in space (Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009). The National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958 raising the awareness, the status and level of foreign languages in the United States and form a more positive national ideology towards languages other than English by awarding generous fellowships and grants to promising foreign language teachers (Ovando, 2003). However, it was not until the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the following Bilingual Education Act in 1968 that the linguistic diversity started to widely be accepted and recognized, shaping thus a new reality for bilingual education programs to flourish. Both Acts constitute one of the most important milestones in the modern history of Bilingual Education in the United states and will be discussed briefly below along with other important events of this brief but crucial period in the history of bilingual education.

The Civil Rights Act (Title VI) and The Bilingual Education Act (Title VII)

In 1964, the Civil Rights Act or Title VI was passed by the Congress following the global Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, which prohibited any type of discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin (Garcia, 2009). From this Act, the Bilingual Education Act or Title II was developed four year later, rewriting the history of bilingual education. The difference between the two Acts was that the former “provided the enforcement mechanism through which the courts could order that limited-English-proficient students be served” and the latter “established the federal role in bilingual education and allocated funds for innovative programs” (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990, p. 31). It has been argued that President’s Lyndon B. Johnson personal story as a

young man receiving instruction in Spanish and English and his overt support of minority populations especially Hispanics, played a significant role in the passing of this particular policy (Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014).

The Bilingual Education Act (BEA) acknowledged the specific needs of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016) and allowed districts and individual schools to apply for grants to try on experimental bilingual education programs that fit the needs of their students (Palmer et al, 2017). The BEA was originally passed in 1964 in support of the poor Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students to help them achieve academically but when it was reauthorized in 1974, the eligibility expanded to students of all socioeconomic status who had limited English-speaking ability (LESA) (Garcia, 2009). It was the first time that federal government money would be distributed for pilot bilingual programs that focused on the students' home cultures and languages and address their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds as a means to boost their proficiency in English and also foster bilingual education research in general (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016).

Guided by good will, the Bilingual Education Act managed to open new spaces for bilingual programs to emerge, and experiment upon. However, it was criticized as not being explicit and clear, but rather ambiguous in the specific methods that should be used in order for bilingual programs to be successful (Ovando, 2003). It was also considered controversial as its goals were not clearly stated with regards to what the purpose of the emerging bilingual programs would be; the teaching of two languages to promote bilingualism/biliteracy or to transition students into English more smoothly and as soon as possible? (Crawford, 2004; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016).

Nevertheless, the BEA, even with its flaws, managed to move bilingual education away from the non-effective and meaningless sink-or-swim models of the past and reach a more meaningful and significant future for bilingual education. The BEA was and still is an important piece of legislation which became part of the federal educational policy and as Malakoff and Hakuta (1990) state that *equal education* is different from *identical education* and all students regardless of the linguistic or cultural backgrounds should have the same equal opportunities in learning, thus opening space towards a more pluralist educational reality (italics in the original, p. 32).

Lau Vs. Nichols

The next critical or landmark event of the rebirth period of bilingual education was the Supreme Court case *Lau vs. Nichols* which took BEA a step further. In 1974, a group of Chinese American parents in San Francisco turned to the courts in an attempt to find justice for their 1,800 children with the claim of not receiving equitable education in the public-school system. More specifically, the class action suits made by the parents, alleged discrimination on the grounds that their children could not succeed academically because the classroom instruction did not accommodate their language difference needs and therefore it was incomprehensible (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). All justices decided that equal treatment of the students by providing them with “the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum” did not constitute equal educational opportunity because “for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education” and “are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful” (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974, cited in Ovando, 2003, p. 9). Therefore, it was concluded that the

school district had violated the Civil Rights of the students according to the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) and there was the “*effect* of discrimination, although there was no *intent*” (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990, p. 34).

The *Lau* decision paved the way for a development in bilingual education and was a proof of the abolishment of the sink-or-swim practices of the past as it legitimized the right for all LEP students to equal educational opportunities and lifted people’s awareness on the need for bilingual education in schools (Teitelbaum and Hiller, 1977 in Ovando; Ovando, 2003). The Court however did not prescribe any particular guidelines on how to address the issue in practice nor it suggested any particular methodology or curriculum in order to restore the students’ rights (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). As one of the justices was quoted, the numbers were at the “heart of this case”, which could have been interpreted that maybe the decision would have been different if the number of students involved was less (Justice Blackman in Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990, p. 34). Nonetheless, the *Lau* decision is framed in history as an attempt to protect the rights of individual speakers’ of LOTE and this fact alone was an important milestone that led to more promising legislation that followed shortly after.

The Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) and the *Lau* Remedies

A few weeks after the *Lau* decision, the Congress passed the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) which extended the decision to all public school districts and not just those receiving federal funds and urged all schools to “take appropriate actions to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs” (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1703 in Ovando, 2003, p. 10). Based on the EEOA, the Office of Civil Rights issued the *Lau* Remedies in 1975 which presented

detailed guidelines on what actions should be taken by schools to cover the needs of their language learners. The Remedies suggested that a form of bilingual education program should be implemented in any school with at least 20 English Language Learners (ELLs), identify and evaluate the learners' learning needs and formulated a strong form of bilingual education program (usually transitional models), hire professional bilingual teachers and use the students' home language to enable them to become bilingual, biliterate and bicultural (Crawford, 2004; Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003). Schools would have to prove that were in compliance with the Remedies and would have to provide proof of having an appropriate bilingual education active, otherwise they would lose any of their federal funds (Crawford, 2004; Ovando, 2003). The *Lau* Remedies was the initiation of a spree in the development of different bilingual education programs for the schools to choose according to their student population's needs. Below, it's a brief presentation of the main bilingual education programs that prevailed at that time.

Bilingual Education Models

Following the passage of Bilingual Education Act in 1968 a number of states started to permit or mandate bilingual education programs in their schools (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990). The main types or models of bilingual education until the emergence of dual-language programs, fall in one of the six categories as described below. With the exception of the Coral Way Elementary school in Florida which established the first two-way enrichment model (or dual language), the majority of the programs offered in these two decades followed different bilingual models. The differences among the types lied on the amount of years a student would spend on a program, the amount of English used in

the classroom, the focus on culture and heritage and more (Ovando, 2003). The main models or types were the following as adapted from Malakoff and Hakuta (1990), Ovando (2003) and Garcia (2009).

It is important to mention here is that although they are called bilingual in name, in practice only three of them are truly bilingual, meaning their goal is bilingualism; the other three are monolingual in nature as their goal is to use the second language as a stepping stone in order to master the first which is English (Garcia, 2009). Also, of the six types, the first four have are designed to help students transition from their home language to English; in other words, “they take monolinguals and produce monolinguals” and in this way they are considered subtractive (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990, p. 39). Only the developmental or maintenance programs, and the immersion programs have bilingualism and biculturalism as their end goal and help students maintain proficiency in two languages and therefore are considered additive (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990; Garcia, 2009). In what follows, I will classify the types according to Garcia’s (2009) monolingual/bilingual dichotomy.

Monolingual Education Programs

Submersion (Sink-or-swim)

This is the model where there is an absence of any special program, it is more or less the traditional sink-or-swim method where no help is offered to the students in their home language, instruction is 100% in English, students follow mainstream education, there are no qualified teachers and the purpose is to shift to assimilate to English Only instruction from the beginning.

ESL pullout (Submersion plus ESL)

In this model, 90-100% of instruction is in English and students may receive a minimal 30-45 minutes of instruction in their home language by being pulled out of the mainstream classroom daily. Teachers are trained in ESL (English as a Second Language) and the purpose of the program is again linguistic assimilation and fast transition to English Only instruction.

Structured Immersion (Sheltered English)

In this model, there is again no use of the students' native language for core subjects, but the students may receive some home language support in the form of ESL instruction with specialized ESL teachers. The amount of home language use is minimal and is tailored to the level of English language proficiency of the students. The total duration of the program is 1-3 years and students are then transferred to mainstream education with the goal of being again assimilated in English Only instruction.

Bilingual Education Programs

1. Transitional Bilingual Education (Early Exit)

These programs provide extensive instruction in the students' native language as well as in English in the early stages starting and gradually increasing the instruction to exclusively in English up to 90%. Teachers are certified in Bilingual Education in some states and provide a high level of instruction in both languages. The program is called 'early exit' because it usually lasts for 1-3 years depending on how fast a student becomes proficient in English, and students exit the program to be transitioned to mainstream education. The difference with the previous models is that that although the

goal of the program is to be assimilated to an English only classroom, this is achieved without them falling behind academically by being supported in their native language in the beginning stages. Of all the programs, the transitional type is the one that was overwhelmingly implemented across the nation.

2. Maintenance or Developmental Bilingual Education (Late Exit)

In this model, extensive instruction is provided both the students' native language and in English, with increased literacy instruction in the early stages in their home language. As the program progresses the amount of input in both languages is balanced at a 50:50 ratio reaching a balanced bilingual mode. The teachers are trained bilingual educators and the program lasts for 5-6 years and this is why it is also called late exit, because the students exit the program later when they usually have mastered the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy. This is an additive bilingual program which adds to the native language of the student and its goal is to provide academic achievement in both languages. It is considered as one of the most favorable models of bilingual education.

3. Immersion Models (Two-Way Immersion, Dual-Language)

This is the most promising type of bilingual education promoting the values of bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism to its fullest. Speakers of both languages (emergent bilinguals and English-native) are put together in the same classroom and are instructed together in both languages for the period of 5-6 years until they truly become bilingual. This type can have either a 90:10 model immersion with 90% in home language and 10% in English in early grades until it reaches a 50:50 balanced ratio in

later grades or can be a 50:50 model from the beginning. Teachers are in most cases professionally trained in bilingual education and this program is also considered as one of the most fair in terms of social justice, equal opportunities and academic success for all students.

Castañeda vs. Pickard

The Castañeda vs. Pickard Supreme Court decision which took place in 1981, is probably the second most important court decision regarding bilingual education and was targeted towards a Texas school which failed to address the needs of its ELL learners according to the EEOA (Bybee et al, 2014). As a result of this decision in favor of the students' rights, a new three-step test was developed for schools to take in order to determine whether the school was taking appropriate action as required by the EEOA (Bybee, 2014; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016). The “three prong standard” or “Castañeda Standard” as it was also called (Bybee et al, 2014, p. 140) mandated that programs for language minority students a) should be anchored on a sound educational theory, b) should have adequate resources and personnel to be implemented effectively and c) the school program should prove to have effects in students' academic performance over time in areas additional to language, such as math, science or social studies (Crawford, 1999; Ovando, 2003; Bybee et al, 2014; Gándara and Escamilla, 2016).

In the years surrounding the Castañeda decision, a lot of reauthorizations of the original Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) had taken place in 1978, 1984, and 1988 initially to introduce minor additions or changes in the types of bilingual education programs to be offered (Garcia, 2009) but gradually these reauthorizations started to weaken “in favor of greater support of English-Only instructional methods”, signaling the

beginning of another period of turbulence in bilingual education, which Ovando calls, the Dismissive Period (Gándara and Escamilla, 2016, p, 4).

The Present

The Dismissive Period (1980's – Present)

The decade of 1980s signals a new stage of restrictions in bilingual education policy, in which some of the largest anti-bilingual movements have started to form and legislations which marginalized or completely banned the use of bilingual program across the nations were voted. New battles against bilingual education began, halting a period of twenty years of progress, development and research activity that the Civil Right movement had created. The new wave of immigration, this time not from Europe but mostly from Latin America, China, Korea and Russia and Haiti (Shin, 2005) raised a new level of xenophobia which in turn was reflected in general politics also affecting language policies. It is clear, that through the years, the history of bilingualism in the United States is closely tied if not the same, with the history of educating immigrants and every policy by shifting government affecting immigrants, also affected bilingual education's fate.

In 1981, during Reagan's administration, a return to English-Only melting pot ideology was attempted by Senator Samuel Hayakawa who proposed to the Congress the first constitutional amendment to make English the official language of the United States (Crawford, 2004; Garcia, 2009).

Hayakawa claimed that "prolonged bilingual education in bilingual education in public schools and multilingual ballots threatened to divide the United States along

language lines” (Crawford, 2004, p. 133) planting thus the seeds for a new public ideological division that doubts the linguistic diversity pride that always characterized the US. President Reagan himself strengthening this vision stated: “It is absolutely wrong and against American concepts to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market and participate” (Crawford, 1999, p. 53) implying thus that any speaker or LOTE has limited opportunities for social mobility unless they are speakers of English. William Bennett, Reagan’s secretary of Education stated that “we have lost sight of the goal of learning English as the key to equal educational opportunity” (Crawford, 1992, p. 360) and in 1988 he raised the cap to allocating money to English-Only programs to 25% as opposed to 4% which was in 1984 (Ovando, 2003).

English as Official Language

In 1983 Hayakawa and Dr. John Tanton, an ophthalmologist, founded the movement ‘US English’ which among other things, claimed to be “the nation’s oldest, largest citizens’ action group dedicated to serving the unifying role of the English language in the United States” (Garcia, 2009, p. 172). The proposed language amendment only passed the hearing stage and never progressed to a vote in Congress however, shortly after, state after state reaching a total number 23, adopted some version of ‘Official English’ legislation or English-Only laws with the number rising to 27 by 2007 (Crawford, 2004; Bybee et al, 2014, p. 141; Garcia, 2009). In the meantime, in addition to the US English movement, more assimilationist political activists founded similar initiatives named English Only, and English First, whereas English Plus created by the

Spanish American League Against Discrimination (SALAD) in response to the anti-bilingual pressure groups did not manage to gain the necessary public attention which had already formed stronger monoglossic ideologies causing an ethnic ideological division (Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009).

Demographics of Bilingual Children

The paradox of those years is that the more the number of immigrants or speakers of other languages increased, the stricter the laws against bilingual education became. Crawford (2004) notes that from 1990 – 2000 the number of bilingual kids was 3.9 million, double the size of what it was in the previous decade. Of those children, the overwhelming majority were speakers of Spanish (70%) followed by Vietnamese (3.9%), Hmong (1.8%), Cantonese (1.8%), Korean (1.6%) and other mostly Asian and eastern European languages reflecting a new reality of declining European immigration and increasing Latino and Asian one (2000 US Census).

According to Crawford (2004), one in five students in elementary and secondary schools is either an immigrant or a child of an immigrant and only 16% are of European or Canadian background in contrast with the 1970 when one in fifteen students were immigrants with 60% coming from Europe or Canada. Today, about 8.6 million students are immigrants themselves with 20% of school aged children reporting to have at least one immigrant parent and the majority of them being Spanish language speakers (80%) (Garcia, 2005). However, the difference with the past is that in many areas in the US, the new generation of bilingual students, are simultaneous bilinguals meaning that they are exposed to English since birth (child of an immigrant) and their language needs are

completely different than those children who only first experience English when they enter school.

Proposition 227

With the Latino population rising especially in borderline states like California, New Mexico, Texas and Arizona, Spanish language itself was under attack, not just bilingual education (Garcia, 2009). In 1998, a Silicon Valley software millionaire funded and initiated a proposition which he named “English for the Children” and presented it to California voters in June of that year. In his campaign he claimed that children remained for too long in bilingual programs and he attributed their failure to thrive academically solely to bilingual education (Ovando, 2003). He proposed that all students in California public schools should learn English by being taught in English and for those with limited English proficiency only sheltered English programs should be offered with a maximum of one year of studies before they transition to mainstream education classrooms (Del Valle, 2003). Proposition 227 as it was later known as, passed with 61% and it prohibited bilingual education in schools all over the State, returning to a sink-or-swim methods with instruction be exclusively in English only with the exception of one year Sheltered English for those who did not speak the English language (Crawford, 2004). Parents could ask for waivers for three reasons: a) if the child is over ten years old, b) if the child has special needs, and c) if the child is fluent in English (Garcia, 2009).

Proposition 203

After his success with the passage of Proposition 227 in California, Ron Unz took his efforts also in Arizona and a similar proposition under the name Proposition 203 was

passed in 2000 with 63% (Garcia, 2009). This proposition also banned all bilingual programs across the state with the exception of one-year sheltered English for LEP speakers and all instruction in English only. This proposition is even stricter than the California one because the waivers are usually denied at all cases (Garcia, 2009).

Question 2 and Amendment 31

Following California and Arizona, Massachusetts passed Question 2 with 68% in 2002, a proposition similar to the previous ones, banning thus bilingual education programs in the State, and replacing the traditional transitional programs with Structured English Immersion programs. Later in the same year 2002, Amendment 31 similar to the previous anti-bilingual propositions was turned down by 56% in the State of Colorado although the public feeling was pro English Only instruction (Garcia, 2009). The reason for this overturn, was claimed to be due a TV commercial which stated that by banning bilingual education, children will be mixed in regular classrooms “creating chaos and disrupting learning” which changed the mind of the voters (Crawford, 2004, p. 330). A separate section of this dissertation is devoted to bilingual education in the state of Massachusetts where this study takes place, and Question 2 will be discussed in more detail there.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

Although 1980s-1900s are characterized by a strong anti-bilingual sentiment, there were still defenders of bilingual education and some developments were achieved. For example, during President Clinton’s administration, some funding cutbacks to language programs in schools were restored by 38% (Crawford, 1997). More specifically,

Congress dropped three riders from a bill that would have: “a) given non-English speakers only 2 years to learn English immersion programs, b) increased the proportion of funds available for English immersion programs, and c) given preferential funding to programs clearly implementing the 2-year limit” which is a very crucial window of opportunity among all these restrictions because in this way it allowed for the establishment or continuation of maintenance/developmental and two-way/dual-language programs (*NABE News*, 1998 in Ovando, 2003, p. 13).

In 2001, the newly elected President George W. Bush, passed one of the most controversial legislation in the history of education and particularly language education in the United States. The Elementary and Secondary Act later renamed as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was a completely new legislation that repealed the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) of the 1960s and replaced it with a new one named English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act. The new Act specifically addressed the language needs of immigrant populations under the name of Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students (Title III) aiming to ensure that all LEP and immigrant students attain English proficiency (Garcia, 2009). The NCLB law stopped federal financial aid that schools would get for bilingual programs and now states were responsible for allocating funds if and whenever they wanted, gaining therefore full responsibility in their Districts (Garcia, 2009). This of course meant that individual States had the power to not fund bilingual programs even in states that had not passed explicit anti-bilingual legislations like California, Arizona and Massachusetts.

Another big change that NCLB brought was the extensive amount of mandatory high-stakes testing that required for all students. Even if a school decided to allocate funds to run a bilingual program, all students were required by law to be tested in English in high-stakes areas like math, science and reading and if the school failed to provide good scores, they would be denied funding (Menken and Solorza, 2014). As a result, ELLs or LEP students with low proficiency in English could not succeed in gaining high scores in core subjects and were held accountable for the school's loss of funding for a program that was supposed to help them. Crawford (2004) ironically refers to NCLB as "No Child Left Untested" (p.336) and Menken and Solorza (2014) as No Child Left Bilingual, in an attempt to raise awareness that the legislation not only does not help students but it actually harms them by widening the achievement gap and drop out rates due to low scores in tests. In studies following the years after the passage of NCLB, the effects of this policy resulted in extremely low scores and poor academic performance for ELL students, the dropout rate rose, and their bilingual skills were lost (Garcia, 2009). Many states, including Massachusetts have passed new laws to put an end to the negative effects of NCLB and allow for bilingual education to flourish again.

An important note to be made at this point is that the word bilingual was slowly but purposely started to steadily disappear from every official document or name or bill and being replaced by other words like English learner instead of bilingual learner, dual-language or dual-immersion instead of bilingual education and so forth (Crawford, 2004; Garcia, 2005; Garcia, 2009; Wiley and Wright, 2004; Nieto, 2009). Crawford, traced the progressive silencing of the "B-Word" as he calls it, in New York Times and noticed that there was a great decline in its appearance from 86 times in 1981-1990 to fourteen times

in 1999-2006 when it was replaced with all the other word alternatives (Crawford, 2004, p. 35, Crawford, 2006b in Garcia, 2009). According to Crawford (2004), the switch to alternatives like dual-language and language-immersion terms is done in attempt to avoid connotation with the troubled past of the highly politicized bilingual education and “minimize opposition” (p. 35). Even currently, while Proposition 227 and Question 2 were recently overturned by new laws, the new legislation still avoid the “B-Word” and bilingual is replaced by phrases like “Language Opportunities” as presented below.

Recent Developments

As we have seen through the historical exploration of bilingual education in the United States, there has been an uneasy balance between pluralism ideologies, meaning multiple ethnicities, cultures and of course languages (multilingualism) and assimilationist ideologies of one country-one nation-one language type forming an endless repetitive cycle through the years. Ricento (2006 book) claims that assimilation in the US context means that “the key to equal opportunity for non-English speakers is a shift to English as rapidly as possible” so they can be assimilated to the country as well (p. 7). He also goes on to say that policy makers who believe in non-assimilationist policies which encourage students “to continue to rely on their native languages, such as bilingual education, bilingual ballots, etc, are actually *hindering* their chances of achieving social equality” (italics in original, Ricento, 2006, p. 7).

However, what has been proven through the years, is that not only did the ban of bilingual education all over the states, did not end the unjust dichotomy between voluntary and involuntary minority groups (Ovando, 2003) and eased their desired assimilation into American society, but it also widened the achievement gap for language

minority students in schools, and raised the dropout rate before finishing high school. Especially for the states that outlawed bilingual education turning into an English-Only instruction (California, Arizona and Massachusetts), ELLs' performance significantly declined (Garcia, 2003). In California, a series of studies showed that English-Only law brought no changes to the academic outcomes of ELLs with only 9% of the students being reclassified as fluent in English (California Department of Education, 2005); Studies in Arizona showed that 60% of students showed no academic gain either (Garcia, 2009, p. 191) and in Massachusetts, more than 50% of students showed no signs of improvement after being immersed in English language classrooms for at least three years (Garcia, 2009).

Gándara and Escamilla (2016) argue that although the profile of the new ELLs is different now, bilingual program designs have “not kept up with the changes” and a new generation of bilingual education should emerge (p. 10). Dual-language programs as already discussed, have spread throughout the nation and their benefits for all students (minority and majority) are remarkable (Pimentel et al, 2008). The advancing popularity of the program and the cognitive and cultural benefits of bilingualism are now known to new parents, who are constantly seeking challenging language programs for their children and usually a close-by dual-language program is one of their top choices (Garcia, 2009). Garcia (2009) notes that many gifted or talented programs in neighborhood schools have now gone dual language to respond to attract more curious and consciously aware parents.

This new wave of bilingual education outweighs the burdens of the troubled past, and should also be reflected in current policies in order to keep up with the changes in the

public ideology, especially in the three states that explicitly voted against it. In November 2016, after more than two decades since Proposition 227, California, overwhelmingly passed Proposition 58 with 73,52% (Ballotpedia, 2016). The new proposition, also known as LEARN (Language Education, Acquisition and Readiness Now) initiative, was strongly supported by parents and official school stakeholders (Hernandez, 2017), and overturned the restrictions of the past by ‘freeing’ bilingual education again. In November 2017, Massachusetts followed with the passage of a similar bill known as LOOK (Language Opportunities for Our Kids) which in turn reversed bilingual education restrictions that Question 2 brought in 2002. Arizona has not yet officially passed a similar law or bill but local news report that actions are being taken with lawmakers preparing to bring a repeal for voting soon to reverse the ban of Proposition 203 (Education Dive, 2020).

Last but not least, along with the LEARN Initiative in California and LOOK Act in Massachusetts, the two states also voted for a new development in Bilingual Education known as State Seal of Biliteracy (SSB). The SSB originated in 2012 and is already in operation in 22 states (Hernandez, 2017). The SSB is used as a recognition method of the bilingual and biliterate proficiencies of students’ graduating a bilingual program. Specifically, it “allows for states, districts, and schools to recognize students’ accomplishments in learning content and state-required material in two or more languages, thus promoting the ability to read, write, and speak in multiple languages as a valued asset” (Hernandez, 2017, p. 147). It also sends the message to parents, families and emergent bilingual learners that being bilingual and biliterate is a skill that is valued and recognized and encourages their self-esteem and sense of pride while it also signals

that being a bilingual is actually a good thing, countering assimilationist ideologies of the past. California passed the State Seal of Bilingualism in 2012 and amended accordingly following the new Proposition 58 in 2017 (California Department of Education) and Massachusetts established SSB in 2017 as well as part of the passing of LOOK Act (DESE Website). An overview of bilingual education historical developments in the state of Massachusetts follows, as it is the focal state of this study.

Historical Developments and Language Policies in the State of Massachusetts

General Observations

After the passage of Bilingual Education Act in 1964 which allowed for bilingual education to reopen throughout the nation, Massachusetts was the first state to pass a mandatory bilingual education law, establishing Transitional Bilingual Education models by 1968 (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1990). This is an ironic observation, because the same state that rushed to allow for bilingual education legally, was one of the three states to rush to pass a law to ban it in 2002 with Question 2. Gándara and Escamilla (2016) also note that while other states might have abandoned bilingual education around those years too, they have “done it more quietly” but Massachusetts, California and Arizona’s cases, received much more attention (p.4).

Another observation that makes Massachusetts’ ban of bilingual education unique, is that in the 1980s-90s when the English as Official Language was advocated by Senator Hayakawa as previously discussed, although officially established, by 2007, 27 states have adopted some type of English-Only instruction (Crawford, 2004). Massachusetts, however, was not one of them (Garcia, 2009). All these observations

make the passing of the restrictive Question 2 ballot look like it does not ‘fit’ the profile of the State, since the signs of the past show that Massachusetts was a place where multilingualism was welcome or at least was not an issue of controversy.

Viesca (2013) offers a conceptual framework in which she claims that the formation of Massachusetts state policies about language education were built and framed through the years under five major ideologies providing thus an ideological setting for the state. These ideologies are: a) the *assimilation* ideology which pushes immigrant populations for assimilation, sameness and conformity with the dominant culture; b) the *individualism* ideology which propagates that it is up to any individual’s efforts and achievements to rise in the social ladder and succeed in social mobility disregarding other factors that hinder this mobility and therefore promoting the myth of meritocracy; c) the *standard language* ideology which promotes the idea that speaking the standard and dominant language equips you with proficiency and tools for success in the socioeconomic scale; d) the ideology of *technicism* which views the role of teachers merely as transmitters of specialized, technical knowledge in their fields, and finally e) the *localism* ideology which argues that all the power about decision making in education lies in the hands of local communities, schools and individuals as a reinforcement of direct democracy. All these ideologies according to Viesca (2013) “institutionalize racism and linguicism” (p. 10) and pushed the state to vote for the ban of bilingual education in the State with the passage of Question 2 in 2002.

Question 2 – English for the Children

Massachusetts although relatively small compared to the other two states that voted for similar propositions (DeJong et al. 2005) has had a very troubled history in

bilingual education. In November 2002 Massachusetts voters overwhelmingly voted by a 70-30 margin, for Question 2, an initiative that replaced 30 years of Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) with English-Only Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) instruction (Chang-Bacon, 2020). The new law required “with limited exceptions” that “all public school children must be taught in English by being taught all subjects in English and being placed in English classrooms” (Galvin, 2002,p.1; DeJong et al. 2005, Smith et al., 2008; Chang-Bacon, 2020). Prior to Question 2, all districts with 20 or more pupils from the same language background were entitled to TBE in their home language in all subjects, until they were ready to transition to mainstream English-Only instruction (Gort, 2017). Question 2 ballot was also sponsored by Californian millionaire and initiator of Proposition 227 Ron Unz, who had already created a large anti-bilingual movement with the passing similar propositions in California and Arizona (Capetillo-Ponce 2003; Ovando, 2003).

According to Gort (2017), signs of discomfort against bilingual education existed long before Question 2 vote with proponents and opponents of TBE entering debates about the effectiveness of the programs on an annual basis. Those in favor of TBE were arguing that the programs did not function to its fullest potential supporting ELLs, and opponents were proposing English-Only legislations every year for two decades claiming that TBE was impractical for Massachusetts’ student populations (Gort, 2017). Mandates and reforms on the implementation of TBE programs were constantly made in the years before Question 2 until the new law was passed in 2002 officially banning bilingual education (Gort, 2017).

Gort (2017) argues that the rationale for Question 2 as presented to Massachusetts voters was based on five assumptions: a) English is the language of opportunity because it is also the prevailing language of science, technology and business, b) immigrant and language minoritized parents want their children to learn English, c) schools ethical obligation is to teach English because of its importance, d) the education of immigrant children in the past was poorly performed by schools (dropout rates and low scores), and e) young immigrant children acquire second languages easily and therefore can quickly switch to English (Gort, 2017, p. 69; Wiley & Wright, 2004). According to Gort (2017) although the majority of voters including parents of emergent bilingual children on a general basis agreed with the first three assumptions, but the last two were “groundless” and “not supported by research” (p. 70). However, the attention of the media of that time focused more on the advertised benefits of switching to English-Only rather on the results of academic research and resulted in the voting of the restrictive referendum (Gort, 2017).

Lastly, another important change that came along with Question, was the wording of the bill (Johnson, 2010). English for the Children, which was the official name of the bill, was strategically assigned to leave the impression that it equally helps all students (English and non-English dominant) when in fact was subtracting the opportunity from non-English students to succeed academically by offering English-Only instruction (Viesca, 2013). The word bilingual started to gradually disappear from official documents and was replaced with paraphrased words a strategy also used after the passage of Proposition 227 and Proposition 203 (Johnson, 2010). Capetillo-Ponce (2003), argues that what makes Question 2 so complex and confusing to understand is that it’s

ultimate goal is not “reaching a consensus on educating youth” but rather “to stress citizens to learn English, without initiating any serious discussion as to how this could most efficiently be reached” (p. 5).

