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Abstract

Two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) programs have demonstrated great success in improving Latino English Language Learners’ educational outcomes. When compared with students in English-only programs, TWBI students have more favorable attitudes towards bilingualism, biculturalism, and other cultural groups, yet TWBI classrooms are not immune to the greater power dynamics and influences of United States society. This Participatory Action Research study brought together a cadre of eight two-way bilingual immersion teachers from two Northern California school districts. The participants collaborated to examine and develop practices that promote cross-cultural competency in their TWBI classrooms. This study investigated the TWBI teachers’ awareness of power imbalance regarding the validation of cultural capital between native English-speakers and native Spanish-speakers, the participants’ understanding of cross-cultural competence, and the teacher organizational routines that lead to equitable distribution of cultural capital in their classrooms.

The data demonstrated that socioeconomic differences strongly influenced student social dynamics. Students from a higher social class, usually the native English-speakers, displayed more confidence and, if left unmanaged, dominated classroom participation. Native Spanish-speaking students from educated, middle class families also dominated
and took on central roles in classroom interactions. TWBI educators often use a native English-speaker/native Spanish-speaker lens to monitor and make instructional decisions. This two-way lens may not reveal the predominant distinctions between the student groups. Awareness of socioeconomic influences and distribution of cultural capital will provide TWBI teachers greater clarity to fine-tune their instructional decision-making.

This study also found that the participants recognized that if left to chance, inequitable power dynamics would take over. The participants were cognizant of the necessity to assume much needed advocacy roles on behalf of their students, and to incorporate organizational routines that promote the cultural capital of their native Spanish-speaking students into their practice.
California State University, East Bay  
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership for Social Justice

This dissertation was presented  
by

Elizabeth Brooke-Garza

It was defended on  
April 25, 2013  
and approved by:

__________________________________  
Gilberto Arriaza, Chair  
Educational Leadership

__________________________________  
Leticia Ramirez  
Teacher Education

__________________________________  
Diane Sharken Taboada  
Vallejo Unified School District
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my children Jessica, Jacob, and Samuel. You have grown up with a mother who was often at class or frantically finishing assignments. Thank you for taking care of each other, helping with chores, proofreading my papers, and providing tech support. Most of all, thank you for your patience, love, and cheering me on. You are my greatest joy and blessing—I love you. This dissertation is also dedicated in loving memory to my parents, Catalina Garza Davila de Brooke and Richard Brooke. Thank you for your love, believing in me, inspiring me to push ahead, and modeling faith in God.

I would like to thank my “borrowed” children Elsa, Rodolfo, and Luis Pablo. Thank you for joining our crazy household, enriching my life, and putting up with a tía who was always busy. Mil gracias to each of my nine siblings, their spouses, and my nieces and nephews who kept encouraging me and wouldn’t let me quit. I have been blessed with so many “angels” who have come to my rescue, brought me meals, ran errands for me, chauffeured my children, and provided enormous support. Thank you to all of you, most especially Joan, Lynn, Lisa, and Valerie.

A very warm thank you to Dr. Gilberto Arriaza, Dr. Diane Sharken Taboada, and Dr. Lettie Ramirez. I feel as if I hit the jackpot with my dissertation committee! Your generous support went far beyond the requirements of a dissertation committee. I owe immense gratitude for your continuous guidance, encouragement and mentorship. Thank you also to the Creekside and Main Street teachers for giving so much of yourselves for this project. Mil gracias to all of you!
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWBI Challenges</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Approach and Methods</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Competency</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals of TWBI</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural competency important in effective learning environments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetrical language and culture status in TWBI programs favors English and Anglo-centric perspectives</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating Social Dynamics and Cultural Capital</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Teaching and Multicultural Education</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital, Field, and Habitus</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourdieu’s theoretical framework</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Routines</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs for Latino Students and Language Politics</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inequitable educational outcomes for Latino students

Programs for English Language Learners: Features and Controversies

Educational programs matter

Various Program Models for English Language Learners

Controversies and Politics Regarding English Learner Programs

Two-Way Bilingual Immersion (TWBI) Model

Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Effectiveness

Need for Further Research

Synthesis

Theoretical framework

Discussion of Latino educational outcomes, program models and controversies, and need for further research

Purpose of study

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Purpose of the Study

Research Questions

Research Approach

Rationale for research design

Validity

Democratic validity
Dialogic and process validity 59
Catalytic and outcome validity 60
Setting 60
Ridgeline School District 60
Creekside Elementary School 61
Ridgeline Middle School 64
Vineyard Valley Joint Unified School District 65
Main Street K-8 School 65
Participant Selection 67
Selection criteria 67
Participant selection process 68
Participants’ Profiles by School 68
Creekside Elementary School Participants 68
Main Street K-8 School Participants 69
Ridgeline Middle School Principal Investigator 70
Data Collection and Procedures 70
Main data sources 70
Initial interviews 70
Focus groups 71
Final interview 72
Classroom observation 72
Transcription, coding, and validity checking 72
CHAPTER 4: TEACHER PROFILES

Introduction 78
Isabel Cruz 79
Luis Vera 82
Ana Lucia Reyes 85
Veronica Bell 88
Lola Peña 92
Anita Kelly 98
Elsa Gray 103
Susan Parker 107
Elizabeth Brooke-Garza 112
Summary 114

Purpose of relating participants’ story 114
Themes 114
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

Introduction

115

Student Social Dynamics

The native English-speaking students experience the social supports that the educational system values

116

The students’ socioeconomic class had a stronger influence on the classroom social dynamics and cultural capital distribution than their linguistic and ethnic background

121

TWBI classrooms do not always achieve linguistic balance and student integration

126

The teachers at Creekside noted more disparity in the cultural capital between the student groups than did the Main Street teachers

132

Participant Understanding of Cross-Cultural Competency

133

Teacher Organizational Routines to Promote Cultural Capital

145

Teachers should take responsibility and not leave equitable learning environments to chance

146

Promote the cultural capital of the native Spanish-speakers

147

Teachers need to purposefully manage student participation and grouping, and spotlight Spanish-speakers as “experts”

150

Teachers need to be in the habit of teaching cultural competency

153

Regularly involving families and students beyond the school day is important

155

Maintaining high expectations for the native Spanish-speakers is fundamental

158

Conclusion

159

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

161
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A. Teacher Focus Group Protocol</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B. Teacher Interview Questions: Initial Interview</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C. Teacher Interview Questions: Final Interview</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D. Teacher Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Scarcity of Latinos who achieve higher education. 36
Figure 2. Student achievement on standardized tests. 52
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Presently, the educational outcomes for Latinos in the United States are discouraging. According to data from the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) (2010) the achievement gap between White and Latino students has remained measurably unchanged for the past 20 years. Latino elementary and secondary students continue to score over 20 points lower than their White peers in both reading and math. When compared to White and African American students, Latinos have the highest high school drop out rate. Of the almost three million students in the U.S. who are English Language Learners, the majority, 73 percent, speak Spanish (NCES, 2010). Given the large number of students identified as Spanish-speaking English Language Learners (ELL), national and state education agencies cannot ignore the impact of Latino English Language Learners on schools. These statistics dramatize the academic plight of Latino students in our country. The problem is that most current educational programs and teacher practices are not adequately meeting the needs of Latino English Language Learners--Latino English Language Learners continue to lag behind academically (Gándara, 2010).

There is no single solution to this “Latino education crisis” (Gándara, 2010, pp. 24–25). Ameliorating the dire state of Latino education will require a comprehensive net of political, social, and economic support. Fervent anti-immigration sentiment and debates regarding the political and civil rights of immigrants and their children have led to legislation and policies that control the language, curriculum, and resources in the
classroom. Latinos are often trapped in alienating classrooms where they are expected to achieve in spite of curriculum, environment, and teacher practices that are linguistically incomprehensible, culturally irrelevant, and socially demeaning (Gándara, 1995; Gay, 2010; Pizarro, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999). The education of our Latino ELLs is often based on politics rather than on sound educational practices (Horwitz et al., 2009). Many Latino students feel disempowered. They experience a school setting that devalues and silences them (Pizarro, 2005). Frequently, teachers cannot or will not implement practices that are academically rigorous, culturally relevant, and affirming of Latinos linguistic assets and cultural capital. Nonetheless, teachers can play a vital role in improving the educational conditions of Latinos. Culturally and linguistically appropriate education impacts students’ school success and life chances (Delpit, 1995; Gándara, 1995; 2010; Gay, 2010; Irizarry & Raible, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Sleeter, 2012). Improving the effectiveness of programs and teacher practices so that they are responsive to the linguistic, cultural, and social realities of Latino English Language Learners is a crucial step toward remedying the grave state of Latino educational outcomes.

This study focused on teacher practices within two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) programs because of encouraging results from these programs in advancing the academic outcomes of Spanish speakers (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). Central to TWBI objectives are high academic achievement in two languages, raising the status of the minority language and culture, and promoting integration and cross-cultural competence (Howard & Lindholm-Leary, 2007). TWBI program goals place a high value on the language and culture of Spanish speakers and
challenge the notion of English and Eurocentric superiority. TWBI recognizes the value of the linguistic and cultural assets of Latino English Language Learners. By exploring teacher practices within this program and involving teachers in a plan to implement new awareness and learning, it is the goal of this study to strengthen a program that is making headway toward equitable educational outcomes for Latino students.

Studies have demonstrated that Latino ELLs in two-way immersion programs that simultaneously provide native Spanish-speakers primary language instruction while teaching native English-speakers Spanish have made great gains in closing the White-Latino achievement gap. Students in well implemented two-way immersion bilingual programs have reduced drop out rates, most students reported more positive attitudes to bilingualism and biculturalism, and by secondary school, native Spanish speakers achieved at or above grade level in reading and math (Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003). In their meta-analyses of programs for English Language Learners authors Krashen and McField (2005) concluded that ELL students in programs with comprehensible English input, primary language literacy development, and primary language content instruction made the greatest academic gains. Two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) promises to erase the achievement gap (Lindholm-Leary, 2005).

Well-implemented late-exit bilingual and dual immersion programs provide primary language instruction so that the English learner can continue to progress academically and cognitively in his/her primary language while still acquiring English. In addition, the English learner can continue to make age appropriate developmental gains in language and cognition. These gains are maintained through the later high school years
As educators and school systems grapple with how best to educate the increasing numbers of English Language Learners, two-way bilingual immersion programs have demonstrated to be an effective approach (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

As well as promoting significant academic gains Howard, Sugarman, and Christian (2003) noted that students participating in TWBI programs exhibited many positive educational attitudes and self-perceptions. The authors presented several studies conducted nationwide that investigate TWBI students’ attitudes and concluded that for the most part these students exhibited “favorable attitudes toward their programs, bilingualism and biculturalism, and other cultural groups. In addition, TWI students tend to have positive self-perceptions as indicated by their generally high self-ratings of academic competence, motivation, and language abilities” (Howard et al., 2003, p. 41).

When compared to their peers in mainstream traditional programs, Latino students in TWBI programs developed the communication skills that strengthened their ability to form relationships with adults and community members. This strengthened interconnection often lead to increased youth resiliency (Block, 2012). Students in TWBI programs are likely to believe that grades are important and that they will go to college (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001). Furthermore, Kohne (2006) noted that the Latinos in the TWBI program she studied were more likely than non-TWBI Latinos to be taking the challenging honors and AP coursework that would put these students on track to attend college.

As schools search for ways to meet the educational needs of Latino English
learners and prepare all students for a more global, multi-lingual future, the two-way bilingual immersion model has increased in popularity. Today there are over 422 two-way bilingual immersion programs in 32 states. Over 93 percent of TWBI programs (394) use English and Spanish as the target language for instruction (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012a). U.S. demographics indicate that the majority of the native Spanish-speakers in these TWBI programs are Latino (Howard & Sugarman, 2001). Many educators hope that they are implementing the silver bullet that will eliminate the White-Latino achievement gap (Lindholm-Leary, 2005).

**TWBI Challenges**

Although two-way bilingual immersion programs have demonstrated great success in raising the academic achievement of English Language Learners and in closing the achievement gap between native English-speakers and English learners (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010), TWBI educators face many challenges in assuring that there are equitable educational outcomes between the native English-speakers and the native Spanish-speakers. In their review of the research of two-way immersion programs Howard et al. (2003) noted that often the language minority students in TWBI programs came from families with lower incomes and whose parents have attained less formal schooling than their native English-speaking classmates.

Because socioeconomic and ethnic differences may exist within TWBI programs, educators must be vigilant in assuring that the educational contexts are meeting the needs of all students. Given the assumptions, pressures, and conditions of the general society Christian, Howard, and Loeb (2000) expressed concern that TWBI programs might
prioritize the needs of the native English-speaking middle class students:

Many questions about TWI remain unanswered, however. These relate particularly to implementation in certain socio-cultural and instructional contexts. For example, how can the voices of the language minority community be well represented in the program when the English-speaking community has such dominance in the broader society? . . . As programs are created, it has become clear that a socio-economic differential often exists between groups of students from the two language backgrounds. This raises questions about the likely power structure in the school as well as the feasibility of extensive social interaction between groups. (p. 259)

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) posited that schools were designed to maintain rather than disrupt social class inequities. They compared the general cultural background, knowledge, skills, and education of an individual to economic goods. They termed the value of this background as cultural capital. This “socially inherited ‘linguistic and cultural competence’ . . . facilitates achievement in school” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Swartz, 1977, p. 547). Thus, an imbalance in the cultural capital between native English-speakers and native Spanish-speakers in a TWBI classroom will likely lead to inequitable educational outcomes. In order to achieve the goal of equitable linguistic and cultural balance, TWBI teachers need to be aware of the distribution of the cultural capital in their classrooms. Without this, even distribution of cultural capital TWBI programs will continue to “favor those who are culturally privileged” and reproduce inequitable social class structures and power relationships (Bourdieu, 1977; Swartz,
Valdés (1997) presented a set of cautionary arguments directed to practitioners, researchers, and policymakers. The author called attention to the possible negative effects of dual language immersion programs. She pointed out that dual language immersion programs aimed to solve two different language purposes. One goal of two-way immersion is to provide foreign language instruction for majority language students using native speakers as models. Another two-way immersion objective is to achieve educational successes for language minority students by providing primary language instruction and prestige to their first language. These two objectives may conflict. Although well intentioned, dual language immersion programs are not the single solution that will solve long standing societal issues of class, race, power, and politics.