Question 2 Restrictions and Specific Waivers

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) passed in 2001, although explicitly instructed a turn to English-Only methods, it left some implementational space nationwide for districts to alter and accommodate, under specific circumstances, their bilingual education programs, in order to serve the linguistic needs of certain populations (Johnson, 2010). Like its predecessors in California and Arizona, Question 2, offered “little choice in instructional programming for emergent bilingual learners” with waivers in “limited circumstances” (Gort, 2017, p. 70). As Smith et al (2008) worded it, “initiatives such as Question 2, emphasize the adoption of new policy but not its implementation” allowing some space for “schools in Massachusetts with high ELL populations” to negotiate “equity and quality in their implementation strategies” and thus adapt a language program that will ‘obey’ the English Only law but at the same time serve some learning needs of its language populations (p. 295).

The only alternative offered, exempted from Question 2 law, were the Two-Way Immersion (TWI) or Dual-Language (DL) programs (Gort, 2017). The TWI waiver was granted in response to communities with schools having longstanding and well-known TWI program which “had demonstrated positive outcomes for all of their students” (Gort, 2017, p. 70). Gort et al (2008) argue that the “co-existence of English-only programs and maintenance/enrichment education through TWI programs” “makes Massachusetts an interesting context to explore how top-down policies and localized practices interact and

intersect” (p. 45). Following this argument, some districts in Massachusetts managed to maintain some bilingual education options and alternative pedagogical methods for their students, albeit the English-only law, by remaining firm to their ideological framework of language equity and by exploiting all opportunities within the gaps that Question 2 created (Gort et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2008). These cases are discussed below.

Districts Resisting Implementation of Question 2 Restrictions

In a study in Pennsylvania soon after NCLB was implemented nationally, Johnson (2010) reported that a district took advantage of the limited liberties and espoused flexibility NCLB offered and developed a new district level language education policy not guided by NCLB principals. This policy reflected a collaborative effort among administrators, parents and teachers of the district in an attempt to support bilingual education by creating a local program that promoted the ideas of equity, linguistic and cultural diversity (Johnson, 2010).

Similarly, in Massachusetts, three districts attempted a collaborative ideological resistance to NCLB by establishing their own language program that reflected the communities’ multilingual and multicultural ideologies (Gort et al, 2008). The minority populations in the district, all elementary schools predominantly of Latino descent, were significantly high with high linguistic needs as well but the districts’ *language as resource* attitude, led to teaching practices that allowed for the use of the students’ home language in the classroom. Although complete avoidance of English instruction and implementation was not possible by the law, the practices of the teachers indicated more leniency and freedom of native language use in the classroom which created a more friendly and welcome environment for emergent bilinguals (Gort et al, 2008). These

efforts and resistance to Question 2 restrictions, and the implementation of new policy directives applicable to their own social and school contexts, opened up new pathways for other oppressed districts to follow (Gort et al, 2008).

In a similar study, Smith et al (2008) discussed the attempts and practices of another three Massachusetts districts, one elementary, one middle and one high school. Five years after Question 2, the three districts managed to find ways, adjust and modify their practices, in order to best address the needs of the English learners and help them succeed academically (Smith et al, 2008). Adhering to the State new law, these three schools shifted from transitional bilingual education programs and started implementing Sheltered English Immersion programs to help their high ELL populations succeed in mainstream classrooms. However, the guided curriculum did not seem to work as hoped with their students and all three districts decided to take initiative, within limits, to modify their instruction and teaching practices in ways they thought seemed fit for their students' needs (Smith et al, 2008). In an attempt to ensure equitable education, disregarding to a certain extent the State's guidelines but without being provocative, they offered multiple types of programs according to various levels of students' proficiency (Gort et al, 2008). All involved agents (administrators, teachers, parents) held very positive ideologies and attitudes toward immigrant students and really cared about their progress; they provided great amount of resources in and outside the classroom and took all training available to become more efficient as SEI teachers (Gort et al, 2008). Additionally, they schools continued to assist students after the completion of their program, engaged parents into their children learning and developed friendly relationships that continued outside the school settings. The majority of those teachers

offered at least two more years support for students, with their own initiative, to ensure that their students are transitioning well in English classrooms (Gort et al, 2008).

Given the examples of a few districts that used every liberty that Question 2 offered, even if limited, and persisted on finding flexibility to serve the linguistic needs of their students, this study also seeks to explore the reasons why the focal town in Western Massachusetts did not have any Dual-Language program before LOOK Act officially opened bilingual education again in 2017.

LOOK Act – Language Opportunities for Our Kids

The recent positive and hopeful political turn with the passage of Language Opportunity for Our Kids (LOOK) Act and the Seal of Biliteracy passed in November 2017 promises exactly what its name indicates, equal language opportunities for kids of all linguistic backgrounds and basically reverses what Question 2 brought along. With the implementation of this law, federal funds are being allocated to legally launch more bilingual education programs and particularly DLP in different Massachusetts districts.

The focal Elementary school in this study, is one of the districts that received \$300,000 State funds collaboratively with a neighboring town in order to establish a new DL program (Orchard Hill) and to maintain an existing one in the near town (The Massachusetts Daily Collegian, 2019). Under this new policy, more bilingual education programs are expected to open throughout the state, with different models representing the needs of different communities. Some of the key issues and changes that LOOK Act bill brings, are selected and summarized as follows:

- Replaces the term Limited English Proficiency students with “English Learners” throughout current law.

- Updates the definitions for “bilingual education”, “dual language education or 2-way immersion”, “English as a Second Language” and “Transitional Bilingual Education”
- Does not change existing definition for “Sheltered English Immersion”.
- Allows districts the flexibility to decide which bilingual program best addresses the needs of their students choosing from a range of programs including sheltered English immersion, two-way immersion and transitional bilingual education as long as they meet state and federal requirements.
- Parents can request any EL program offered by a district for their child as long as it is age/grade appropriate.
- A group of 20+ parents/guardians of students, can request from their school district the initiation of a language instruction program and the school must respond within 90 days with a plan for the implementation of such a program or provide reasons for the denial of it.
- Establishes a state Seal of Biliteracy for students who have attained a high level of proficiency in English and another language.
- Directs DESE (Department of Elementary and Secondary Education) to establish education endorsements for all EL program types including sheltered English immersion, two-way immersion and transitional bilingual education.

(Language Opportunity: Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition, 2017)

Critical Consciousness: Towards a more equitable future in Dual Language Education

The 4th Pillar of Dual-Language Model of Bilingual Education

The undeniable benefits of DL as previously discussed (Colier and Thomas, 2014; Lindholm-Leary, 2005) make DL programs rank as the most promising model of bilingual education. Both English and non-English dominant students benefit from this model, as both groups of students are brought together in the same classroom to learn each other's languages by being taught both in English and the target language (DeJong, 2016). Apart from the linguistic part of the DL curriculum, emphasis is given on the cultural aspect (Lucido and Montague, 2008) and results of studies have shown that students from both groups succeed academically and develop a sense of bilingual pride (De La Garza et al, 2015). However, despite their academic benefits, DL programs have also received a great amount of criticism in terms of equality issues by benefiting more white middle to upper class families, and not fulfilling their expectations for social justice as the DL philosophy originally states (Valdéz, 1997; Cervantes-Soon, 2014).

Despite the criticism, DL programs continue to be the most preferable model of bilingual education and parents are intentionally looking to enroll their children in an area school that runs a DL program as their popularity is continuously rising (Garcia, 2009). In the modern US society, the more heterogenous and diverse elementary schools become, the more essential it becomes that schooling should foster inclusivity and build upon social justice principals, including language programs of any type (Scanlan & Palmer, 2009).

Howard et al (2018) in their *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* state three main goals that DL programs should aim for all students: a) academic

achievement, b) bilingualism and biliteracy, c) and sociocultural competence. The notion of equity also plays a central role in their Guidelines as it is the most important factor for inclusion of students with diverse backgrounds (Howard et al, 2018; Palmer et al, 2019). Although in theory targeting equity in education sounds easy, studies have shown that in practice it is a very challenging task for US schools (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Palmer et al, 2019). In an attempt to repurpose the role of equity and social justice in DL settings, Palmer et al (2019) propose a fourth goal, or a fourth pillar to the philosophy of the programs in addition to the other three that Howard et al (2018) suggest. They name this fourth pillar critical consciousness and suggest that if all people directly involved in a DL program (administrators, teachers, students and parents) are educated upon, then equity should be succeeded (Palmer et al, 2019).

Definition and Components of Critical Consciousness

By citing Freire (1970) and Nieto & Bode (2012), Palmer et al (2019) claim that a general explanation for critical consciousness is that it is the “*ability to read the world*” and the ability to understand ourselves and others as “cultural beings embedded in the power structures of society”, thus valuing the sociocultural nature of the term (p. 123, emphasis in the original). In educational settings, critical consciousness, helps stakeholders to see the purpose of schooling with clarity and better equip them to “critically analyze curriculum, instruction, policies, relationships, and school practices to foster social justice” (Palmer et al, 2019, p. 123). For the authors, critical consciousness is the essence to humanize language education and move it toward a more culturally, linguistically, humanly connected paradigm” (Palmer et al, 2019, p. 124).

Palmer et al (2019) propose that critical consciousness should consist of four elements in order to be successful and complete. These elements which complement each other and often overlap are the following: a) continuously interrogating power, b) historicizing schools, c) critical listening and d) engaging with discomfort (Palmer et al, 2019, p. 124). Below, each of them is briefly discussed based on Palmer et al (2018) original manuscript, and they are supported with examples and references from relevant literature.

Continuously Interrogating Power

Questioning the exercise of power is a continuous effort that all school official, teachers, parents and students should focus on, if transformation of existing power structures is to be achieved. This process involves all levels of education from district, school to classroom and should be the responsibility of all stakeholders to interrogate inequalities of unfair power relations, for social justice to be established. DL programs are criticized for not involving minority-parents in the school meetings and not providing translation services to ease participation (Hernandez, 2017). However, minority-language families constitute half of the population of a DL program and should be equally represented and allowed for their voices to be heard (Garcia, 2009). This is when, school administration should interrogate their power and make sure that every school meeting or event allows space and resources for all enrolled families to be heard.

Additionally, DL program teachers are often found to favor English-dominant students in the classroom allowing for interruptions over their Spanish-dominant classmates, or for overcorrecting language minoritized students (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017, Palmer, 2008). Several studies have shown how teachers themselves play a major

role in determining even how languages policies are enacted in their classroom by deviating from them if they did not agree (Gort et al, 2008; Menken & Garcia, 2010). Teachers have also been criticized for having contradictory ideologies outside and inside the classroom which does not adhere to the inclusive nature of DL programs (Henderson, K. & Palmer, D. (2015). For example, in a study in Texas, teachers reported having strong beliefs about students' bilingualism but in practice they did not allow for any hybrid language practices and code-switching among students, sticking to strict language separation in instruction (Henderson, K. & Palmer, D. (2015). By being alert and continuously interrogating their power in the classroom, teachers can ensure that all students are equally participating by being sensitive and understanding to the emerging bilingual practices of their students. By building their students' confidence, they are also building a new inclusive and equitable learning environment.

Historicizing Schools

This element of critical consciousness suggests that students, parents, teachers and administrators should be educated on the history of bilingual education, learn about the political struggles of the past and acknowledge the fact that bilingual education is also a political issue rather than merely educational. This way, white families would acknowledge the fights for the rights of minoritized children, and non-English dominant families would gain pride in knowing that their history is recognized. Both minority and majority students would learn that the program they attend symbolizes a win over older types of bilingual education and be alert for not repeating imbalances of the past. Educators will be better informed about the historical context under which DL was formed and be able to explain "bilingual pedagogies in a credible way – that is, in a

political context that members of the public can understand and endorse” (Crawford, 2000b, p. 124).

By being educated on the history surrounding bilingual education, all stakeholders build strong foundations around issues of equity and are more conscious when rights of minoritized populations are threatened. Teaching a language or a second language is not only a matter of teaching its structural system, but it is also the transmission of other values connected to culture, to everyday experiences people of the same language background share (Fishman, 1996).

Critical Listening

Critical listening as a component of critical consciousness, suggests that those with privilege take a step back by allowing space to those with less privilege by just listening, without interrupting or questioning. This element is closely related with the element of interrogation of power as it requests from dominant speakers to ‘lose’ their dominance by refraining from speaking and engaging into active listening. In the example of more active parental participation in school meetings, Palmer et al (2019) suggest that non-English dominant families should start being *listened to* rather than just listen, and this could be achieved by providing translation and interpretation services when needed (p.127, emphasis in the original). Critical listening, can be also be achieved by visiting the real world of the minoritized population, engage in their communities, organizations and neighborhoods and listen to community members’ voices.

In the element of critical listening, I would add Flores and Rosa’s (2015) raciolinguistic perspective on how certain languages are ‘listened to’ and perceived by the white privileged ear achieving the opposite of social justice and equity is noted. More

specifically, raciolinguistic ideologies “produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects”. (Flores and Rosa, 2015, p. 150). People’s different linguistic uses and accents are under the microscope according to their degree of correspondence to the standard forms of language, which in this case is unofficially attributed to English language (Flores and Rosa, 2015, Pennycook, 2007). The “privileged white ear” who could be a teacher, a headmaster or a fellow classmate (the listener) could mistakenly listen to an accent that is not English enough and be judged by how they sound rather than by what they mean (Flores and Rosa, 2015, p. 152). If critical consciousness is the goal, then critical listening should also refrain from listening right or wrong varieties of the same languages.

Engaging with Discomfort

The last component of critical consciousness as Palmer et al (2018) propose, is learning how to engage in uncomfortable situations and deal with discomfort in an attempt to restore equity. In order to achieve transformative actions, teachers should be able to face awkward situations with diverse groups of children and not just “shy away” from them (p.127). “White people” must learn “to live with the discomfort of acknowledging their own unearned privilege” and turn it into a “*productive* discomfort” by helping create an equitable learning environment at school (Palmer et al, 2019, p. 127-128). In the authors’ words “learning about different and social relations of power through embracing discomfort” even in young ages, “is messy, risky and potentially

painful” but DL communities “must learn to negotiate such ambiguity and together engage in deep self-examination” (Palmer et al, 2018, p. 128). Engaging into social transformation may not be easy but the reward is bigger than the discomfort it causes.

The addition of critical consciousness as the fourth pillar of DL education is a suggestion to collectively transform DL education into a space where social justice is established and applauded. Teaching minority and majority students in DL settings to be allies by building their critical consciousness around sensitive issues of equity and difference from a young age, can be a force of social transformation not only for language education but for society in general.

Summary

This Chapter offers a literature review of the history of bilingual education from early 19th century to present. Through the historical exploration, I reviewed bilingual education background alongside major political events that shaped the context for language policies and minority language education throughout the United States. The role of language ideologies as a powerful tool that shapes public opinion and is shaped by political debates was discussed through the most important language policies and legislations over a long period of time. The discussion then turned toward the most important bilingual education policies in Massachusetts to provide a historical context for the state where this study takes place in. Lastly, the inclusion of critical consciousness as the fourth core goal of DL education is discussed in relation to past studies which serve as examples and lessons in order create a new reality for a more equitable bilingual education future that focuses on the principles of social justice for all students. Chapter 3

provides the study design and methodology that was followed for the completion of this research study.

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore and analyze the language ideologies among school officials, teachers, administrators, and parents involved in a local newly launched DL program in Orchard Hill Elementary. The participants' ideologies were reviewed and discussed in relation to issues of social justice, fairness and equity among all students and how these notions were circulated through discussions around the program. My goal was to explore participants' understanding of the concept of critical consciousness (Palmer et al, 2019) and how this was communicated through their beliefs and attitudes about the implementation of the DL program.

A review of the literature about DL programs focusing on the critiques and the benefits, set the ideological context of this study and the researcher's stance in exploring the ideologies of the participants. An extensive review of the historical developments in bilingual education in the past and present through the analysis of the most important language policies set the sociopolitical context for this study. The review of the history of bilingual education in Massachusetts, situated and framed this study and the participants within the local geographical sociopolitical context.

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. *What are the language ideologies of parents who have chosen this dual-language program for their children?*
2. *What are the language ideologies of the administrators, school officials and teachers who are involved in the creation and implementation of the dual-language program?*

- a) *How are these reflected in the structure of the program?*
- 3. *Do families and administrators see critical consciousness as an integral part of the DL program?*
 - b) *How does this manifest in their engagement in the program? For families, in their choice of schooling? For administrators, in the programming and implementation of curricular practices?*

For the purposes of this study, I conducted qualitative research and more specifically a descriptive case study design as it will be discussed in the following section. For the data collection process, I interviewed participants using a semi-structured in-depth interview lasting for about 30-minutes each. Initially the study design also included a qualitative demographic survey in the form of a simple and comprehensive questionnaire intended to be distributed online to the focal participating parents.

However, due to limited participation, it was decided to be removed from the study. The required demographic data of the families were instead obtained from the school administration records. As my data analysis methods, I used thematic content analysis (King and Horrocks, 2010) and sorted my findings into categories responding to the overarching research questions. The restrictions of the unexpected COVID-19 pandemic had minimal to no effect on the design of the study as its nature allowed for data collection in an exclusively remote mode and will also be discussed in a separate section in this chapter.

Study Design

Qualitative Research Methods

A qualitative research design suited the nature of this study as it focuses on “discovery, insight, and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied” (Merriam, 1998, p.1). Qualitative researchers are interested in interpreting and understanding how people make sense of the world and the experiences they have in it (Merriam, 1998; 2009). According to Merriam (2009) the product of qualitative studies is *richly descriptive* with detailed descriptions of the context and participants, their interests and their actions and words are used instead of numbers like in the quantitative studies (p. 16, emphasis in the original). This study sought to understand how the participants in the DL program made sense of issues of social justice as implemented through the program and how they communicated these views through their language ideologies.

In the context of social justice research, when research takes a transformative role to bring equality and help the disadvantaged, Denzin and Lincoln (2018) propose the new term of inquiry instead of research, which holds a more transformative role for social change. Based on the new terminology, Kamberelis et al. (2018) propose five types of qualitative inquiry: 1) positivist (objectivism), 2) interpretive (modernism), 3) skepticism (critical), 4) power-knowledge (poststructural) and 5, ontological (postqualitative). Another classification of qualitative research comes from Denzin and Lincoln (2018) who in their turn define five interpretive paradigms as they call them: a) positivist and postpositivist, b) critical, c) feminist, d) constructivist-interpretivist, and e) participatory, postmodern-poststructural (p. 19). In the context of educational qualitative research, three lenses could be applied in practice that relate with the above more generalized categories: a) the

scientific and positivistic methodologies, b) the naturalistic and interpretive ones and c) the critical theory methodologies (Cohen et al, 2000, p. 3).

Education, politics, policies, ideologies (especially the unconscious ones) are inextricably intertwined and affect decision making and acting both at micro and macro social levels (Cohen et al. 2000). In analyzing the ideologies in my data, including those about language, I explored how they are circulated in ways that may create social discrimination. As already discussed in the researcher positionality in Chapter 1, as a committed researcher with my own ideological and political stance and personal subjective standpoint, I brought my own subjective values in my research, but this subjectivity was not treated “as a problem to be avoided, but as a resource that can be developed in ways that augment and “intensify social research and bring social change” (King and Horrocks, 2010, p. 126).

Case Study

I employed a case study design to “gain an in-depth understanding” of the dual-language program philosophy in terms of social justice and equality issues and also “gain meaning” from the people involved (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). “A case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance phenomenon, or social unit” (Merriam, 1988, p. 21), like the particular DL program in Orchard Hill Elementary. Case studies focus on the process of conducting the study rather than the outcomes, “in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation” (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). In this sense, I consider the exploration of my participants’ understanding of critical consciousness about the DL program, as a discovery of new information rather than confirming presupposed assumptions. Merriam (2009) notes that case studies often have

finite data collection and there is a limit on the number of people who participate in the study. In my project, I interviewed six school officials and four families whose children are enrolled in the first grade of the DL program; therefore the numbers of participants were specific and ‘finite’, making the study ‘bounded’ which is a decisive characteristic of case studies (Merriam, 1998, p. 27).

Research suggests that there are three main types of case studies, descriptive, interpretative and evaluative (Merriam, 1998; 2009), while other scholars identify descriptive case studies as holistic which can be interpretative and evaluative in addition to just providing a description of a single setting and event (Yin, 1994). I describe my own study as a holistic descriptive study which apart from describing a series of events (interviews) was also interpretive in attempt to decodify participants’ meanings as implied in their ideologies. Additionally, it was also evaluative which involves “description, explanation, and judgment”, steps that were taken during the analysis of each participant’s language ideologies (Merriam, 1998, p. 39). A holistic “tailormade” approach is also preferable in case studies when the objective of an evaluation is to “develop a better understanding of the dynamics of a program” (Kenny and Grotelueschen, 1980), which is exactly what this study aimed to reveal through the analysis of the participants’ language ideologies. Finally, qualitative case studies are “limited to the sensitivity and integrity of the investigator” (Merriam, 1998, p. 42), and the researcher is the primary instrument of data analysis which is the case in my own research study in Orchard Hill Elementary DL program.

COVID-19

One main characteristic of qualitative research is its emergent nature meaning that the study can remain open and fluid to any new factors or parameters that can emerge through investigation and exploration (Dornyei, 2007), such as the unexpected emergence of a global pandemic which has affected all levels of life including research decisions. During the study design process of a study, researchers need to take some decisions in order to take the emerging phenomena and turn them into something worth to be analyzed (Flick, 2018).

According to Merriam (1998) “the qualitative researcher must have an enormous *tolerance for ambiguity*” and be able to “adapt to unforeseen events and change direction in pursuit of meaning” (p. 20, emphasis in the original). In addition, a strength of case studies is that because they are dynamic, they can adapt to new events and “other factors in a unique instance” such as COVID-19 (Cohen et al, 2000, p. 181). Lastly, Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) suggest that a case study “is particularly valuable when the researcher has little control over events” (p. 322). I am happy to report that that the emergence of such an important event like a pandemic contributed to a new way of conducting research in a fully remote way and still reached meaningful and valuable conclusions.

Having said all these, this study was originally designed to be conducted with in person interviews and visits in the field in order to become familiar with the participants and the school setting. However, since the pandemic restrictions and school closures require physical social distancing, new decisions needed to be made in order to both continue with the research and have the least possible impact on the outcome of the study. Therefore, I had to adapt my IRB protocol according to the new COVID-19

guidelines and switch the study design and data collection into a fully remote mode. The nature of this study allowed for such a switch without any significant consequences in the goals of the study.

Context of Study

Orchard Hill is one of the three public elementary schools in the focal town which is located centrally near the town center. It is thought to serve neighborhood districts which are considered high performing. The school reports from 2016-17 as we can see in the table below, also show a good deal of diversity both racial and socioeconomic. More specifically, the school serves K-6 grades and it has a total of 335 enrolled students. Although 47% of student population identify as white, 22.1% are Hispanic or Latino, 24.8% report that their first language is not English with 15.5% being ELLs.

Also, 38.8% are considered economically disadvantaged which shows that diversity is not just racial and linguistic. The general enrolment records of the school fulfil all the requirements of establishing a dual-language program which as mentioned before is considered the most appropriate bilingual education program to promote language and social equity. (District Website). Following an itinerary of prior to the vote for the implementation of the dual language program in September 2019, as portrayed through the local media, school website records and the district superintendent presentations, I will provide a brief chronological overview of the context of the program.

Table 1. Participants, Pseudonyms and language (s) spoken

Enrollment 2016-17	School	District	State
Total Count	335	1,148	953,748
Race/Ethnicity (%)			
African American or Black	11.3	9.5	8.9
Asian	14.0	14.5	6.7
Hispanic or Latino	22.1	22.8	19.4
Multi-race, Non-Hispanic	5.4	7.2	3.4
Native American	0.0	0.1	0.2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.0	0.0	0.1
White	47.2	45.8	61.3
Gender (%)			
Male	49.6	51.0	51.3
Female	50.4	49.0	48.7
Selected Populations (%)			
English Language Learner	15.5	16.8	9.5
Economically Disadvantaged	38.2	31.8	30.2
Students w/Disabilities	21.5	19.5	17.4
First Language Not English	24.8	26.7	20.1

In June 2017, Orchard Hill school formed five different Enrollment Working Groups (EWG) to address the issues of the dropping enrollment rates that the school faces during the last years a continuous work through winter 2018. One of the propositions was to turn the school into a magnet school and serve the language needs of its diverse population. The idea proposed was to start a dual language program. An analysis of the reasons why this program would be appropriate for the school, was presented to the school committee by the superintendent in February 2018 leading to a more formal proposition in March 2018.

Among the numerous reasons why the school was a good fit for the DL program, was that the passage of LOOK Act in 2017 which allowed also for the seal of biliteracy. The review of relevant research about the benefits of dual language programs for all students and also the similarity of the town's constantly changing demographics with other MSAN (Minority Student Achievement Network) schools which have been running

dual-language programs (50:50 model) for years were among the main reasons the school was chosen to run the DL program. In addition, the school's central location to ease transportation for kids from other districts who enrolled through lottery, was important along with the size of the school that allowed for the creation of three kindergarten classrooms (two bilingual and one monolingual). Also, this type of program was the most cost conscious for the district since it can utilize the already existent bilingual teachers (Spanish-English). Enrollment in the school is achieved through a lottery system prioritizing students from the district but also allowing space for students of other districts as well, to promote inclusion.

The proposition for the program was officially presented to the public in April 2018 in two sessions held at the town's local library (Local newspaper, April, 2018) and soon the news started spreading across town. During October 2018, two school information presentations in Spanish and English respectively were held for prospective students and in November 2018 the School Committee voted for approval of the dual language program at Orchard Hill (School website). In January 2019 a press release confirmed that the focal and a nearby town's Public Schools had jointly received a \$300,000 Bilingual Education Grant by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) for the initiation of the dual language program at the first and continuation of an existing one at the second (Public Schools Press Release, January 2019). Numerous local news published the news in the coming months especially in spring when enrollment season is on, including posters and flyers circulating in local preschools until the official opening (in a pilot mode) in September 2019 starting at kindergarten level.

Participants

The participants in this study were divided into three categories: a) parents/guardians of children currently enrolled in the first grade of the DL program in Orchard Hill, b) administrators of the school including two principles, the superintendent, and the English Language Learning Coordinator, and c) the two teachers of the two classrooms in the first grade of the DL program. All parents were invited to participate in the study via an email that the school administration distributed on my behalf. This action was taken following the IRB guidelines to protect the privacy of the participants and ensure confidentiality of the families in the school community (Merriam, 1998; 2009; Cohen et al, 2000). Of the total population of parent/guardians (all females) that decided to participate, I interviewed four families via Zoom on a scheduled interview meeting.

A non-probability sampling method was employed to choose the participant which is also the preferred method in qualitative studies as my focus is not to “be statistically representative” (Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003, p. 78), but rather to engage into deep description and “bring about understanding that in turn can effect and perhaps even improve practice (Merriam, 1998, p. 41). The participating parents/guardians in the survey and the school officials were the “*typical* purposeful sample” of the study as the site and people were specifically selected for the purposes of the study (Merriam, 1998, p. 62, emphasis in the original).

The next set of participants were the school administrators, including the principal, the assistant principal, the ELL coordinator, and the district’s superintendent. These participants were selected to be interviewed because they were key people to the set up and running of the dual language program and their ideologies and viewpoint is

crucial to its implementation as they represent the policy factor in my study. Lastly, the third group of participants were the two teachers of the first grade of the program. Their contribution to the study was of utmost importance as they are in everyday interaction with the program, and they are the immediate transmitters of its principles. All selected population who was interviewed constituted also a “convenience sampling” because they were selected as the term implies, based on convenience with the goals of the study and research questions, and they were immediately involved with the operation of the program in the focal school (Merriam, 1998, p. 62). Throughout data collection, no contact was attempted or made in person and all procedures were completed via zoom calls on a scheduled meeting. All prior correspondence and interviews were conducted online via Zoom respecting COVID-19 restrictions and guidelines.

Lastly, it should be noted that all participants in the study were assigned pseudonyms and their names or identity was never documented. The same counts for the focal school and town in Massachusetts where pseudonyms were also used. Below, in Table 1, is the list of the participants in the study and the pseudonyms assigned to them for future reference in the findings and analysis section. A column with their linguistic background is also added that will be discussed and analyzed in the findings Chapter. All parents were given first names as pseudonyms because of the less formal tone of the interview, whereas all administrators and teachers are mentioned with a Mr./Mrs. title and a last name.

Pilot Study

In Fall 2019, I conducted a pilot study where I explored the language ideologies of a parent whose child was enrolled in the kindergarten classroom of the focal DL program. Conducting a pilot study serves many practical purposes for a new researcher as it allows them to test the whole process of a research study from study design, data collection, interview practice skills and data analysis in order to be better prepared for a larger scale study. The data of the pilot study showed that the participant held a generally positive ideology towards bilingualism as an idea and as a tool for oral communication in an additional language. For Spanish language in particular the participant viewed its learning as a practical tool for her son to expand his social and geographical horizons as it is one of the most spoken languages after English both nationally and internationally.

Table 2. Participants, Pseudonyms and language (s) spoken

Parents/Guardians	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
Parent 1	Katie	English (native) - Cypriot Greek
Parent 2	Lisa	(fluent)
Parent 3	Celia	English/French (native) –
Parent 4	Sarah	Spanish
		English (native) – German
		English (native) – French, Spanish
Administrators	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
Principal	Mrs. Collins	English
Assistant Principal	Mrs. Garrison	English
ELL Coordinator	Mrs. Roberts	English
Superintendent	Mr. Miller	English
Teachers	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
English Teacher	Mr. Clark	English
Spanish Teacher	Mrs. Hayes	Spanish (native)

The findings also showed the participant's limited knowledge about the actual operation and goals of the dual-language program at Orchard Hill and revealed lack of parental involvement in the learning process than the basics. The study also revealed that the participant had no knowledge of bilingual education history or policies to better engage into a discussion about social justice issues in DL education. However, this result is not uncommon in people not familiar with the field of bilingual education, but certainly the participant's responses indicated that changes should be made in how relevant questions should be phrased and asked in order to elicit discussion from participants who have limited or no knowledge on this matter. I expect this to happen mostly with parent interviews since school officials should be aware of the social justice goals of DL education.

With the help of the pilot participant, I was able to practice and test my interview questions and I realized that the order of some of them should be rearranged in order for the conversation to have a smoother flow. Lastly, I realized the importance for the interviewer to have "superb listening skills and be skillful in personal interaction, question framing, and gentle probing for elaboration" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 102), all of which performed with the participants' interviews.

Data Collection Methods

Interviews

Marshall and Rossman (2006) list four methods for data collection in qualitative studies: a) participation, b) observing, c) interviewing and d) analyzing documents. For this study, I originally intended to collect data through in-depth semi-structured

interviews and a demographic questionnaire. While the survey was distributed, due to limited participation, I will not be reporting on data from this survey. However, the overwhelming source of my data had always been designed to derive from interviews with the school administration, DL program teachers and the families (one parent from each family). The needed demographic information to be obtained from the survey, was also retrieved from the school administration records. For Yin (1994), interviews are “one of the most important sources of case study information” (p. 84). In my study, since I could not ‘observe’ my participants’ language ideologies in the literal meaning of the word, interviews were considered the most beneficial source of information to obtain rich and meaningful results.

Among many types of interviews, I used semi-structured interviews which allow for some flexibility in turn taking and ways of response (King & Horrocks, 2010). Semi-structured interviews are also flexible, allowing the conversation a certain amount of freedom in terms of the direction it takes, and respondents are also encouraged to talk in an open-ended manner about the topics under discussion or any other matters they feel are relevant” (Gall et al, 2003, p. 203). Therefore, both the participants and I will have the freedom to deviate from one question to another following the flow of discussion. This interview type could also be characterized as hermeneutic, a type that elicits more understanding and “interpretation is seen as an essential part of the interview process itself, rather than an isolated phase that occurs after the completion of the interview” (Roulston & Choi, 2018, p. 235).

I wanted to have a holistic view of my participants’ profile and for this reason I prepared a list of questions covering a wide range of information about my participant.

Therefore, I included *background and demographic questions* especially about the language background of my interviewee, *opinion/values questions* to understand and explore my participant's views on bilingualism and bilingual education, *feeling questions* to explore the interviewee's feelings about the dual language program and any possible concerns, and *knowledge questions* to gain factual information of what the participant's knows about the structure and operation and the philosophy of the programs (adapted from King and Horrocks, 2010).

Prior to the interview, I emailed the participants individually with a description of my study and my goals for conducting an interview with them. I also emailed them the consent form as DocuSign document to complete it and return it to me before the scheduled meeting. A Zoom link of the meeting was also included in the correspondence emails and participants were also asked if they agreed to be recorded during the interview which lasted approximately 30-35 minutes. In addition, even though during the interview the questions were guided by me in a specific order, because they were semi-structured, I often allowed myself to be led by "how the participant frames and structures the responses" (Marshall and Rossman, 2006, p. 101) and we often followed the flow of the conversation to lead our discussion. This way I also allowed space for emerging issues or topics of interest that could contribute to new ideas in the topic and could add to the participants' viewpoint, which happened many times in various interviews (Merriam, 1998).

Data Collection Timeline

After receiving approval from the IRB/Kuali Committee to move ahead with my research and data collection procedure, I had been in contact with the school

administration to obtain official approval to commence my research in their school. Once all necessary paperwork was completed, I emailed school administrators and teaches to invite them to my study and set up meetings for their interviews. I also asked the principal to forward an invitation email invitation to the parents/guardians of first grade of the dual language program on behalf of me, kindly asking for their participation in the study. Data collection was fully completed in March 2021 when all interviews from the targeted participants were completed.

Data Analysis

Data analysis refers to the process of making sense of the collected data which involves “consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people have said”, “it is the process of making meaning” (Merriam, 2009, p. 175-176). According to Merriam (1998) “the right way to analyze data in a qualitative study is to do it *simultaneously* with data collection” (p. 162, emphasis in the original). Following Merriam’s recommendation, I started analyzing my data as soon as I had completed my first interview. To fully familiarize myself with my data, I printed the transcribed text and used the margins to make notes which later connected. Since the interviews were conducted online participants were asked if they could be videorecorded through the available feature that Zoom offers. They all agreed, and their interviewed were also transcribed using Zoom’s closed-captioned option. Then I edited the transcripts for any typos that occurred during the automatic closed-captioning, and they were ready for analysis.

After the transcription of the first interview, I applied thematic analysis using King and Horrocks (2010) basic thematic analysis system. According to this system, the analysis was divided into three stages: a) stage one, which was the descriptive coding,

where I identified the parts of the transcript that were more adherent to my research questions and allowed me to see my interview as a whole before breaking it into parts, b) stage two which was the interpretive coding and where coding takes a more specific role in identifying data that can be grouped into same groups according to their theme and c) stage three coding where I defined overarching themes which built upon the thematic ones but were more abstract in nature and drew on the theoretical framework and general questions of the study (King and Horrocks, 2010). This system of analysis allowed for flexibility in moving between stages and go back if needed to alter or inform themes without having to follow a strict sequence (King and Horrocks, 2010).

When creating categories or themes during the data analysis process, Merriam (2009) suggests that new categories should meet the following criteria. Merriam's (2009) categorizations were also followed in the analysis of the data and are explained below (adapted from p. 185-186, emphasis in the original).

- a. Categories should be *responsive to the purpose of research*, meaning they should relate to the overarching research questions.
- b. Categories should be *exhaustive*, meaning they should be able to 'contain' all relevant data in a main category or subcategory
- c. Categories should be *mutually exclusive*, that is a specific unit of data should fit in only one category. If it fits in more than one, maybe a new category or subcategory should be created.
- d. Categories should be *sensitizing*, meaning that the category should be as sensitive and as accurate as possible to what it is in the actual data.

- e. Categories should be *conceptually congruent* which means that all categories should be characterized by the same level of abstraction, in other words if a set of categories or subcategories make sense together and are conceptually related. This was the hardest of the criteria to follow as it required for the researcher to be constantly alert of the grouping of categories to belong to the same conceptual unit.

Trustworthiness

As far as trustworthiness and validity of results are concerned, several provisions were made in order to secure them. LeCompte & Preissle (1993) claim that the background and objectivity of the individual researcher is crucial when conducting a study because certain personal biases can disrupt the process of data analysis. Regarding this perspective I offered a full account of my positionality as a researcher entering this study in Chapter 1 recognizing that although I could not avoid having my own language ideologies on the different topics to be explored, I tried to not let them intervene in the analysis process. Merriam (1998) also suggests some basic strategies an investigator can follow in order to ensure validity of their research. Among those is the strategy of triangulation, using more than one sources of data (interview and survey), peer examination and researcher's biases which have already been discussed. For the peer examination factor, after I completed my data analysis, I asked a fellow doctoral candidate in my program to review my transcripts and analyses and evaluate my conclusions. By comparing my viewpoints with a reviewer in the same field I could gain confidence in my findings and add to the analysis of the data (Merriam, 2009).

To ensure trustworthiness of data and my participants' information, I assigned a pseudonym to the focal school, and I also assigned pseudonyms or coding numbers to all

my participants securing their personal information and anonymity. The transcripts of interviews were securely be kept in coded folders on my personal computers to which I only had access to. Under no circumstances, data names, emails or other personal information of the participants were shared with anyone than myself and the interviewee, upon request.

Limitations

A limitation that arose during data collection was the limited to no participation to the online demographic survey. The study was originally designed to include a brief qualitative survey addressed to the parents/guardians of the first grade of the dual language program. The survey included mainly demographic questions and language background of the participants. It also included a couple of multiple choice and open-ended questions on the reasons of enrollment to the program. The link to the survey was sent to the families by the school administration through an invitation email and later as an attachment on a reminder flier, on behalf of me. Unfortunately, participation in the survey was very limited and did not lead to meaningful and useful data and therefore was later decided to be removed from the study. However, the school administration was able to provide me with demographic information of the students in the program and other statistical records that proved useful and contributed to the study. Additionally, this study was also limited to what participants were willing to share with me in their interviews. I made sure to inform participants of their privacy rights and made every effort to make the interview process as comfortable as possible. However, I could not ensure the truthfulness of their responses or the amount of information they decided to share with me.

Summary

This Chapter provided an overview of the research design I used to carry out this study. I provided the study's context, the participants and data collections procedures I employed. I also offered an analysis of data collection and analysis methods I used in order to group my findings and sort them into thematic units that correspond to the study's research questions. I also briefly presented findings and insights from a previous pilot study I conducted in the Fall of 2019. Lastly, I concluded the Chapter with notes on trustworthiness issues that were followed throughout the study as well as limitations that arose during data collection and analysis. The following Chapter will focus on the presentation of findings of the study as they are grouped under the research questions.

CHAPTER 4 – FINDINGS

Introduction

This study sought to explore and understand the language ideologies of families, school officials, administrators and teachers directly involved in a newly founded DL elementary program in a town in Massachusetts. Four parents, two teachers, two principals, the ELL coordinator and the district's superintendent participated in in-depth interviews aiming to provide an insight into their thoughts on issues of bilingualism and bilingual education, social justice, and touch upon issues of race, whiteness, and language dominance in a DL program. The concept of critical consciousness and how it manifests both in the ideologies of participants and in their practices, decision making and choice of schooling, is thoroughly discussed and analyzed as a significant part of the interviews focused on this concept. The analysis of the findings aims to answer the three research questions that frame and guide this study. Lastly, the chapter is organized around the research questions and findings pertaining to each question is presented in a separate section with its own distinct themes.

1. *What are the language ideologies of parents who have chosen this dual-language program for their children?*
2. *What are the language ideologies of the administrators, school officials and teachers who are involved in the creation and implementation of the dual-language program?*
 - a) *How are these reflected in the structure of the program?*
3. *Do families and administrators see critical consciousness as an integral part of the DL program?*

b) How does this manifest in their engagement in the program? For families, in the choice of schooling? For administrators in the programming and implementation of curricular practices?

Research question one: What are the language ideologies of parents who have chosen this dual-language program for their children?

This section explores research question one concerning the general language ideologies of four parents/guardians of the children at the first grade of the dual-language program. This research question is addressed through various interview responses covering topics like their personal linguistic background, views on bilingualism, reasons for enrollment in the program, attitudes toward the Spanish language, beliefs, and concerns about the language program their children attend, among others. These areas of discussion constitute the different themes that emerged from the data analysis corresponding to research question one. Each theme is discussed in a headed section below. Throughout this section the terms ‘parents’, ‘families’, ‘participants’ or ‘interviewees’ might be used interchangeably, but primarily, all four parents will be mentioned and addressed with using their assigned pseudonyms from the table below.

Table 3. Parent/Guardians Pseudonyms

Parents/Guardians	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
Parent 1	Katie	English (native) - Cypriot Greek (fluent)
Parent 2	Lisa	English/French (native) – Spanish
Parent 3	Celia	English (native) – German
Parent 4	Sarah	English (native) – French, Spanish

Linguistic background and language (s) spoken at home

All four participating families had rich and diverse linguistic background varying from being raised bilingually to gaining proficiency in a language other than English later in their childhood or adult life. Lisa spent three years in Germany as a kid being raised by Hungarian parents and was fluent in both languages with Hungarian being her mother tongue. She later moved to Canada with her family where she learned English and French and took Spanish lessons as a high school student. Growing up in Canada she gradually became fluent, in English and French. She lost fluency in Hungarian and describes her Hungarian as “like kids’ level” and while she can understand some Spanish “if people speak slow” but “can’t talk about complicated things”. Katie grew up in Cyprus “initially speaking English only” and then learned Greek “probably around five or six” by attending a Greek American school in Cyprus, “being in Cyprus” and “being surrounded by Greek speakers” and speaking Greek with her dad. Celia was also raised speaking English, took Spanish for four years in high school and then intensively learnt German in college as part of her studies in German history and later as part of her “work and research” as a historian. Sarah grew up speaking English, immigrated from South Africa to the US and started to learn Spanish in fifth grade when her parents switched her from a public to a private school. Her Spanish was at an “advanced” level by high school where she picked up French as an additional foreign language. She later stated that French became her “main second language” and she also works as a professor in comparative and French literature at a local University.

Regarding the language (s) spoken at home all four parents reported they speak mainly English with their children with Celia only mentioning she introduces “some

phrases and words in Spanish and German but in terms of the everyday language that it's constantly spoken, it's English". Sarah started off raising her children bilingually, especially with her eldest son with her husband speaking to them in Hebrew and her in English. However, she explained that the "experience of raising a child bilingually" was hard on their household. Her husband's frequent travelling for work, made him decide to "drop" the second language because "he realized that it was more difficult to bond with our kids especially as the language got more advance, so now we just speak English with the kids" (Sarah). Regardless of their current language practices and the dominance of English, the interviews indicate that all participants had a diverse linguistic background and contact with one or more languages other than English. For Celia and Sarah, their language backgrounds significantly affected who they are as they chose a career path directly involved with languages they studied later in their life.

Bilingualism/biculturalism/biliteracy

All families demonstrated awareness of the differences among the terms of bilingualism, biculturalism and biliteracy with a focus mainly on the term bilingualism which for most of them entailed all three. Katie considered bilingualism as "mainly speaking two languages" adding that "I know some places consider culture, but mainly it's the words". When asked if she thinks if being bilingual is different from being bicultural, she responded "not necessarily". Lisa stated that bilingualism "is knowing two languages, but also knowing some culture, but I guess it's really that language piece". She also added that "I think you can be bilingual, you can know two languages, but not necessarily know anything about the people who speak the language". Celia argued that

being bilingual is the ability to “go back and forth into different languages and to feel comfortable on them”. In her own words:

“to be able to freely express oneself on both languages, that’s really important to me, for it to come naturally and come easily because of the fluency, so that you can not only go about your everyday activities, using that language, you know, interactions, but to be able to have deeper conversations”.

Regarding the difference between the terms bilingualism and biculturalism, she stated that being bicultural it’s not “something that’s linguistic, but having, you know, kind of a broader understanding of culture and maybe participation in that culture”; “bicultural is like a stronger notion than bilingual”. Similarly, Sarah, mentioned that “bilingualism is really feeling equally comfortable in two languages and using those two languages, not only outside the home but inside the home”. She also attributed depth and value to the term bicultural claiming that “language carries culture, so I think that if you are bilingual, you’re essentially bicultural”, thus equating these two notions.

Sarah, whose professional field is directly related to language and culture, also pointed out that although she speaks an additional language fluently and teaches it (French), she does not consider herself bilingual; “I mean because I’m fluent in French, but it’s not really a native fluency because I started so late”. Katie who was raised in Cyprus speaking Greek and English, also did not identify as bilingual reporting English as her dominant language although she grew up “speaking two languages”. Lastly, Lisa who grew up in Canada speaking both English and French she identified as a fluent speaker of both languages but not a bilingual, with English being her strong language. Although all participants are aware of the differences among the terms bilingualism,

biculturalism and biliteracy, for each of them they matter differently or have a different significance stemming from their own language histories, how they identify themselves in terms of language learners and what (implicit) expectations they have for their children's language learning.

Reasons for enrollment in the program

Although different families had different responses to this question, they all made connections, direct or indirect, to their own linguistic background when it came to the decision of the program they chose for their children. All four of them valued bilingualism and its benefits and consider a language program as beneficial for their child's development. Lisa said she acknowledged the "value in kids learning more than one language" and she wanted that experience for her daughter who just like her, loves languages. She also added that "finally something else (a different program in the schools), you know for the kids" came up in town, which she believed it was "definitely worth trying". Katie also felt the same; a new program being offered in the neighborhood school that might be worth considering. Although it was "more of a random choice", "we were going to go to the school. This is what they were offering, we were going to try it out".

Celia, judging from her own relationship with languages, stated that she "knew it was much easier to learn the language when you're young" an opportunity which she did not have until she was fourteen years old. She emphasized on the "huge advantage" to be able to study a language earlier because learning becomes "much easier and natural" for a child when it is done "through play and song and music". Lastly, Sarah expressed a more detailed response to the reasons why she chose this program for her daughter. She began

her argument stating that she “strongly” believes that her own personal and professional background in teaching languages had definitely played a major role in choosing a language program for her child. However, as she went on, the argument developed further, and more grounded revealing deeper and more elaborate reasons for her choice of schooling:

“I think we really have a major handicap in our country, in starting languages so late. It’s always been frustrating to me that in a town like this with a so called very excellent school system, languages are being pushed into the seventh grade. And actually, I have a child in middle school now and the language is only one semester in seventh grade and then the full year in eighth grade. And it seems like, no wonder we’re behind and you know I have applicants to our graduate program coming from Poland, anywhere else in the world, and they have such an advantage with languages”.

“...so, and my own field is supposed to be comparative literature, it was supposed to teach literatures in their original language, but now increasingly we’re forced to teach them in translation..”.

Sarah’s arguments and ideological positioning showed that enrolling her child to Orchard Hill’s DL program was not a random choice or just an option that ‘happened’ to be available in the neighborhood school, but rather a more sophisticated and well considered choice. Her beliefs about the language learning system in the country were strong, as strong were also her beliefs on how foreign language literature should be taught to university students. By choosing the DL program for her daughter, she was also affirming her own beliefs and hopes for a different future in language learning in the US.

Expectations and benefits from the program

All participating families considered speaking an additional language from such a young age as a great benefit for their children's personal and academic life. Their hopes and expectations from the program focused mostly on the academic gains and benefits of acquiring another language. However, other reasons and expectations were also expressed to strengthen and support their arguments. Below are the three main categories as shaped by the participants' responses.

Language and academic benefits

Celia said that in the following years she expects her daughter to “be conversant in Spanish” and also “write and spell in Spanish as well”. Being “quite proficient” and “getting both subjects in both languages” is a “wonderful” opportunity for young kids. She explained that eventually kids in the DL program will receive instruction in mathematics or social studies in both languages, they will not “miss out anything”; therefore “why not have this opportunity?” She argued that for some families the fact that their children would be taught all subjects including math and social studies in both languages, is reassuring “so you feel like you know, the child will not be behind in English, and then you do that the other language is just kind of an advantage”. Especially in the US, where there's a “huge Spanish population, it's a useful language” (Spanish) another parent commented (Katie). Sarah was impressed by how “amazing” the kids' accents are already and how “they have integrated all the consonants and the vowel sounds beautifully” which is a great thing to witness in young children. Parents' beliefs about the academic gains of attending a DL program were overtly positive, viewing Spanish as a useful language, an advantage for their children to learn in a country like the

US. Additionally, the fact that students are taught all subjects in both languages, is also considered 'advantageous. However, it would be interesting to explore whether the parents would feel the same if certain subjects were taught exclusively in one of the two languages. Lastly, the responses are limited to participants whose children are English dominant; Spanish dominant families might have valued the language gains in a different way.

Cultural Benefits

Katie argued that mainly the benefits of speaking and interacting in two languages is a big benefit to everyone but also "interacting with other cultures" and "being exposed to other cultures in class" is "useful" and she does "not see the harm" into attending such a program. Lisa also reported that she expects her child to become fluent in both languages and "be culturally aware that there's other ways of doing things and other things out there". She later added that attending the DL program is the "best thing that happened" to her daughter and "kids are smart when they're younger; that's the time for them to learn languages because it's much easier and it sticks better". Sarah claimed that the expectations from the program focus on helping her daughter gain "a broader sense of the community, and a more integrated community with the diverse people" and Spanish can eventually "become a second nature influence". Likewise, Celia said that being part of the DL program could help her child become more culturally aware and "luckily, her school is quite diverse to begin with, which is wonderful". She also added that by including in the curriculum cultural celebrations and "different practices in Mexico, you know like, the Day of the Dead, kids become more familiar with the Spanish culture in a more "standardized" and "streamlined" that can later come as more "natural". Lastly,

Sarah remembered “a strong cultural moment” with students celebrating the Puerto Rican flag singing songs for this national Puerto Rican holiday outside the town hall, which strengthened the cultural benefits of the program.

Language as resource

Celia expected that her daughter’s attendance in the program will make her feel proud about herself one day, the same way she takes pride in being able to speak German fluently. She claimed that speaking more than one language is “so important on different levels, on one level it’s a confidence booster”, “it builds confidence but then much more”. On another level, Celia mentioned that it’s to “get by in a foreign country”, study abroad or work abroad “and, you know, navigate the environment, these skills really help with that”. Effective communication and deeper connection to speakers of other languages also added to her line of argumentation about the potential benefits of being in a DL program. In terms of communication, she noted that in a country like the United States, knowing an additional language like Spanish “is really helpful, you know, especially if you are in the medical profession or the legal profession” and other environments where the “command of Spanish is really helpful, given our diverse population”.

Moreover, Celia stressed the fact that for her, effective bilingual communication, means being able to engage deeply into complex conversation with speakers of both languages and “fully express yourself”, “make a joke or something like that”, “dream” in another language and “really understand people and be able to reach out to people”. As with academic gains, Spanish language was also seen as a resource, a tool, to help DL students advance their chances in achieving a better career, expand their working and

living horizons and boost their confidence as individuals. The ‘advantage’ of the Spanish language was again perceived from the English dominant family perspective, and it would be important to be explored from a Spanish dominant family as well.

Overall feelings about the program

Overall, all four parents in this study showed a very positive attitude and feelings toward the DL program, school, and administration. When asked if they would recommend it to new interested parents and what would say to them, the responses were overwhelmingly positive. Celia was enthusiastic about the program claiming that this is one of the reasons to make her “want to stay in this area” “because of the education that my daughter’s receiving”. Sarah, started her arguments by saying how impressed she is with the “teaching and the level of support” they receive from the school. The engagement of the teachers and the “thought” that has gone into all this endeavor, was something that made a huge impression on this family, who entered the school and the program initially with some hesitations and concerns that will be mentioned in other sections in the findings.

Sarah’s positive experience in the school, led her become a strong advocate for another DL program in a nearby town which she would not have done if she “had not been so pleased and impressed” with the focal program. She also expressed a level of disappointment and concern that the school is “losing our principal” due to move to another country, because “the level of engagement she’s shown in concurrently learning Spanish herself and communicate in Spanish” was something remarkable “showing that the school is so onboard”. Lisa thought that the program is “great honestly” especially for kids who are keen in learning languages and “would encourage anyone who thinks their

child is capable of it to try it out”. Lastly, Katie encouraged interested parents to consider what programs their neighborhood school offers and if their children are also interested, she recommends to definitely “go for it”.

Concerns about the program

Although all parents showed enthusiasm, support and overall trust in the structure and effectiveness of the program, a few concerns were raised regarding plans for future expansion of the program, funding, and pace of learning. Celia worried what will happen to the children’s language knowledge when they graduate from the program in 6th grade. She hoped that the program extends in later years, in middle school or high school so that knowledge of Spanish will not fade. Sarah seemed to have the same concern and it is her hope for programs like this to continue beyond the elementary years because it is a pity a strong language foundation to be “lost” and not be “reactivated” in middle or high school. Lisa mentioned that she worries about the program’s continuous funding. She specifically stated, “I hope it stays funded, that’s my biggest concern”, they might “take it away (funding) because it’s the first year so they’re building on it every year and the have to hire a new teacher for the next grade”.

Regarding the language learning concerns, Celia acknowledged the fact that the actual “educational advantages” of the program will show a few years later which is challenging at first because it slows literacy levels down, but “you know it’ll get better”. “You know, we’d like to go to a point where the children on their own would be speaking Spanish, you know like, when they’re eating lunch or on the playground, and I’m not sure at what point we’re going to get there” she continued. Sarah was also aware that learning in two languages at once “will be a little bit more difficult and much slower” but she

expected that because of the nature of the program. Sarah also added that although they “had some concerns initially” about the teachers “having a bigger class size” and working with almost “double the amount of students”, this concern had easily faded away and is currently impressed by the quality of teaching and learning. Through the responses of the feelings toward the DL program, it is concluded that the overall positive and enthusiastic attitudes the participants shared, outweigh the few but also noteworthy concerns that some parents had.

Familiarity with the program before enrollment

The news about the newly launched dual language program in the town was delivered in different ways to different families. Sarah stated that she was aware of the program before it opened its doors to the students through friends “who have been involved in the program in thinking about it, who are kind of activists, and they told me about it”. Celia and Kate said that she first heard about the program through the local preschool their children attended at that time. They received an information email, studied provided flyers and attended a recruitment presentation by the superintendent and ELL coordinator that also took place at the same daycare preschool. Finally, Lisa said that they were familiar with the idea of setting up a DL program at the focal school for a few years through their older son who attended the same school. Then by the time their daughter was at kindergarten level they were “really lucky” that it was also the year the program was launched.

Child's feelings about the program

Most parents reported that their children are very happy to be part of the dual language program and it is an environment that they enjoy learning. The main 'dislikes' on behalf of the kids concern the expected difficulties in understanding a totally new language especially in the beginning of the program and the changes and disruption of teaching and learning that COVID brought which will be discussed at a different section. Katie explained that her son "doesn't like not always understanding what's going on in class" but overall "he's pretty excited about you know hanging out with his friends and I think he likes the English program more than the Spanish". Lisa also commented on the difficulty her daughter faced at her first encounter with Spanish language. "It was frustrating because she just couldn't understand and couldn't speak, and it was really difficult, but now I think she loves that she gets more teachers" and "learning very different things over the course of the day.

Lack of understanding all activities or the teacher's instruction was also reported by Celia about her daughter although as she explained, this fact did not seem to bother or frustrate the child who actively enjoys participating in class especially when songs, "artwork and cultural things" are involved which make "learning more fun". Sarah commented on how much their daughter enjoyed the fact that she socialized with friends whose native language is Spanish "she doesn't think of them differently, she's happy socially", which really frustrated her with the isolation that COVID brought. She also mentioned that many times, especially during remote learning, their daughter didn't understand an activity and the teacher could not explain "because she was helping other

people”, that usually would not happen in an in-person school room when attention and help can be direct and hands on.

COVID-19

Undoubtedly, the global pandemic had brought significant changes in all fields of life, and it greatly affected educational settings. The switch to remote online learning for an extended period had been a difficult and stressful experience for all students but especially for younger ones like those who attended dual-language programs since they are learning in two languages. Below are some of the challenges it brought for the students in the first grade in the DL program in this study.

Katie was worried that the program was not going to be offered remotely and as they did not feel comfortable sending their kid to school, they were concerned that their child was going to miss school. “Learning a language like Spanish involves a lot of movement and interaction. It’s really an in-person program” and “it’s very different now when they’re looking at a book on the screen and trying to read in Spanish” Katie claimed. Celia said that her limited time to be involved with her own remote teaching and simultaneously assisting her daughter with her own remote learning was particularly challenging especially during the first few weeks of the pandemic. She also expressed her concern that “because it is dual language and because this odd year that we’ve had” literacy progress in students had been delayed more than usual especially writing skills. “It’s harder to get them writing, and the teacher reviewing and giving them feedback because of the pandemic, because she’s not necessarily collecting their work regularly to see what they’re doing in terms of writing”.

Lisa also felt that the switch to remote learning had been particularly hard in the beginning because a lot of daily routines that would normally take place in the in-person DL environment had to readjust. She explains that students used to “physically switch rooms” for Spanish and English time and it was “really neat because there’s like a separate space for when you speak Spanish and English” and that was so hard to achieve with remote learning. Additionally, she mentioned the importance of being expressive when teaching a foreign language and she interact with gestures to convey meaning. Sarah also felt that the beginning of remote learning was “frustrating” because the “teachers provided so many links, like if you want to read a book, take this link and everything was online” and impersonal. She then explained that it was mostly the increased screen time that alienated her rather than the fluctuation of links which she understood it was intentional, an “issue of accessibility” and “about making sure that everybody has the same resources”.

Lisa remembered how the teacher in the pre Covid time “would pretend to not understand” something until the children came up with the right words on their own, whereas in remote learning she would correct them more and allow “them to ask more things in English” to speed things up and make sure the students understand. For Sarah’s daughter the lack of in-person social interaction with her friends was the most challenging part of virtual learning and the fact that one to one teacher access, for example “if she didn’t understand” an instruction or activity was much harder and time consuming with online class. Regardless of the challenges that Covid-19 brought to the regular routines of the program, most parents acknowledged that this was a unique

circumstance and overall, the school did “a really good job with the program and it worked pretty well” (Lisa).

Parental involvement in children’s learning

The majority of the interviewees showed some extend of participation in their children’s learning by helping them with challenging homework or simply checking their progress. Involvement was considered more than usual during the year of the pandemic and all the changes it brought with the remote learning. Celia mentioned that she would “periodically, every couple of months” and “not necessarily right after school” review a few worksheets and drawings with her daughter and go over some words or phrases and decide which to keep and which to recycle. But it is mostly her daughter who prefers “her Spanish teacher to be doing the Spanish” and not review them with her mother. Sarah said that she sometimes would “check in, I don’t help as much as I wish I did” and occasionally would assist with instructions in an activity” especially during remote learning which she thought it would not be a problem once the kids are back into in-person learning. Lisa reported that she would often work together with her daughter to check on her progress. She reported that since her “level of Spanish” was appropriate for her daughter’s language needs, she would occasionally help her with instructions, or unknown vocabulary or if they don’t know a word in a reading, they “would google translate” it and figure it out.

When asked to describe a typical day in their child’s schedule, all parents with the exception of one (Katie), showed clear understanding of the daily structure of the program and how the curriculum is designed. Katie reported that “we don’t really know what’s going on in school, as much” and “we don’t really monitor” homework “so, it’s

hard to know what's going on in a typical day". Part of the lack of involvement could be justified because of the language barrier that Spanish brought on the some of the parents. "It was a brand-new language, so it was hard not understanding anything and now we obviously understand a lot more" Katie explains. She also argued that "surprisingly there is no homework, so we don't have to offer support" which was a finding that was not met in any other parent responses. However, the majority of the participants showed involvement and interest in their children's learning, support in homework or classroom activities and awareness of any challenges that may occur (remote learning) which reveals an overall positive attitude toward the program.