TWBI programs seek to promote bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural competence (Howard & Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Teachers in these programs stated that they struggle with how to promote the third goal—cross-cultural competence and the social justice issues of equitable distribution of linguistic and cultural capital (De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2009; Hernández, 2011; Palmer, 2009b). “This is an area for further research and a necessity for staff development opportunities at schools implementing TWBI programs” (Hernández, 2011, p. 234).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine teacher practices that promote cross-cultural competency in the TWBI classroom. I examine: (a) teacher awareness of power imbalance regarding the validation of cultural capital between native English-speakers
and native Spanish-speakers; (b) teacher understanding of cross-cultural competence; and (c) the teacher organizational routines that lead to equitable distribution of cultural capital in their classrooms. I focus on the attitudes, reflections, and practices of fourth through sixth grade TWBI teachers. I explore the practices they use to develop a culturally responsive classroom environment in order to ameliorate inequitable distribution of cultural capital. Educators may not be able to change the social, political, cultural, and racial inequities of an entire society. However, teachers can control the practices and strategies they choose to implement in their classrooms (Dantas-Whitney & Waldschmidt, 2009; Freeman, 1998; Gay, 2010).

**Research Questions**

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

- What practices do teachers use to promote cross-cultural competency in the two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) classroom?
  - A. How do teachers describe the social dynamics between cultural capital of native Spanish-speakers and the native English-speakers in the TWBI classroom?
  - B. How do teachers understand cross-cultural competency in the TWBI classroom?
  - C. What organizational routines do teachers use to promote cultural capital in the TWBI classroom?
Research Approach and Methods

This is a qualitative study that involves Participatory Action Research (PAR). I was the principal investigator. Because I utilized the PAR approach, I was also a co-participant and collaborated with the other participants. First, I individually interviewed eight fourth through sixth grade teachers at two dual immersion programs in two different school districts. Teachers discussed their background, understanding of cross cultural competency, the social dynamics between native English-speaking students and native Spanish-speaking students, and the organizational routines that they use to promote cultural capital in their classrooms. Then, we met in a series of weekly focus groups where we formed a community of inquiry, action, and reflection. In the focus groups we reviewed the research regarding concerns within TWBI programs, culturally relevant pedagogy, and equitable spaces. The focus group then reflected on and discussed practices which promoted equitable linguistic and social interactions among students. The teachers planned how they could incorporate these strategies into their classroom practice. Throughout the week the teachers kept a journal and reflected on the successes and challenges they encountered in their efforts to infuse culturally responsive teaching strategies and encourage equitable distribution of centrality and status in their classroom. The teachers met for a series of four focus groups where we reviewed research, shared insights from our struggles and successes, and reflected how we could incorporate our learning into an action plan in our classrooms. At the end of the study teachers participated in a final individual interview.
Significance of Study

As socially responsible leaders and educators, we must explore ways to better address the educational and sociopolitical issues that confront Latinos in the United States. This study brought together a cadre of teachers who worked toward improving the educational experiences and outcomes of their Latino students. Data supports that Latino English Language Learners in TWBI programs make greater academic gains and have more favorable attitudes about school and their heritage than Latino English Language Learners in other programs (Howard et al., 2003). Promoting the TWBI goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural competency is more than an academic endeavor; it is a sociopolitical act. Because most of TWBI programs target Spanish and serve a large number of Latino students (Howard & Sugarman, 2001) focusing on and promoting the principles of equity within these programs is a sound approach to advancing the educational and sociopolitical conditions of Latino English Language Learners. TWBI programs hold great promise in disrupting the status quo of unfavorable educational outcomes of Latino students (Fitts, 2006b). Through the core TWBI goals of ensuring equity, valuing diversity, encouraging integration, and promoting academic rigor for all students (Howard & Lindholm-Leary, 2007), TWBI program educators have the opportunity to empower the underserved Latino population.

To implement TWBI programs properly, it is crucial that the status of the minority language and culture be on par with English and American culture. Both languages and cultures must have equal capital. Despite the TWBI emphasis on equity, teachers and students are impacted by social, cultural, and political influences of the
communities to which they belong. These socio-cultural and linguistic forces may hinder the equitable integration vital in TWBI (Carrigo, 2000; Christian, Howard, & Loeb, 2000; De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2009; Palmer, 2004; Palmer, 2009b; Valdés, 1997). Researchers have noted that TWBI teachers feel most challenged by how to implement the cross-cultural competency that facilitates this equitable distribution of power, status, and voice. However, there are few studies exploring how teachers can improve their practice to promote cross-cultural competency and equitable interactions and engagement in the TWBI classroom. The TWBI literature regarding teacher practice to develop this concern of cross-cultural competency is thin (Fitts, 2009; Hernández, 2011). Educators need more understanding and information on how to establish greater cultural-competency. With these studies and guidance, they can better counter the social and political forces that encourage dominance of the English language and mainstream Euro-American culture. This study adds to the present body of research, increases awareness, and thus, it better equips teachers and promotes improved teacher practice.

Teachers are most receptive to make changes in their classroom practice when the guidance and insights come from other teachers (Diamond, 2012). By involving teachers in a plan to implement this new awareness and learning, teachers gain insight into the attitudes and behaviors that lead to more equitable learning environments. In turn, such changes generate higher educational benefits for Latino English Language Learners, thus fostering stronger, more socially just two-way bilingual immersion programs.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In the following review, I first discuss the available knowledge about cross-cultural competency in the classroom and how it is more particularly applied to immersion education. I define cultural competency and discuss the implications that culturally responsive teaching practices have on the educational outcomes of students of color. Second, I look at the ways teachers navigate the social dynamics of cultural capital in the classroom. Third, I examine the most relevant research on organizational behavior, more particularly the formation of routines that promote cultural capital. I close the chapter by reviewing the background of programs for Latino English Language Learners and language politics related to these programs. I show that strong schooling with effective educational programs and teacher practice impacts Latino student learning and educational outcomes. I give a synopsis of educational programs for English Language Learners then discuss the political controversies regarding implementation of English learner programs. I also offer a background on immersion programs as a way to frame the larger language politics. Lastly, I report on the gaps in the literature and the need for more research on teacher practices and strategies that promote socio-cultural and linguistic equity in the TWBI classroom.

Cross Cultural Competency

Goals of TWBI. Two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) programs have demonstrated great success in improving English Language Learners’ educational
outcomes (Block, 2007; Christian, Genesee, & Lindholm-Leary, 2004; Gold, 2006; Howard et al., 2003; Kohne, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002). TWBI programs provide academic content instruction to native English-speaking students and native speakers of the target language in the same classroom. Instruction is in both languages, one of which is the primary language of each group. TWBI aims to provide “high academic achievement, first and second language proficiency, and cross-cultural understanding” (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010, p. 333) in an integrated environment that equally values and promotes both languages and cultures. Thus, TWBI is founded on the central tenants of integrating students in order to develop bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural competency.

**Cross-cultural competency important in effective learning environments.**

Student integration is “central” for both linguistic and socio-cultural purposes (De Jong & Howard, 2009, p. 82). The integration at the core of this program validates and affirms the non-dominant language and culture. Legitimizing the non-dominant language and affirming a student’s home language and culture are the first steps towards building and bridging a student to succeed academically and in mainstream society (Hollie, 2010). TWBI programs are designed to tackle concerns of inequities through the integration of language minority and language majority students. Ideally, this integration elevates the status of the minority language. Additionally, peer models that are native speakers of each language offer students opportunities to interact at high cognitive and linguistic levels in both languages. The expectation is that this integration will generate an environment where the culture, language, and experiences of the non-dominant language
students are promoted and valued.

By its integrated nature, the TWBI classroom is a cross-cultural environment. In order to function at its most effective levels, students and teachers must share a willingness to understand, work, and relate with people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Successful, effective classrooms have students and teachers with strong relationships and mutual understanding (Nieto & Booth, 2010). Being culturally competent is “central in increasing understanding and improving relationships across cultures” (Nieto & Booth, 2010, p. 408). Diller and Moule (2005) defined cross-cultural competence as “a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enable that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations” (Diller & Moule, 2005, p. 12).

Bull (2012) studied the relationship between cultural competence and teacher efficacy and noted that teacher beliefs and cultural competence influenced student achievement. Culturally competent teachers who utilize culturally responsive teaching practices positively impact the educational outcomes of students of color (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran, 2004). Cultural competency is important in all classroom settings (Banks, 1993; Gay, 2010; Hollie, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 2011; Nieto, 2002; Sleeter, 2011). Because TWBI is based on successful integration of students from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, for linguistic and academic instruction to be effective, cross-cultural competency is crucial in the TWBI classroom.
Asymmetrical language and culture status in TWBI programs favors English and Anglo-centric perspectives. Despite this emphasis on integration and equity, De Jong and Howard (2009) noted that “the successful outcomes of integration in TWI programmes are by no means guaranteed, and the subject warrants closer examination in order to avoid inequities in instructional practices and programme outcomes” (De Jong & Howard, 2009, p. 84).

De Jong and Howard (2009) examined the empirical work of several researchers. They also analyzed data from a three-year longitudinal study of 474 upper elementary grade students in 11 two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) programs (Howard, Christian, & Genessee, 2004). Through their research, the authors concluded that the intended outcomes of equal access to learning opportunities in both languages and the equalization of language status of each language were “extraordinarily difficult to achieve, given an English-dominant sociopolitical context” (De Jong & Howard, 2009, p. 86). The authors found an imbalance between English and the minority language in resource allocation, accountability systems, teacher requirements, and patterns of language use.

The asymmetry between the two languages almost always favors English. Assessments occur more extensively and consistently in English than in the minority language. Student supports such as Reading Recovery, Title I, volunteer tutors, special education services are often available only in English. Guest speakers, assemblies, and specialists are frequently monolingual English speakers and many materials are unavailable in the minority language (Carrigo, 2000; De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2006b; Potowski, 2002). Code switching from the minority language to English during
instruction in the minority language was common (De Jong & Howard, 2009). Rarely did the reverse occur. Students and teachers seldom reverted to the minority language during English instruction. Despite a program design that promotes equalization between the two languages, English continues to be the dominant, privileged language.

Regardless of the ideals of TWBI programs that include valuing and promoting both languages, there is a strong pull to English (Carrigo, 2000). The No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) legislation further solidifies, through educational policy and law, that English is the language that matters. Most states require students to take the high stakes standardized testing in English. Many TWBI teachers often feel that they must juggle between the pressures to prepare students for the mandated state testing in English and preserve the minority language. As a result of this pressure to prepare their students for English testing, teachers may weaken or neglect instruction in the minority language (De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2006b; Potowski, 2004). In our society, English is the favored language of power and importance. This hegemonic mindset of our societal environment is infused throughout our schools and codified into our education legislation. Our dual language classrooms cannot buffer all the systemic forces that privilege English and Euro-centric dominance.

Given the power associated with English, TWBI educators find it difficult to maintain equal status between the two languages. Even students whose primary language is Spanish will engage in English because they feel that English holds a higher status (Carrigo, 2000). In her study of student language use in six upper elementary grade dual language classrooms, Carrigo (2000) revealed, “Students perceived a greater status for
English than for Spanish and a greater status for people who speak English, especially European American students, than for those who speak Spanish” (Carrigo, 2000, p. 238).

Students will often choose to use English because they feel it will increase their social standing. In her ethnographic investigation of fifth grade students in a Spanish-English dual immersion program, Potowski (2002) noted that the students engaged in considerably less Spanish than intended by the program structure and teacher objectives. Students used Spanish roughly half of the time that was planned for Spanish instruction. During the Spanish designated instruction time, students averaged 82 percent Spanish when speaking with the teacher and only 32 percent when interacting with peers. While there are several reasons for the students’ language choice (proximity of the teacher, teacher expectation, task at hand, need to connect with peers) Potowski surmise that the student’s identity and “investment” (purpose for engaging in social interactions) had the greatest influence. Bilingual students choose a language to position themselves on the social hierarchy (Potowski, 2002, 2004). Thus, how a student wishes to portray him or herself in social interactions is an influential factor in language use.

Other studies also report on the challenges TWBI programs encounter when seeking to promote equitable linguistic and socio-cultural outcomes and counter White, Euro-American, and English language dominance (De Jong, 2006; De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2006; Palmer, 2004, 2009). Fitts (2009) explored the interactions of fifth grade students and their teachers at a dual language school. The author selected the site, Pine Mountain Elementary, because “the goals of this school were to foster bilingual and biliterate students who honor cultural diversity and cultivate cross-cultural friendships”
Despite the school and teachers’ intentions to promote an agenda of integration, cultural understanding, and social justice, the teachers struggled with achieving equitable interactions and learning spaces in the classroom. At Pine Mountain, English-speaking students were accustomed to dominating classroom discourse in both English and Spanish. Additionally, English-speaking patterns and Anglo-centric curricula perspectives and practices prevailed. Fitts (2006) asserted, “Teaching for social justice and social change is a significant principle underlying dual-language education, but this guiding principle is frequently undermined by larger institutional ideologies and structures that demand and exact increased standardization in curricula and instruction” (2006a, p. 10). Fitts’ study highlighted the difficulty TWBI programs have had in overcoming the status quo of the greater society (2006a, 2006b).

Palmer (2009b) studied the role of status and power in a TWBI classroom through language choice and participation patterns. She noted that a disparity in social class and parental educational background often existed between the predominately immigrant, working class native Spanish-speaking students and the mainly White, middle class native English-speaking students. Although the integration of students in the TWBI classrooms opens many opportunities for increased language learning and the development of cultural competencies, there continues to exist concerns regarding potential negative impacts:

…[T]hese middle-class English-speaking students appeared to vie for the floor, to push for attention, and to assert their status as English speakers, or as middle-class children. At times, they dominated the discourse and drew the teacher’s attention
away from other students; they made themselves and their needs difficult to ignore. They appeared to play a role in encouraging the use of more English both in and out of the classroom. (Palmer, 2009b, p. 198)

Palmer conceded that it might have been difficult to discern how much of the native English-speakers dominance was due to their status as English speakers or to their class identity; nevertheless, these students were more comfortable exerting their power and were able to attain more attention and English use. Palmer posited that the “linguistic market” in the TWBI classroom was not balanced, and “[t]his imbalance is one manifestation of the symbolic dominance of English in this classroom setting” (Palmer, 2009, pp. 190-191). She referenced the work of Bourdieu (1991) as an explanation for this imbalance. Bourdieu explained power relations through an economic perspective. He extended the concept of capital to social relations. Language is not simply a means of communication but a medium to convey symbolic power.

Palmer (2009) showed that equitable balance of power in the TWBI classroom continues to be a challenge. Native English-speaking students exert greater symbolic dominance and as a result gain more teacher attention and class resources. However, Palmer also asserted that teacher practice influenced how these unbalanced social dynamics played out in the classroom, “Much depends, it seems, on the teachers as program implementers” (Palmer, 2009, p. 182). In order to mitigate this imbalance, Palmer recommended that teachers be cognizant and ready to intervene.

It appears that if a teacher is aware and proactive in confronting English dominance head-on and teaching children to interact appropriately in diverse
multilingual multicultural academic settings, this can help tip the balance toward more positive and less negative impacts. Teachers must be consciously aware of the role that power can play in classroom talk. (Palmer, 2009, p. 199)

Teacher practices can have a strong impact on the power dynamics in the TWBI classroom. “There is tremendous potential in helping teachers develop awareness of the impact of power on classroom language dynamics” (Palmer, 2009, p. 199).

**Navigating Social Dynamics and Cultural Capital**

Bearse and de Jong (2008) considered the role of capital—status and power relationships, in the unequal distribution of program benefits as TWBI students progressed to the secondary level. They described students’ increasing resistance to using Spanish and a program design that emphasized English importance relative to Spanish. They argued that culture and language were related with symbolic capital. The authors asserted that educators have a responsibility in legitimizing Spanish.

Through their institutional policies and classroom practices, schools play a central role in the legitimization of symbolic capital, that is, cultural (which values, tastes) and linguistic (what language practices or choices) norms (Bourdieu, 1991; Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996).

The continuous devaluation of Spanish in the program diminishes its already threatened symbolic capital in the wider sociopolitical context of the United States and undermines the program’s intent to equalize language and student status. The linguistic hierarchy sends a clear message that learning English is more important than learning Spanish and the students’ responses indicate that they are quite aware of these status differences.
Bearse and de Jong (2008) proposed that educators consider the institutional, organizational, and linguistic practices that reinforced the linguistic and cultural resources of the students. Program design and teacher practices send a powerful message as to what is valued. By insisting that students maintain high levels of Spanish, educators reinforce the linguistic and cultural capital associated with Latino identity.

In her ethnographic discourse analysis of second grade students in a dual language classroom, Palmer (2004) studied how the students used linguistic capital to control classroom “discourses” (p. 1). Palmer concurred with Valdés’ (1997) cautionary statement that educators must be mindful of the linguistic and cultural capital dynamics in the TWBI classroom. Dual immersion can “over simplify” racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity. Alternative discourses need to be established and sustained in order to ensure that the language minority students have a voice and are not silenced by the native English-speaking students. Palmer (2004) suggested that dual immersion teachers be mindful of “linguistic market forces” in the classroom:

. . [D]ual immersion teachers should be aware of the “linguistic market forces” in their classrooms and the various discourses influencing that market, both locally and in the broader community. They need to learn tools to intentionally manage talk for equity, working to balance the status of the majority and minority languages and their speakers in every turn of talk. Without this attention to the language/power dynamic, even an ideal dual immersion classroom will suffer the consequences of a language/power imbalance. English will dominate such a
classroom on many levels, both blatant and subtle, and in the end it will best serve the needs of its English-speaking students. (Palmer, 2004, p. 202)

When TWBI programs place diverse groups of students in the same classroom, educators run the risk that the English-speaking group will dominate. The point is not to avoid the integration, but for teachers to be watchful, attuned, and prepared to intervene with strategies and structures that promote equitable discourses. Teachers can manage conversations to include all students, “...[T]hrough careful deliberate work educators can positively influence the power dynamic of diverse groups of students” (Palmer, 2004, p. 2). Because TWBI integrated classrooms force teachers and students to sort out the “messy” struggles of dominance and equity, dual immersion offers great hopes for real and lasting social change (Palmer, 2004).

Fitts (2009) also discussed how TWBI teachers could mitigate the tendency of U.S. classrooms to favor English language and Anglo-centric practices. The author purported that in order for TWBI programs to realize the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism students from the various linguistic, social, and cultural groups needed to be central, contributing members. Cultivating a school-based community of practice that gives voice, affirmation, and space to all students requires that teachers be conscious of the interactions and discourses in their classrooms:

...[I]t is critical that teachers be aware of how to value, engage, and build upon the unique cultural and linguistic resources that bilingual children bring with them to the classroom. Educators must go beyond making connections between a child’s cultural and linguistic resources and academic tasks and discourses to
actually using these connections to transform instructional practices, curricula, and school-based communities of practice. (Fitts, 2009, p. 88)

Fitts argued that teachers needed to utilize third spaces—“hybrid learning spaces in which students’ linguistic and cultural forms, styles, artifacts, goals, or ways of relating interpenetrate and transform the official linguistic and cultural forms of the school, teacher, or classroom” (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada, 1999, as cited in Fitts, 2009, p. 88). In third spaces academic discourse (“official discourse”) and students’ funds of knowledge (“unofficial discourse”) interact to create another space for learning. Third spaces are a conceptualization that describes this realm where “official” and “unofficial” discourses interact. Fitts (2009) contended that these instructional third spaces should be part of the typical dual language model. “The creation of third spaces promotes and engenders bilingualism, biculturalism, and multiculturalism, features that dual-language programs are also designed to support” (Manyak, 2002, as cited in Fitts, 2009, p. 90). Fitts also pointed out that, in her study of classroom discourse in a dual language classroom, English-speaking students most often played central roles. TWBI teachers must be watchful of “the centrality of English, English discourse patterns and Anglo-centric curricula” (Fitts, 2009, p. 102) and create communities of practice where all students have the opportunity to play central roles in these third spaces. The author concludes,

If teachers hope to promote biculturalism and cross-cultural awareness, then they must employ and encourage patterns of participation, discourse styles, and interpersonal relationships that are not just Anglo-centric in nature. When
a greater diversity of children is allowed to influence classroom discourse, curricular content, and the development of relationships and processes, then linguistically diverse classrooms will become more culturally diverse as well. (Fitts, 2009, p. 102)

Thus, dual language teachers can maximize the linguistic, cultural, social, and equity components of TWBI through attention to equity in discourse interactions and patterns.

**Culturally Responsive Teaching and Multicultural Education**

Although the above authors highlighted program concerns and critiqued the inequities of the teacher, student, and peer interactions in the TWBI classroom, they, nevertheless, advocate for the continuance of integrated dual language programs (De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2006, 2009; Palmer, 2009; Potowski, 2002). The purpose of their critical lens is not to undermine the linguistic, cultural, and ethnic integration of the TWBI classroom, but to examine aspects for reflection and improvement. De Jong and Howard explain their intent:

> Our purpose in the preceding analysis has not been to minimize this potential or the documented success that these programmes have demonstrated. Rather, we hope that our discussion will serve to highlight some of the pedagogical challenges that can arise in integrated settings and to prompt critical reflection on the linguistic benefits of integration in order to ensure that the potential of TWI programmes is realised in ways that will ultimately benefit both language minority and language majority students equally. (De Jong & Howard, 2009, p. 92)
Other researchers have recognized the urgent need for change and the power of teaching. In her book, *Culturally Responsive Teaching*, Geneva Gay (2010) sounded a call to action:

Improving the school achievement of students of color who are currently not performing well requires comprehensive knowledge, unshakable convictions, and high-level pedagogical skills. The information presented in the chapters of this book is intended to facilitate the development of these and to resist the temptations of some educators to provide superficial analyses, simplistic interpretations and quick-fix responses to these complex issues. (Gay, 2000, p. xix)

In their overview of the conceptual and theoretical literature of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy, Brown-Jeffy and Cooper (2011) used the principles asserted in the work of Gay (2010) distilled five themes: identity and achievement, equity and excellence, developmental appropriateness, teaching the whole child, and student-teacher relationships. Brown-Jeffy and Cooper (2011) also saw hope in preparing the nation’s teachers to counter the inequities of our society, “We must and can prepare teachers with responsive tools and strategies to make sure that all students learn” (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011, p. 80). Through a greater focus on Cultural Relevant Pedagogy, and strategies that promote equitable learning spaces, educators can foster more equitable learning environments in the TWBI classroom.

**Capital, Field, and Habitus**

*Bourdieu’s theoretical framework*. Bourdieu’s (1977, 1984, 1991) theories on
field, social reproduction, capital, and habitus offered a foundation for the study and understanding of power relations. Capital is one aspect of Bourdieu’s theoretical framework to explain the power relationships. Bourdieu compared cultural and social background to “economic goods that are produced, distributed and consumed by individuals and groups” (Swartz, 1977, p. 547). Bourdieu described economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital (Moore, 2008; Swartz, 1977). Individuals use their “capital” to negotiate and position themselves within social structures. Economic capital is mercantile, economic resources. Social capital refers to valued social networks and relationships. Cultural capital is the knowledge and background that is considered legitimate. Symbolic capital can be contrasted with economic capital; this describes honor and prestige. Depending on the field, other forms of capital, such as cultural and linguistic, can be considered subtypes of symbolic capital (Moore, 2008). Capital, habitus, and field are all components of social practice and action (Bourdieu, 1984, 1992). Fields are the arenas where agents compete for power resources or capital. These fields are “the settings where practices take place” (Dumais, 2002, p. 47). Bourdieu describes a field in terms of “network” and “relations between positions”:

In analytic terms, a field may be defined as a network, or configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective
relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.). (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 97)

Thus, field is the setting where agents vie for capital. Capital exists only in relation to the field. Examples of a field may be a school system, classroom, religious institution, political sphere, or workplace. For the purposes of this study, the field is the TWBI classroom.

Bourdieu (1977) posited that the educational system perpetuates the culture and preeminence of the dominant class. “The system of higher education, according to Bourdieu, functions to transmit, privilege, allocate status, and instill respect for the existing social order” (Swartz, 1977, p. 544). The school system rewards students with the cultural capital of the dominant social classes. Cultural capital is “comprised of ‘linguistic and cultural competence’ and a broad knowledge of culture that belongs to members of the upper classes and is found much less frequently among the lower classes” (Dumais, 2002, p. 44). According to Bourdieu, a student’s academic performance was closely tied to her cultural background. The educational system is not an impartial meritocratic institution—it favors those who with the propitious social class and cultural background. Although the educational system reproduces the status quo, schooling can make a difference (Bourdieu, 1977). The educational system does provide for some limited access for the lower classes to attain the cultural capital necessary for upward social mobility:

The educational system "retranslates" the initial degree of educational opportunity and amount of inherited cultural capital into characteristically academic traits.
This process is particularly visible for academically successful lower-class students who rely more heavily on the school for their acquisition of cultural capital. The school provides the basis for a limited and controlled social mobility and thereby represents one of the richest sources of support for meritocratic ideology. (Swartz, 1977, p. 548)

Habitus was central to Bourdieu’s theoretical framework. Habitus is the mental, cognitive disposition an agent has regarding her position and opportunities in the social structure. This is an individual’s or group’s internalized self-perceptions and demeanor. A person’s internalized habitus is influenced by her social relations, status, and cultural capital. Habitus develops in the context of a field and through social interactions.

“(H)abitus is the problem of how the ‘outer’ (the social) becomes ‘inner’ (the social self or a ‘second nature’)” (Moore, 2008, p. 110). One’s habitus will determine the aspirations she may hold and what actions she will endeavor (Bourdieu, 1977, 1984, 1992). Bourdieu describes habitus thus:

A system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks, thanks to analogical transfers of schemes permitting the solution of similarly shaped problems. (Bourdieu, 1977, pp. 82–83)

An example of habitus is how a student may perceive herself and how that identity is manifested in her demeanor, actions, and aspirations. Suppose through her relations, a student receives external messages that her knowledge base, culture, and status are less
valued in society; that student’s disposition and behavior may reflect her feelings of powerlessness and hopelessness. She may not feel that she has much of a voice in the classroom and may limit her participation. Likewise, she may not feel that she can succeed academically; thus, she may not focus her efforts toward achieving an unlikely goal. Habitus internalizes the constraints that a student may feel limit her opportunities. Therefore, it has a strong influence on a student’s school success. Dumais (2002) explained the interplay of cultural capital, field, and habitus in the educational outcomes of students:

Bourdieu (1973) argued that one's habitus develops in relation to how much cultural capital one has; a person from the lower class is aware that people from that class tend to have little cultural capital and that without cultural capital, they are unlikely to succeed educationally. Therefore, lower-class students tend to self-select themselves out of the college-going track on the basis of their views of what is possible and what is not. On the other hand, exceptional students from the lower class may see the accumulation of cultural capital as a way to overcome the obstacles that are typical for those in their class position. (Dumais, 2002, p. 47)

Bourdieu’s theories lay a basis for understanding the social dynamics in a classroom. Student and teacher interactions are influenced by self and group perceptions of oneself and the cultural resources, or capital one brings.