Attitudes toward Spanish language

All four participants thought highly of the Spanish language and for many of them it was an additional reason to attract them to the DL program. Furthermore, they all showed awareness of the difference between European Spanish and Spanish spoken in the US. More specifically, Lisa said that she is grateful that the language offered at program is Spanish because it is a very useful language to know because "a large fraction of the world speaks that language" and "is the predominant language" in this county. She also stressed the fact that although there is a Chinese immersion program in a nearby town, "it would never crossed" her mind to send her kids there because it would not be as useful for them to know. She later added that if another language like French was offered instead of Spanish, she might have considered it but still "probably go with Spanish" because it is such a useful language. Regarding familiarity with Spanish speaking population and culture outside the program, Lisa said that she had travelled with her

family a few times both to Spain and Mexico and have been acquainted with the different cultures through these trips.

Sarah mentioned that while her children were young, they had hired au pairs from Catalonia, Spain, and Germany, and therefore the kids had been exposed to different language and cultural backgrounds. Being a language professor herself she argued that she had “actually appreciated Spanish as something that’s not really monolithic but has different dialects”. She therefore explained that she has formed “great appreciation” of Spanish dialects coming from Spain, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic or anywhere else and she feels very happy that her daughter is exposed to one of these dialects in her DL program. When asked if she would have preferred a different language instead of Spanish in the DL program, Sarah enthusiastically responded that any language offered in the public school system whether it was Spanish, French, Arabic or Chinese “anything really” she would still enroll her daughter to it.

Katie said that although she knows that there is “Spanish from Spain versus Spanish from Latin America” she was never interested in knowing what variety is taught in the DL program although she would guess it is probably from “Puerto Rico given the local population”. As a family she mentioned that they have not been exposed to the Spanish language and culture outside of school although she knows “Spanish speakers, but they speak English” with them. Celia’s professional and personal background helped her have a more informed attitude toward Spanish language and culture. Being a historian, she elaborated on the history of colonization of Latin American countries, and she acknowledged that the “big geographical gap between Mexico and Costa Rica vs.

Spain” also created big differences in the Spanish taught “in textbooks” and the actual Spanish taught in American classrooms.

Celia’s personal connections with Spanish speakers from Colombia and Costa Rica and the local demographics made it easy for her to recognize accents and dialects that shape “our area” and she felt it is natural for this kind of Spanish to be taught in the DL program. Celia also expressed her preference on Spanish language over the other local DL program offering Chinese immersion, for reasons because they “offer a 90:10 model” instead of a 50:50 one which she considered more balanced and accessible for younger children. Regardless of the minor differences in the participants’ responses, all four of them showed appreciation of the Spanish language taught in the program as well as an overall sense of pride to be able to receive this kind of public education.

Summary of findings on parents’ language ideologies

This section of data analysis focused on the presentation of findings responding to research question one which addressed the language ideologies of four parents whose children attend the first grade of the DL program in this study. The resulting themes from the participants’ responses covered areas of the interviewees’ linguistic background, beliefs about bilingualism and biculturalism, their expectations and concerns about the program, their attitudes toward Spanish language and culture as well as the reasons that led them choose this program for their children’s education. All the areas presented, helped shape an initial portrait of the participants’ language ideologies, before analyzing their beliefs and viewpoints on critical consciousness and social justice in a later section. An important theme that was also added to all sections of the dissertation findings was the unprecedented COVID-19 pandemic, the changes it brought to teaching and learning

and how it had affected the families in this DL program. The next section explores the languages ideologies of school officials and teachers directly involved in the running and implementation of the focal language program covering emerging themes addressing research question two.

Research question two: What are the language ideologies of the administrators, school officials and teachers who are involved in the creation and implementation of the dual-language program?

a. How are these reflected in the structure of the program?

This section explores the language ideologies of six key people involved directly with the creation, implementation, and day to day practices of the dual-language program at Orchard Hill Elementary. The school's principal, assistant principal, ELL coordinator and the district's superintendent, provided a thorough insight into important issues and values that shape the functions and operations of the DL program. Furthermore, the two first grade teachers' ideological viewpoints complement the picture of the daily academic and ethical principles that construct program through as they are portrayed through their daily interaction with students. All participants are given pseudonyms which are summarized in the table below.

The terms participants, interviewees, administrators, school officials would be used interchangeably along with their titles and pseudonyms. Themes created in this section to address research question two, respond to interview questions regarding participants' ideologies about social justice, beginning stages of DL program, challenges along the way, structure of the program, how culture is performed in the program,

COVID-19, and more. What is prevalent through the analysis of data of all school officials was an overwhelming existence of social justice values that framed their ideologies and was consistent throughout the length of the interviews and characterizes the moral principles of the whole school.

Another important note to be made and that can also be shown in the table below, is that all but one of the school officials, who is also the Spanish teacher of the program, reported speaking a language other than English. In particular, all administrators in the interviews, said that they were raised speaking only English with the principal Mrs. Collins, making an effort to learn Spanish currently with the initiation of the DL program. From the teachers, Mr. Clark, the English teacher mentioned that he his mom is of Spanish heritage but she “never taught” Spanish to him while he was growing up. The only person who reported bilingual was Mrs. Hayes, the Spanish teacher, who was raised speaking Spanish only and started learning English at school when she moved to the US with her family as a kid. She commented that “English is a complex language”, “yes, I consider myself bilingual” but also “I am trying to learn better English as I grow”.

Despite the limited personal experience, the participants had with bilingualism, they were all strong advocates of bilingualism, bilingual education and the demonstrated a committed devotion to the principals of dual language programs and the equity causes that it represents. Lastly, they all showed solid and thorough knowledge of the differences among the terms of bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism stressing the fact that these are all core values they are addressing in the DL program of the school.

Table 4. Administrators’ pseudonyms

Administrators	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
Principal	Mrs. Collins	English
Assistant Principal	Mrs. Garrison	English
ELL Coordinator	Mrs. Roberts	English
Superintendent	Mr. Miller	English
Teachers	Pseudonyms	
English Teacher	Mr. Clark	English
Spanish Teacher	Mrs. Hayes	Spanish/English

The themes created in this section are primarily based on the responses and data collected from the interviews with the administrative personnel of the school who are responsible for the implementation of the DL program. Integrated in some themes, are also the ideologies and data collected from the interviews with the two teachers of the program which are presented and discussed under a different heading. Not all themes include subsections with the teachers' views, but these are included when their responses directly address the research question and add to new findings and knowledge for the study. A theme particularly created drawing from data from the interviews with the teachers, is presented below prior to all other themes and refers to the teachers' to previous teaching experience in bilingual or monolingual settings, in order to complement the profile for their practices in the DL classroom.

Teachers' professional background and experience with bilingual education

For Mr. Clark, the DL first grade English language teacher, the current academic year has been his first year teaching in a DL setting. Prior to this year, he had been teaching first grade in the same school for two years and then taught first and third grades for nine years in different schools nationally and internationally, before joining Orchard Hill. Compared to mainstream education classroom he reports that a difference that DL instruction entails is teaching the same content twice a day (morning and afternoon) “just to different students” (the two DL classrooms).

Additionally, he mentioned that lesson planning and instruction of vocabulary, especially when introducing new English words, is “a bit more explicitly taught” than in a monolingual classroom. But the most significant difference he noticed is the new feature of “the bridge”. During ‘bridging time’, the English and Spanish teachers meet weekly at the end of each unit especially for science and social studies “try to make connections between the two languages” and make sure the same meaning and material is taught. Lastly, Mr. Clark also mentioned that subjects like math or literacy are “a bit shorter” compared to monolingual classrooms.

Mrs. Hayes, the Spanish language teacher, had been teaching Spanish as a second language in elementary schools for several years before joining the dual language program. She was also worked as a paraprofessional at a DL program in a nearby town at the first year of the program’s operation. Although she had some experience with DL settings before, she describes teaching Spanish as a second language and teaching Spanish as part of DL education, as a different experience through which she had to make several “adjustments” in her teaching. One difference lay in the fact that for the DL

program she has to learn how to also teach in Spanish courses like “social studies, science and math” instead of just “grammar, reading, writing, speaking” for which she had trained as an ESL teacher in college. For the DL program she had to receive additional training and “guidance” through a different curriculum and “model” the classes following the new curriculum.

Mrs. Hayes also mentioned that she now uses more body language, adapt her pace of talk from natural fast native to a more slow and calm pace to make sure the students “really understand”, given the fact that she is not allowed to use English to explain new notions or vocabulary to them”. Despite the adjustments both teachers needed to make to their previous teaching strategies in order to effectively teach in the DL classroom, they both reported that their special bilingual training helped them significantly and they feel comfortable and happy in their new role.

Reasons for the creation of the DL program

The social justice framework that shapes the ideologies of all staff in the school was prevalent the reasoning behind the decision to initiate discussion on launching a DL in the focal town. The principal Mrs. Collins stated:

“It’s been very clear for years that we’ve been under serving specifically our Latino Spanish speaking population that they have been underachieving, and we’ve been over identifying them as students with disabilities, primarily students with communication disorders , and in analyzing all of our data, it’s very clear to us that we needed to adjust our practice to serve them better because they’re perfectly capable of achieving the test scores of their non-Latino counterparts. So, we needed to adjust our mode of reaching them and our motive instructing them so they could actually reach their potential”.

“...and we certainly value diversity and measure whether there’s multiculturalism present in our curriculum, but I don’t think we elevated their skills and having a second language or being fluent in Spanish, to the way that they should have been and could have been and therefore their long-term outcomes weren’t as successful as they should be”.

The school’s assistant principal mentioned that “there’s always been a history of valuing bilingualism in the district” and referred to the Cambodian community and bilingual program that existed in the town about twenty years ago (Mrs. Garrison). Mrs. Roberts, the school ELL coordinator felt that the timing of a DL program to open in the town was about right and there were a “bunch of reasons coming together at the right time” although there have been discussions in the community for many years now. The influx of research on benefits of DL education in the past 15 years along with the continuous growth in the Spanish population with an obvious “opportunity gap in terms of outcomes” for their scores, made the decision for the DL program easy (Mrs. Roberts). Additionally, the enrollment records across the district schools were declining and “language came as a possibility” to raise these numbers for the public schools in the area (Mrs. Roberts). Through the key administrators’ responses, a combination of reasons including demographics, declining enrollment, and the benefits of DL education, led to the decision to establish such a program in the area.

Orchard Hill Elementary to host the DL program

The ELL coordinator mentioned that among the three elementary schools in town Orchard Hill was probably selected that there was a significantly smaller student population in the school compared to 15 years ago and the decline in enrollment was

“part of choosing that school, as opposed to the other ones” along with more “space” in the facilities, “it made the most sense” to pick this school.

Mrs. Collins claimed that the central location and easy access from across town was probably the most important reason for the selection of Orchard Hill to host the DL program in addition to the school demographics and staff “enthusiasm” for this opportunity. She also added that the school’s size was appropriate to host additional classroom for the program compared to the other elementary schools in town, but Orchard Hill’s central location was certainly the most “decisive factor”. Similarly, the superintendent noted that Orchard Hill was not selected based on a “magnet school setup” but because of its appropriate size and central location, factors that were taken into consideration after visiting a “bunch of similar programs in the east coast” that served as models. Lastly, the demographics of the school which have “by far the highest” ELL population, with roughly half of the students speaking Spanish or being of mixed dominance, this school’s choice to host the DL program was certainly reasonable (Mr. Miller).

Even though Orchard Hill has a large Latinx population, Mrs. Roberts reported that all DL classrooms are filled “a little bit less than the cap” both for Spanish and English students. The principal, Mrs. Collins, explained that both kindergarten and first grade are under enrolled right now because the school does not have “as many Spanish speakers as we would like or as we have the capability to” but because they are very strict on keeping the 50/50 ratio of English and Spanish speakers that DL proposes, they decided to run the program as is. From all the above, it is clear that the decision for

Orchard Hill to host the DL program, was the result of a thoughtful process and a mixture of reasons, rather than just a straightforward option.

Setting up the program

In the initial stages of the creation of the program, Mrs. Collins remembered doing “extensive research, a lot of community outreach to make sure we have community partners for it”. The assistant principal stated that the planning of the program was not “something that just happened” but it lasted for over 18 months and involved multiple levels of communication, including school committees, the superintendent office, and planning groups (Mrs. Garrison). She also attributed a big part of the success of communication and promotion of the program, to the families who with their “authentic communication” and “word of mouth” spread the news of the newly launched DL program in the area.

On another note, guided by the social justice mission that the whole school is committed to, Mrs. Collins stated:

“we did a lot of groundwork to getting folks to trust us that this is the right thing to do. And honestly, our Spanish speaking population was super receptive, and it was our English-speaking counterparts that needed more convincing that this would be a program that was quality program.

“But ultimately, we’re doing this for our Spanish-speaking kids that have been underserved historically so it’s a wonderful bonus and added skill that our English-speaking kids will have. They are going to be able to be bilingual in Spanish. That’s wonderful, but this really was an effort to level the playing field for our kids that we been under serving and over identify, maybe Spanish was the first choice as that was the population that needed or needed us to adjust our instruction to support them better”.

Mrs. Roberts remembered that while the DL program was being set up, there have been a lot of community info sessions where the benefits of bilingualism were discussed along with “connection to culture, maintaining and supporting the identity” of Spanish speaking population, and “elevate Spanish within the school and the Community”; stressing that the importance of biculturalism and racial equity.

In an attempt to secure equal opportunities for all students in the district, the school officials made sure to establish an equitable enrollment system that would guarantee a 50/50 ratio of English and Spanish dominant students. ELL coordinator, Mrs. Roberts explained that she “worked really hard to figure out how to have a lottery system that was equitable and prioritizing Spanish speaking families”. Mrs. Collins also stressed the fact that right from the start of the program, the school administration made sure to make it known district wide, that there is a “preference for Spanish and bilingual students” for admission in the program and that “was a key component to the institution” that would not be overlooked even if that meant that the program would be under enrolled.

Similarly, Mr. Miller, the district’s superintendent commented on the importance of staying “firm on our enrollment policy” in an attempt to also stay true and further contribute to the “equity and diversity values” which are the A and Z in the mission statements of the whole district. Specifically, about enrollment in the DL program he stated:

“The last few years, to put it bluntly, across the district we set up boundaries, where students from across all three of elementary schools can attend this program at this school. ...Over 90% of the Latinx students in the district in grades kindergarten and first graded are involved in our community program, so it’s definitely drawing from our target population”.

Establishing clear enrollment boundaries, setting clear goals and planning ahead of time with the support of the community and working collaboratively for the promotion of these goals, Orchard Hill school team managed to plan and successfully launch the first DL program in the area after twenty years since Question 2 bill, paving the road for bilingual education to make a promising comeback.

Challenges in setting up the program

While setting up a brand-new education program, let alone a language program undoubtedly has its challenges, the principal of Orchard Hill mentioned that there is still “a lot to learn” but the overwhelming support of the local community, superintendent, and the school’s partners, made any emerging challenge look minor and insignificant (Mrs. Collins). The district’s superintendent also commented on the school staff support and the continuous guidance by NABE (National Association for Bilingual Education) which were “critical” but he also commented on a few challenges that the district faced in the first steps of the creation of the program. Specifically, he outlined the following challenges:

- a. Spending a lot of time recruiting and training staff members to be successful in the program both on the Spanish side and the English side.
- b. We had transportation challenges, how to get kids from all over town to all be at the same site to participate in the program.
- c. We had outreach challenges, how to reach out to Spanish families who had a bad experience with speaking Spanish and convince them that this is the right program for their children.

- d. The financial burden of training bilingual teachers and acquire specific bilingual teaching certificate through collaborations with local institutions
- e. The time burden for staff to be doing special training on top of their teaching responsibilities.

(Adapted from Mr. Miller's interview transcript data)

On a different note, Mrs. Garrison commented that the “white privileged modeling with families that wanted to access the program” was one of the biggest challenges they had to regulate when first setting up the program. “Sometimes people needed a lot of repetition to understand” that the English-speaking families “was not the core audience the program was crafted for”. Despite the challenges that are usually expected in the initial stages of any significant endeavor like the running of a language program, the school administration, under the guidance of NABE, overcame them and managed to run the program with success.

Benefits of DL education

Mrs. Collins as the principal, acknowledged and celebrated the obvious and straightforward benefits of dual language programs for students, be it bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism. Mrs. Garrison also referred to DL education as the “instructional leader” in languages, the “best way to teach bilingual kids” where kids’ “funds of knowledge are used collectively” and kids can bring their heritage in class “versus just seeing the English side of the world”.

But above all, they both stressed the importance of understanding that in the school setting all students are equal regardless of their country of origin or the language

they speak. Mrs. Collins noted that it is essential for students “knowing that white supremacy is not the only way to find success here. and we’re trying really hard to overcome white supremacy and let kids of color, know what every opportunity should be afforded to them as possible. Mrs. Garrison also commented:

“The Spanish language is elevated in a school that exists in a culture where English is really the predominant language and so for the kids and families who come from Spanish homes, you know, their identity and lives are affirmed and reaffirmed”

Through the mixed linguistic and cultural learning environment that a DL program offers, values about equal opportunities in learning become more transparent and easily accessible to younger students, and these values are carried for life, beyond the program to their teenage and adult years. Mrs. Garrison also added that the benefits of DL education go beyond the DL classroom and are for the whole school and staff who enthusiastically support the extra training of bilingual teachers, the new instructional methods and therefore help spread the ideology of affirmation and acceptance of Spanish language through “the whole building”.

Another important aspect that dual language education offers to students in connection with issues of equity and same opportunities for all, is that it offers a safe and inclusive space for Spanish speaking children to feel comfortable and thrive. As Mrs. Collins explained, it was remarkable to witness Spanish speaking students “leading in ways that we hadn’t seen before, they’re able to speak more now that they’re taught in their native language”. Students showed willingness to volunteer in class activities, “willingness to be vulnerable” and “experience joy” that they wouldn’t have in an

English only classroom because of the language barrier. The benefits of dual language education are well known for years in the academic fields. Being able to ‘witness’ them through a school personnel’s eyes and personal experience, adds to the literature around DL education and spreads awareness of their effectiveness on an individual and community level.

Culture in DL program

Administrators

Biculturalism is one of the three pillars of dual language education and a goal to be reached by educators involved in this field (Howard et al, 2018). Mr. Miller clarified that while planning the DL program “we were very intentional that it’s not just about academic learning but it’s a cultural experience we want students to have”. The school administration makes sure that DL classrooms are equipped with textbooks “that represent a wide range of cultures in a wide range of histories” and generally encourage students to “talk about themselves and their families” and their cultural backgrounds, “share their own history, and making sure that everybody feels comfortable and safe to share what their heritage is” (Mrs. Collins). Art, songs, dance, and foreign cuisine is also encouraged and celebrated in the classroom in addition to textbooks so students can be exposed to more real-life experiences with the targeted culture.

The ELL coordinator of the school stressed the importance of hiring bicultural teachers to teach the Spanish part of the program because it is through them that students can truly have the “cultural experience and heritage there’s within the curriculum” they are taught. Mrs. Roberts explained that DL teachers are allowed the time and space to

embed the cultural aspect of the Spanish language and “plan how they are going to address it” based on the principals of the overall social emotional curriculum that the school follows. She added that within this curriculum there is a “unit about holidays and heroes” and the school works with teachers to make sure that instruction goes beyond the “Anglo-centric” approach and include aspects of “Puerto Rican or Cuban American” history. Mrs. Garrison also commented on the role of teachers and the importance of hiring bilingual and bicultural teachers for the program especially from Puerto Rico since the overwhelming population of Spanish students are from there. She clarified that one unit in the curriculum based on families and cultural dynamics in different families; this way teachers are “elevation culture in that sort of level of discussion” too.

Teachers

Both teaches see culture as an inseparable part of teaching and learning in a DL setting. Mr. Clark claims that “a really positive way to learn about other cultures and connect with students in different ways” is by really seeing the lives, experiences, traditions students already have and bring into class and “involve families” in teaching, as much as possible. For non-Spanish dominant students, to see themselves as part of another culture outside of the usual “white Eurocentric or white American centric type”, is an invaluable asset that DL students have.

Mrs. Hayes, being a bilingual and bicultural person herself, valued the cultural aspect of the program above all others. She argued that many people ‘see’ the obvious benefits of bilingualism first “like oh it’s important for you to learn two languages, why, well, you’’ have more opportunities in life, like jobs”; but being bilingual for her is also

“communicating with family and friends” from the target language, really immense into their culture and “understand” what it means to be “Puerto Rican” (her country of origin).

Mrs. Hayes also expressed her enthusiasm when she sees parents and Latinx families who were previously reluctant to speak their native language because “all their friends speak English” to feel comfortable and proud to speak again and teach it more to their children, because of the support they have through the DL program. Similarly, seeing “a lot of students that are white, really understanding, that they can repeat, that they can talk in full sentences without having the support at home” and truly love to “learn, you know, not just to learn Spanish, to learn in general, it is amazing”, she proudly exclaimed. Through all participants’ responses and views on the importance of culture in teaching and learning a new language, it becomes clear that it becomes an inseparable feature of DL language education that both teachers and administrators acknowledge, support and promote through their practices.

Positive ideologies across school – Strong bond and teamwork under a social justice framework

Administrators

During the analysis of interview data with all administrative and teaching personnel in the DL program, it became obvious from the very beginning that they all held strong bonds with each other, worked as a team, acknowledged their colleagues’ efforts and supporting each other. This general finding along with the social justice framework that guided their arguments and viewpoints throughout their interviews, built a solid foundation of an overall very positive teaching and learning environment that was

prevalent at all times through the interviews. Some highlights that support the above statements, could be found in the following experts from interview data.

To begin with some general observations, teachers and staff in Orchard Hill are aware that:

“language learning in a different way that even if they’re teaching in a monolingual classroom, our job is still to teach language, there’s an academic language there, and every student should be taught. With that in mind, the strategies of teaching second language learning are better strategies for teaching. So, we’re trying to incorporate all of those strategies across our classrooms, K-6 whether they’re monolingual or bilingual” (Mrs. Collins).

DL teachers in Orchard Hill are an integral part of the social justice framework that the school and the district is guided by, and their practices are also based on principles of social justice.

“Teaching tolerance curriculum or social justice framework which focuses on key areas that teachers can include into the curriculum; so they look at the connections between those standards and then build them into the units as they’re planning” (Mrs. Roberts).

Mrs. Collins also added that one of the core values of the whole school that all staff are proud to have is “the anti-racist mindset” and the ideology that all are welcome and equal in the school setting, can excel in any area they wish to excel and ultimately “empower them to love learning” in general, and love learning language as an asset in particular. In order, to step into the children’s shoes and join them in the rewarding but also challenging process of learning a brand-new language, the principal has been trying

to learn Spanish along with them. Through her own experience she acknowledges the fact that “it’s really difficult to put yourself out there, and it’s really validating to see these students that come to us as only speaking Spanish” to grow, learn and interact with their classmates in both languages.

Mrs. Garrison, whose area of expertise and professional background centers around special education, added to the social justice framework of the school in general and the DL program in particular, from her own perspective:

“You know there are some concerns you have, and let’s face it, it’s this idea of only kids who are typically developing should be part of dual language programs. That’s not what we believe in. We don’t do that here”.

For the DL program, she also stressed the important role of teachers and how crucial it is to support them in the classroom and remind them to “hold space for kids to speak on both sides on the English side, and on the Spanish side”, through “the act of honoring families and what they bring”. Lastly, she added that through the activist rights’ unit offered in the school curriculum, teachers have the choice to choose about which activist they want to talk about. Therefore, teachers can adapt their teaching according to their intended audience and context of their classroom and include discussions about activists like “Cesar Chavez” or “women of color”.

Teachers

The overall feeling of support, strong colleague bond and teamwork, was also obvious in the interviews with the two teachers of the first grade in the DL program. Mr. Clark felt grateful to be working in this school and in this program with the “amazing” principal and assistant principal and the “wonderful” and so “knowledgeable” ELL

coordinator always being supportive of the program and transforming the whole school into a “hotspot for social justice” and equal opportunities for all students. He explicitly commented how wonderful it is to watch Spanish speaking students being affirmed and seen within the school and classroom setting, an achievement that has been collaboratively done with all the school staff and administration.

“Seeing our groups of especially Latinx students that have been traditionally oppressed and not have had a curriculum where they could be as seen in it, and trying to shape a curriculum where they are affirmed, you know bringing the assets they have from home, of course their language, and given voice and being, I guess, in a sense, like feeling they’re leaders in the classroom”

...we’re trying to really make it a place where they’re celebrated more. Even though that’s something that we try to do throughout the rest of the school too”.

Regarding values of social justice, Mrs. Hayes, like all other participants, reported that these are met throughout the school district and not “something that is coming up now”. On the contrary, students “really have the background knowledge, and they understand, you know about respecting each other, about treating people with color, you know, different color the same”, a fact that was particularly obvious in a lesson about Martin Luther King, Mrs. Hayes remembered. All school officials’ arguments, values and beliefs as presented in their responses, reveal a strong commitment to social justice principles that are valid throughout the school and the district and not just the DL program. Through their interviews, it also became obvious that both administrators and teachers share a strong bond with each other, supporting one another and working as a team to promote not just academics but also ethical values.

COVID-19

Administrators

The sudden and unavoidable switch to remote learning posed significant obstacles in practicing and learning an additional language, especially when this is in its early stages. “The best way to acquire a language is to practice using the language, and in the remote setting the opportunity for kids to engage in meaningful dialogue is limited”, although the splitting of kids into small breakout rooms helped with providing this opportunity to a certain extent (Mrs. Collins). Mrs. Roberts also commented on the challenge first graders faced with limited opportunities in talking via the computer and remote learning. “The amount that I want every kid to be speaking and using the language of their learning, you know, that’s really hard with remote”.

Despite the challenges that the pandemic brought, Mr. Miller commented that “our staff had done a “great job and I’ve heard about evaluation came up very smoothly after this quirky year” and it has “really been a team effort to make it successful”. However, he also acknowledged that remote teaching and learning had been really difficult, challenging and “also draining to be learning a language that’s not your first” through a screen with occasional auditory problems making communication “particularly challenging”. He also commented on the decreased participation on the kindergarten orientation because of its virtual mode this year due to COVID restrictions.

Teachers

Undoubtedly, teachers all over the country had carried the heaviest weight in adapting their instructional methods from in person to remote and still be effective and

meaningful for learners. Likewise, teachers in the DL program had to face considerable challenges and obstacles in teaching remotely, let alone teaching in another language. Mr. Clark's experience with virtual teaching is presented below:

“In a dual language context, especially, I think the bridge has been really really hard. Like ideally, I would if we were in person, I would want to have all the students together and spend two to five days bridging the concepts, the vocabulary and doing it virtually has been really really tough. I think overall, this is for teaching and specific to the dual language program too, I think assessment virtually is very time consuming and tricky”.

“...you know, we can do breakout rooms, a lot, but I think one of the best ways to practice speaking, listening skills is when you can just talk in person, one on one, when you're in person, you can do that so easily”

For Mrs. Hayes, switching to remote teaching “changed everything”. Apart from the obvious challenges in teaching a second language virtually instead of in-person which comes more naturally, she also had to guide students through technology issues which created many questions that she could not respond all at once, and it “took time for them to adjust”. Lastly, she also commented on the difficulty to alter and adapt once “hands on activities” into virtual ones because “students got tired of the screen”. Regardless of the expected and unexpected challenges that a switch to online teaching brought, both teachers reported that it was a successful year, and they were excited to go back in person when the circumstances allowed for a return into the building.

Future plans, development and promotion of the program

Administrators

Development and future plans

Through the interviews, all school officials showed a powerful bond with each other and a dedication to effective teamwork as the recipe for the success of the DL program. They all demonstrated a thirst to improve aspects of the program and a strong commitment to expand the program and make it flourish in all ways that it could, spread the word to more families, and continue providing high quality education. Mrs. Collins envisioned more community celebrations when COVID-19 restrictions are all lifted and hoped for a development in the already active partnership with the linguistics department at the local University to prepare and train more bilingual educators. The principal expressed her expectations for future growth in “the network of support systems”, more partnerships with experts in the area to afford more resources to the program and more personal connections with the community to “experiment with language and culture outside of school” and celebrate with the families, different cultural events.

Mrs. Roberts felt that the school is already in “a good path” but she suggested that the following areas still have room to grow. In her own words, she visualizes the following developments:

- a. Continue to develop our curriculum
- b. Train our staff to really see the whole school as a language learning school
and to really use strategies that promote language learning

- c. More project-based activities where the kids are really taking on their own learning and taking control of it and building on their interests, and have room to grow in those areas and room to grow in assessment
- d. Capture language models or better language samples, along the way, as students progress, so that we can really holistically look at their language development
- e. Bridging in the curriculum; bridging between one unit moving to the next and transferring the language
- f. Getting increased family involvement
- g. Continue the program into middle school
- h. Maintain the balance of English and Spanish speakers
- i. Develop a different model of enrollment if the program expands

(Adapted from Mrs. Robert's interview transcript data)

Promotion of the program

Mrs. Collins is a firm believer that when “good work” is happening, the news will spread themselves. She envisioned current DL students to be the ambassadors of the program by showing genuine excitement of the program they attend and subconsciously advertise it by interacting with each other in public spaces bilingually. Increasing the “level of trust” throughout the community with more Latinx staff informing interested parents, was a suggestion made by Mrs. Garrison. She explained:

“Public education has really grown people custom for 20 years thinking that bilingual education was bad and that it was illegal and all this stuff, and so we

have to do a lot of kind of undoing for us, like the culture of schooling, American schooling. So, I think we can do that over time”.

Mr. Miller also felt that the outreach to the community through “word of mouth” had already resulted in big waiting lists and “managing the disappointment” of interested families has been a challenge to the school administration.