**Social capital.** Bourdieu (1977) contended that social capital is rarely acquired without material resources (economic capital) and cultural knowledge (cultural capital). Coleman (1988) also described the influence of social capital in determining an
individual’s life chances. Coleman explained that social capital as “relations among persons that facilitate action. . . . Just as physical capital and human capital facilitate productive activity, social capital does as well” (1988, p. S100-S101). Both Bourdieu (1977, 1984, 1991) and Coleman focused “on the benefits accruing to individual or families by virtue of their ties with others” (Portes, 2000, p. 2). Putnam (2001) also asserted that social networks have had value and could open opportunities as well as serve as protective agents. In his ethnographic study, Arriaza (2003) noted that teachers can make a difference. They can use their influence to either reproduce the inequities of the social structures, or they can facilitate the accrual of students’ social capital and be protective agents of underserved radicalized students:

[T]he article . . . looks at the ways children write a narrative of resistance within contradictory cultural norms, which offer, on the one hand, a space for teachers to become protective agents who build students’ capacity to decode cultural signals, to develop a strong racial and cultural identity, and to cope with stressful borders and institutional barriers. On the other hand, schools offer this very same space that can be used to reproduce and perpetuate inequities and injustices. (Arriaza, 2003, p. 71)

Teachers can play a role in forming productive relationships that develop a student’s social capital that can in turn lead to increased learning and achievement (Katz, 1999).

**Organizational Routines**

In the classroom a teacher and student often respond to social stimuli with “habitualized actions” which are “patterned responses [that] arise from repeated
encounters with particular social phenomena” (Larson & Ovando, 2001 p.102 ). These reoccurring responses within a system are often referred to as organizational routines. Becker (2004) reviewed the literature on organizational routines and noted the many “ambiguities and inconsistencies” (p. 643) that were prevalent in the literature. The definition and application may vary from field of study and researcher. For the purpose of this study, I will use the definition of organizational routines as “a repetitive, recognizable pattern of interdependent actions, involving multiple actors” (Feldman & Pentland, 2003, p. 96). Habitualized responses narrow our choices, facilitate decision making, and help us “to cope with the everyday complexity of events occurring in our lives and to simplify and order our life world” (Larson & Ovando, 2001, p. 102). Despite the automaticity and economy of choice in routines, the individual continues to have agency and makes mindful decisions. Pentland and Rueter (1994) argued that routines were “effortful accomplishments” (p. 102), that is practices that were specifically chosen from a repertoire of options. For instance, a teacher can adopt a routine response to certain student behaviors, yet she is still making a mindful choice to resort to a preselected collection of tried responses. To sum, because the literature offers a range of operational definitions of organizational routines for this study, I will narrow the definition to encompass the work of Pentland and Rueter (1994) and Becker (2004). This study defines organizational routines as the repeated, habitual actions a teacher chooses to employ in response to social situations in her classroom.

Key features of the operational definition of organizational routines anchoring this study are that they are patterned responses, purposeful, a response to a social situation,
and central to understanding and developing teacher practice. Sherer and Spillane (2011) emphasized that social interaction leads to practices or actions that later develop into habitualized routines or patterned behavior.

Practice can be framed in a variety of ways. Many frameworks privilege individual actions, equating practice with the actions of particular organizational members and as a function of their knowledge, skills, and beliefs. Still, actors do not act in a vacuum; a person acts, someone reacts, and it is in their interactions that practice takes shape (Bourdieu, 1990; Weick, 1979). People act in organizations, but do so in relation to others. Practice, then, is fundamentally about interactions. (Sherer & Spillane, 2011, p. 617)

Thus, teacher practices and routines are a response to the interactions that occur in the classroom.

By being mindful of organizational routines, educators and researchers are able to gain insight into teacher practices. Organizational routines are how things get done in the classroom. Focusing on developing organizational routines is a powerful tool in changing the norms and culture within a school setting and improving teaching (Sherer & Spillane, 2011). Establishing organizational routines that lead to equitable classroom environments that promote the cultural capital of the language minority students is important because “organizational routines both change and sustain work practice in K-8 schools” (Sherer & Spillane, 2011, p. 615). Thus teacher routines can support the status quo or disrupt predictability of the effects of cultural capital.
Educational Programs for Latino Students and Language Politics

Inequitable educational outcomes for Latino students. The Latino population is the fastest growing ethnic group and is becoming an increasingly larger percentage of students in U.S. schools (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010). Nationwide, Latino school enrollment has doubled since 1988 with over 10 million Hispanics attending American schools in 2008 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). In California, Latinos are the largest ethnic group in the state’s schools; over 50 percent of the California students are identified as Hispanic/Latino (Ed-Data Website, 2010).

Despite Latinos’ increasing numbers and significance in our educational system, they continue to be one of our most underserved populations. Latinos are America’s least educated ethnic group (Gándara, 2010; Yosso, 2006). Whereas college completion rates for Blacks and Whites have been steadily rising during the past three decades, Latinos have seen no significant growth (Gándara, 2010). Latino students are more than twice as likely as their White peers to enter kindergarten in the lowest quartile in reading and math skills. Furthermore, when compared to their White peers, a greater number of Latino children have parents without a high school diploma, are two times more likely to live in poverty, and are among the nation’s “poorest of the poor” (Gándara, 2010). Latinos have the highest high school drop out rates. The National Center for Education Statistics reported that for the period between 1980 and 2008 “the status drop out rate was lower for Whites and Blacks than Hispanics” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010, p. 68). Foreign-born Hispanics, the majority of the U.S. English Language Learner
population, are dropping out of school at a rate of 35 percent (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

Presently, the educational outcomes of Latino students are of great concern for educators. If conditions do not shift, this population may never attain the same level of academic achievement as their peers. According to results from the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP), the gap in reading and math scores between White and Hispanic fourth and eighth grade students has remained measurably unchanged from the early 1990s to 2009. Whites continue to score 24 to 26 points above Hispanics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). According to this national data, Latino students are not making gains toward narrowing the achievement gap with their White peers in math and reading.

Latinos are not enrolling and graduating from college at the same rate as their White classmates: The White-Hispanic gap of young adults receiving a bachelors degree increased from 14 to 25 percentage points from 1971 to 2009 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). In his report for the Pew Hispanic Center, Lopez (2009) noted that “Latino schooling in the U.S. has long been characterized by high dropout rates and low college completion rates. . . .[A] persistent educational attainment gap remains between Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites” (Lopez, 2009, p. 2). Yosso and Solózano (2006) decried the dismal educational outcomes of Latinos in the U.S., “Chicanas/os suffer the lowest educational attainment of any major racial or ethnic group in the U.S.” (p. 1). The authors described the progression of knowledge, skills, and students through academic institutions as the “educational pipeline”: 
U.S. Census data makes these unequal outcomes clear. Of the 100 Chicana and Chicano students who start at the elementary level, 54 of them drop out (or are pushed out) of high school and 46 continue on to graduate. Of the 46 who graduate from high school, about 26 continue on toward some form of postsecondary education. Of those 26, approximately 17 enroll in community colleges and nine enroll at four-year institutions. Of those 17 in community colleges, only one will transfer to a four-year institution. Of the 9 Chicana/os attending a four-year college and the 1 community college transfer student, 8 will graduate with a baccalaureate degree. Finally, 2 Chicana/o students will continue on to earn a graduate or professional school degree and less than 1 will receive a doctorate. In contrast, of every 100 White elementary school students, 84 graduate high school, 26 graduate with a baccalaureate, and 10 earn a professional or graduate degree. (Yosso & Solórzano, 2006, p. 1)
Figure 1 illustrates the scarcity of Latinos who achieve higher education (Yosso & Solórzano, 2006, p. 1).

Figure 1. Scarcity of Latinos who achieve higher education.

Because the majority of the nation’s English Language Learners (ELL) are Spanish speakers (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA), 2010), the education of ELLs impacts the Latino community. Over five million U.S. students sit in classrooms where they are expected to master a language that they do not yet understand. According to the Office of English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction, Educational Programs, one in ten students in the U.S. is classified as an English Language Learner (NCELA, 2010).
California has the largest number of English Language Learners. Over one and a half million students, almost a fourth of the state’s total student population, are limited English proficient (California Department of Education, 2009). Although English Language Learners come from a diverse linguistic and cultural background, the majority of the English Language Learners are Spanish speakers. Within the group identified as English Language Learners, 75 percent of the U.S. students and 85 percent of the California students speak Spanish. Spanish speakers account for almost four million U.S. English Language Learners (NCELA, 2010; California Department of Education, 2009).

The majority of these English Language Learners will fail to attain English proficiency. Fifty-nine percent of secondary English Language Learners are Long-Term English Learners (LTEL), languishing in ineffective instructional programs for more than six years without reaching English proficiency. Most of these Long-Term English Learners stated that they want to go to college; however, they are not developing the academic skills and taking the courses that will prepare them to accomplish this dream (Olsen, 2010a).

Latino students continue to experience inequitable educational outcomes, and the achievement gap between Whites and Latinos is not narrowing. Latinos have the highest high school drop out rates when compared to Whites and Blacks, and Latinos continue to lag behind in college completion rates and the bulk of the English Language Learners are Latino (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010; NCELA, 2010; U. S. Census Bureau, 2010).
Programs for English Language Learners: Features and Controversies

Educational programs matter. Gándara (2010) stated that the solutions to the underachievement of Latino students were multifaceted. She recommended a network of support systems along a continuum that followed the child from birth to bachelor’s degree (Gándara, 2010). Out-of-school factors (OSF) associated with poverty (Berliner, 2009), issues of racism, in addition to educational and instructional policies and programs, all affect the educational achievement of Latino students. Social, political, and economic concerns have a strong impact on Latinos’ educational outcomes (Yosso, 2006). However, effective educational programming can improve student achievement. Alexander, Entwisle, and Olson (2001) noted that “schooling plays an important compensatory role” and that “schools do matter, and they matter the most when support for academic learning outside school is weak” (p. 184). In their ethnographic study of immigrant students Suarez-Orozco, Suarez-Orozco, and Todorova (2008) also noted the strong impact schools can have on immigrant students academic achievement. These authors observed that the schools and mentoring could be factors that gird students to overcome disadvantageous socioeconomic, home, and community circumstances. Thus, strong schooling and effective educational programs can narrow the achievement gap between White and Latino ELL students.

Waxman, Gray, and Padron (2003) emphasized the importance of teacher practices and classroom learning environments in developing student capacity to overcome the economic and social barriers that obstructed educational success. The authors constructed the concept of “educational resilience” (p. 1). They stressed the
significant influence of schools and teachers. “While educators cannot control community demographics and family conditions, they can change educational policies and practices to ensure that they address the specific needs of students at risk of academic failure” (Comer, 1987; Waxman, Gray, & Padron, 2003, p. 1). Teachers who focus on the strengths of the students who have been traditionally oppressed by their communities can empower these students to prevail over daunting adversity. Educators need to be aware of the needs of their students and take action.

Students in disadvantaged school environments, however, often cannot choose which schools or classes they attend. Educators need to be aware of the issues facing these students as well as how schools contribute to these problems. In conclusion, it is apparent that some of the risks associated with students’ failure in school are due to their particular school environment. This is an unacceptable situation, and the solution will require collaboration among teachers, administrators, university faculty, parents, and the government. (Futrell, 1988, p. 15)

In addition to this call to action, a change in attitude is necessary that reflects an awareness of the severity of the problems that students at risk face and a serious commitment to reversing the cycle of educational failure (Waxman et al., 2003, p. 15).

Key factors in improving instruction to better equip students of color for academic success in the American school system is the use of culturally responsive teaching (Delpit, 1995; Gándara, 1995, 2010; Gay, 2010; Irizarry & Raible, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Sleeter, 2001, 2011; Waxman et al., 2003; Yosso & Solórzano,
Culturally responsive teaching embraces diversity, values the wealth of students’ linguistic and cultural background, and cultivates students’ assets. Educational programs and teacher practice impact Latino student learning and educational outcomes. Schools and teachers can make a difference.

Various Program Models for English Language Learners

Because of different demographics, political environments, and local resources and needs, educators have developed various program models to educate second language learners. The choice of which program model schools adopt can be an emotional and political issue. California’s Proposition 227, Arizona’s Proposition 203, and similar legislation in several other states have established limitations as to which program model schools will implement to serve their English Language Learners. Decisions on program models and curriculum are often based on politics rather than on program effectiveness and research (Horwitz et al., 2009; Olsen, 2010b).

Baker (2007, 2011) described the various programs for English Language Learners as additive or subtractive. In the U.S., additive programs seek to build on or add to the existing language skills of the student rather than to replace the home language with English. In additive programs, the home language is viewed as a resource to be maintained and developed while English is acquired. Subtractive programs, on the other hand, often regard the non-English language as a hindrance or deficit and seek to replace this language with English. The home language is either ignored in favor of English or used temporarily as a support until the student can eventually transition to monolingual English communication. Neglecting to develop the home language often leads to
weakening skills or loss of the non-English language. Thus the home language is “subtracted”. The aim of most subtractive programs is linguistically and culturally to assimilate the language minority speakers into the dominant English speaking society. Examples of subtractive programs are monolingual forms of education such as structured immersion, English as a second language (ESL) or English language development (ELD), sheltered English content classes, and transitional bilingual programs. Additive programs include developmental bilingual, dual language, and two-way immersion. Additive programs follow an enrichment model and aim to promote bilingualism.

**Controversies and Politics Regarding English Learner Programs**

The education of our nation’s English Language Learners is a contentious issue. On the surface, the debate focuses on methodology and teaching practices, yet the concerns and differences run much deeper. Beneath the arguments citing test scores, achievement data and graduation rates are undercurrents of race, class, ethnicity, and power. Instead of classroom experiences and academic discourse driving the development of education policy for ELLs, the policies are often formed in courtrooms, legislative halls, and ballot boxes. Bilingual education involves more than issues of pedagogy; it cuts into our sense of national identity, power, ethnicity, and the role of the federal government. As a result, federal bilingual education policy is wrought with argument. San Miguel (2004) traced the history of the bilingual education movement; he noted the contentiousness embedded in this educational model. “From its origins in the 1960s to the present, different groups with competing notions of ethnicity, assimilation, pedagogy, and power have contended, clashed, struggled, and negotiated with each other
for hegemony in the development and implementation of bilingual education” (San Miguel, 2004, p. 99).

Decisions are often made based on politics rather than research. In their report, *Succeeding with English Language Learners: Lessons Learned from the Great City Schools* (Horwitz et al., 2009), the authors emphasized the strong role of politics in ELL programming:

Consistency in implementation of ELL programs faces the additional challenge of political controversy. The politics of language are intimately tied to questions of rights and identity in the United States, and school districts often find themselves caught in the middle of an increasingly contentious battle over the use of native language in public school classrooms. One side encourages native language instruction as a way to better acquire academic knowledge and bi-literacy; the other demands the fastest possible transition to English-only instruction in the name of assimilation to mainstream culture. The end result is that school districts are frequently forced to make ELL programming decisions—and alterations—based on politics rather than considerations of how to provide effective, high quality instruction. (Horwitz et al., 2009, p. 30)

Educational policies regarding English Language Learners are frequently controversial. Politicians, interest groups, and community members are often passionate in defending their stance. Fueled by well-financed English-only movements, voters in California, Arizona, Massachusetts, and several other states have passed initiatives that limit or prohibit bilingual education. Editorials, blogs, websites, commercials, and rallies
continue to stir fervent responses. Reform movements and educational programs regarding the education of our English learners can be highly political and emotional (Goldenberg, 2008; Horwitz et al., 2009; Jost, 2009; Olivos & Quintana de Valladolid, 2005; San Miguel, 2004; Schmidt, 2000; Williamson, Rhodes, & Dunson, 2007).

Bilingual education in the United States is not new. Since the 1600s, American schools have used non-English languages to teach academic subjects. Until the past four decades, this tradition of using languages other than English and using more than one language for instruction was left to the discretion of local or state agencies (San Miguel, 2004). The Civil Rights Era of the 1960s and 1970s led to government policies favoring bilingual education (Jost, 2009). In the 1960s, activists pushing for minority civil rights viewed language as a vital element of significant school reform and social justice. The rationale was that people of color have often had to resort to using “education and schooling for social justice aims” (Williamson et al., 2007, p. 214). In 1968, bilingual education supporters succeeded in enacting the Bilingual Education Act that provided funds for primary language instruction. Although this legislation was vague, and programmatically small, it initiated the involvement of the federal government in the bilingual education movement (San Miguel, 2004).

During the 1970s and 1980s linguistically and culturally diverse students made significant improvements in closing the achievement gap with their White peers. Sleeter (2011) attributed this narrowing of the gap to a political climate that promoted multicultural and bilingual education. When these educational reforms began to be replaced with more standardized curricula, and English-only programs, the gains in
Latino test scores began to flatten. The implementation of multicultural and bilingual education was not the only factor leading to the rise in Latino test scores. Nevertheless, it was a component of a political attitude that favored educational programs benefitting Latinos and other students of color:

. . . [O]ne certainly cannot attribute gains in achievement of students of colour solely to beginnings of multicultural, bilingual and culturally responsive teaching. The desegregation of schools coupled with other efforts, such as the War on Poverty, were significant. Yet, the importance of work to respond to diverse students in schools, coupled with visible social movements for equity, should not be underestimated. (Sleeter, 2011, pp. 11–12)

In the 1980s and 1990s a backlash against bilingual education began to form and escalate. Critics characterized bilingual education as ineffective and promoted English immersion. The Reagan Administration began to cut funding for bilingual education and the English-only movement grew. In 1998 California passed Proposition 227, a voter initiative funded by political activist and millionaire Ron Unz. Proposition 227 required schools to provide structured English immersion programs for English Language Learners and restricted bilingual programs. In 2000 and 2002 Arizona and Massachusetts followed with stricter English-only laws. In 2002, George W. Bush repealed the Bilingual Education Act when he signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002).

NCLB emphasizes results rather than methodology or curriculum. Although bilingual education supporters were disappointed that the No Child Left Behind Act removed the federal preference for bilingual education, many approved of providing
minority language groups more attention (Jost, 2009). However, the neoliberalism reforms of NCLB failed to better the educational outcomes of Latinos and other students of color (Sleeter, 2011). The realities of NCLB outcomes have been disenchanting:

[N]eoliberal reforms purport to address racialised achievement gaps treat racism and culture as if they do not exist. Although racial achievement gaps in the US have been a focus of attention, solutions have emphasized offering all students the same curriculum, taught in the same way, regardless of the fact that they are based on the language, worldview and experiences of white English-speakers. (Sleeter, 2011, p. 8)

NCLB specifically steers clear of recommending a particular method of instruction for English Language Learners (No Child Left Behind (NCLB), 2002). Under NCLB the Office of Bilingual Education was renamed the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students — OELA. Guidebooks issued by the Department of Education intentionally avoid giving guidance over the English-only versus the bilingual education dispute (Jost, 2009). Nevertheless, in practice, NCLB views English Language Learners as deficient and in need of compensatory education. NCLB promotes developing skills in English rather than encouraging bilingual education (Olivos & Quintana de Valladolid, 2005).

Despite decades of research, the issue of how to educate our English Language Learners continues to be debated. Historically, the motivation behind policies regarding bilingual education is the public’s attitude toward assimilation, ethnic hierarchy, and
White power (Williamson et al., 2007). Bilingual education is fiercely debated because of the importance language plays in our identity as a nation-state. At odds are centuries old conflicts between those who view America as an assimilationist country with one language and culture against integrationists and those who define our nation as a pluralist society with many languages and cultures (Arriaza, 1997). “Thus, throughout U.S. history the struggle for language rights in a way synthesizes peoples’ aspirations for cultural representation, and the institutions of the nation-state have been the arena where this tension has been unleashed” (Arriaza, 1997, p. 8). Many historians and political scientists contend that this struggle to define and identify ourselves as a nation has been the core of the emotional debates regarding linguistic educational practices, access to political and civil rights, and designation of English as the only official language (Schmidt, 2000; Tyack, 1993; Williamson et al., 2007).

**Two-Way Bilingual Immersion (TWBI) Model**

Two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) programs are founded on the concept of *additive bilingualism*—“all students are given the opportunity to acquire English as a second language at no cost to their home language” (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010, p. 354). Two-Way Bilingual Immersion (TWBI) is commonly referred to as two-way immersion (TWI), dual language, dual language immersion, and dual immersion (DI). Frequently, many researchers and educators use the terms synonymously. However, some institutions distinguish between the terms (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012b). Dual language and dual immersion are umbrella terms for programs that aim to develop “bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement and multicultural
competence for all students” (Howard & Lindholm-Leary, 2007, p. 1). Under this definition, the dual language term can include any of the following programs: developmental bilingual programs, two-way immersion programs, and foreign language immersion programs. Two-way immersion programs integrate approximately 50 percent native English-speakers and 50 percent speakers of another language with the goal of promoting “bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement and positive cross-cultural attitudes and behaviors in all students” (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012b, "Two-Way Immersion," para 1). Because TWBI classes consist of both language groups, all students interact as first language models and second language learners.

TWBI is enrichment rather than a remedial or compensatory program. It is considered an additive bilingual environment since both groups are developing their primary and second language simultaneously. Students develop their language abilities and the academic content while they interact with their teacher and peers and work on academic tasks. Most TWBI programs begin at the kindergarten or first grade level and may continue through the end of elementary school or possibly continue through middle and high school (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). TWBI programs include four key features:

- Instruction and class work take place in two languages, with the non-English language used for at least 50 percent of the students’ instructional day.
- The day includes periods of instruction during which students and teachers use only one language with no translation or language mixing allowed.
- Both English Language Learners and native English-speakers do work in both
languages in a balanced proportion.

- English Language Learners and native English-speakers are together for most content instruction. (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 56-57)

The two most common models of TWBI programs are the 50:50 and the 90:10 instructional designs. In the 50:50 model, instruction is in the non-English language at least 50 percent of the time. In the 90:10 design, 90 percent of the academic instruction for kindergarten and first grade students is in the non-English language. Reading instruction is introduced to both language groups in the non-English language. In the 90:10 model the percentage amounts shift every successive year as more English is added. By fourth or fifth grade, instruction is divided about 50 percent for each language (Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010).

TWBI is based on the research from bilingual education for language minority students and foreign language immersion education (August & Shanahan, 2010; Howard et al., 2003). A considerable body of research has demonstrated that skills and knowledge acquired in the primary language transfer to the second language. The first language is utilized in developing the second language. Language minority students who receive primary language instruction along with English language support reach higher levels of English proficiency than if they had been taught in English alone (August & Shanahan, 2010; Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Ong & Aguilar, 2010).

**Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Effectiveness**

Two-Way Bilingual Immersion programs have demonstrated encouraging results in the educational outcomes of English Language Learners. In their meta-analyses of
programs for English Language Learners, authors Krashen and McField (2005) concluded that ELL students in programs with comprehensible English input, primary language literacy development, and primary language content instruction made the greatest academic gains (Krashen & McField, 2005). Bilingual programs that aim to maintain and develop the student’s home language provide cognitive advantages that aid the development of English. Skills, knowledge, and experiences attained in the first language contribute to the development of learning in English. Language learners can draw on competencies gained in their first language to shore up advancement in English. “English learners use their existing home language skills to ‘bootstrap’ into English literacy” (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010, p. 326). For example, several studies have confirmed that English learners with solid phonological awareness in their first language acquired phonological skills more readily in English, thus leading to stronger decoding skills than students with weaker phonological awareness in their home language. Literacy development in the first language facilitates literacy in English (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Riches, 2006).

English learners with advanced levels of competence in certain aspects of the home language demonstrate superior achievement in English literacy compared with English learners who lack or have lower levels of competence in these home language abilities. Moreover, English learners with more advanced levels of bilingual competence (in English and the home language) attain significantly higher levels of academic achievement than do English learners with lower levels
of bilingual competence. (Lindhom-Leary & Borsato 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010, p. 325)

In their review of programs for English Language Learners, Lindholm-Leary and Genesee (2010) reported that in studies that included results from standardized reading and math tests, English Language Learners in two-way immersion programs developed grade level achievement or above in English by middle school. Research using standardized test data in English has confirmed that English Language Learners in two-way immersion programs significantly out performed English Language Learners in mainstream, English-only programs (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). By late elementary and middle school, TWBI English Language Learners were scoring on par with native English-speakers in English-only classrooms. The “program of choice” for English Language Learners to attain long term, sustained, academic parity with native English-speakers is a well-implemented two-way language program (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Several other studies have documented the favorable achievement results for English Language Learners in TWBI. Because the majority of the TWBI programs target Spanish and English, most of the research is based on results from Spanish-speaking English Language Learners (Howard & Sugarman, 2001). In their longitude study, analyzing the achievement data of 210,054 English Language Learners in several school districts and program models throughout the United States, Thomas and Collier (2002) concluded that students in dual language, bilingual immersion outperformed language minority students in all other program models:
Enrichment 90:10 and 50:50 one-way and two-way developmental bilingual education (DBE) programs (or dual language, bilingual immersion) are the only programs we have found to date that assist students to fully reach the 50th percentile in both L1 and L2 in all subjects and to maintain that level of high achievement, or reach even higher levels through the end of schooling. The fewest dropouts come from these programs. (Thomas & Collier, 2002, p. 333)

The authors further concluded that well implemented dual language programs could “reverse the negative effects” socioeconomic status when compared to other program models for English Language Learners (Thomas & Collier, 2002, p. 5).

Figure 2 illustrates the student achievement results on standardized tests in English reading comprehension throughout seven different program models. Late-exit or developmental bilingual education and two-way bilingual education were the only program models where English Language Learners scored at or above their native English-speaking peers. Students in two-way bilingual education programs demonstrated and maintained the strongest gains. Thomas and Collier’s (1997, 2002) data reinforced the importance of developing the primary language in order to make greater strides in second language performance. Furthermore, the data confirmed that students in programs with long-term primary language schooling reached the strongest achievement outcomes. Of these bilingual programs, two-way immersion students perform best. Students with no primary language education were unable to reach grade level achievement in English. “The strongest predictor of L2 student achievement is amount of formal L1 schooling. The more L1 grade-level schooling, the higher L2 achievement” (Thomas & Collier,
Thomas and Collier’s study revealed the astounding academic success of English learners in two-way immersion.

*Figure 2.* Student achievement on standardized tests.

In addition to improved performance on English standardized tests, Latinos in TWBI programs were also more likely than their peers in mainstream English-only programs to enroll in advanced coursework such as AP courses, advanced math, honors classes, and classes that meet university entrance requirements: “[T]wo-way immersion students willingly select higher number of advanced classes in both middle and high school, classes that will open doors for these students to enter universities” (Kohne, 2006, p. 107). When compared to their high school counterparts who had participated in mainstream English programs, initially identified English Language Learners who had
participated in TWBI programs were more likely to state that they would not drop out of school. Furthermore, these high school students were also more likely to express that school and grades are important and that they would go to college (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001). Students in well implemented two-way immersion bilingual programs have reduced drop out rates, students reported more positive attitudes to bilingualism and biculturalism, and by secondary school, native Spanish-speakers achieved at or above grade level in reading and math (Howard et al., 2003). TWBI may be one answer to disrupt the discouraging results in the Latino educational pipeline.

**Need for Further Research**

How to promote the third goal of cross-cultural competence and the social justice issues of equitable distribution of linguistic and cultural capital are concerns shared by many TWBI teachers (De Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2009; Freeman, 1998; Hernández, 2011). The majority of studies that addressed social-cultural and linguistic equity in TWBI compared language minority students (usually Latinos) in TWBI programs with students in other program models. A large body of empirical data supported the favorable outcomes for Latino English Language Learners in TWBI when compared with peers in other programs (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). Studies that made comparisons of student groups within TWBI usually focused on academic achievement data (Howard et al., 2003). Only a few studies explored equity concern of groups within a TWBI program. A common theme in the literature regarding social-cultural and linguistic inequities in the TWBI classroom is that teachers are most challenged by how to implement the equity and cross-cultural component of the TWBI core tenets (Carrigo, 2000; Fitts, 2009; Freeman,
2008; Howard et al., 2003; Parkes, Anberg-Espinoza, & De Jong, 2009; Potowski, 2002).