Teachers

Mr. Clark envisioned a future where the DL program would gradually transform from a 50/50 model to a 70/30 or even 90/10 with progressive immersion into Spanish language even if that means for him, as he joked, “losing his job” at some point. He also expressed his desire and hopes for:

- a. Continued professional development opportunities and time for planning to be done with colleagues
- b. Hiring bilingual music teachers, PE teachers so that there’s more opportunity to hear Spanish throughout the day
- c. More changes in the physical space of the school building, brighten it up, update the playgrounds, community garden and hallways
- d. Increase the amount of Spanish being spoken around the school building by continuing to build students’ confidence and be a hospitable and welcoming place to be themselves
- e. Increase parental involvement from more volunteering Spanish and non-Spanish families

(Adapted from Mr. Clark’s interview transcript data)

The collection of ideas and thoughtful suggestions and implications for future improvement and additions to the existing program, indicate a team of practitioners and educators who do not take success for granted. On the contrary, instead of resting, they are already thinking of the next step of this endeavor to make the DL classroom an even better environment for future emergent bilingual learners to learn and grow ethically and linguistically.

Summary of findings on school officials' language ideologies

This section explored the language ideologies of four key administrators directly involved with the running and implementation of the DL program studied. The beliefs and attitudes of the school's principal, assistant principal, superintendent and ELL coordinator were analyzed and presented in close connection with issues social justice and equal opportunities for both Spanish and English dominant students in the DL program. The ideologies and personal reflections of the two first grade teachers of the program, complemented the themes created to address research question two, covering topics on how culture is performed in the program, what were the reasons that led to the creation of the program, what challenges the district faced while setting it up, how COVID-19 affected teaching practices as well as plans and expectations for future improvements. The next section focuses on research question three, the exploration of the notion of critical consciousness and how it is manifests in the choices of parents, administrators and teachers make regarding the students in the focal DL program.

Research question three: Do families and administrators see critical consciousness as an integral part of the DL program?

- b. How does this manifest in their engagement in the program? For families, in the choice of schooling? For administrators, in the programming and implementation of curricular practices?**

This section explores the language ideologies of all the participants' involved in this study, regarding the notion of critical consciousness as the proposed fourth pillar of dual language education (Palmer et al, 2019). The four participating families, the four key administrative staff of the school and the two first grade teachers' of the dual language program, provide their feedback and views on their understanding of critical consciousness, how it is encouraged in the DL classroom and how their practices are impacted by their understanding of the term.

The terms participants, families, parents, interviewees, administrators, school officials, teachers, educators would be used interchangeably along with their titles and pseudonyms which are also summarized in the table below for reference. The section is organized in three different subcategories referring to the three groups of participants: parents, administrators, and teachers. Themes created in this section to address research question three, respond to interview questions regarding participants' ideologies about critical consciousness and its practical applications, choice of schooling, criticism about bilingual education, discussion around bilingual education history and LOOK Act, and similarities of Orchard Hill's DL program with other programs in the area. The findings for this research question indicate an overall high awareness of the term in question, which for many of the participants coincides with the values and principals of social

justice which all interviewees are already familiar with through the mission that guides the whole school.

Table 5. List of participants

Parents/Guardians	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
Parent 1 Parent 2 Parent 3 Parent 4	Katie Lisa Celia Sarah	English (native) - Cypriot Greek (fluent) English/French (native) – Spanish English (native) – German English (native) – French, Spanish
Administrators	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
Principal Assistant Principal ELL Coordinator Superintendent	Mrs. Collins Mrs. Garrison Mrs. Roberts Mr. Miller	English English English English
Teachers	Pseudonyms	Language (s) spoken
English Teacher Spanish Teacher	Mr. Clark Mrs. Hayes	English Spanish (native)

Parents/Guardians

Critical consciousness

Through the discussions with families, all but one parents were familiar or guessed the meaning of critical consciousness and quickly connected it with notions around social justice. Lisa guessed that a possible definition could be that someone is “able to being aware and being able to think about that is aware that there’s differences or there’s other things out there”. Sarah accurately described it as “awareness of ones’ own position in society and awareness that there are other people who come from different backgrounds”. In support of her definition, she also referred to cultural connections to the

term giving an example of how different cultures have different celebrations for different events like the Three Kings day, Jewish holidays or Greek Easter and how all these should be celebrated and acknowledged as part of an inclusive school curriculum that affirms differences in cultural backgrounds. On that note, Sarah also commented that “there is a little bit of inequity” because certain cultural holidays like the previously mentioned ones, are celebrated and other are not and she stressed again the importance of acknowledging the fact that an American classroom is a mixture of different linguistic, cultural or religious student backgrounds.

Celia also had a very interesting insight of what critical consciousness might mean, linking it to an acquired skill that people gain while making connections with people of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. She specifically stated:

“I think it might have something to do with a term that I learned called meta cognition, which it’s not kind of adopting things passively being very conscious of, like your interest in a language or cultural connections. It goes beyond just the ability to speak the language but a more conscious choice to learn about the culture and history of people tied to that language. It’s something that you can voice and talk about which is not just something you do naturally but it’s about awareness I would think”.

Even though, critical consciousness is not yet a popular concept within language education settings, participating parents provided interesting interpretations of mostly connected to cultural awareness in diverse ethnic backgrounds. Below, are some of their thoughts on how critical consciousness could be applied in a DL setting.

Critical consciousness in the dual language classroom

Part of being in critical conscious is being aware of ones' privileges and the use of these privileges in order to promote equity in a given setting, in this case a dual language classroom. Participating families showed increased interest in this concept and tried to build coherent and meaningful arguments and suggestions to address this statement which was also an interview question Lisa stressed the fact that the idea of critical consciousness is prevalent throughout the school and not just the DL classroom. Specifically, she stated that

“they don't point out peoples' differences but they acknowledge the difference between the kids and they kind of normalize that there are differences and make kids know sort of aware that people need different things and do different things, and they just embrace all of that and that's definitely present in the (dual language) classroom as well”.

Sarah provided an interesting and very thorough response:

“I don't know, it's really a hard question because in public schools is always, I think, somewhat frustrating at the elementary level, that the kids are really kept in the middle, you know if they have really strong interest or abilities. They're not given the opportunity to excel at them and to push themselves they have to stay in the middle so that everybody goes together, more or less, I think I support that in terms of justice and everything but I also then look at, you know, internationally, America is not really competing and the kids have these really fungible minds, there are so malleable at this age, that it's a pity to me that in terms of you know, allowing, I don't think it has to be about only people who have like social privilege. It can be recognizing talents at all children and nurturing those talents better, so that I feel this kind of critical consciousness is coming into school mostly in terms of thinking about access but I also feel like maybe we are not doing our kids a favor by keeping them all in the middle where all kinds of kids with different talents should be pushed and, you know, realize those abilities. So, in general, the school environment and the classroom and school perspective promote social justice”.

Sarah's argument is twofold: on the one hand she acknowledges the fact that public school system, including the DL program is set up in a way to promote social justice, values which she and the whole school are committed to. On the other hand, if her arguments are analyzed from a position of privilege, she would prefer a more competing system where good and talented students stand out and are distinguished from the 'less good', a belief that contradicts her overall argument. A more in-depth analysis of Sarah's statement will be provided in the discussion section in the next chapter.

For Celia, critical consciousness could be applied in a DL setting by raising students' cultural awareness, which is "certainly something the ELL coordinator and superintended are advocating for anyway". She suggested that instruction could focus around international celebration throughout the calendar year, like the International Women's Day "which is sadly not very well represented in American culture, maybe because of its origins with socialist groups internationally", or focus on the reasons why the US has a different Mother's Day or Labor Day celebrations than the rest of the world (Celia). Celia also suggested that critical consciousness can be raised in the classroom through discussions about people around the globe who face socio economic challenges or are affected by environmental factors. Specifically, she argued:

"So, there are ways of using kind of the calendar to bring up issues of this sort, or when they're learning about things like even water use, or environmental issues, they can bring up case studies and examples from like the Amazon rainforest in Brazil, during Spanish time, you know people who understand Spanish can understand a little Portuguese too and it's, you know, affecting the whole continent, to some extent.

Despite the differences in the approach of the notion and meaning of critical consciousness and the lack of familiarity with relevant literature regarding the term, participating families showed genuine interest on the importance of the term and its presence in a DL classroom, both by ‘guessing’ possible definitions for it and also by providing thoughtful and elaborate feedback on how this notion could be used in a bilingual education setting.

Critical consciousness and the history of bilingual education

Familiarity with the history of bilingual education in the US is not an area of knowledge that is common with people not related to the fields of language education particularly bilingual education. Not surprisingly, none of the participating families in the study were aware of the political shifts and struggles of bilingual education of the past and none of them were familiar with LOOK Act and the changes it brought to the state of Massachusetts. However, when prompted and given a brief historical background, most of the participants were able to use their background knowledge and to their surprise, make associations of bilingual education policies with their own personal experiences.

Sarah remembered that there were French bilingual schools available in California years ago, but she was surprised to know that these either belonged in the private sector or applied for a waiver to operate because of the policy ban. Lisa, hesitant at first to have an opinion of bilingual education because she “didn’t know anything about it”, was truly surprised to know about restrictive policies in Massachusetts finding them “so weird”, used her schemata to build on her argument based on her stored memory of French immersion programs in Canada while she was growing up:

“I mean, I saw I grew up largely in Quebec in Canada and they have all kinds of funny language laws about preserving the French language and I thought that was normal but I’m hearing this, this is even weirder and so interesting to know”

Lisa’s surprise but also interest to know more about the history of bilingual education in the US, made her realize and interpret, after being prompted and educated upon, the reasoning behind not having a dual language program in the area or in the State before and made her question why such policies took place in the first place. Historicizing schools like critical consciousness addition proposes, adds to the education of parents and students who without this knowledge would not be aware of the troubled past that bilingual education had in the US territory.

Celia’s professional background as a history professor and also her personal experience as the daughter of a first-generation German American father, growing up in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Through her job she was familiar with language education of the Native American and indigenous peoples through mission schools, in which “children would be going to these schools where they would be taught English and probably in some ways indoctrinated culturally” and where the experience “was not always positive” with abuse involved in many of these cases. Through her personal experience, Celia remembered her father telling her that he attended German Saturday school and spoke German as a kid, which he suddenly stopped after World War 1 and the anti-German wave that spread around the globe. It was because of her father’s experience that Celia was also deprived of the opportunity to be raised bilingually and is one of the reasons why she would like such an experience for her daughter.

When asked to think of a reason of why the focal town and the community did not have a DL program in the past, in an attempt to make connections with the passage of LOOK Act and lift of bilingual education restrictions, none of the participants was able to make these connections. For Sarah, the reason was because “everything in this town takes such a long time” to put in action. Katie speculated that a possible reason could be that “maybe people weren’t as interested” and also “sometimes, the population of an area plays a role like if there is a lot of Spanish speakers, they might do a program to offer instruction in their language”. Similarly, Lisa was “actually surprised that it took so long” for such a program to emerge in the town “given that the Community is of well-educated people” and it “really needed someone to push for it and make it happen”. With the superintendent’s support and advocacy, the school managed to launch a DL program after several years of English Only education a fact that helped “bringing those families together (Spanish speaking) and appreciating their different cultures and where they’re coming from and giving their kids a more even playing field” (Lisa).

Celia believed that there had been attempts to start a bilingual program in the past which were not fully successful. Although she was not aware of the particular reasons why bilingual education was not offered in the town in the previous years, she commented that “there’s been a desire for a dual language program for a long time, there has been interest, but implementation has been challenging”. The lack of reasoning behind the non-existence of bilingual education in the past twenty years in the area, could also indicate lack of familiarity with language policies in the State, Question 2 bill and the passage of the most recent LOOK Act. However, different participants were able to make different connections with bilingual education history, and after certain prompting,

they were able to reflect on their personal experiences and engage in a meaningful discussion on language policies.

Choice of schooling and similar programs in the area

In the section regarding parents' language ideologies, a theme that was created and discussed, focused on the reasons for choosing the DL program for their children's primary education. This theme, although similar, focuses on the choice of this particular program compared to similar programs in the area. More specifically, families were asked to provide their reasoning of choosing another DL program in the area if Orchard Hill was not offering DL education, given the benefits of bilingual education which all enthusiastically support. Interestingly, none of the parents stated they would choose to enroll their children in a DL program in another place or school, but they would stick with what Orchard Hill elementary monolingual program. The most claimed reason for not choosing a different option if Orchard Hill was not offering bilingual education, was the ease of transportation and convenience of the neighborhood school.

Sarah argued that "it would take such a huge commitment to the issue (commuting to a farther place) that I'm afraid I don't have time, because three kids, two careers", and "kids do a lot of activities out of school, particularly in music and it takes time, so I wouldn't want the kids to be spending that time commuting and commuting". Regarding a Chinese immersion school in a close by town which transportation is not an issue, Sarah said she would still not pick this school for their children not for ideological reasons because it is a charter school and she would prefer federal funding to be attributed to the development and upgrade of the public schools instead to alternative options.

For Celia, transportation and convenience also played a role in the selection of Orchard Hill for schooling throughout the academic year although she wouldn't mind commuting to a nearby town for a summer language program, if that was an option. She also commented that "there's somehow a deficit in terms of intensive foreign language programs that could be labeled as dual language or bilingual in our area" and that she is grateful her daughter is attending the only available option. With regards to the Chinese immersion charter school that is in a very close distance to the focal town, Celia stated that she would not consider it as a choice because of the immersion model (90/10) they have chosen for instruction:

"The percentage of time spent on Chinese versus English changes over time, where they're doing a lot of Chinese early and then by high school, it's mainly English, which makes some sense because English, you know had dominated the internet in some ways, and research fields you know like if you go to an international conference, often English is spoken as a common language. And so, when you're studying high level, science, or mathematics. Being able to converse in English does have some advantages, so I can see how on the high school level, they're doing more English, but earlier on, focusing more of a greater percentage on Chinese, I don't know".

From Celia's statement, it is clear the 50/50 model of instruction that Orchard Hill chose to implement for their DL program, played a significant role in her choosing to attend a DL program in the first place. Although, Celia is an enthusiastic advocate of bilingual education, the ultimate English dominance that inevitably takes place in early adulthood in the US, is of high importance to her family and having a more balanced and equal instruction in Spanish and English from early on and onward, seemed to be a source of the main reason for not choosing the Chinese immersion for her daughter's

education. No matter the reasons behind their choice of Orchard Hill, all parents were happy with the decision to join the DL program and they all picked it over a similar immersion charter school in the area.

Bilingualism as a privilege

One of the most interesting but also tricky part of the interviews with all participants, was when they were asked to provide their feedback on one of the most common points of criticism in relevant literature which considers dual language education as elite or boutique bilingualism, or bilingualism for the privileged that was thoroughly discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017; Flores and Garcia, 2017; Flores and Rosa, 2015). To the sound of the word ‘criticism’, all participants appeared defensive and they all claimed they have not heard or thought of any criticism about dual language education. After explaining to them the source of criticism that for some scholars DL models are viewed as another enrichment tool for white families, most of the participants gave meaningful responses. However, the majority of them, if not all, associated the notion of privilege with the 50/50 enrollment policy that the school takes very seriously.

Based on this consideration, all families thought that because Orchard Hill is very strict and straightforward about enrollment procedures making sure that the exact same number of Spanish and English-speaking students are enrolled, it ‘guarantees’ and presupposes equity and fairness. To a certain extent of course it does, and it is an important factor to promote equity in DL setting, but it is not the reason for the notorious ‘elite’ title DL model has been given by some scholars. Drawing from the parents’ beliefs on the topic, some of their viewpoints are presented below.

Katie said that ‘privilege’ is not something she would consider for the Orchard Hill’s dual program since “in this current program there are quite a few Hispanic speaking, kids in the class, they tried to balance that out”. Lisa commented on the strict lottery system which sometimes could also be “a little bit unfair because it it’s geographically, where you are in town and we happen to live in the right district”, but equal numbers of Spanish and English speaking students “alleviates some sort of the issue”. Likewise, Sarah wondered whether this type of criticism “would be a valid criticism for the Orchard Hill program when they really made it 50/50 and they widened the school district to include families from outside who really wanted to participate”. Soon after, reflecting on her own personal experience with learning French later in life as teenager and young adult and later as a French professor, she commented:

“it’s always going to be a second language for me, not a real true native language, and I think I would have moved heaven and earth to try to; it’s not I don’t view it as privilege thing, as you know I view it as really being culturally competent and children from bilingual families are ready, even if they go to a non-bilingual program so as a Hispanic kid who is going to public school where they’ve been taught English they do have that richness already. So, it’s really like you could say, the privileged families that are coming from an American background that are deprived actually from that cultural competence”.

Similarly, Celia commented on the “lovely mix of students” that also attend the program from “nearby towns and also the average population itself is somewhat diverse. Which is great, you know, in terms of socio-economic diversity but also of cultural diversity”. At the same time however, Celia also stated that she could understand the ‘privilege’ argument “because this (the program) isn’t offered everywhere that you know it’s sometimes children whose families can’t afford high property taxes and such”,

without realizing that her family is also one of the ‘privileged’ families who can pay these taxes and ultimately have the opportunity to attend this program.

The idea of privilege as it is talked about in the academic fields about DL models of bilingual education was not fully interpreted in the same way by the participating families but focused mostly on principles of equal enrollment as a counter argument. However, it is important to consider that these views were seen through the eyes of families who are considered privileged white English speaking ones, and would be important to compare views on the same topic from Spanish speaking households.

Administrators

Critical consciousness

As with parents, administrators defined critical consciousness in very thoughtful and meaningful ways and most of them in connection to social justice principles although they did not equate their terminology. Specifically, the superintendent stated that “it is related, not the same, with social justice aspects” but “consciousness only comes developmentally from the lived experience”.

“I think you’re right to bring that up because we think it’s a bit broader about how children see themselves in the world, how they see their peers in the world and understand difference and have an asset based model. Because in Spanish class some kids if they weren’t in this program would almost never have the opportunity to be the expert, just because of linguistic barriers” (Mr. Miller).

The assistant principal understood critical consciousness in relation to metacognition. More specifically, she thought of the term as “being aware of your biases, you’re thinking you’re the lens in which you look at kids and adults and all interactions and then being able to say to oneself why is it that I see it that way, and what could be the perspective of a kid or a family member, so critical and sort of a very metacognitive way”.

Mrs. Roberts, the ELL coordinator, on the other hand links the meaning of critical consciousness with that of sociocultural competence. However, she makes this important and noteworthy distinction attributing more value and importance to critical consciousness:

“I think a lot of us would say at this point that the idea of competence is not awesome because it’s limiting; it’s like you can reach a competence. Whereas having, you know, these more open terms critical consciousness, cultural humility like finding ways that mean that you are aware of power and privilege and the dynamics that those play in society, it means that you’re able to look critically at the world around us and dig, for you know what’s really going on here and whether that’s related to an equity issue or a way that systems are structured, so I think that’s how you know we always want our students to leave us with that awareness of not just sort of taking things because they’re told, but to because they discover a deeper meaning”.

Lastly, Mrs. Collins, the principal of the school, viewed critical consciousness as “being hyper aware of English is often presented as the go to and as the norm, and that need to be eradicated, we need not to expect everybody to speak and communicate in English”. Based on this view of critical consciousness related to linguistic freedom and diversity, the principal added comments on racial freedom and diversity as well:

“I think it goes with anti-racism as well, that people of color should be allowed to excel in every single way that white people have historically been able to excel”

“So, having that critical lens that bilingualism invites culturalism and literacy is an avenue to achieve that and allow everybody those same opportunities. I think that naming our biases through naming the system of oppression that has been in existence for hundreds of years, and doing all of our work to develop curriculum and systems that eradicate it and make space for people and voices of color”.

The concept of critical consciousness raised the interest of the administrators and invited them to engage in a deeper discussion about ethical and equity values beyond the educational setting. Connections of the concept with cultural applications of the term, with social justice, lived experiences, links to anti-racist ideologies and self-reflections as a way to recognize personal biases, created a beautiful conceptual puzzle. The genuine administrators’ involvement in the discussion, showed a team of educators who prioritize racial, linguistic, cultural and socio-economic equity among the students in their school.

Critical consciousness in the dual language classroom

The suggestions and insights for effective promotion and application of critical consciousness from the administrators’ point of view were as helpful and considerate as the feedback collected from the families. Mr. Miller accurately reflected on the age that students are naturally introduced to this concept and how important it is to explore it independently within the classroom:

“With early childhood education, you want students to discover those things on their own, and I think the more adults play heavy hands and explicitly mentioning it doesn’t feel authentic and it feels like the right thing to do point out the discovery moment that the child had. And so, I think as kids get older, that shifts.”

“So, you know, I think for us it’s rare as kids get older developmentally how you know what they’re studying and social studies and what literature they’re reading, how that affects their consciousness, and it becomes more explicit, but in the early childhood ages, you want them to be experiential learning and you want them to be recognizing these things and you want to add the adults, we want to set up situations where they’re able to recognize it, but we want them to do the recognizing independently because, that’s our belief structure, that’s how young kids learn best”.

On a different note, Mrs. Garrison claimed that in order to apply critical consciousness in any classroom and also in the DL classroom, privileged individuals, traditionally white ones, should use their privilege to “open up spaces for people to share their perspectives” be it as students or as she later explains as teachers too. She particularly commented on the role of the teachers stating that some “teachers have had decades of teaching and have been in very privileged position so I think it’s very hard for new early to mid-career Latinx, to be able to have space to push another, a different perspective, I see this happening and that is real”. As an assistant principal she tries to make sure that new Latinx teachers especially at kindergarten level, are encouraged to voice their perspectives and opinions and not feel less privileged than their white counterparts in any way.

Mrs. Roberts, the school’s ELL coordinator suggested working more with families in building up the concept of critical consciousness with them in more explicit ways, so it is clearly understood and known by all, even though the majority of them are already reflecting on this concept since it is part of the town Community. She explained:

“You know, our Community here, you know people are generally liberal generally supportive of you know, equity overall but it’s not always enacted to the level that we would want. And so, we all have to take that on as people with privilege like I’ll say as an English speaking white person in this Community, and so I think

naming that really explicitly for our parents of students in this program is one way that we can look at that more and encourage it more because you know, our white English speaking families need to know that there's a power dynamic when there's a meeting of parents, they need to know that our tendency is to elevate English speakers, is to elevate English (language), is to elevate certain class and cultural experiences when we have all these members of our Community who may not center themselves in the same way, but whose experiences are equally valuable and should be part of our school community so I guess that's a piece that I'm hoping to work on more within the dual language classroom"

Lastly, Mrs. Collins, commented that the school and herself as educator and principal are "still in the beginnings of a long journey" to achieve equity at all levels, it's a "continual work in progress since the civil rights movement", but it's not "quite done yet". Mrs. Collins also stressed that, "although she cannot "imagine what the end point" of "eradicating white supremacy" will look like, the school is "on the road and everybody has a unified mindset and moral obligation" to do everything they can to serve kids of all backgrounds. A way to achieve this is by "making sure we have educators of color, we're still extremely imbalanced" but diverse teaching staff is definitely one of the priorities of the school.

Applying critical consciousness in the DL classroom was a possibility that raised many ideas on behalf of the school administrative personnel. The school officials embraced the concept and considered multiple interesting ways how to make it happen in the future by suggesting experiential initiation in the concept for the younger students, educating more families explicitly through meetings and making sure they have diverse teaching staff to address the increasingly diverse student population.

Critical consciousness and the history of bilingual education

Mrs. Roberts, as the ELL coordinator of the school showed a broad and deep knowledge of the struggles of bilingual education in the past decades both across the country and in the State. She explained that about 20 years ago the town had a thriving Cambodian community and a successful DL program to serve the language needs of that population that were unfortunately “shut down in 2002” under Question 2 bill. Mrs. Garrison also commented on the flourishing Cambodian community and a Cambodian bilingual program in the area two decades ago that was “overthrown” when Question 2 passed in the state. The “legal opening” that LOOK Act offered gave the opportunity for “bilingual ed to live again” in the State and the “impetus to the district to “start talking about creating a program” in the area along with the reason of rising demographics in Spanish population.

However, as the ELL coordinator clarified, the passage of LOOK Act in 2017 was not the decisive factor to start the program but “those plans were kind of underway before” it “but they ended up coinciding which was great”. Adding to this argument she explained that “there was this misconception that we weren’t allowed to have bilingual programs when really we were”; “dual language or two-way immersion was still out” but the schools did not have enough “political or administrative backing to get going” prior to LOOK Act (Mrs. Roberts).

Similarly, the assistant principal, Mrs. Garrison, stated that even “during the years of Question 2”, school could still apply for a waiver like other towns in the state did both in public and charter schools, however, she did not “really know” why such an action was not taken in the focal town before. She acknowledged later in the discussion though, that

the school's professional networks were definitely easier to maneuver and handle after LOOK Act passed and therefore moving forward with the DL was faster. Lastly, Mrs. Collins confirmed that regardless of the passage of LOOK Act which undoubtedly made things easier the DL to progress, the school administration had already made the decision to move forward anyway. "We were working with NABE (National Association for Bilingual Education) already as a precursor before the legislation changed to allow language instruction again" and when "it actually went in our favor we were very relieved".

Mrs. Collins' professional background in California when Proposition 227 was active, had helped her become more receptive and aware of the needs ELL learners and the language opportunities they were deprived of during bilingual education ban. For her, the language opportunity that the DL launch offered to the local Spanish speaking families was a promise that was "long time coming" and it was a personal mission for her to reassure these families that they will get the education they deserve.

The administrators' experiences and knowledge of bilingual education in general and Question 2 in Massachusetts in particular, might have been different, coming from different resources, however they all were aware of the history of bilingual education in the state, and the underlying goal of DL education to serve culturally and linguistically, historically oppressed populations.

Bilingualism as a privilege and the role of the school

The last part of the interview with the administrators focused on the literature about DL programs, which critiques this model as elite, or bilingualism for the few (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017) that is used as an additional tool for the white privileged

families (Flores and Garcia, 2017; Valdés, 1997) instead of serving the underrepresented populations that was originally designed for. Again, Orchard Hill's school officials' beliefs were important and worth quoting.

Although privilege, is "a funny word" that the district tries to avoid, the superintendent pointed out that the context of discussion that it is used is very accurate. Positioning himself no longer as a superintendent but as a researcher as he claimed, took his time to think through ways how privilege is met in the school setting and what actions the school administration takes to eliminates any cases it might be met. The arguments he provided are very insightful and for this reason I decided to use the whole excerpts of the interview following his line of thinking from the beginning until he reached his final concluding remarks. He first commented on the meaning of the word privilege in the DL classroom, stating the following:

"The fact that they are learning two languages as a privilege I think they would say that they do. You know, I do think one of the things we're very conscious of is, we have a model English class as well at the school in the same levels, and we've been very very sensitive to the fact that that class shouldn't feel like a second class".

After thinking it though for a couple of minutes Mr. Miller mentioned how he really liked this question, and he needed more time to not provide simple answers for not simple questions. He continued with the following:

I think, privilege as a thought, definitely comes up. I think in this particular community, we have families that there's definitely a correlation between language status and socio economics but it's perhaps less pronounced than in other communities because of the university and you know, it's not as simple as one set of kids who speak a certain language as their first has less privileges and the other,

I think in the aggregate that's true but it's not true in the individual level. You know, we find ourselves being very careful to not make any assumptions about that".

And few seconds later he also added:

"It's true overall but it's also not true, you know there's plenty of Spanish speaking students in our classes whose parents are professors in the University, things like that, there's plenty of English speaking students, you know, who live in subsidized housing, so, it sort of does blend in a little bit and that's a good thing for the program, I think it's a good thing for kids to grow up with this, instead of some communities where maybe that divide is more, you know, universal".

Mr. Miller clarified that as a district and as a school, they have been very specific and straightforward from the beginning of the program both at the school committee level and public that they "are unrelenting on the enrollment characteristics that we need, and we will wait until the first day of school" to make sure that no more Spanish speakers would like to enroll first. The rules and boundaries about enrollment policy were always strict at the school and it was their mission to make this known to everyone, stick to it and not deviated from their plan even if that meant having under enrolled classrooms.

"We're not like oh well, not enough Spanish speaking kids enrolled let's fill it with modeling (English class), we just don't do it. Will do small classes instead to do it right. And luckily, I'm very fortunate to be in a district where school Committee supports us in that".

On a different note, which focuses on the existence of elite bilingualism and position of privilege viewed from another angle, the assistant principal argued:

“The elite pieces are real and alive, and we watch them all the time. Once kids are in (the program), how the families maneuver and push for what they feel like is the right thing for their kid. Definitely from a privilege perspective” (Mrs. Garrison).

Similarly, Mrs. Collins, the principal, commented:

“Yeah, not to condemn our community but there certainly is a lot of white families who reach out and say I want my kid in that program. And that does come from a place of privilege. And I think that we are very much aware of that try to be very measure which is why we save our seats as much as we possibly can for Spanish speaking kids and make sure that we give them priority placement, even if they’re from a different homeschool neighborhood. And we save these seats until the very end of August, to make sure we try to give them an opportunity first, because the program primarily was designed for them. It is an added bonus for our English speaking kids for the program was not designed with them in mind”

Driven from this discussion, both the principal and the assistant principal, individually commented on concerns parents in the DL program have with regards to their children’s pace of learning. These concerns usually come from the English speaking families, therefore Mrs. Garrison referred to their concerns as part of expressing them from a privilege perspective:

“You know one of the things we are really at, you know, we’re at this place now where we’re having to do a lot of work and it’s not surprising but people are wanting to refer kids to special ed now, because they’re learning across two languages. They’re learning across two language as a collective right is probably the same but when, we’re measuring on the English side or the stronger side, kids aren’t making the progress that we would want plus we’ve had all this interrupted schooling and it’s been a disaster, but I think one of the critiques, I don’t know if it’s a critique but one of the concerns that people have is that the rate of growth in kindergarten, first and second grade is like concerning. But I think it’s because we haven’t gotten to third grade right where they’re beginning to consolidate their skills across two languages, so I don’t know if it’s a critique but it’s a real misunderstanding that we’re trying to educate both our teachers and our families

to understand that there's nothing wrong with them is that they're learning in two languages and we need to give them some time".