In her study of discourse in a fifth grade dual language community of practice, Fitts (2009) noted that the teachers were highly motivated to infuse culturally responsive teaching into their practice but, nevertheless, still struggled with this component of their pedagogy. Fitts writes,

> Although many teachers assert that schools and curricula must build upon students’ strengths and work to create more culturally responsive pedagogy and curricula, there is less certainty as to how one actually achieves that goal or what that might look like. The call to create multicultural learning environments is a challenge even for experienced teachers who are aware of the need and willing to change. (Fitts, 2009, p. 88)

Whereas bilingualism and biliteracy can be assessed and quantified, cross-cultural competence is more abstract. As a result, teachers have stated that they face “difficulties. . .realizing cross cultural competence in their TWBI classrooms and schools” (Hernández, 2011, p. 255). Furthermore, according to the author, “This is an area for further research and a necessity for staff development opportunities at schools implementing TWBI programs” (Hernández, 2011, p. 234).

**Synthesis**

**Theoretical framework.** I begin this chapter by presenting the literature that supports the theoretical framework for this study. Two-way bilingual immersion is an effective program that is demonstrating favorable educational outcomes for Latino students. Successful integration of students from both language groups is central for
linguistic, academic, and social purposes. Despite its effectiveness, TWBI has inequities and concerns: asymmetrical language and culture status that favors English, and inequitable power balance among students. Teachers struggle with implementing the third component of TWBI, cross-cultural competency because of the overarching societal forces that influence the classroom social dynamics. Bourdieu (1977, 1984, 1991), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Coleman (1988), and Putnam (2001) explained these unbalanced social dynamics through their theories of cultural, social, and symbolic capital. Establishing organizational routines that promote the cultural capital of Latino English Language Learners strengthens cross-cultural competency, thus leading to stronger, more equitable TWBI programs (De Jong & Howard, 2009). Improving TWBI programs strengthens an educational model that is already showing gains in favorable educational outcomes for Latino English Language Learners.

Discussion of Latino educational outcomes, program models and controversies, and need for further research. In the latter part of this chapter, I discuss more deeply the inequitable educational outcomes for Latino students, and the features, controversies, and politics of programs for English Language Learners. I elaborate on the description of the two-way bilingual immersion model and present studies documenting the effectiveness of the TWBI model for Latino English Language Learners. I close the chapter by demonstrating a need for more research on teacher practices to develop cross-cultural competency in the TWBI classroom.

Purpose of study. In this review of the literature I establish that TWBI is a sound program model for English Language Learners. Because of social and political
influences, instructional models that use non-English languages are controversial and are often under attack. The purpose of this study is not to argue the effectiveness of TWBI in comparison to other programs; a substantial body of research bears out the success of the TWBI model for English Language Learners. The aim of this study is to analyze the teacher practices that promote cross-cultural competency within TWBI programs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter contains the methodology for the research. I begin with the purpose of the study. Then, I state the research questions. I follow with the research approach where I discuss the rationale for the research design and the research validity. Next, I describe the setting, participant selection, and the participants. Later, I explain the data collection and procedures and the data analysis. I conclude this chapter with a discussion of the ethical considerations and the limitations of the study.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher practices that promote cross-cultural competency in the TWBI classroom. I examined the following: (a) teacher understanding of cross-cultural competence; (b) teacher awareness of power imbalance regarding the validation of cultural capital between native English-speakers and native Spanish-speakers; and (c) the teacher organizational routines that lead to equitable distribution of cultural capital in their classrooms.

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following question: What practices do teachers use to promote cross-cultural competency in the Two-Way Bilingual Immersion (TWBI) classroom?

I have operationalized the research question into the following three researchable questions:
• How do teachers describe the social dynamics of cultural capital in the TWBI classroom?

• How do teachers understand cross-cultural competency in the TWBI classroom?

• What organizational routines do teachers use to promote cultural capital in the TWBI classroom?

Research Approach

Rationale for research design. Because of its focus on improving teaching and learning practices, Participatory Action Research (PAR) is a commonly used approach in educational research (Berg & Lune, 2004; Walter, 2009). The goal of this methodology is to resolve an issue of mutual concern (Walter, 2009). The focus of this research model is to investigate a problem collaboratively and bring about change. This methodology is active and in situ. The participants are stakeholders embedded in the area of concern and have a mutual interest to bring about change. The research is cyclical. Stakeholders plan, act, observe, and reflect. This reflection can in turn lead to a continued spiral of planning, action, observation, and reflection.

I chose to use PAR as the appropriate way to examine the concern of power dynamics within the TWBI classroom. When researching ways to empower all students and create equitable learning environments, the research approach should also be of a democratic and equitable nature between principal investigator and participants. Additionally, this research method is a well-suited approach to analyze the concern of power dynamics within the TWBI classroom to promote equity in the classroom.
Validity. Throughout the study, I followed the principles of action research methodology which focuses on action, while prioritizing the generation of knowledge (Reason & Bradbury, 2001). Herr and Anderson (2005) addressed issues of validity for action research by identifying the five goals of action research and linking validity criteria with each goal. The authors listed the following action research validity criteria: democratic, dialogic, process, catalytic, and outcome validity. I conducted this study adhering to the action research goals and the associated validity criteria.

Democratic validity. During this study, I honored the democratic nature of the action research framework by being collaborative and sensitive to the needs and recommendations of the co-participants. I was open to variations from the initial research plan. Democratic validity requires that the participants themselves have a voice in the method and direction of the research (Berg & Lune, 2004; Herr & Anderson, 2005). I adhered to this essential element of Participatory Action Research by maintaining a democratic relationship between the principal investigator and participants.

Dialogic and process validity. While being receptive to collaboration, we executed the study with process validity and rigor. The study followed a qualitative research format using Creswell’s (2011) six steps in analyzing and interpreting qualitative data: (a) Prepare and organize the data for analysis; (b) Explore and code the data; (c) Use codes to develop general themes; (d) Represent and report findings; (e) Interpret findings; and (f) Validate the accuracy of the findings. To reinforce the trustworthiness of my data and findings, I triangulated the data through classroom observation, member checking, and external audit (Creswell, 1994). Participants checked
the accuracy of the transcripts and findings and non-participant two-way immersion teachers reviewed the process and findings.

**Catalytic and outcome validity.** My aim of this action research study was to educate the researcher and participants and “deepen their understanding of the social reality under study” (Herr & Anderson, 2005, p. 56). This goal was aligned with the catalytic and outcome validity criteria of action research. The participants in the study stated that becoming involved with the focus groups helped raise their awareness of power and cultural capital imbalance and influenced their teaching. Classroom observation revealed the accuracy of the teachers self-reporting. Furthermore, the participants expressed a desire to continue to network with other teachers. These results demonstrate that this study satisfied these validity criteria.

**Setting**

**Ridgeline School District.** Ridgeline Unified School District (RUSD) is located in an affluent mid-sized suburban city in the San Francisco Bay Area, East Bay. The school district has 14,904 students. The racial/ethnic demographics of the school district are described by the following: White (54.6%), Asian (28.2%), Hispanic (9%), Filipino (2.6%), African American (2.1%), two or more races (1.9%), and less than 1% are either Native American or Pacific Islander. Ridgeline Unified School District has 5.2% English Language Learners, and 2% of the student population is Spanish-speaking English Language Learners. In RUSD, 6.7% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch (Ed-Data Website, 2012).
Presently, Ridgeline Unified School District is grappling with how best to meet the needs of all of its students and how to close the achievement gap between different subgroups. The 2011 state testing data revealed that the District’s African American, Hispanic/Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Language Learner, and Students with Disabilities were lagging behind their White and Asian peers (California Department of Education, 2011). District wide the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and Students with Disabilities did not meet the 2011 Federal Annual Measurable Objectives and the District faced the possibility of falling into Program Improvement status next year. In 2011, Creekside Elementary entered Program Improvement. For a high-performing school district that is accustomed to receiving accolades, news of this admonition caused a strong reaction and much reflection.

**Creekside Elementary School.** Creekside is one of the school district’s nine elementary schools. With 730 students, Creekside is now one of the district’s largest elementary schools and is one of RUSD’s three Title I schools. In 1998 Creekside received a $375,000 Title VII grant to establish a two-way immersion program. The school’s dual immersion program began in the fall of 1998 with one kindergarten and one first grade class. By 2012 about half of the campus was dual immersion classes, and there was a long waiting list of students wanting entry into the program. Most of the students on the waiting list were native English-speakers. Creekside has been spotlighted for many of its accomplishments. In 2003 Creekside received the CABE Seal of Excellence, and it was also named a 2006 California Distinguished School. Creekside’s 2011 API was 899. Although many may regard this API as a high score, it is one of the lowest of the
district’s elementary schools. Only one other elementary school has an API below 900. Creekside is in Year One of Program Improvement. The Program Improvement status has made public that not all of Creekside’s students are attaining the same levels of “success.” For years Creekside’s overall high test scores masked the discrepancies in test performance of the different subgroups. The school’s Hispanic/Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Language Learner, and Students with Disabilities scored lower than their peers. This disparity exists on the other RUSD campuses, but because Creekside is a Title I school it is in Program Improvement status. The school population is predominately White (59 %), Latino/Hispanic (27.1%), Asian (6.8%), African American (1.9%), Filipino (1.9%), American Indian or Alaska Native (1%), and 8% reported no racial information (Ed-Data Website, 2012). Because of the high housing costs in the area, most of the students come from affluent families. However, 18.8% of the student population is on free or reduced lunch. Most of the school’s limited English proficient students’ primary language is Spanish. About 15.5% of the students are limited English proficient. 13.2% of the school’s students are Spanish-speaking English Language Learners (Ed-Data Website, 2012). Although the Creekside population is predominately White, upper and middle class, this school has a greater number of Latino and socially economically disadvantaged students than other RUSD schools.

Creekside has 730 students, with approximately half of the students in the Dual Immersion program and the other half in the standard English program. The Ridgeline Dual Immersion program follows the 90:10 model. In this program design instruction in
kindergarten begins with 90% Spanish and 10% English. Each year the percentage shifts, increasing the English instructional time percentage and decreasing the Spanish instructional time percentage until by fourth and fifth grades, the students are instructed 50 percent in Spanish and 50 percent in English. Because Creekside houses the Dual Immersion program it has open enrollment—students through the district can enroll onto this campus. Many families take advantage of this option and commute to Creekside. Most students, however, come from the school’s attendance area. Open enrolled students must provide their own transportation to the non-attendance area school. Many students of poverty are unable to attend a school that is not walking distance from home. Within the classrooms, especially the Dual Immersion classes, students of vastly different socio-economic backgrounds sit side by side.

Due to the popularity of the Dual Immersion program and pressure from parents, the school district steadily increased the number of Dual Immersion classrooms. Originally in 1998 each year began with one kindergarten class. Later, the district increased the initial kinder classes to three per year. As a result the demographics within each classroom shifted—the dual immersion classrooms now had a greater percentage of White, native English-speaking students. Few classes had the ideal 50:50 balance of native Spanish-speakers to native English-speakers. In most classrooms only 15 to 30 percent of the students were native Spanish-speakers.

The Creekside website and staff define the school’s program as a two-way immersion model. As such, the written admission policy is to give entrance priority to native Spanish-speakers in efforts to reach a 50 percent balance of each student
population. Despite this admission policy, the Creekside dual immersion program has had difficulty attaining the 50:50 entrance program description.

**Ridgeline Middle School.** Ridgeline Middle School is a sixth through eighth grade school with 1,203 students enrolled. It is a Title I school in its second year of Program Improvement. Racially/ethnically the student body is described by the following: White (51%), Asian (28%), Hispanic (12%), African American (2.2%), Filipino (1.7%), two or more races (1.6%), less than 1% Native American or Pacific Islander, and 1.1% did not indicate a race. The school has 61 English Language Learners, which is 5.1% of the student body. Of the English Language Learners, 35 students (2.9% of the total enrollment) is Spanish speaking. The percentage of students at the site on free and reduced lunch is 10.6% (127 students) (Ed-Data Website, 2012).

In 2010 Ridgeline Middle School, a 2009 California Distinguished School with a 932 API, entered Program Improvement because the school failed to meet the AYP requirements for its Hispanic/Latino students in math. Although this subgroup has been performing below target in previous years, the group became numerically significant, when the state recalculated the identification criteria of one student. A large discrepancy exists between the performance of the school’s White and Asian students and the Black, Students with Disabilities, Socially Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic students (California Department of Education, 2009). The No Child Left Behind Program Improvement sanction resulted in an increased administrative focus on staff development, student scheduling, staffing, and coursework to address the concern.
In 2004 Ridgeline Middle School created a Spanish language arts class for students who had participated in the Creekside Dual Immersion program. Because there were only 13 Dual Immersion students in the initial class of incoming sixth graders, the school district would not commit to forming the Spanish language arts class. Several parents in that year’s class raised the money to pay a percentage of the cost of the teacher so that the class could be formed. Since then, the middle school Dual Immersion Program has increased to approximately 160 students a year. Although the school district and the community speak of the Ridgeline Middle School Dual Immersion program, it is only one daily 46-minute Spanish class. I teach all sections of the Dual Immersion Spanish language arts classes.

**Vineyard Valley Joint Unified School District.** The Vineyard Valley Unified School District (VVJUSD) and Ridgeline Unified School District (RUSD) are adjacent to each other. VVJUSD has about 2,000 fewer students than RUSD with an enrollment of 12,771. The racial/ethnic demographics of VVJUSD are White (56.8%), Hispanic (26.4%), Asian (5.6%), Filipino (2.9%), Black (2.5%), two or more races (1.3%), less than 1% Native American or Pacific Islander, and 4.5% declined to respond. In VVJUSD, 13.6% (1,737 students) are identified as English Language Learners. Of those English Language Learners, the majority (1,449 students) speak Spanish. The percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch is 25% (Ed-Data Website, 2012).

**Main Street K-8 School.** Main Street is a kindergarten through eighth grade school with a total enrollment of 770 students. It is designated as a Title I school. At Main Street the majority of the school population is Hispanic at 60.8%; 24.5% are White,
4% are African American, 4.3% are Filipino, 1.8% are Asian, less than 1% are American Indian or Alaska Native, and 4% reported no racial information (Ed-Data Website, 2012). The school has 290 students; 37.7% of the student body identified as English Language Learners. Most of the school’s limited English proficient students’ primary language is Spanish; 279 students (36.2% of the school’s students) are Spanish-speaking English Language Learners. Most of the student body of 470 students (61%) receive free or reduced lunch (Ed-Data Website, 2012).

The Main Street Dual Immersion program is a strand in a small elementary program in a kindergarten through eighth grade campus. The dual immersion program is in its seventh year. It was formerly a transitional bilingual program. In 2004, the principal, district ELL coordinator, and several of the teachers were interested in providing primary language support and bringing together diverse populations. They also wanted to offer a program that would interest the English speaking families after a district alternative program closed and the students in that program would be forced back to their home school. Therefore, the principal, ELL coordinator, and teachers spearheaded the formation of the dual immersion program. They adopted the 50:50 model in order to attract English-speaking families. Initially, the school had difficulty drawing English speakers into the program. Many English-speaking families who originally enrolled their children never fully bought into the idea and soon left. The dual immersion program was originally housed at Vasco Elementary. Three years ago, Vasco Elementary was closed and the entire elementary program, both mainstream and dual immersion classes, moved to Main Street K-8 School. In the past three years, the school has increased focus on
recruitment, publicity, and explaining the program. As a result, more English-speaking families have enrolled their children.

The Main Street dual immersion program follows a 50:50 model in that 50 percent of the instruction is in English and 50 percent is in Spanish from the program onset. The language of instruction is divided by days. A day is designated as either an English or Spanish day, and instruction is in the designated language that day. The first cohort of students is now in sixth grade. The demographics of the Main Street Dual Immersion program are considerably different than the Creekside Dual Immersion program. The first few cohorts are predominately Latino Spanish speakers. The sixth and fifth grade classes are almost entirely native Spanish-speakers. As word has gotten out about the program more native English-speaking parents are enrolling their children. The kindergarten through second grade classes have close to 50 percent mix of each student group.

Participant Selection

Selection criteria. All participants form a convenient sample. This is so given my access to the school sites and my personal and professional relationships with the participants. In selecting these individuals, I followed these criteria:

1. Participants identified themselves as two-way immersion teachers in a program self-described as following the two-way immersion model.
2. The participants were either presently fourth through sixth grade two-way immersion teachers or the teachers had previously taught fourth through sixth grade two-way immersion classes.
3. Participants exhibited a desire to form a community of inquiry and action research.

A total of nine people participated in this research. These included myself, the principal investigator, and eight teachers from two dual language programs, in two different Northern California school districts. The choice of teachers in the study was limited by who volunteered to participate.

**Participant selection process.** First, three teachers, colleagues at a different school site from my own, were approached during informal conversations the school year prior to the start of the study. I also asked a friend and former colleague who is now teaching at Vineyard Valley Joint Unified School District if she was interested in participating. She, in turn, stated that several colleagues at her school site were also interested in participating. Through conversations, word of mouth, and email recruitment, a total of eight teachers joined the study. Our community of practice consisted of eight female and one male teacher, between the ages of early 30s to 50s, with varied years of experience.

**Participants’ Profiles by School**

**Creekside Elementary School Participants**

*Isabel Cruz.* Isabel teaches fifth grade dual immersion. She has been teaching for 11 years, nine of those years in dual immersion.

*Veronica Bell.* Veronica teaches fifth grade dual immersion. She has taught for seven years, all of them at the Creekside Dual Immersion program.
Ana Lucia Reyes. Ana Lucia teaches fourth grade dual immersion. She has taught for 12 years, four years in a bilingual classroom and eight years in the Creekside Dual Immersion program.

Luis Vera. Luis teaches fourth grade dual immersion. He has taught for six years, all of those years at the Creekside Dual Immersion program.

Main Street K-8 School Participants

Lola Peña. Lola teaches fifth grade dual immersion. She is in her second year of teaching. Her first teaching position was last year at the Main Street Dual Immersion program. Before earning her teaching credential, Lola worked for several years at Creekside as the parent liaison. As the parent liaison, she was active in reaching out and assisting the school’s Spanish-speaking community.

Anita Kelly. Anita teaches sixth grade dual immersion. This is her first year teaching dual immersion. She has taught for a total of 15 years; 10 years at the college level teaching career development and 5 years at the middle school level teaching English language arts.

Elsa Gray. Elsa teaches kindergarten dual immersion. She has taught in two-way programs in the upper elementary grades for several years and was eager to participate in the study even though this year she is teaching in the lower grades. She stated that her experience as an upper elementary grade teacher made it possible to see the concerns through the lens of an upper grade teacher.

Susan Parker. Susan teaches first grade dual immersion. Last year, she taught fourth grade at Main Street. She became interested in participating in the study last year
when she was teaching fourth grade dual immersion. Like Elsa, Susan felt that her previous experience as an upper grade elementary teacher afforded her the lens to view concerns and practices through the lens of a fourth grade teacher. Susan has been teaching for 13 years, nine years in dual immersion.

**Ridgeline Middle School, Principal Investigator**

*Principal investigator.* I teach sixth, seventh, and eighth grade Spanish language arts to the students who participated in the Creekside Dual Immersion program. I have taught for 19 years, 12 of those years in dual immersion. Previously, I taught in bilingual programs and held positions as the English as a second language specialist.

**Data Collection and Procedures**

*Main data sources.* The principal data sources included interviews and focus group conversations. With each participant, I conducted an initial interview. Then we participated in four focus groups over the course of a month and a half. At the conclusion of the study I individually interviewed each of the participants again. In addition to the interviews I also observed each teacher in his or her classroom during instruction.

*Initial interviews.* I first interviewed the teachers individually, using semi-structured questions. During the initial interview, teachers described their background, experiences, attitudes, and told of the practices that they use to promote equitable linguistic and social interactions among students. I also explained the overall project design, and we discussed what the teacher hoped to gain from participation in this cycle of inquiry.
Focus groups. The principal investigator and the teachers from both sites met for a series of four focus groups at Creekside. We formed a community of inquiry, action, and reflection. During the focus groups, the principal investigator introduced readings to prompt reflection and discussion. We reviewed the research describing the fundamental concepts of two-way immersion programs, power imbalances, culturally responsive pedagogy, and equitable spaces. The focus group then reflected and discussed which practices promoted cultural competency, increased the cultural capital of the native Spanish speakers, and aided equitable linguistic and social interactions among students.

The teachers developed an action plan to incorporate these strategies into their classroom practice. The teachers then maintained a daily journal where they jotted down brief notes. The daily entries reflected on the successes and challenges the teachers encountered that day in their efforts to infuse culturally responsive teaching strategies, cultural competency, and encourage equitable distribution of centrality and status in their classroom. The teachers were encouraged to keep the journal entries brief so that the journaling experience would more likely be consistent, reflective, and not burden teachers with a time consuming task. The purpose of the journals was to help teachers reflect on a regular basis and to help jog participants memory during focus group discussions. The teachers were asked to bring their journals to the focus group meetings as a source of information to refer to during the discussion. I too kept a journal and participated in the inquiry, action, and reflection in my own teaching practice in my classroom.
**Final interview.** At the end of the study teachers participated in another individual interview, using semi-structured questions. Some of the initial questions from the first interview were repeated to see if teachers experienced any change or transformation in their description of awareness, attitudes, and practice. I also asked the teachers to describe how the cycle of inquiry, action, and reflection influenced their thinking and practice. The teachers reflected not only on transformations in their attitudes and practice but also on the process of inquiry itself.

**Classroom observation.** In addition to the individual teacher interviews and focus group discussions I also observed a lesson in each teacher’s classroom. During the classroom observations, I noted the use of strategies discussed during the interviews and focus groups. I made holistic observations of teacher practices, student participation, use of language, discourse, and classroom dynamics. During these observations, my role was that of an observer. Because of my role as a co-participant, I also invited the participant teachers to observe me in my classroom.

**Transcription, coding, and validity checking.** Interviews and focus group conversations were recorded and later transcribed. Participants reviewed the transcripts for accuracy. The researcher examined the transcripts exploring the data for themes and descriptions. The data was coded with the HyperResearch program. After forming the findings, the researcher validated these findings through the use of triangulation, member checking, and external audit (Creswell, 1994). The researcher triangulated the data through the classroom observations, conducted member checking by asking participants
in the study to check for the accuracy of the report, and employed an external audit by having other two-way teachers who were not participants in the study to assess the report.

**Data Analysis**

This study approached data analysis by organizing codes under predetermined themes and then continuing to analyze the data for emerging thematic threads. After transcribing the interviews and focus group conservations, I read and reread the transcripts. I used the data analysis program HyperResearch as a tool to organize the data, codes, and themes. I initially established three themes aligned with my research questions: (a) cross-cultural competency, (b) social dynamics around cultural capital, and (c) organizational routines. As I coded the data, I categorized the codes under these groups. Additionally, I continued to review the data for other themes that did not initially fit theses original themes. I coded key words and phrases as they emerged from the data. I then grouped the codes together under similar themes. During the data analysis, I employed predetermined themes based on my research questions to categorize the teacher responses. This provided an initial structure to the analysis in order to assure that I was addressing the research questions. However, I continued to code keywords and phrases that were not categorized into the initial groups.

Then, I repeatedly reviewed and grouped the codes as I probed for additional themes.

**Ethical Considerations**

There were minimal risks to the participants in this study. Participation was voluntary. Measures were taken to protect each participant’s privacy. Pseudonyms were
used for participants’ names, school districts, and school sites. The participants were told to answer only those questions they chose to answer, and were allowed to stop participation in the research at any time. The researcher began the focus group by asking the participants to agree to the importance of keeping information discussed in the focus group confidential. The teachers were given copies of the transcripts to review for accuracy and could request portions to be deleted.

Furthermore, I emphasized the democratic nature of this inquiry process. Participants’ interests were considered when selecting research and discussion topics. I only observed the teacher participants in their classrooms when invited and reciprocated by inviting the participants to observe me in my classroom.

**Limitations**

**Subject position.** My position as principal investigator and co-participant must be addressed. As noted earlier, the impact of teacher education programs, policies, and administration on teacher pedagogy is meager (Diamond, 2012; Irizarry & Raible, 2011). Fellow teachers are the strongest influence in transforming teacher practice (Diamond, 2012). My position as a colleague and an insider reinforced the purpose and authenticity of the goals of action research. In their examination of action research methodology Herr and Anderson (2005) noted,

. . . [W]hen researchers authentically positioned themselves as insiders doing action research or self-studies, they moved individual, organizational and social transformation through actions taken within the setting to the forefront. These authentic studies were more likely to engage in the traditional action research

**Program model, size of sample.** I am examining only the Spanish/English dual immersion programs. Although the majority of the two-way bilingual immersion programs in the United States target English and Spanish, there are many other target languages in this program model. Since my study focuses on the cultural, social, and linguistic issues of Latino English learners in TWBI programs, it is appropriate to limit my research to TWBI programs with Spanish and English as the target languages. Additionally, I examine the perspectives and practices of a small number of teachers at two school districts. Although one cannot surmise broad generalizations that would encompass the thousands of other teachers and students and their unique demographics and circumstances, the study, nevertheless, adds to the body of research in an area that is of great concern yet scarcely studied.

**Two-way immersion definition.** The program model definition needs to be clarified. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) distinguishes between the definition of dual language and dual immersion, and two-way bilingual immersion. According to the CAL definition, two-way immersion programs require a close to 50:50 balance between the two student populations. Neither the Ridgeline nor the Vineyard Valley dual immersion programs have this ideal linguistic and ethnic balance. Nevertheless, the staff, administration, school websites, and community often referred to their program as a two-way immersion model. Both programs have self-defined their program as aiming to follow the two-way immersion model. These two districts use the terms dual immersion
and two-way immersion interchangeably. The CAL glossary states that dual language and dual immersion are “used synonymously” (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012a).

Regarding the dual language term, the CAL glossary also states: “Throughout the U.S., it is frequently used synonymously with two-way immersion” (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012a, "TWI Glossary," para 1).

**Focus group process.** The focus group process and the way groups can influence each other is an additional limitation to note. The group dynamics in a focus group may lead participants with stronger personalities to have powerful effects on the group. This study focuses on balancing the power relationships among students in the classroom. Just as we will be discussing the importance of giving all students a voice in the classroom, as a group we will also discuss and be aware of our own group interactions so as to maximize equity in the participation all group members.

**Participant selection.** Another limitation of this study will be that the participants were not randomly selected. The TWBI teacher participants were colleagues of the researcher. Their relationship with the researcher may have affected their responses to interview questions and their behaviors when observed in the classroom. I would argue that any relationship, even a detached professional connection, might affect the nature of participants’ responses. Because we have a long history of collaborating and working together, our shared past and friendship strengthens the collaborative nature of the study.

A commonality of Participatory Action Research is that it produces “knowledge that (is) not only fed back into the setting, but also contribute(s) to a conversation taking place in the larger scientific community” (Herr & Anderson, 2005, p. 111). Participatory
Action Research sets out to produce both local and public knowledge (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). My goal was to do more than add to the fund of knowledge regarding teacher attitudes and practice. I also aimed to take action in creating more socially just and equitable TWBI classroom environments. Therefore, my position as a co-researcher and colleague strengthens the research design.
CHAPTER 4
TEACHER PROFILES

Introduction

Collay (2010) stated that teachers’ life experiences, “shaped by race, culture, language, gender and class” (2010, p. 229), are the foundation of a teacher’s professional identity and practice. Teachers who choose to advocate for underserved students often do so because of their own personal experiences and commitment to serve marginalized students. Teachers’ experiences influence their attitudes and practice. By definition, cultural competency encompasses attitudes. Therefore, in order to study teacher understanding of cultural competency, one needs to gain insight into the teacher participants’ background and attitudes. Cultural, social, and linguistic capital is exchanged through social interactions in a “field” or context (Bourdieu, 1977). The field in this study is the teachers’ two-way bilingual immersion classroom. I describe each teacher’s specific classroom demographics in this chapter. Thus, the reader gleans an understanding of each teacher’s personal background, attitudes, and teaching environment.