Judging from her role as the ELL coordinator and how she had witnessed white families viewing the opportunity of the DL program from a privilege perspective or as an enrichment program for their children Mrs. Roberts admittedly argued that this is an attitude that "they see happening". Specifically, she made the following statement:

"Lots of you know, well educated white families are really drawn to the program because it does provide that exciting, you know aspect and additional kind of program piece for them. So I guess my role is to keep centering the needs, the voices, the experiences of the Spanish speaking students and families for a moment, this is, you know, it's primarily for them and it's like a nice piece that other folks get to go along, for the ride"

"You can't leave out other folks with my privilege, but we have to keep just centering and saying well why we are doing this, you know, what's the goal here, how are we going to make these decisions and who's benefiting".

The concept of critical consciousness and idea of the use of one's privileges to promote equity was of high interest in the interviews with all participants but especially with the school officials who are responsible of setting the field for even play among all students both in a DL setting and also throughout the school. As discussion later revolved around issues of privilege often met in DL settings, the school administration staff reported instances and ways that white privilege emerges and provided actions that they currently take and also plan to take in the future, to eliminate such instances from occurring.

Teachers

Critical consciousness

The last group of participants, the two first grade teachers in the DL program also provided thoughtful ideas and views on the concept of critical consciousness. For Mr.

Clark, the English language teacher, critical consciousness translates into:

“this sort of awareness of your thought and your being in a sense of it, as if it was in different settings so you can act as an empathetic and responsible citizen around those that are like your and not like you. With respect and kindness. It really is the empathy and seeing the humanity in everybody”

For Mrs. Hayes, the Spanish language teacher, critical consciousness is closely related to critical thinking, when you “can use your brain” to “say what you have to say with respect, you know express your opinion right and I don’t know, understand your position in society”. Both teachers consider respect for other individuals as important component of how they understand critical consciousness. Their viewpoint on the concept is important as they are the ones who actually practice it in the classroom with the DL students and are the mediators of spreading awareness on it. Below, are some ways they envision critical be applied in the classroom.

Critical consciousness in the classroom

An integral part of critical consciousness is being aware of ones’ privileges and use them in a way that promotes equity. The two teachers came up with multiple ideas and ways that they try to raise this awareness within the DL class and promote equity

among all students. Presented below are their preferred ways to achieve that starting with Mr. Clark's suggestions:

"One of my favorite ways to achieve that is through really rich read aloud with students, and I mean there's so much great children's literature, not that can spark wonderful conversations and raise a lot of really important issues of today"

"I always like to do a lot role playing and modeling of different situations like that you might run into the playground or in the classroom or outside of school"

"I mean in the past, I should have struggled with how much do I talk about the ugly history of the United States and the world. As far as the history, and also what's going on now to traditionally oppressed groups. And I felt more called to do so, obviously with the encouragement of our administration. But I'm talking about big issues and talking about how make some people feel uncertain in situations and how we as a population, a diverse population support that and stand up for it"

Mrs. Hayes' practices and recommendations are summarized below:

"I introduce myself and the way I express, I tell the students that we are one, we are learning from each other. We are just a team, you know, like nobody is more than the other one, you know, because I have an accent. That doesn't mean I'm not smart because some students cannot pronounce. So, the way I explained to them, the way I created the classroom was that we are the same. We are a team. We help each other".

"I don't see students; I'm not even bragging. They're like they are a community. And if we see something like when they are sharing, you know show and tell and somebody is doing something and we might see like one of the students might feel like, you know, sad because economic you know status or whatever, we talk about

it. So, we change things a little like for example show and tell is going to be something that you created, not something that you've got, that mom and dad got you for your birthday".

"It's like that, simple things like we are the same. We are a team, we're here for each other, we learn from each other. And I think that, for me, that's the best way to really promote that. Because I don't want students to feel like this because I know Spanish, I don't want students to feel like this because I know more English, we all learn. I learn new words every day, and I tell them, you know Mrs. Hayes is learning something new, you guys are teaching me, we're in this together".

Judging from the teachers' responses, their teaching methods and instructional practices, the DL classroom is an environment where equity thrives. Students learn to work as a team and treated the same, learn from each other. The use of role play to talk and exploration of relevant children's literature to touch upon 'big issues' of American history, indicate that this particular DL classroom already had already embraced the concept of critical consciousness.

Critical consciousness and the history of bilingual education

As mentioned in a previous section, both first grade teachers in the DL program had received special bilingual training to prepare for teaching in a DL classroom. Among the classes they had to take at the local University's College of Education, there were courses on multiculturalism, biliteracy and bilingualism which also included units on bilingual education history. Mr. Clark, the English language teacher, said that he was not aware of the "negative notions" and struggles of bilingual education of the past until he took these courses which he characterized as "terrific". He also stated that he first became acquainted with LOOK Act and the changes it brought as he was not aware that the State

was under Question 2 restrictions since 2002 (Mr. Clark). Additionally, since the current year was his first year teaching in a DL classroom, he was truly immersed into the model's philosophy through practicing it; his previous contact with DL education and its benefits was only through theory and through conversations with "friends from graduate school" who had taught in "other failing bilingual programs in other parts of the country".

Mrs. Hayes with bilingual education was long before she became a language teacher herself. She explained that when she moved to Massachusetts from Puerto Rico at 1995, she was 15 years old and she joined a bilingual program as a Spanish speaker. She remembered about that time:

"There was still like a bilingual program, right, it was not called dual language, but it was bilingual. I remember taking all my classes, science, social studies, math in Spanish. And then English and then ESL classes right, so that was that bilingual program. I was still learning my subject matters in Spanish but at the same time I was learning a new language. So, I didn't feel lost. So, when the Department of Education took away that program, it was like English ESL only".

Even though both teachers were familiar to a certain extent with bilingual education history and policies, their education and experiences were very different. For Mr. Clark, it was part of a required course he took for his bilingual teacher training for the DL program, and for Mrs. Hayes it came through her personal experience as a bilingual program student herself, and later also as a trainee at the same bilingual teacher training. Historicizing schools is one of the four components of critical consciousness and having teachers who are educated on this issue is an asset for any DL program.

Summary of participants' language ideologies on critical consciousness

This section focused on the exploration on the language ideologies of all three groups of participants, in connection to the concept of critical consciousness. The themes created covered areas on the participants understanding and practices of the concept, their familiarity with bilingual education history and language privilege. The findings indicate that all participants viewed critical consciousness as an integral part both of the DL philosophy and moral values throughout the school. For the families, their views are justified through their choice of schooling for their kids, for the school officials is portrayed through their overall school mission and principals of social justice that the whole school is committed to, and for the teachers is manifested through their everyday practices which promote equity and unity among all students.

Summary

In this chapter, I presented and analyzed the findings resulted from the interviews with all participants in this study in an attempt to address the three research questions that guide this study. The language ideologies of four families attending the DL program in Orchard Hill were explored in connection with reasons for enrolling their children in this program, their hopes and expectations of attending it and their overall attitudes on Spanish language as well as bilingualism and biculturalism. Additionally, the four key school administrators' and two teachers of the program language ideologies were also analyzed as they were unfolded through their beliefs and attitudes on bilingualism, social justice, reasoning and decision making to launch a DL program in the focal town. Lastly, the views of all participants through the lens of critical consciousness are analyzed as well as the role the concept played in their choice of schooling, school mission and

teaching practices. The last chapter of this dissertation will conclude this study with a detailed discussion of the most important findings as revisited through literature review, along with implications for future studies.

CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The final chapter of this dissertation offers a summary of the study, the findings following each research question, and a more thorough discussion of the most noteworthy findings from the previous chapter. Findings will be discussed alongside relevant literature from the first two chapters in the dissertation. The outline of this chapter starts with a brief overview of the study, continues with the discussion of the most important findings from all three research questions with a particular focus on the conclusions drawn regarding the function and application of the concept of critical consciousness. Finally, the chapter closes with implications for practice, limitations, recommendations for future studies and final concluding reflections.

Summary of Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore, understand and analyze the language ideologies of three groups of members of a school community directly involved in a newly launched DL in a town in Massachusetts. On the district and administration level, in depth interviews were conducted with the school's principal, assistant principal, superintendent and ELL coordinator who represent the policy, planning and implementation part of the program. The actual practice of the program is carried out by teachers and therefore interviews with the two teachers of the first grade of the DL classroom were also included as an invaluable part of this study. Lastly, the interviews with four families attending the first grade of the program, provided an insight on their understanding of bilingual education, reasons of enrollment, and expectations from the

program. Exploring the participants' individual language ideologies, explicit or implicit, was a crucial parameter in interpreting the dynamics between school officials and attending families and in understanding how that is enacted and circulated in and outside the school setting.

The primary research questions guiding the study were the following: *a) what are the language ideologies of parents who have chosen this dual language program for their children, b) what are the language ideologies of the administrators, school officials and teachers who are involved in the creation and implementation of the dual language program?, and c) do families and administrators see critical consciousness as an integral part of the DL program?* The analysis of interview data provided a portrait of the participants regarding their attitudes and beliefs on issues of bilingualism, bilingual education, social justice and equity, touched upon issues of race, as well as white and language dominance in an elementary DL classroom.

Using Palmer et al's (2019) conceptual framework of critical consciousness as the 4th pillar of dual language education, the ten semi-structured interviews aimed to provide a full picture of the participants' understanding of the concept, how it manifested in their practices, in decision making about the program, choice of schooling and significance of the program in connection with bilingual education history and policies. The discussion in this chapter focuses particularly on the impact the concept of critical consciousness had on the beliefs of the participants regarding their overall attitude and viewpoint on issues of social justice, equity and privilege between English and Spanish speaking students.

The findings on participants' language ideologies for research questions one and two, showed a strong advocacy for dual language model of education as well as support and willingness to promote social justice values. However, the responses and discussion in the third research question about critical consciousness revealed a big mismatch among the school officials' and families' interpretation of the concept in practical applications and also in their understanding of privilege in language education settings. Therefore, a larger part of the findings discussion of this chapter will focus on the analysis of this conceptual mismatch between the participating groups.

Note of the researcher on selection of data and participants

At this point, I would like to make an important note before I proceed with the analysis of data, as I feel it is very important to explain why I chose these data to focus on in a deeper discussion. Through all the interviews with my participants, I came across wonderful conversations, I learned from them in ways that I did not expect, and I believe they learned from our talk as well. At no point did the interviews become dull, conventional or too formal, but it ended up being more like a talk with friends who did not want to end their discussion. The interviews produced a very big amount of data around so many topics that not only addressed all my research questions in full, but I was left with a surplus of data that I could analyze for days. I am grateful for the meaningful and honest conversations I had with them, for their time and the information I collected from them and for the beautiful experience I had while collecting my data.

The overall conclusion of the interview results is that it is a community of people, especially the school officials, with high moral and equity values, who respect and welcome differences of all kinds in people, including linguistic and cultural ones.

Orchard Hill's school mission is framed within a strong and solid foundations of social justice principles which were prevalent, shining, in the entirety of the interviews with the administrative and teaching staff. Students who attend this school and the focal DL program are lucky to be learning in this fruitful environment and grow academically, emotionally and ethically into mature human beings. The group of parents I was lucky to interview, complete the picture of a liberal, educated and progressive profile of the whole community, with similar values of inclusion, acceptance of difference, and equity ideologies overwhelmingly guide their arguments throughout the interviews. I am grateful I live in this area and that my children will benefit from attending this school and being raised in this community of people.

When it was time for the selection of data to be analyzed in more detail came, it was very difficult for me to choose which areas I should focus on. On the one hand I could focus on the overwhelming positive ideologies and strong community bond and also in the quality academic work that takes place in the DL program, or I could focus on the few but important areas of weakness that were hard to find but are worthy of further discussion. Focusing on all the good parts I could pick to talk about would be easier and would produce more data since they created the overall portrait of all participants and constituted the majority of data. But I believe that the little things that could 'use some more work' in order to turn this already good program into an excellent and model one, is more productive and useful for future development.

It is ultimately the beliefs, attitudes, and values that shape the field of bilingual education, determine how language programs are implemented in schools and connect with the broader societal issues (Gort, 2017). Focusing on just the positive aspects of any

issue can demonstrate what are the strengths of a program but providing counter arguments and shedding light on the areas that need improvement allows for growth and could lead to transformation on a social scale. Therefore, for the following discussion, I chose to focus on a few areas of disconnect between the goals of the program and the goals of participating families. Through the interviews I found some points of discussion that could be improved over time, in an attempt to help this program perfect itself, and also serve as food for thought for other DL programs in their early stages of development.

Discussion of the Most important Findings

The next sections will focus on the most important findings for all three research questions as concluded from the analysis of all data from the study. The chosen data will be analyzed and discussed in depth by revisiting literature from the field, and new themes focusing on the disconnect between school and families' goals and interpretation of certain issues will be created. A significant amount of the discussion and commentary will focus around the third research question regarding the concept of critical consciousness, as it produced the most contradictory results in the perceptions between the two groups of participants, the families and the school officials, especially around the notion of privilege and who the program was designed to serve.

Strict separation of languages

Mrs. Hayes, the Spanish language teacher, when asked to describe differences between teaching Spanish as a foreign language and Spanish in a DL setting, she responded that in the latter she uses more 'body language', adapts her pace of talking from natural fast native to a more slow and calm pace in order to make sure that students

“really understand”, as she is not allowed to use English to explain new terms or vocabulary. A characteristic of dual language education is the strict separation of languages (Genesee & Riches, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Collier & Thomas, 2004) during English and Spanish time which not all scholars agree nor research support and has created a debate over the years (Garcia, 2005, 2009, 2014; Flores and Garcia, 2017; Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017; Palmer, 2008)

Scholars argue that the strict separation of languages, a strategy modeled from the French immersion programs in Canada (Genesee, 1978) could not just simply transferred and applied to the US DL classrooms because of the different sociopolitical contexts of the two countries require different teaching methods to address the needs of their student populations (Flores and Garcia, 2017). “There is a big difference between *teaching children bilingually and teaching two languages*” (Flores and Garcia, 2017, p. 25, emphasis in the original). According to their work, bilingual instruction presupposes the existence of dynamic bilingualism or translanguaging which embraces the true nature of bilingualism. Translanguaging or mixing of the two languages to communicate for many researchers in the field, represents the future of bilingual education and the most natural way to emerge as a bilingual learner.

On the other hand, the strict separation of languages goes back to the traditional, ‘stiff’ models of bilingual education of the past and resembles foreign/additional language education teaching methods (Garcia, 2009; Flores and Garcia, 2017). Additionally, the strict separation of languages can at times be challenging for bilingual teachers to enact as it is ‘artificial’ and does not depict neither the reality of their bilingual nature nor the reality of emergent bilinguals. It can also be challenging for

young children to fully understand concepts or instruction in the beginning stages of learning two languages. Lisa, one of the parents reported that “the kindergarten teacher would pretend to not understand” what students were saying until they “came up with the Spanish” word which was very confusing for young students. Lastly, it can also be misleading since it could potentially promote monoglossic ideologies of ‘pure’ bilingualism, which cannot be ‘mixed’, which is not the reality of emergent bilinguals and does not promote pluralistic or heteroglossic ideologies (Garcia, 2009; Garcia, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017).

In the US context, Latinx students, and probably other emergent bilinguals, engage more in translanguaging practices rather than strictly separate their two languages when they communicate with speakers of each of the languages. Supporting the translanguaging reality of emergent bilinguals also in the DL classroom, is a way support heteroglossic ideologies which do not disadvantage the practices of Latinx students, and therefore further promote equity which DL education is built on.

Culture in the DL classroom

When asked how culture is performed or encouraged in the classroom since reaching biculturalism is one of the principles of DL education, administrators and teachers suggested many ways through which it can be achieved including bringing in personal histories and lived experiences of the students and celebrating holidays and events from the target culture. Mrs. Roberts, the ELL coordinator, also suggested continuous incorporation of art, songs, cuisine, and dance as additional elements that can raise students’ cultural awareness and pride. Although, this addition is important and enhances the sense of culture, it could also be considered as rather simplistic because just

mere knowledge and occasional exposure to these elements, does not make someone bicultural but rather broadens the students' knowledge and familiarity with a different culture.

The cultural perspective or 'cultural responsiveness' in connection to bilingual education is important because it not only affects the formation of appropriate pedagogies but is also a political struggle against linguistic discrimination (Valdiviezo & Nieto, 2017). Culture should be embedded and coexist within the complex system of language and power relations and ultimately with knowledge and familiarity with bilingual education history and policies in order to be fully absorbed from both minority and majority students. Exposure to cultural elements is beneficial and certainly not harmful but it could be better acquired if performed through the lens of critical consciousness and its four components. 'Historicizing schools' by bringing up instances of bilingual education history that disadvantaged minoritized population through culture, and 'continuously interrogating power' in cultural performances or celebrations could help create a bicultural awareness for young DL students. Additionally, 'critically listening' to students' histories and experiences and 'engaging' with the 'discomfort' of the 'not so fancy' culture of the minority populations could complete building a solid bicultural identity of the DL students (Palmer, 2018).

Bilingualism as a privilege

The idea of privilege as it is talked about in the academic fields about DL models of bilingual education was not fully interpreted in the same way by the participating families who focused mostly on principles of equal enrollment as a counter argument. However, it is important to consider that these views were seen through the eyes of

families who are considered privileged white English speaking ones and would be important to compare views on the same topic from Spanish speaking households. Below are some of comments that a few parents made, without realizing it, but stemming from a position of privilege. Through the parents' statements, we can see their language ideologies, which even when they are unconscious, they impact the way they view language and ultimately schooling in a DL setting.

A program for the “well-educated”

The overall portrait of the families involved in this study but also in the general town community is characterized as open minded, liberal and progressive, traits that could be identified when analyzing the interview data and school officials pointed out and confirmed several times during our discussions. However, taking a step further to the core of their implicit ideological views, and critically analyzing certain instances of their discourses and statements, the majority if not all of the participating families, expressed a number of beliefs and viewpoints from a privilege position. It should be noted however, that these are subconscious beliefs that parents possibly did not realize having, and they overall had well intentions and genuinely meant well and had overall positive attitudes toward the DL program and the principles it represents.

Going back to the conceptual framework of language ideologies that also framed this study, it would be useful to be reminded of the nature of the terminology of language ideologies and their impact both in language education. To start with, language ideologies are “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979, p.193). These sets of beliefs are formed, structured, reinforced and developed through the use of language and therefore

construe a new ‘version of the world’ (Hodge and Kress, 1993, p. 9; Martinez – Roldan & Malave, 2004). All ideologies including language ones, are rooted in a person’s social position, history and experience and operate as internal values and personal attitudes (Tollefson, 2007; Gort, 2017).

Ideologies about language are not necessarily conscious, planned or deliberate as in the participating parents’ case, but they can be implicit; they can be the habitual choices of people referring to a particular linguistic and cultural context (Woolard, 2008; Shi, 2015) and can be explicitly stated and/or revealed in practice (Kroskrity, 2004). When they are linked to language policies they inevitably carry ideas of power, they are a social construct can therefore be rooted in a person’s social position consciously or unconsciously and ultimately affect how people are valued and treated in different speech communities (Woolard, 1998; Palmer, 2011; Gallo et al, 2014). “Understanding ways policy approaches to language are grounded in ideologies about language means being attentive to how cultural conceptions of language create a particular social order” that may or may not discriminate particular linguistic groups over others (Beth, 2017, p. 233). Below, are a few instances that parents’ implicit language ideologies, may have contributed to a subconscious ‘social order’ and sense of linguistic privilege.

To begin with, to the sound of the word ‘criticism’ about DL programs in a relevant question, all participants initially appeared defensive and they all claimed they have not heard or thought of criticism on this matter. Below are some of the instances that some parents responded from a privileged position to various questions throughout the interview, without realizing it.

In a discussion regarding the reasons why the focal town and school district did not have a DL program for over 20 years, Lisa, in true surprise and wonder exclaimed: “I am actually surprised that it took so long” for a program like this to emerge in our town “given that the Community is of well-educated people” and it seems like “it really needed some to push for it and make it happen”. In a critical analysis of Lisa’s statement, it seems like deep down she believed that the DL program was set up and created for the ‘well-educated’ people in the community who up to now did not have the opportunity to benefit from the benefits of this program. Stemming from a position of privilege and lack of knowledge, she was not fully aware of the historical reasons that led to the creation of bilingual education and lacks familiarity of the reasons why DL education was originally created for and which population is primarily designed to serve. Lisa’s views come in contrast with the school administration’s framework and the goals they set for this particular DL program as we have seen throughout the findings chapter who explicitly many times said that this program was primarily created to serve the school’s Latinx population.

Lisa, mistakenly thought that the program is created from the actions of well-educated people because another group of well-educated people is in need for, therefore reifying the enrichment ideology which supports that white educated privileged families could benefit from also being educated in an additional language. This commentary goes back to Valdés (1997) cautionary note that DL programs although designed to serve the historically under served populations, they end up serving the already privileged ones by additionally being labeled as language programs for the ‘gifted’ or ‘talented’ ones (Valdés et al, 2016).

Cultural competence

In the discussion with Sarah about criticism in DL education, after she first defended herself and the school for not being “a valid criticism” for Orchard Hill, when “they really made it 50/50 and they widened the school district to includes families from outside who really wanted to participate” she also made the following comment:

“it’s always going to be a second language for me, not a real true native language, and I think I would have moved heaven and earth to try to; it’s not I don’t view it as privilege thing, as you know I view it as really being culturally competent and children from bilingual families are ready, even if they go to a non-bilingual program so as a Hispanic kid who is going to public school where they’ve been taught English they do have that richness already. So, it’s really like you could say, the privileged families that are coming from an American background that are deprived actually from that cultural competence”.

Sarah’s comment about privileged families from an American background being culturally deprived compared to their the Latinx classmates who come to school already favored with a cultural competence, contradicts her previous comments about the importance of critical consciousness and reifies the privilege position when in facts she tries to prove the exact opposite. To be more specific, Sarah defined critical consciousness as “awareness of one’s position in society and awareness that there are other people coming from different backgrounds” and have different cultural traditions and celebrations.

For her, this is a competence, a privilege that people “from different backgrounds” have, a ‘privilege’ she wished she had as a child if she grew up bilingually/biculturally, a ‘privilege’ that monolingual mainstream English speaking children are “deprived from” and should gain by attending the DL classroom. Sarah’s

view on cultural deprivation of English speaking children, is disconnected from the overall advocacy she expressed for social justice and equity in previous parts of her interview. Her comment appears disengaged from the realities of what it's like for immigrant students to struggle in US school because of language among other things.

Although, Sarah doesn't "view this as a privilege thing", her argument about cultural competence deprivation of English dominant children, shows a stark class difference and an ideology stemming from a position of privilege. This conclusion can also be supported through other parts of her interview where she mentioned that as a family, they hired au pairs from Germany and Spain while their older children were growing up, a convenience which for many other families is considered a privilege.

Sarah's language ideologies on this matter fall under the umbrella of raciolinguistic ideologies which center around language in connection with issues of race, ethnicity and cultural background (Rosa and Flores 2015, 2017). Hernandez (2017) also notes that "no matter how progressive or transformative a program model may be, it cannot be extracted from the current high-stakes educational-reform model we continue to function under" and it would be irresponsible if not dangerous to believe that a bilingual program's philosophy or nature "can replace the hard work of engaging the raciolinguistic ideologies at the implementation level" (p. 149) which is true if we take into account participating parents' views and especially Sarah's arguments which are currently discussed.

Since language and raciolinguistic ideologies like all ideologies are social constructs, acknowledging them, detecting them, understanding and analyzing them can equip us with a powerful tool to use them effectively to transform social structures and

bring social change. Language ideologies are a great analytical tool, a ‘weapon’ because they can both help detect a social problem by analyzing them and can also help circulate beliefs about social change and transformation by spreading them anew. In this case, by understanding and analyzing participating families’ language ideologies concerning issues of race and social status, we can deconstruct them and turn them into a powerful force of change for the future.

Location of the program

During our discussion on privilege, Celia commented that the “lovely mix of students” that attend the program from “nearby towns and also the average population which itself is somewhat diverse, refutes the idea of privilege since it is an inclusive program for all. She also added that this mix “is great, you know, in terms of socio-economic diversity but also of cultural diversity”. At the same time however, Celia also stated that she could understand the ‘privilege’ argument “because this (the program) isn’t offered everywhere that you know it’s sometimes children whose families can’t afford high property taxes and such”, without realizing that her family is also one of the ‘privileged’ families who can pay these taxes and ultimately have the opportunity to attend this program. At another time in her interview, Celia also stated that one of the reasons that makes her “want to stay in this area” because of “the education that my daughter’s receiving”, acknowledging again not consciously, that she is privileged because of the quality education she is able to offer to her child.

Going back to literature, we are reminded that traditionally DL programs were founded in neighborhoods with low socioeconomic status in order to help with the integration of historically minoritized populations in the local communities and primarily

provide enrichment for them (Lucido and Montague, 2008). A central point of criticism on DL education, is that nowadays, the location of the newly launched programs has slowly started shifting from poor immigrant neighborhoods to affluent white ones transforming them to ‘elite’ educational programs for the privileged families (Flores and Garcia, 2017; Flores and Rosa, 2015).

Celia’s arguments about the “high property taxes” that residents in Orchard’s Hill neighborhood are able to afford compared to other towns and districts where this program “isn’t offered” because those “families can’t afford” it, is an indication of a privileged point of view and a sense of superiority in terms of better education for the children who afford to live in this area and can choose to attend a language program as an option offered in their neighborhood school. What is interesting though in the case of the focal town community is that this particular DL program is not created because the town could ‘afford’ it, so it is not a privileged program per se in that sense. On the contrary, it was created as we saw in the findings chapter, with social justice goals in mind, as there was a real need to serve the increasingly rising Latinx population in the area. But possibly there is a lack of knowledge of the changing demographics in the community, that existing non-immigrant parents are not yet aware of, as in Lisa’s case, that prompted her to comment on the town’s ‘taxes’ state. Familiarizing current and prospecting families with the town’s new demographics picture, could help minimize ideological views connected with the socioeconomic status of participating DL students.

Furthermore, on a counter argument and possibly as an implication for a future study, it would be interesting to know how the views of the same families who live in this neighborhood would be impacted if in the school there is an influx of students whose

families cannot afford to live in this high taxed town but are offered to attend the program in larger numbers. On this note, it should be stressed that the focal school is prioritizing enrollment for Spanish speaking students from other areas and promotes social justice framework and ideologies of equity and inclusion in the local community. However, the school enrollment records of Latinx students coming from other districts for the DL program are still on the lower end, so low that it could not create a possible class divide, and the general DL population although equally mixed comes from the local neighborhoods. By incorporating critical consciousness in the DL curriculum, the school can educate parents on the history of bilingual education and for whom these programs were traditionally created for, in an attempt to help families realize their privileges and redirect their way of thinking about the DL program. This way the gap between school officials' and families' interpretations of issues of privilege will shrink and their social justice educational goals will better align with each other.

Language as an enrichment tool - A 'useful' 'foreign' language for the 'smart' kids

Although all parents were very vocal and proud of the strict and equal 50/50 mixing of Spanish and English speaking students as an indicator of an inclusive, and fair educational program for all, there were instances in their interviews that showed they viewed the DL classroom as an enrichment, and intensive foreign language program. Many times, in different occasions, but especially as the primary reason for enrollment to the program, they all responded that Spanish is a very 'useful' language, spoken by a large population in the country, and a 'useful' tool for traveling and job opportunities later on. This ideology lacks the historical foundation of whom these programs were created to serve and reifies the view that DL serves as an intensive foreign language

program for English speaking families. Learning a different language may be ‘useful’ to them who already have the English privilege, but it is ‘essential’ to others who lack it.

Adding to the foreign language argument about DL programs, all participants responded apart from finding the Spanish language useful to know if you live in this country, they also knew that Spanish was chosen for this DL program because of the rapid raise in Latinx population in the area. However, when asked if they would prefer another language instead, many of them said that they really like Spanish as an option but other languages like French, German or Greek languages that they are familiar with and use as foreign, were also given as alternative options. Sarah also mentioned that even “Arabic or Chinese, or anything really” could still draw her attention to enrolling her daughter to the program, which supports the ideology that any language would ‘work’ since it will provide the benefits that foreign language leaning has. At two other parts of her interview, Sarah also stated:

“I think we really have a major handicap in our country, in starting languages so late. It’s always been frustrating to me that in a town like this with a so called very excellent school system, languages are being pushed into the seventh grade. And actually, I have a child in middle school now and the language is only one semester in seventh grade and then the full year in eighth grade. And it seems like, no wonder we’re behind and you know I have applicants to our graduate program coming from Poland, anywhere else in the world, and they have such an advantage with languages”.

“I don’t know, it’s really a hard question because in public schools is always, I think, somewhat frustrating at the elementary level, that the kids are really kept in the middle, you know if they have really strong interest or abilities. They’re not given the opportunity to excel at them and to push themselves they have to stay in the middle so that everybody goes together, more or less, I think I support that in terms of justice and everything but I also then look at, you know, internationally,

America is not really competing and the kids have these really fungible minds, there are so malleable at this age, that it's a pity to me that in terms of you know, allowing, I don't think it has to be about only people who have like social privilege".

Sarah, mistook foreign or additional language learning that student in US schools receive when they are in 7th grade, a fault of the US public school system, in comparison to European countries where children have "advantage" to learn a second language at an earlier age because their minds are "fungible" and "malleable" in this age. The lack of exposure to a second language at an earlier age, is one of the reasons that "America is not really competing" internationally and smart kids who have "really strong interest or abilities" do not have the chance to compete with their peers in other countries. Similarly, Lisa at one part of her interview, when asked if she would recommend the DL program to other interested parents, she said she "would encourage anyone who you know, thinks their child is you know, capable of it, to try it out", thus assuming that smart, capable kids are usually better at attending such programs.

For immigrant Latinx students, the option of DL classroom is important for their future academic achievement, as it is for their social integration (Warhol and Mayer, 2012; Baker and Wright, 2017) whereas for English speaking kids is an additional option they have, a chance to learn a foreign language at a young age and compete their international counterparts. If an English speaking child does not thrive in a DL classroom, or it is not a good fit for them, they have the option to switch to the mainstream monolingual English-only classroom and still grow academically and socially. But a student who does not speak English and wants to also grow academically and socially, the options are limited to ESL (English as a Second Language) and SEI

(Structured English Immersion) programs but only DL programs can offer support and instruction and cultural immersion in their home and heritage language.

Adding to the argument of DL programs viewed by English speaking families as foreign language options, Celia commented that “there’s somehow a deficit in terms of intensive foreign language programs that could be labeled as dual language or bilingual in our area”, indicating that she equated foreign language education with bilingual education which are ideologically completely different. US language education is two different directions of the same line: on one end is the foreign language education, usually associated with those who already have English privilege and on the other end is bilingual education which is historically associated with educated immigrants who lack the English privilege (Cervantes-Soon et al, 2016).

Complementing the last comment about immigrant education, the lack of familiarity with bilingual education history and policies was another aspect that may complement Celia’s view about bilingual education. For Celia previous bilingual education experience, was only known through her father’s story as a first-generation German American who was forced attending his Saturday German school and stop speaking German after WW1, as the anti-German ideology was then spreading throughout the US. However, what bilingual education history has taught us is that being a white European immigrant in the US is completely different than being an immigrant of color, as are many Latinx students. Bilingual education history is often used a synonym for the history of immigration in this country as policies affecting language education were usually a product of policies against immigrant populations (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1989; Gándara & Escamilla, 2016; Bybee et al, 2014).

Orchard Hill's school administration, also confirms some of the participating families' privilege position, however, have responded in ways that demonstrate that they are committed to DL's primary goals of serving the historically underserved, but also taking action in centering these views and prioritizing enrollment to avoid the possibility of the program becoming an elite or boutique one (Flores and Garcia, 2017). Whether this enrollment policy is a successful and adequate school administration strategy to advocate for their Latinx families', it remains to be seen and reevaluated in the future when the DL program will be active for a few consecutive years. Below are some of their most noteworthy excerpts on the issue of privileged language education. These comments highlight the disconnect between the administrators' stance and parents' interpretation on issues of privilege.

“Yeah, not to condemn our community but there certainly is a lot of white families who reach out and say I want my kid in that program. And that does come from a place of privilege. And I think that we are very much aware of that try to be very measure which is why we save our seats as much as we possibly can for Spanish speaking kids and make sure that we give them priority placement, even if they're from a different homeschool neighborhood. And we save these seats until the very end of August, to make sure we try to give them an opportunity first, because the program primarily was designed for them. It is an added bonus for our English speaking kids for the program was not designed with them in mind” (Mr. Collins).

“The elite pieces are real and alive, and we watch them all the time. Once kids are in (the program), how the families maneuver and push for what they feel like is the right thing for their kid. Definitely from a privilege perspective” (Mrs. Garrison).

I think, privilege as a thought, definitely comes up. I think in this particular community, we have families that there's definitely a correlation between language status and socio economics but it's perhaps less pronounced than in other communities because of the university and you know, it's not as simple as one set of kids who speak a certain language as their first has less privileges and the other, I think in the aggregate that's true but it's not true in the individual level. You know, we find ourselves being very careful to not make any assumptions about that" (Mr. Miller).

"Lots of you know, well-educated white families are really drawn to the program because it does provide that exciting, you know aspect and additional kind of program piece for them. (Mrs. Roberts).

"You can't leave out other folks with my privilege, but we have to keep just centering and saying well why we are doing this, you know, what's the goal here, how are we going to make these decisions and who's benefiting" (Mrs. Roberts).

Historicizing schools as a component of intentional inclusion of critical consciousness in family meetings and everyday teaching practices, can gradually shed light on the differences between the history of the education of white children and that of Brown immigrant children. The former have always had access to various types of foreign language programs which were conveniently and sometimes naively named bilingual or dual language whereas the latter had always been faced with policies that banned much needed bilingual education, to both support their home language practices as well as support their development in English.

The integration of critical consciousness into the DL curriculum but also in the school and community philosophy, can among other things, also educate families who are not recent immigrants on the fundamental differences between bilingual education and

foreign language education. By historicizing schools, gradually communities can learn about bilingual education history, the restrictive language policies that have targeted immigrants through the years, and recognize how bilingual education is a win over the struggles of the past which is primarily centered around immigrant populations who have been underserved for several years because of these policies. It's not those parents' fault that they are not familiar with this part of language history but through intentional teaching and education, the district can ideally put into practice their commitments to critical consciousness, and support all of the families in their district, both those who have been underserved, as well as those for whom, this 'stepping back' might be new and unfamiliar territory, however, necessary to achieve goals of social justice and equity.

General discussion

The concept of critical consciousness raised the interest of the administrators and invited them to engage in a deeper discussion about ethical and equity values beyond the DL classroom. Connections of the concept with cultural applications of the term, with social justice, lived experiences, links to anti-racist ideologies and self-reflections as a way to recognize personal biases, created a beautiful conceptual puzzle. The administrators' genuine involvement in the discussion, showed a team of educators who prioritize racial, linguistic, cultural and socio-economic equity among the students in their school.

The school officials reported several times throughout the interviews that the ultimate reason for the creation of the DL program was "for our Spanish-speaking kids that have been underserved historically" and the district had "been underserving for years" by "overidentifying them as students with disabilities, primarily students with

communication disorders” when what they only needed was instruction and help in their primary language (Mrs. Collins). Similarly, the assistant principal, Mrs. Garrison, added that there were instances that a few parents wanted “to refer kids to special ed because they’re learning across two languages”, in an argument she stated about parents worrying about their children’s slower pace of learning. This also added to the idea of ‘elite’ or privileged language education where in order to be considered successful or gifted was by historical definition to not be an ELL learner (Juárez, 2008).

The discomfort parents felt when the discussion turned around problematic areas of DL education aligned with their overall progressive, inclusive and fair in terms of equity ideas and beliefs they all had about the meaning and importance of critical consciousness. It seemed like a logical reaction because a program like this, set up from administrators they look up to and admire, and attended by a community of people who are all advocates of social justice and equity, should and did embrace the concept of critical consciousness. However, when later on the discussion revolved around the issue of privilege and language as enrichment, at no point did any of the families talk about or question the fact that the program might not be set up for ‘them’ but for the Latinx students who have been underserved and underachieving for several years prior to the creation of this DL program.

Critical consciousness includes the idea and stance of life from the privileged members taking a step back to give room for the less privileged ones to progress and flourish and reach their full potential (Palmer et al, 2019). As a concept, it is the epitome of fairness and equity and it is the ideal pedagogical ‘skill’ in terms of social justice that all educators, families and students across educational fields should be educated on.

However, since it is a fairly new applied principle, members outside the education or language education settings are not familiar with and it could be a harder concept to conceive. Especially for families who have always had privilege, giving it up or stepping back in order for other children (who have always been underserved) to get what they deserve, or an equitable share, this is a particularly complicated concept to digest.

This reason alone, and the gradual but conscious education of families on the concept, justifies Palmer et al (2019) proposition for the official establishment of critical consciousness as the 4th pillar in DL education and for including in the DL curriculum the components of critical listening, historicizing schools with units on bilingual education history, engagement with discomfort with ‘difficult’ conversations like the one of privilege, and continuous interrogation of power dynamics in and out the classroom setting. In the following sections are implications for practice and future studies in the field of bilingual education, primarily centering critical consciousness as an integral part of DL model which is rises in popularity all over the US nation (Garcia, 2009; Cervantes-Soon et al, 2017).

Implications for practice

Historicizing schools

The importance of educating families and staff on bilingual education history (Ovando, 2003; Garcia, 2009) restrictive language policies of the past (Menken and Solorza, 2014; Gandara and Escamilla, 2016) and their correlation with policies against immigrant populations (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1989; Bybee et al, 2014) has been stressed in the previous sections of this chapter though examples and analyses of participants’

perceptions on issues of privilege in DL education. By historicizing schools as critical consciousness proposes, families from non-recent immigrant background would become familiar with the educational struggles recent immigrants and immigrants of color have faced in the previous decades and embrace the efforts to shift the historical trajectory of the past with initiatives like DL education. On the other hand, families from a Latinx backgrounds, can have their home language supported in school and their heritage, history and culture can be acknowledged, known and be an integral part of school curricula.

The participating families in this study, although not fully familiar with bilingual education, nor its history or language policies, when prompted, they all had a distant memories or stories to share of their own linguistic histories and became involved in the discussion demonstrating interest in learning more about it. Even after, the interview was over, many of them kept the conversation going by asking more questions about language policies with genuine interest and wonder.

Sarah remembered that there were French bilingual schools available in California years ago, but she was surprised to know that these either belonged in the private sector or applied for a waiver to operate because of the policy ban. Lisa, hesitant at first to have an opinion of bilingual education because she “didn’t know anything about it”, was truly surprised to know about restrictive policies in Massachusetts finding them “so weird” used her schemata to build on her argument based on her stored memory of French immersion programs in Canada while she was growing up:

“I mean, I saw I grew up largely in Quebec in Canada and they have all kinds of funny language laws about preserving the French language and I thought that was normal but I’m hearing this, this is even weirder and so interesting to know”

Katie, another parent, held another ten-minute conversation after our interview had ended and invited her husband to join and learn more about restrictive language policies in Massachusetts and Celia finally made connections with why her German American father never taught her his native language.

Lastly, the DL teaching staff, through their specialized bilingual training, were acquainted with the history of bilingual education policies whether they come from Spanish or English background, since they are the people who directly transmit knowledge to students. Both participating teachers in this study, became familiar with the language policies through their specialized bilingual training they received at a local University prior to entering the DL classroom. Mr. Clark at one point of our interview reported:

“I mean in the past, I should have struggled with how much do I talk about the ugly history of the United States and the world. As far as the history, and also what’s going on now to traditionally oppressed groups. And I felt more called to do so, obviously with the encouragement of our administration. But I’m talking about big issues and talking about how make some people feel uncertain in situations and how we as a population, a diverse population support that and stand up for it”

Judging from his statement, it seems like Mr. Clark already practices talking about the “ugly history” of the “traditionally oppressed groups in the US to his students

with “the encouragement of our administration”. Similarly, he could also include in his instruction, instances of bilingual education restrictive policies of the past and educate his already specialized DL classroom audience on historical milestones directly involved with the nature of the language program they attend.

Mrs. Hayes, the Spanish language teacher, when talking about the teaching methods she utilizes in the DL classroom, she mentioned: “I don’t see students; I’m not even bragging. They’re like a community”. The color-blind ideology of not seeing differences in students skin color or race, is generally outdated and not preferred in today’s classrooms (Lewis, 2001). Although, later in her interview, as she explained, it is clear that she did see students’ differences and she does not adhere to this outdated ideology. By adding bilingual education history into the curriculum and everyday practices, teachers, students, and parents can be educated on the restrictive language policies and help them notice differences of all kinds, acknowledge them and embrace them. By recognizing that all those differences had led to different life experiences, as a community of different individuals, we can work together toward the common goal of equal language opportunities and access to learning.

To conclude, if all of these families were eager to know more about bilingual education history on this small-scale study, imagine what impact historicizing schools would have on the whole classroom, the school, the neighborhood, town, district. Organizing more intentional and purposeful family nights in English and Spanish, where seminars on bilingual education will be presented and discussed with parents, training more bilingual staff and creating a unit on the DL curriculum and maybe in the general school curriculum focusing on the historical milestones in bilingual education, are only

some of the suggestions to raise public awareness and critical consciousness in the field. From then on, every school can come up with various other ways to address the issue, based on the specific individual needs of their school populations.

Bilingual staff hiring and training

Over 25 years ago, Valdés, (1997) stressed the importance of hiring trained bilingual educators for teaching in DL programs because they can understand the complexity in cultural and linguistic nature of emerging bilinguals and promote the academic success for minority students whereas foreign language teachers tend to mostly focus on the acquisition of language proficiency for English-dominant (white) children. These groups of teachers, according to Valdés, can work together but, at their core, they would serve different student groups needs who represent also different social group needs: the white, English-dominant American families and the Latinx families.

Mrs. Garrison, the assistant principal, also commented on the role of teachers and the importance of hiring bilingual and bicultural teachers for the program especially from Puerto Rico since the overwhelming population of Spanish students are from there. She clarified that one unit in the curriculum based on families and cultural dynamics in different families; this way teachers are “elevating culture in that sort of level of discussion” too. As the assistant principal of the school, she also tries to make sure that new Latinx teachers especially at kindergarten level, are encouraged to voice their perspectives and opinions and not feel less privileged than their white counterparts in any way.

From Mrs. Garrison’s comments it is clear that she is thinking about issues of dominance and privilege impacting her bilingual staff and encourages them to express

their beliefs and viewpoints without feeling threatened or subordinated in any way by English speaking colleagues. This statement aligns with the school's overall mission for social justice and equity both for students and school personnel. A possible implication would be to observe through time how much the administration is attending to the way adult relationships and power dynamics are playing out and what are some possible intervention methods they could use to prevent any unequal interactions.

What is more, in family meetings when both English and Speaking families participate, are there families that dominate the conversation? Research has shown that usually white English speaking families usually dominate family nights. Through *critical listening* and *continuous interrogation of power*, that critical consciousness proposes, English speaking families, with the administrations' monitoring and intervention, can take a step back and listen to the Spanish speaking counterparts and also be alerted to ask themselves if they overstep in certain conversations (Palmer et al, 2019). Additionally, when family meetings resume after COVID ends, they can be conducted both in English and Spanish as Mrs. Collins and Mrs. Roberts made sure they will, to encourage more participation of Latinx families.

Lastly, with regards to hiring more bilingual staff especially from Puerto Rico, important implications like adequate funding for special bilingual training and also special training to make sure they pass the challenging English language licensure exam, should be taken into account. The more the program progresses to higher grades, especially if it moves to middle school as the district hopes, the more bilingual trained teaching staff they will need to hire and train and having abundant financial resources to cover these expenses is an important factor for the continuous success of the program.

Integrating Spanish speaking students from other towns into the program

One section of the interviews with parents centered around the possibility to enroll their children in a DL program in another nearby town, if the focal one did not offer a DL option. All of them unanimously responded that they would not reporting convenience and commuting challenges as the primary reason. The town where this study takes place is primarily a white middle to upper class town and although Orchard Hill elementary takes equal enrollment in the DL classroom very seriously, the overwhelming majority of students attending the DL classroom and the school in general, are neighborhood children with a very few exceptions from other districts as school choice for the Spanish class.

In a hypothetical reverse scenario, it would be interesting to observe and explore the school and DL classroom dynamics if the majority of the Spanish speaking population came from other town or districts with lower socioeconomic status. If the transportation issue was solved and 50% of the classroom population consisted from Spanish speaking students from different neighborhoods and towns, how will the school dynamics change? How will families navigate this new student mix? What will it mean for these families to realize that the neighborhood population is not the target enrollment population for the program, and ultimately, they are not placed at the center of attention but instead families of less privileged neighborhood and towns are? Will the school still be able to meet the needs of the two different populations? What (new) actions will they need to take to accommodate this kind of diversity?

Effectiveness of enrollment policy

Several times throughout the interviews with all participants, the strict, fair and absolute 50/50 enrollment policy of English and Spanish students was mentioned as a measure taken to ensure equity. Administrators stressed the fact of clearly setting boundaries on the amount of English speaking families that are enrolled in the each grade so as to meet the exact same number of the Spanish speaking counterparts, even if that meant that classrooms would be under enrolled. Families also mentioned how lucky they felt for being chosen through the lottery system to join the DL program and how firm the school is with the enrollment system.

As we already explored through the study, DL programs are inclusive, they integrate minority and majority language students, and securing equal enrollment to promotes equity and social justice. However, as the program progresses through the years, it is worth wondering where this integration and inclusion, without other additions and interventions, is leading the school and its participants in the long run. If mere integration and inclusion happens without acknowledging and interpreting that certain language ideologies of discrimination or privilege exist, even on the subconscious level, then will we as a community, continue walking into a path of continuous affirmation rather than transformation of social injustice in a language program, in schools or in society in general? (Juárez, 2008; Frazer, 1995 in Juárez, 2008). What other explicit actions are taken by the school administration to promote social justice in ways that lead to social transformation starting from the DL classroom. Is critical consciousness becoming a 'conscious' skill that teachers, administrators, students and families acquire through time, and does this lead to social transformation?

Other implications – Administrators’ plans for the future

Part of the interviews with the administrators and teachers focused on the plans they have for future development and expansion of the program. Discussed below, is a collection of their suggestions and implications for future practice that I think is important to be mentioned again. Mrs. Collins envisioned more community celebrations when COVID-19 restrictions are all lifted and hoped for a development in the already active partnership with the linguistics department at the local University to prepare and train more bilingual educators. As a principal of the school, she expressed her expectations for future growth in “the network of support systems”, more partnerships with experts in the area to afford more resources to the program and more personal connections with the community to “experiment with language and culture outside of school” and celebrate with the families, different cultural events.

Mrs. Roberts felt that the school is already on “a good path” but she suggested that the following areas still have room to grow. In her own words, she visualizes the following developments:

- a) Continue to develop our curriculum
- b) Train our staff to really see the whole school as a language learning school and to really use strategies that promote language learning
- c) More project-based activities where the kids are really taking on their own learning and taking control of it and building on their interests, and have room to grow in those areas and room to grow in assessment

- d) Capture language models or better language samples, along the way, as students' progress, so that we can really holistically look at their language development
- e) Bridging in the curriculum; bridging between one unit moving to the next and transferring the language
- f) Getting increased family involvement
- g) Continue the program into middle school
- h) Maintain the balance of English and Spanish speakers
- i) Develop a different model of enrollment if the program expands

(Adapted from Mrs. Robert's interview transcript data)

Mr. Clark, the English language teacher, suggested the following implications:

- a) Continued professional development opportunities and time for planning to be done with colleagues
- b) Hiring bilingual music teachers, PE teachers so that there's more opportunity to hear Spanish throughout the day
- c) More changes in the physical space of the school building, brighten it up, update the playgrounds, community garden and hallways

- d) Increase the amount of Spanish being spoken around the school building by continuing to build students' confidence and be a hospitable and welcoming place to be themselves
- e) Increase parental involvement from more volunteering Spanish and non-Spanish families

(Adapted from Mr. Clark's interview transcript data)

The collection of ideas and thoughtful suggestions and implications for future improvement and additions to the existing program, indicate a team of practitioners and educators who do not take success for granted. On the contrary, they demonstrated a thirst to improve aspects of the program and a strong commitment to expand the program and make it flourish in all ways that it could, spread the word to more families, and continue providing high quality education. The next section will focus on implications for future studies in the field of DL education.

Implications for future research

Longitudinal study

Orchard Hill's DL program is still in its infancy and just completed the second year of operation. The results of this study indicated that it is a very promising program built on solid foundations. The school's administrative and teaching staff's statement and comments indicated a strong bond among all of them, supporting each, and the good impression and impact the program has had so far demonstrates that it is the result of common effort. The parents' enthusiastic comments about the program also indicate a community closely involved with the school's practices.

It would be interesting to see and evaluate the effectiveness of the program in a few years' time and explore students', teachers', school officials' and families' attitudes and interactions after some time that the program has been running. How similar will the findings be after the first graduates of program exit elementary? Will the program have achieved the goals of DL education in reaching bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism? Will critical consciousness be in effect as the 4th pillar of DL education and what changes has it brought in the students' and families' interactions and school dynamics? But above all, will the program have reached its most critical goal in having a positive impact on the academic achievement of their Latinx student population? The possibilities of additional research on the same topic are many and it would be interesting to see what possible routes they could take in the future.

Students' language ideologies

In this study, the language ideologies of key school officials directly and teachers involved with the implementation of a newly launched DL program were explored covering many areas of study with a particular focus on the concept of critical consciousness and its possible enactments in the program. Additionally, four families who are currently attending the first grade of the program were also interviewed as the recipients of the DL education as parental involvement in children's education and especially language education is considered important for the smooth operation of any program and for evaluating the dynamics of a school program. But, the direct recipients of this model of language education are in fact the students attending it and not their parents.

In the future, the language ideologies of participating students would be important to be included in the current or similar study to complete the puzzle of the collection of language ideologies of key people directly involved in the implementation of the focal DL program. Interviewing young children, and especially when targeting in collecting and interpreting their language ideologies in complicated issues of social justice, bilingual education history and critical consciousness among others, can be particularly challenging. However, as the existing students grow up and the program is progressing through the grades, it would be easier to engage into conversations about complex matters with the students as their socioemotional maturity levels raise, and their learning experiences have progressed.

Limitations

This study was limited to just interviews with school administration and a few participating families. The four participating families were English speaking and it would be essential to explore the ideologies and perspectives of the Spanish speaking families. Different lived experiences, different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and possibly different socioeconomic statuses could produce completely different results to the exact same research questions.

The study was originally designed to also include a demographic survey. This survey was removed from the study due to low participation, which in part could be due to families being overwhelmed with surveys, as the district was preparing their return to in person learning at the time that this study was conducted. In the future, it would be interesting to include qualitative surveys for all grades in the DL program and also include responses from the corresponding monolingual grades to evaluate and compare

responses from two different academic groups in the same school. Lastly, because of COVID restrictions, the study was limited to only remote methods of data collection such as online interviews. In the future, classroom observations, in person interviews with staff, observation of school and family nights would add to the study and possibly cover topic areas that the interviews could not.

Concluding reflections

Dual language programs are distinct and serve different purposes compared to other models of bilingual education that prevailed through the years. Administrators and school officials promote the benefits of bilingualism and biliteracy and incorporate these programs into the school curriculum and parents feel that their kids benefit from learning an additional language. Furthermore, families of the non-dominant language in the program, take pride in honoring and maintaining their heritage language while also succeeding in English and participate in a safe and equitable learning space for all (Pimentel et al, 2008).

While there is a vast array of studies on DL programs' effectiveness, academic achievement and bilingualism (Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Collier and Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Collier, 2009; Warhol and Mayer, 2012; De La Garza et al, 2015; Baker and Wright, 2017) there is limited research on the explorations of ideologies related to issues of fairness, equity and social justice in a DL setting (Amrein and Peña, 2000; Juárez, 2008; Hernandez, 2017). Adding to this the recently proposed (Palmer et al, 2019) component of critical consciousness as the fourth pillar of DL education complementing the rest three, bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism, and the unique factor of the

pandemic, this study provided a new perspective in the exploration of language ideologies' dynamics among members of a DL program.

Ten in depth semi structured interviews were conducted with Orchard Hill's school staff and families attending the first grade of a newly founded DL program in a town in Massachusetts. The principal, assistant principal, ELL coordinator and superintendent of the school painted a detailed picture of the school's profile and mission, and practices, and provided invaluable information and knowledge on the school's reasons for setting up the DL program, challenges faced in the initial stages of the program's launching, the school's enrollment policies and social justice framework, fruitful discussions on bilingual education and notions of privilege and their views on the concept of critical consciousness and its application in language educational settings.

The interviews with the two first grade teachers of the program, complemented the study with their insights on teaching in a DL program, what adjustments they had to make to their teaching methods and what special training they had to take to adhere to the philosophy and principals of DL education. They also shared their views on bilingual education history and policies as well on their interpretation and attitudes toward the concept of critical consciousness and how they plan to implement it in their classrooms in the future.

Moreover, the interviews with the four parents whose children attend the first grade of the DL program, added to the language ideologies' puzzle by sharing their views on reasons of enrollment, hopes and expectations from the program, reflections on critical consciousness and notions of privilege and many more. The compilation of data from all my participants but more importantly the close contact with the data during analysis of

the findings, and the familiarity with my participants through all this process, gave me an experience that I will forever be grateful both personally and academically.

The results of the data analysis indicated that there is a strong sense of social justice values throughout the school and town community which is prevalent in many instances of the interviews. School administrators and teachers share a strong colleague bond and work as a team, supporting each other, toward the common goal of helping all students reach their full potential academically and feel safe and equal in the school building regardless of their racial, linguistic, cultural or socioeconomic background. Their understanding of English or social privilege and their interpretation of critical consciousness aligns with the principles of social justice and all indications show a school community built on solid social justice foundations.

The findings of the analysis of parents' interviews, built a portrait of participants who value public education, languages, bilingualism and social justice and who showed awareness to the not so well-known notion of critical consciousness. The few instances of social and language privilege they showed and that were chosen for deeper analysis and discussion on this chapter are not indicative of their overall progressive, liberal and down to earth profile but these instances are mostly resulting from lack of familiarity with bilingual education history and policies that could help them construct an even more complete profile in terms of critical consciousness understanding.

The numerous themes that emerged through the analysis of parents' and administrators' language ideologies addressed the first two research questions that guided this study and included topics like reasons of enrollment in the program, reasons for creation of the program and strengths and challenges of the program among others.

Particular focus, both on the findings chapter and also in the discussion section was placed on the third research question of the study regarding the participants' understanding of the concept of critical consciousness and how it fits in the DL curriculum. Issues of social justice, fairness, equity and privilege were thoroughly discussed as seen through all participants' eyes. The findings reflecting on this research question revealed a mismatch or disconnect between the school administration and parents' views on certain topics around the issue of privilege in language education that led to a further deeper discussion in this chapter. The selected data that were analyzed, were chosen not to highlight the weaknesses and blind spots of my participants but to help improve and perfect an already 'nearly excellent' community of people participating in "nearly perfect" DL program, in an attempt to provide a solid basis for improvement of the current program and serve as a role model for similar program to emerge in the future.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (PARENTS/GUARDIANS)

1. What is your language background? What language (s) did you grow up speaking?
2. What is bilingualism to you? How would you define bilingualism?
3. Is being bilingual different than being biliterate and/or bicultural?
4. What language (s) do you speak at home with your children?
5. What made you decide to enroll your child in this program? Did your own language background and schooling influence your decision to enroll you child in this program?
6. How did you first hear about the Dual-Language program at this school?
7. What were your initial thoughts/reactions/feelings?
8. Why did you choose a school that teaches Spanish instead of another language?
Would you have preferred another language instead?
9. What are your expectations of the school and the program?
10. What would you tell interested parents about the dual-language program?
11. What do you hope your child will gain from a program like this?
12. How does your child feel about the program? Could you tell me a couple of things that your child likes about the program?
13. Anything they don't like?
14. Can you tell me a few things about the daily structure/schedule of the program?
Could you describe a typical school day?
15. Do you support your child in their home learning/homework? How do you overcome the language barrier (if any)?

16. Do you have any concerns about the program?
17. What changes has remote learning due to COVID-19 brought to your children's learning?
18. What are the benefits of dual-language programs on a personal, academic or societal level?
19. What contacts/experiences have you had with Spanish prior to enrolling your child in this program?
20. Are you familiar with the different varieties of the Spanish language? Do you have any knowledge of what variety or varieties are taught in the dual-language program?
21. The goals of dual-languages programs are bilingualism, biculturalism, biliteracy and recent literature suggests a fourth one, critical consciousness. What is your understanding of critical consciousness?
22. Being critically conscious also includes the idea \of being aware of your privileges and use them in a positive way to promote equity. Can you think of a way that this is practiced within the DL program?
23. Does the classroom environment promote equity/social justice among all students?
In what ways? Any experiences/examples?
24. What goals were communicated to you in terms of social justice/equity issues within the program?
25. Are you familiar with any similar programs in the area?
26. Would you consider sending your child to a dual language program in another town if this town didn't have Orchard Hill's dual-language program?

27. Are you familiar with the history of bilingual education in the US or MA? Are you aware of the struggles of bilingual education in the past?
28. Are you familiar with the LOOK ACT and the changes it brought?
29. Why do you think Amherst did not have a similar bilingual program before?
30. Have you heard about criticism regarding DL programs?
31. There is criticism that DL programs promote elite bilingualism, as enrichment tool for white families. What are your thoughts on it?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (ADMINISTRATORS)

1. What language(s) do you speak, or did you grow up speaking?
2. How would you define bilingualism?
3. Is being bilingual different than being biliterate and/or bicultural?
4. What is the total population of enrolled students and staff for the dual-language program?
5. How many enrolled students are from a different district or a different school?
6. How many of the students are Hispanic/Latinos?
7. How did you come up with a decision for a dual-language program?
8. When did you start preparing the implementation of the dual-language program?
9. Did you encounter any difficulties in setting up the program?
10. How did you advertise the program to the public? What actions did you take to attract more diverse population?
11. Why did you choose Spanish for the program?
12. Could you tell me a little bit more about how this program works on a daily schedule? A few things about the curriculum?

13. What were the most decisive factors to hire the teachers for this program? Could you tell me a few things about them?
14. How is culture performed within the program?
15. What are the benefits from this program for the students and for the school?
16. What are the pros and/or cons of a dual-language program compared to other types of bilingual education programs?
17. Did you face any challenges in the first year of the operation of the program? How did you deal with them?
18. What changes are you planning to implement to improve/better the program in the future?
19. What actions are you taking to recruit more families for next year?
20. Any concerns about the program so far?
21. What changes did COVID-19 and remote learning have brought to the running of the program?
22. Why did you choose this school (among others in the town) to run the dual-language program?
23. Why this town did not have a dual-language program before? Why now?
24. Are you familiar with the history of bilingual education in the US or MA? Are you aware of the struggles of bilingual education in the past?
25. Is this decision to open a dual-language program influenced by the recent shift in bilingual education policies in Massachusetts (LOOK Act)?
26. What changes does the LOOK Act bring to current language policies?

27. What are the benefits of dual-language programs on a personal, academic or societal level?
28. What groups of students/people are mostly benefited from dual-language programs?
29. What goals are communicated to parents in terms of social justice/equity? Was social justice goal included in the recruitment process?
30. Given the commitment of the district to social justice, could you give me a few examples of how this is performed in the dual-language program?
31. The goals of dual-languages programs are bilingualism, biculturalism, and biliteracy. What are some ways the district addresses these goals in the program itself?
32. Recent literature on bilingual education suggests a fourth goal, critical consciousness. What is your understanding of critical consciousness?
33. The four key components of critical consciousness suggested by scholars are: continuously interrogating power, historicizing schools, critical listening and engaging with discomfort. How do you understand these terms?
34. How do you think critical consciousness is practiced or should be practiced in the school's dual-language program?
35. Being critically conscious also includes the idea of being aware of your privileges and use them in a positive way to promote equity. How is this achieved in the dual-language classroom?
36. Have you heard about criticism around DL programs?

37. There is some criticism that dual-language programs promote elite bilingualism, as enrichment tool for white families. What are your thoughts on it?

38. How does the school respond to any potential criticism?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (TEACHERS)

1. What language(s) do you speak/did you grow up speaking?
2. How would you define bilingualism?
3. Is being bilingual different than being biliterate and/or bicultural?
4. Were you a teacher before teaching in the dual-language program?
5. Were you a teacher in the same school before the launch of the dual-language program? What did you teach?
6. How many students do you have in your class?
7. How many of these students are Hispanic/Latinos or Spanish dominant? What are the classroom dynamics?
8. Did you know about dual-language education before you become a teacher in this class?
9. What changes/adjustments you had to make to your teaching for the dual-language program?
10. Did you encounter any difficulties in the beginning of the program? What challenges did you have to face?
11. What changes did COVID and remote learning bring to your teaching and to students' learning?

12. Could you tell me a little bit more about how this program works on a daily schedule? A few things about the curriculum?
13. What do you like more/least about the dual-language program?
14. How is culture performed and taught in the program?
15. What do you think are some benefits of dual-language programs on a personal, academic and social level?
16. What are the pros and/or cons of a dual-language program compared to other types of bilingual education programs?
17. What changes are you planning to implement to improve/better the program for further grades? Why?
18. Any concerns about the program so far?
19. Why do you think this town did not have a dual-language program before? Why now?
20. Are you familiar with the history of bilingual education history in the country? Do you know the struggles that bilingual education has faced in the past?
21. Do you have any knowledge on language policies and policy shifts in Massachusetts?
22. What changes does the LOOK Act bring to current language policies? Are you familiar?
23. What groups of students/people are mostly benefited from dual-language programs?
24. What goals are communicated to students and their families in terms of social justice/equity?

25. Given the commitment of the district to social justice, could you give me a few examples of how this is performed in the dual-language classroom?
26. The goals of dual-languages programs are bilingualism, biculturalism and biliteracy. How are these addressed in the classroom?
27. Recent literature on bilingual education suggests a fourth goal, critical consciousness. What is your understanding of critical consciousness?
28. The four key components of critical consciousness suggested by scholars are: continuously interrogating power, historicizing schools, critical listening and engaging with discomfort. How do you understand these terms?
29. How do you think critical consciousness is practiced or should be practiced in the dual-language classroom?
30. Being critically conscious also includes the idea of being aware of your privileges and use them in a positive way to promote equity. How is this achieved in the dual-language classroom?
31. Have you heard about criticism around DL programs?
32. There is some criticism that dual-language programs promote elite bilingualism, as enrichment tool for white families. What are your thoughts on it?
33. Given your role as a teacher, how would you respond to this criticism?

APPENDIX B

Teachers/Administrators Consent Form for DocuSign

Consent Form for Participation in a Research Study

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Researcher(s):	Eirini Pitidou, Ph.D Candidate, Children, Families and Schools
Study Title:	Language Ideologies and Bilingual Education Policies in a Dual-Language Program
Funding Agency:	College of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

What is this form?

This form is called a Consent Form. It will give you information about the study so you can make an informed decision about participation in this research. We encourage you to take some time to think this over and ask questions now and at any other time. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form electronically and return it to the researcher.

What are some of the important aspects of this RESEARCH study that I should be aware of?

- 1) *The fact that consent is being sought for research and that participation is voluntary;*
- 2) *The purposes of the research, the expected duration of the subject's participation, and the procedures to be followed in the research;*
- 3) *The reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to the prospective subject;*
- 4) *The benefits to the prospective subject or to others that may reasonable be expected from the research*

WHY ARE WE DOING THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to examine the language ideologies, attitudes, hopes and expectations from enrollment of your children in a Dual-Language (Spanish/English) program. I am interested in learning more about your views on bilingual education, the reasons that prompt you enroll your child in the program and your understanding of language policies and how they should be enacted in school programs.

WHO CAN PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

The participants in this study are teachers and administrators who work with the first-grade level students at the Dual-Language program at Fort River Elementary school, starting Fall 2019.

WHERE WILL THIS RESEARCH STUDY TAKE PLACE AND HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PARTICIPATE?

Interviews will take place once online over the phone or via a videoconference using Zoom or a similar online tool, at a time convenient for you. The interviews will last approximately 30 minutes. The two teachers of the program, the two principals, the ELL coordinator and superintendent of the school will be asked to participate in this study. Interviews will be audio recorded and later transcribed. Any participant who would not like to be recorded can opt out or choose to completely withdraw.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO AND HOW MUCH TIME WILL IT TAKE?

There is a one-part interview session which will be conducted over the phone or using a videoconferencing tool like Zoom which will last for approximately 30 minutes. The questions will be related to your experiences as a teacher/administrator in a Dual-

Language program and your hopes for future development of the program. During the interview, you may skip any question you feel uncomfortable answering.

WILL BEING IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY HELP ME IN ANY WAY?

You may not directly benefit from this research; however, it is my hope that your participation in the study may contribute to the field's understanding of how and develop multiple languages within Dual-Language programs.

WHAT ARE my RISKS OF being in THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

We believe there are minimal risks associated with this research study; however, a risk of breach of confidentiality always exists and we have taken the steps to minimize this risk as outlined in section 9 below.

How will my personal information be protected?

Your privacy and confidentiality are important to us. The following procedures will be used to protect the confidentiality of your study records. The following procedures will be used to protect the confidentiality of your study records. The researcher will keep all study records (audio files, questionnaires, transcriptions of interviews), including any codes to your data, in a secure location. These will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked office. Research records will be labeled with a code. A master key that links names and codes will be maintained in a separate and secure location. The master key and recordings will be destroyed 3 years after the close of the study. All electronic files (transcriptions of interviews, recordings and field notes) containing identifiable information will be password protected. Any computer hosting

such files will also have password protection to prevent access by unauthorized users. Only the members of the research staff will have access to the passwords. At the conclusion of this study, the researcher may publish their findings. Information will be presented in summary format and you will not be identified in any publications or presentations.

WILL I BE GIVEN ANY MONEY OR OTHER COMPENSATION FOR BEING IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

There is no monetary or other form of compensation for participation in this research study.

WHO CAN I TALK TO IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Take as long as you like before you make a decision. We will be happy to answer any question you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher(s), Eirini Pitidou at 718-715-2813 or epitidou@umass.edu

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the University of Massachusetts Amherst Human Research Protection Office (HRPO) at (413) 545-3428 or humansubjects@ora.umass.edu.

WHAT HAPPENS IF I SAY YES, BUT I CHANGE MY MIND LATER?

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. If you agree to be in the study, but later change your mind, you may drop out at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do not want to participate.

WHAT IF I AM INJURED?

The University of Massachusetts does not have a program for compensating subjects for injury or complications related to human subjects' research, but the study personnel will assist you in getting treatment.

SUBJECT STATEMENT OF VOLUNTARY CONSENT

When signing this form, I am agreeing to voluntarily enter this study. I have had a chance to read this consent form, and it was explained to me in a language which I use. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have received satisfactory answers. I have been informed that I can withdraw at any time. A copy of this signed Informed Consent Form has been given to me.”]

Participant Electronic Signature:

Print Name:

Date:

By signing below, I indicate that the participant has read and, to the best of my knowledge, understands the details contained in this document and has been given a copy.

Electronic Signature of Person
Obtaining Consent

Print Name:

Date:

Parent Consent Form for DocuSign

Consent Form for Participation in a Research Study

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Researcher(s):	Eirini Pitidou, Ph.D Candidate, Children, Families and Schools
Study Title:	Language Ideologies and Bilingual Education Policies in a Dual-Language Program
Funding Agency:	College of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

What is this form?

This form is called a Consent Form. It will give you information about the study so you can make an informed decision about participation in this research. We encourage you to take some time to think this over and ask questions now and at any other time. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form electronically and return it to the researcher.

What are some of the important aspects of this RESEARCH study that I should be aware of?

- 5) *The fact that consent is being sought for research and that participation is voluntary;*
- 6) *The purposes of the research, the expected duration of the subject's participation, and the procedures to be followed in the research;*
- 7) *The reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to the prospective subject;*
- 8) *The benefits to the prospective subject or to others that may reasonable be expected from the research*

WHY ARE WE DOING THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to examine the language ideologies, attitudes, hopes and expectations from enrollment of your children in a Dual-Language (Spanish/English)

program. I am interested in learning more about your views on bilingual education, the reasons that prompt you enroll your child in the program and your understanding of language policies and how they should be enacted in school programs.

WHO CAN PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

The participants in this study are parents/guardians of children who are at the first-grade of the Dual-Language program at Fort River School starting in Fall 2019.

WHERE WILL THIS RESEARCH STUDY TAKE PLACE AND HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PARTICIPATE?

For this part of the survey, some selected parents are individually asked to participate in a follow up virtual interview after the online survey, at a time convenient to the participant. The interviews will last for approximately 30 minutes and can be conducted over phone or Zoom or a similar videoconferencing tool. Interviews will be audio recorded and later transcribed. Any participant who does not comfortable with being recorded can opt out or completely withdraw.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO AND HOW MUCH TIME WILL IT TAKE?

Interviews: For the parents who will participate in the interview, you will be asked questions about your language history (what languages do you speak? when did you learn them?), your reasons for choosing the Dual Language program for your child, and a description of your child's language development and practices (What language(s) do you speak at home? What language(s) does your child speak? When did they learn their language(s)?). Part of the interview will focus on questions regarding familiarity with

language policies in US and MA. During the interview, you may skip any question you feel uncomfortable answering. The total amount of time for the interview will be 30 minutes maximum.

WILL BEING IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY HELP ME IN ANY WAY?

You may not directly benefit from this research; however, it is my hope that your participation in the study may contribute to the field's understanding of how and develop multiple languages within Dual-Language programs.

WHAT ARE my RISKS OF being in THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

We believe there are minimal risks associated with this research study; however, a risk of breach of confidentiality always exists and we have taken the steps to minimize this risk as outlined in section 9 below.

how will my personal information be protected?

Your privacy and confidentiality are important to us. The following procedures will be used to protect the confidentiality of your study records. The following procedures will be used to protect the confidentiality of your study records. The researcher will keep all study records (audio files, questionnaires, transcriptions of interviews), including any codes to your data, in a secure location. These will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked office. Research records will be labeled with a code. A master key that links names and codes will be maintained in a separate and secure location. The master key and recordings will be destroyed 3 years after the close of the study. All electronic files (transcriptions of interviews, recordings and field notes)

containing identifiable information will be password protected. Any computer hosting such files will also have password protection to prevent access by unauthorized users. Only the members of the research staff will have access to the passwords. At the conclusion of this study, the researcher may publish their findings. Information will be presented in summary format and you will not be identified in any publications or presentations.

WILL I BE GIVEN ANY MONEY OR OTHER COMPENSATION FOR BEING IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

There is no monetary or other form of compensation for participation in this research study.

WHO CAN I TALK TO IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Take as long as you like before you make a decision. We will be happy to answer any question you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher(s), Eirini Pitidou at 718-715-2813 or epitidou@umass.edu

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the University of Massachusetts Amherst Human Research Protection Office (HRPO) at (413) 545-3428 or humansubjects@ora.umass.edu.

WHAT HAPPENS IF I SAY YES, BUT I CHANGE MY MIND LATER?

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. If you agree to be in the study, but later change your mind, you may drop out at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do not want to participate.

WHAT IF I AM INJURED?

The University of Massachusetts does not have a program for compensating subjects for injury or complications related to human subjects' research, but the study personnel will assist you in getting treatment.

SUBJECT STATEMENT OF VOLUNTARY CONSENT

When signing this form, I am agreeing to voluntarily enter this study. I have had a chance to read this consent form, and it was explained to me in a language which I use. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have received satisfactory answers. I have been informed that I can withdraw at any time. A copy of this signed Informed Consent Form has been given to me.”]

Participant Electronic Signature:

Print Name:

Date:

By signing below, I indicate that the participant has read and, to the best of my knowledge, understands the details contained in this document and has been given a copy.

Electronic Signature of Person
Obtaining Consent

Print Name:

Date:

APPENDIX C

INVITATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Dear Parents of children in the Dual-Language Program,

My name is Eirini Pitidou and I am a Ph.D. student in Children, Families, and Schools program at the College of Education at UMass Amherst. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study that would look at the language ideologies revolving around the Dual-Language program your child is enrolled in. The purpose of the study is to learn more about your motivation on attending this program, your hopes and expectations for future gains for your children, your understanding of the goals of a Dual-Language program and what changes you think it brings in the local community.

For the first part of the study, you will be asked **to fill out a simple online parent/guardian survey** mainly for demographic and linguistic background purposes while some questions will address your views on bilingualism and bilingual education and your hopes and expectations for academic, cultural, and social gains. The survey will take no longer than 10 minutes to complete and it will be **anonymous**. The front page of the survey serves as a consent form that you have to agree upon if you wish to take the survey. All parents/guardians are invited and encouraged to fill out the survey.

The second part of the study consists **of follow-up interviews that will last approximately 30-40 minutes** and will be conducted online via zoom at a date/time that suits your schedule. Interview questions will expand on the survey questions and will center around topics of bilingual education, bilingualism, and beliefs/expectations about language programs. Interested parents/guardians can contact me individually to arrange

an interview. All subject names will be changed or omitted to ensure participants' **anonymity and confidentiality**. If you agree to participate for the follow up interview you will be asked to sign an electronic consent form which I will provide you.

Participation in the project is voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time. Participation in this study will have no effect on your child's education or classroom experience.

To take part in the survey please click on the link below:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1cDm0aipE-WMyDRMB8-H6LPqHhhwRoP_7EtwcOnTEdA/edit?gxids=7628

For the follow-up online interviews, please contact me at 718-715-2813 or by email at epitidou@umass.edu

Sincerely,

Eirini Pitidou

Ph.D Candidate

UMass Amherst

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 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.
- Alfaro, C., & Hernández, A.M (2016). Ideology, Pedagogy, Access, and Equity (IPAE): A critical examination for dual language educators. *The Multilingual Educator, CABE 2016 Edition*, 7-11.
- Amrein, A. & Peña, R. (2000). Assymetry in dual language practice: Assessing imbalance in a program promoting equality. *Education Policy Archives*, 8 (8), 1-17.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: Texas University Press
- Baker, C.& Wright, W. (2017). *Chapter 9: Historical introduction to bilingual education: The United States*. In Baker, C.& Wright, W. (Eds.) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (6th Edition) (pp. 172-195) Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C.& Wright, W. (2017). *Chapter 11: Education for Bilingualism and Biliteracy*. In Baker, C.& Wright, W. (Eds.) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (6th Edition) (pp. 215- 242). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Beth. T. A. (2017). Language policy, language ideology, and visual art education for emergent bilingual students. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 118:4, 228-239.
- Blackledge, A. (2008). Critical discourse analysis. In Wei & Garcia (Eds.) *Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing: USA.
- Borg, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). Chapter 1: The nature of inquiry. In Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (Eds.) (Fifth Edition) *Research Methods in Education*, (pp. 3-45), London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bybee, E. R., Henderson, K. I., & Hinojosa, R.V. (2014). An overview of the U.S. Bilingual Education: Historical Roots, Legal Battles, and Recent Trends. *Texas Education Review*, 2 (2), 138-146.
- Ballotpedia (2016). California Proposition 58, NonEnglish Languages allowed in public education. Retrieved from: [https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 58, NonEnglish Languages Allowed in Public Education \(2016\)\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_58,_NonEnglish_Languages_Allowed_in_Public_Education_(2016))).
- California Department of Education (2016). CA Education for a global economy initiative. Retrieved from: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/caedge.asp>
- Capetillo-Ponce, J. (2003). The Vote on Bilingual Education and Latino Identity in Massachusetts, Gaston Institute Publications 129. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umb.edu/gaston_pubs/129 .
- Cencus 2000 Getway – US Cencus Bureau (2000). Retrieved from: <https://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2009). Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the US. Retrived from: <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the New Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37, 64-82.

- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., & Choi, R. S. J. (2017). Compating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, 41, 403-427.
- Chang - Bacon, C.K., (2020). Monolingual language ideologies and the Massachusetts Sheltered English immersion endorsement initiative: A critical policy analysis.. *Educational Policy Archives*, 1-41.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). Chapter 1: The nature of inquiry. In Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (Eds.) (Fifth Edition) *Research Methods in Education*, (pp. 3-45), London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). Chapter 9: Case Studies. In Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (Eds.) (Fifth Edition) *Research Methods in Education*, (pp. 181-190), London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). Chapter 14: Questionnaires. In Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (Eds.) (Fifth Edition) *Research Methods in Education*, (pp. 245-266), London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Collier, V.P. & Thomas, W.P (2004). The astounding effectiveness of bilingual education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice* 2 (1), 1-20.
- Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English Only."* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Crawford, J. (1997). *Best evidence: Research foundations of the Bilingual Education Act*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity. US language policy in an age of anxiety*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2000b). The Proposition 227 campaign: A post mortem. In Crawford, J. *At war with diversity. At war with diversity. US language policy in an age of anxiety*. (pp. 104-130). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. (5th ed). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.
- DeJong, E. J. (2016). Two-Way Immersion for the Next Generation: Models, Policies, and Principles, *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10 (1), 6-16.
- DeJong, E. J, Gort, M. & Cobb, C.D (2005). Bilingual Education within the context of English-Only policies: three districts' responses to Question 2 in Massachusetts, *Educational Policy*, 19 (4), 595-620.
- De La Garza, T. O., Mackinney, E., & Lavigne, A.L. (2015). Dual language instruction and achievement: a need and a void in the Midwest. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 27 (4), 363-382.
- Delpit, L., & Downdy, J.K. (Eds.) (2008). *The skin that we speak: thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. The New Press.
- Del Valle, S. (2003). *Language rights and the law in the United States: Finding our voices*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters

- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2018). Introduction: The discipline and practice of Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (Fifth Edition) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (pp.2-26), London: SAGE Publications.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Education Dive (2020). Arizona board approves more flexibility for Els under English-only law. Retrived from: <https://www.k12dive.com/news/arizona-board-approves-more-flexibility-for-els-under-english-only-law/571185/>
- Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-languague school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 337-365.
- Fishman, J. (1996). What do you lose when you lose your language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.) *Stabilising Indigenous Languages* (Monograph Series, special issue) (pp. 80-91). Flagstaff: Center for Excellence in Education, Norther Arizona University
- Flick, U. (2018). Part I: Doing qualitative datat collection – Charting the Routes. In Flick, U. (Editor) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection* (pp. 3-16), London: SAGE Publications.
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30 (1), 13-38.
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Flores, N. & Garcia, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14-29.
- Frazer, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a “post-Socialist” age. *New Left Review*, 212 (1), 68-93.
- Gallo et al. (2014). Conflicting ideologies of Mexican immigrant English across levels of schooling. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8, 124-140.
- Gall, M, Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th Edition). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Galvin, W.F. (2002). 2002 information for voters: English language education in public schools. Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Retrieved from: <https://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/elepdf/ifv02.pdf>
- Gandara, P. and Escamilla, K. (2016). Bilingual Education in the United States, in Garcia, O et al. (Eds.) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, pp. 1-14.
- Garcia, O. (2005). *Teaching and learning in two languages. Bilingualism and schoolling in the United States*. Teachers College Press, New York.
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O. (2014). US Spanish and education global and local intersections. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 58-80.
- Genesee, F. (1978). A longitudinal evaluation of an early immersion school program. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 3 (4), 31-50.

- Genesee, F., and Riches, C. (2006) Literacy: Instructional Issues. In Genesee, F., Linholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W.M., and Christian, D. (Eds.) *Educating English Language Learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp.109-175), USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gort, M. (2017). Language Ideologies in bilingual education policy and practice. *Texas Education Review*, 5 (1), 67-75.
- Gort, M., DeJong, E. J. & Cobb, C. D. (2008). Seeing through a bilingual lens: structural and ideological contexts of structured English immersion in three Massachusetts districts, *Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies*, (8)2, 41-67.
- Goundar, P. R. (2017). The characteristics of language policy and planning research: An overview. In Jiang, X. (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics – Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 81- 88), IntechOpen.
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hernandez, S.J. (2017). Are they all language learners?: Educational labeling and raciolinguistic identifying in a California Middle school dual language program. *The CATESOL Journal*, 29 (1), 133-154.
- Henderson, K. I., & Palmer, D. K. (2015). Teacher and student language practices and ideologies in a third-grade two-way dual language program implementation. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(2), 75-92.
- Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the teacher* (2nd edition). London:Routledge
- Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1993). The scope of linguistics. In R. Hodge & G. Kress (Eds.), *Language as ideology* (second edition) (pp. 1-14). London, England: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1994). Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education*, 8, 75-86.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning research. In Recento, T. (Ed) *An introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 24-41), Blackwell.
- Howard, E., Lindholm-Leary, K., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jeon, M. (2007). Language ideologies and bilingual education: A Korean-American perspective. *Language Awareness*, 16 (2), 114-130.
- Johnson, D.C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 13(1), 61-79.
- Johnson, D.C. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 267-279.
- Johnson, D. C. (2017). Critical ethnography of language policy: a semi-confessional tale. In Martin-Jones, M. and Martin, D. (Eds.) *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic perspectives*, (pp. 105-120), New York: Routledge.
- Juárez, B. G. (2008). The politics of race in two languages: an empirical qualitative study. Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education, *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 11 (3), September 2008, 231-249.

- Kamberelis, G., Dimitriadis, G., and Welker, A. (2018). Focus group research and/in figured worlds. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (Fifth Edition) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (pp.692-716), London: SAGE Publications.
- Kenny, W.R., & Grotelueschen, A.D. (1980). Making the case for case study. Occasional Paper, Office for the Study of Continuing Professional Education. Urbana-Champaign: College of Education, University of Illinois.
- King, N. & Horrocks, C. (2010). Chapter Three: Designing an interview study. In Kings, N. and Horrocks, C (Eds.) *Interviews in Qualitative Research*, (pp. 25-41), London: SAGE Publications.
- King, N. & Horrocks, C. (2010). Chapter Eight: Reflexivity in qualitative interviewing. In Kings, N. and Horrocks, C (Eds.) *Interviews in Qualitative Research*, (pp. 125-141), London: SAGE Publications.
- King, N. & Horrocks, C. (2010). Chapter Nine: An introduction to interview data analysis. In Kings, N. and Horrocks, C (Eds.) *Interviews in Qualitative Research*, (pp. 142-174), London: SAGE Publications.
- Kloss, H. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House (Original work published in 1977).
- Krashen, S.D. (1999). *Condemned without a trial: Bogus arguments against bilingual education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kroskirty, P.V. (2004). Chapter 22: Language Ideologies. In Duranti, A. (Ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, (pp. 496-517), Blackwell Publishing.
- LeCompte, M.D. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. (2nd edition). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Lewis, A. E. (2001). There is no “Race” in the Schoolyard: Color-Blind Ideology in an (Almost) all-white school. *American Educational Research Journal*, SAGE Journals, 38 (4), 781-811
- LOOK ACT summary (2017) retrieved from:
https://languageopportunity.files.wordpress.com/2017/11/look_law_summary_112917.pdf
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005). The rich promise of two-way immersion. *Educational Leadership*, 62 (4), 56-59.
- Lucido, F & Montague, N. (2008). Dual Language program: Deal or No Deal? *Journal of Border Educational Research*, Special Issue: Language, Life, and Learning Conference, 101-112.
- Malakoff, M. & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of language minority education in the United States, In Padilla, A, Fairchild, H. & Valades, C. (Eds), *Bilingual Education: Issues and Strategies*, (pp. 27- 44), London: SAGE Publications.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Martinez-Roldan, C. & Malave, G. (2004). Language ideologies mediating literacy and identity in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4(2), 155-180.
- Mass Live (2016). Bilingual education never really left Massachusetts, but it’s been changing. Retrieved from:
https://www.masslive.com/news/2016/09/bilingual_education_never_real.html
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) (2017), LOOK Act, Retrieved from: <https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/look-act.html>

- Menken, K. & Solorza, C (2014). No child left bilingual: accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Education Policy*, 28(1), 96-125.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Revised and Expanded from qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitchell, C. (2019). The truth about bilingualism. Education Week, January 2019, Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2019/01/09/the-truth-about-bilingualism-its-only-for.html>
- Mora, J.K., Wink, K., & Wink, D. (2001). Dueling models of dual language instruction: A critical review of the literature and program implementation guide. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(4), 417-442.
- Morales, Z. P., & Rao, A. (2015). How ideology and cultural capital shape the distribution of Illinois' bilingual education programs. *Teachers College Record – The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, 1-4 Retrieved from: <https://www.tcrecord.org/PrintContent.asp?ContentID=18139>
- Moyer, M. (2008). Research as Practice: Liking Theory, Method, Data. In Li Wei & M. G. Moyer (Eds.), *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp. 18-31). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nieto, D. (2009). A brief history of bilingual education in the United States. *Urban Education Journal*, 6(1), 61- 71.
- Ovando, C (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal* 27 (1), 1-24.
- Padilla, A.M. (1990). Bilingual education: Issues and perspectives. In Padilla, A, Fairchild, H. & Valades, C. (Eds), *Bilingual Education: Issues and Strategies*, (pp. 15-26), London: SAGE Publications.
- Palmer, D. K. (2008). Building and destroying students' "academic identities:" The power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(6), 1-24.
- Palmer, D. K. (2011). The discourse of transition: teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5, 103 - 122.
- Palmer, D.K, Zuñiga, C.E. & Henderson, K. (2017). A dual language revolution in the United States? On the bumpy road from compensatory to enrichment education for bilingual children in Texas. In Wright, W., Boun, S. & Garcia, O. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 92- 108). USA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Palmer, D.K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, 58, 121-133.
- Pennycook, A (2007). The myth of English as an international language. In S. Makoni, & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 3-47). Multilingual Matters Ltd. Clevedon: England.

- Petrovic, J.E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4(4), 395-416.
- Pimentel, C., Diaz Soto, L., Pimentel, O., & Urrieta, L. Jr., (2008). The dual language dualism, Quiénes Ganan?, *TABE Journal*, 10 (1), 200-223.
- Ricento, T. K. & N. H. Hornberger (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3), 401-427.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(2), 196-213.
- Ricento, T. (2006). Theoretical perspectives in language policy: an overview. In Ricento (2006) (Eds.) *Language Policy: theory and method*, (pp. 3-9). Blackwell Publishing.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621-647.
- Roulston, K. and Choi, M. (2018). Part III: Qualitative interviews. In Flick, U. (Editor) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection* (pp. 233-249), London: SAGE Publications.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). 'Orientations in language planning'. *NABE Journal* 8(2), 15-34.
- Silverstein M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P.R Slyne (ed) *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Shi, J. (2015). The combination of critical discourse analysis and ethnography in language policy and planning study: a literature review. *ARECLS*, 12, 118-137.
- Shin, S. J. (2005). *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Skutnabb – Kangas, T. (1996). Educational language choice-Multilingual diversity or monolingual reductionism? In M. Hellinger & U. Ammon (Eds.), *Contrastive sociolinguistics* (pp.175-204). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Smith, J. M, Coggins, C. & Cardoso, J.M. (2008). Best Practices for English Language Learners in Massachusetts: Five Years After the Question 2 Mandate, Equity & Excellence in Education, 41:3, 293-310.
- Teitelbaum, H., & Hiller, R.J. (1977). Bilingual education: The legal mandate. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47(5), 138-170.
- Tollefson, J.W. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. London: Longman.
- Tollefson, J.W. (2002). Introduction: Critical issues in educational language policy. In Tollefson, J.W (Ed.) *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (pp 3-16), USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Perez-Milans, M. & Tollefson, J.W. (2018). Language policy and planning: Directions for future research. In Perez-Milans, M. & Tollefson, J.W (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and planning*, (pp. 727-742), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V.P. (2009). English learners in North Carolina, 2009: A research report provided to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved from http://p1cdn4static.sharpschool.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_4502383/File/NC_ELL_Study_Yr1_FinalReport.pdf

- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V.P. (2010). English learners in North Carolina, 2010: A research report provided to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved from http://p1cdn3static.sharpschool.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_4502383/File/NC_ELL_Study_Yr2_Final%20Report_Jul27_2011.pdf
- Valdiviezo, L. & Nieto, S. (2017). Culture in bilingual and multilingual education: Conflict, struggle and power. In Wright, W., Boun, S. & Garcia, O. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 92- 108). USA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-Language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, Fall 1997, 67 (3), 391- 429.
- Valdés, G. (2002). Enlarging the pie: Another look at bilingualism and schooling in the US. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 155(156), 187-195.
- Valdés, G., Freire, J., A., & Delavan, G., M. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *Urban Rev*, 48, 601-627.
- Viesca, K. M. (2013). Linguicism and racism in Massachusetts education policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21 (52), 1-37.
- Warhol, L. & Mayer, A. (2012). Misinterpreting School Reform: The Dissolution of a Dual-Immersion Bilingual Program in an Urban New England Elementary School. *Bilingual Research Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 35 (2), 145-163.
- Wiley, T. & Wright, W. (2004). “Against the undertow: Language minority education policy and politics in the ‘Age of Accountability’”. *Educational Policy* 18(1), 142-168.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3-47). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.