The aim of this chapter is to allow the participants to “tell their story” and express their attitudes and feelings with their own voice. Knowing the participants’ narrative in their own words provides the reader with insights into the background, attitudes, and context that influence the participants’ practice. This chapter is composed of nine parts. Each part relates to the background of a participant. I describe the teachers’ personal experiences; this encompasses the teacher’s ethnicity, language background, schooling
experiences, training, and teaching history. I also reveal the participants’ own
descriptions of their class and community demographics and background.

Isabel Cruz

Isabel teaches fifth grade dual immersion at Creekside Elementary in Ridgeline,
an affluent suburban city in Northern California. She describes herself as “Cuban,
Hispanic.” Spanish was her first language, but she learned English before she entered
school. For Isabel, her heritage and ability to speak Spanish was a source of pride. She
states, “So I think that I probably spoke English at two, three years old. People admired
me that I spoke Spanish. It was always a real positive thing for me” (I. Cruz, personal
communication, November 1, 2012). She sees her students display shame or
embarrassment to speak it, “I was never embarrassed. I didn't feel different. Sometimes in
Ridgeline that's a little different. . . ” (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1
2012). She feels that two-way immersion is part of the “work” to counter the negativity
associated with Spanish and Latino background. Indeed, as Isabel states, Spanish has
been a positive asset that has opened opportunities for her. Her students see it differently.
Isabel states,

For me, I don't see Spanish as that low socioeconomic status. I don't feel that way.
It's landed me this job, for crying out loud. It's been a huge part of my life since I
was small. I didn't have these experiences growing up. . . . Sometimes these kids
are a little embarrassed to speak Spanish or just want to speak in English. They
want to blend in and they want to fit in, and that wasn't my experience. It was
always like my life. This is what made me different. There's work to be done in
Ridgeline. I don't know if I'm allowed to say that where we are, but there's work to be done. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2012)

Isabel has been teaching for 11 years, nine of those years in two-way immersion. She states her reason for first teaching two-way immersion, “It was sort of the credential that I had and my background and the job openings. I sort of just fell into it. It wasn't something that I sought out” (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012). She states that the difficulty of the job surprised her, and she is amazed by the high standards that the program demands of the students in both languages and feels much pressure to push the students to maintain those high levels of proficiency in both languages. Isabel describes the challenges and pressure:

It's the most challenging assignment ever known on the face of this Earth. I could be a CEO at this point [laughs]. It is the most challenging job. It surprises me that we really expect these kids to perform like native speakers at this stage of the game. The resources that we have to do that. . . .A lot of parents do work with their children at home and encourage Spanish, and then you have a lot of people who do not. That's a huge eye-opening thing for me, how it's so much pressure. It's so much what we're expected to do. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

She is excited to see her students reaching high levels. “But it also surprised me how amazing it is and how much these kids are learning despite all of those things, and how amazing they're doing and how they are learning, and that's super cool” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013). Despite the difficulties, she wants to continue
teaching in two-way immersion. She has a strong sense of commitment to the program and has enrolled her son in the Creekside Dual Immersion program. Isabel says, “I totally own this program. I put my own son in this program” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013).

Although she has a strong sense of belief and commitment to the program, Isabel also has concerns. In her fifth grade class of 27 students, only five students are native Spanish-speakers. She sees a discrepancy between the status of her native Spanish-speakers and native English-speakers. She would like to make the program more equitable and wonders if the Ridgeline school district two-way program is meeting all its goals. Isabel feels that the program is doing a satisfactory job with the bilingualism and biliteracy aims of the two-way program. “As far as bilingualism and biliteracy goes, I think that yes, we're doing a really fair job.” (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012)

However, Isabel does not see the biculturalism component of the program taking hold. Isabel states that the cross-cultural component of the Creekside Dual Immersion program is stuck at superficial levels that focus on the “light and fluffy.” This concerns her. She states,

I struggle with this one. I think that it might be a Creekside problem in particular, or in Ridgeline. I'm not sure, but I don't think that biculturalism is happening at all. I think that we celebrate some holidays and we do some really light, fluffy stuff, but I don't know if kids really get a sense of another culture and appreciate that. I don't think that we're doing a really good job with that. What I see in fifth
grade, I get discouraged sometimes. (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012)

Nevertheless, Isabel feels that for the most part, both groups of students are better off participating in the two-way program. At the end of fifth grade, the students are “not finished,” and they still have years to continue their growth. She is unsure whether that growth continues, but Isabel feels that dual immersion has laid a valuable foundation of confidence for the Spanish speakers. Both groups will benefit from the opportunities their background in dual immersion will open for them. She feels both groups of students are better off participating in dual immersion. Isabel comments,

But I have to realize that they continue. I don't, sometimes, see the results in high school. But I do think that it pays off. I really do. . . .That's positive because. . . it might lead to open up doors for them in the future. It gives those Spanish speakers that confidence. . . .That confidence helps you. It goes to other areas. That it is valuable, for both parties. They're better off. . . .Dual immersion is definitely the right program for these kids, and it can only be a benefit. I don't think that they're worse off. . . .It's hard for me, because sometimes, at this level, they're not finished. . . .I don't know if that's quite happening, but I do see a sense of pride in the DI students and a sense of, even if it's not perfect, I do think that kids really enjoy being a part of it. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

**Luis Vera**

Luis describes himself as “Latino, Mexicano, to be specific” (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012). He teaches fourth grade dual immersion at
Creekside. In his class he has seven native Spanish-speakers and 21 native English-speakers. He has been teaching for six years, all of which have been at Creekside. His first language was Spanish, and he began to speak English at the age of eight. He says that he is a balanced bilingual who feels equally comfortable in both languages. Luis states the reason why he chose to teach in a two-way program, “Because I have the background with the language, and also because I actually went through a DI program myself” (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012). When describing his own schooling experiences, he says that they were “favorable. I never experienced any sense of inequity or being made less than the other kids. Maybe because I did OK in school” (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012). Luis has enrolled his son in the Creekside Dual Immersion program.

Luis feels that inequities exist within the dual immersion program and feels that the native English-speaking students benefit most from the two-way immersion program because they are demonstrating stronger academic outcomes. He thinks that the dual immersion program caters to the native English-speaking students at the expense of the native Spanish-speaking students. He is concerned about the state standardized testing data that shows the native Spanish-speakers in the program lagging behind the native English-speakers. Luis comments,

The DI program, when it comes to the Spanish speakers does not serve the Spanish-speaking population. It's catered towards the English-only students learning a second language, and that's very noticeable with the CSTs. That's the subgroup that's benefiting from the D.I. program. (L. Vera, personal
Although Luis sees the dual immersion program providing more advantages to the native English-speakers, he wonders if placing struggling native Spanish-speakers in mainstream English-only classes would benefit them. Perhaps, despite the discrepancy, the native Spanish-speakers are still better off in dual immersion. Luis feels a sense of commitment to two-way programs but wants to make sure that his beliefs concur with data. Luis would like to see more research comparing results across programs:

The achievement gap...if you take standardized testing and you look at the data, I think that the native Spanish speakers are worse off because they're not getting that important English development instruction, and this is just my hypothesis. See, that's the thing. I wouldn't know how to compare them because I wouldn't know how a Spanish speaker [in an English-only program] would compare to our DI students. Now, I've heard here and there that our DI [Spanish-speaking] students tend to do much better than if they were in a regular, English-only class. I have yet to do the research and perhaps compare numbers between both. I would hope that they do better. (L. Vera, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

Luis notes that the reasons the native English-speakers are outperforming the native Spanish-speakers is due to the resources and background that support the students:

I think that many times the beneficiaries of the program are the native English-speakers because they have, at times, the foundation at home. They have the resources to either get tutoring or their parents are able to read with them in
English; whereas, the native Spanish-speakers don't necessarily have that support at home. That's what I've noticed. (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

Despite his concerns for the native Spanish-speakers, overall, Luis feels that dual immersion is a good program. “I know the DI program does work. Not for all, of course” (L. Vera, personal communication, February 1, 2013).

**Ana Lucia Reyes**

Ana Lucia teaches fourth grade dual immersion at Creekside. She has taught for 12 years, all of those years in either bilingual or two-way programs. She describes herself as a “Latina, Mexican-American” who grew up speaking English at home. She formally began to study Spanish in middle school. When describing her own schooling she says that her experience was favorable:

Favorable, because I was in Castro Valley for most of my schooling. They were exceptional schools. . . .In terms of cultural, definitely, I experienced racism, although I don't think that in my schooling, in the educational system I was ever discriminated against. (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)

Ana Lucia chose to teach in bilingual programs because, “I speak Spanish and I could get an emergency credential to teach at Hayward and I needed a job. I fell into it because my mom was a teacher. She told me” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). She felt that when she first began teaching dual immersion, she was not given much guidance regarding how to teach the curriculum and how to separate the language instruction. Ana Lucia says, “They didn't really know--when they came in, they didn't
really know what I was doing. I wasn't told, ‘Here's the curriculum; here's what subjects you teach in English, [and] here's what you teach in Spanish’” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). She feels that there is no cohesive understanding among the staff as to how to teach dual immersion. Ana Lucia states,

There wasn't an understanding of--among the whole staff of methodology in dual immersion, like it seems like every year it's like reinvented. . . . It just doesn't seem like there's a set understanding and a sticking with of a core belief and understanding about how the best type of dual immersion program works. (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Ana Lucia is concerned with the impact Program Improvement designation has on the Creekside Dual Immersion program. Ana Lucia has 30 students this year; seven are native Spanish-speakers and a few are bi-ethnic. She is particularly concerned with her native Spanish-speakers getting pulled out of their Spanish content classes in order to participate in an English intervention program. She comments,

One issue specific to our school--our Spanish-speakers, English learners, are not getting the Spanish, because they're being pulled out for a core replacement. So there's not really a dual immersion program for the Spanish-speakers that are not on grade level. It really doesn't exist for them. And how can that be fixed, so that they're getting this important Spanish, while at the same time getting the remediation in English? (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)

Ana Lucia feels that this issue is indicative of program inequities that benefit the native English-speakers. She says, “The DI program advantages the native English-speakers”
(A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). She sees the program providing the native English-speakers instruction in English and Spanish. The struggling native Spanish-speakers, the ones who, according from the research, could most benefit from primary language instruction, are not receiving adequate Spanish instruction. She feels angry that “dual immersion does not exist” for her native Spanish-speakers. Ana Lucia states, “Dual immersion does not exist for those kids anymore. They're getting all English. So, there's no advantage for those kids to be in a dual immersion program” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). Ana Lucia expresses that dual immersion is an enrichment program for the native English-speakers but for the native Spanish-speakers it is a crucial support. She explains,

The kids that are actually benefiting from the dual immersion, more often than not, are the English speakers because they get the program. They're doing well in their primary language, and then that's transferring over into the Spanish, so they get the benefit of Spanish, where the native Spanish-speakers are really the ones who need it. I mean, for the English speakers it's just an enrichment for them; whereas with the native Spanish speakers, research shows that when they get primary language support, they do better, but then it has to be consistent from Kinder through middle school, and they're not getting that at Ridgeline. . .which is so sad. (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)

Ana Lucia sees problems in the dual immersion program; however, she feels that these are concerns to be addressed and corrected. She believes that dual immersion is a positive educational model. “I don't think anyone loses out in dual immersion. It's just a
valuable thing to be able to speak two languages. I think the idea that kids can learn two languages in a public school is fabulous” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Ana Lucia wants to continue to teach in a two-way program, “I don't think I would ever go back to teaching English-only. I love being able to teach Spanish and using my Spanish. I don't see myself ever teaching anything else” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). She believes strongly enough in the program to have recently enrolled her oldest child to enter dual immersion kindergarten at Creekside next year.

**Veronica Bell**

Veronica teaches fifth grade dual immersion. She has taught for seven years, all of them at the Creekside Dual Immersion program. She describes herself as “Hispanic.” She came to the United States at 16 years old from Venezuela to learn English. Veronica says that although she first struggled with learning English, her schooling experiences in the United States were favorable. She describes her entry into American schools, First. . . I went through ESL classes for nine months, so that was just immersed in English,[and] that went really well. After that, I started college. I was taking regular college classes while I was also attending ESL” (V. Bell, personal communication, November 5, 2012). Veronica states that she chose to teach in a two-way program “Because I feel like I could make a difference. We didn't have a lot of native Spanish-speakers teaching, and I love teaching, so this was the perfect place for me. (V. Bell, personal communication, November 5, 2012)
Veronica has 27 students: seven are native Spanish-speakers and 20 are native English-speakers. When she first started teaching in the dual immersion program, she was surprised by the rigorous expectations for the students to excel in both languages. She has concerns regarding the Creekside program meeting the needs of the native Spanish-speaking students. The program is not focusing enough on the native Spanish-speakers’ need to advance academically in English. The program needs a stronger focus on assuring that the native Spanish-speakers make academic gains in English and needs to focus more a strong English language development component. Veronica states,

I think that we have not had a really good program that has kept the English part for our Spanish-speakers, for them to advance. Even though kids who have parents who are very involved in school, I do see them struggling in English, because I don't think that we're spending enough time teaching English language arts. (V. Bell, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

She is pleased with the newly adopted language arts program which is much more rigorous in Spanish. Veronica wants both a strong English and Spanish program for her students. Veronica explains,

I think we didn't have a program, a very systematic program, that covered that [needs of the native Spanish-speakers], and now we do, and I think it's going to make a difference. I think the other reason is because I honestly think we're focused more on the Spanish, and we're teaching Spanish instead of English. (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013)
Veronica is hopeful that the newly adopted language arts program and the increased focus on English learner needs will bring positive changes for her students. She says, “I don't think it is ideal. I don't think it's 100 percent there, where we need it to be. I think we're working toward that, especially now with this new program” (V. Bell, personal communication, November 5, 2012). Even with her concerns of an inequitable lack of focus on native Spanish-speakers needs, Veronica, nevertheless, feels that native the Spanish-speakers are “definitely better off” in a two-way immersion program. Veronica states that teaching in a two-way program is difficult and frustrating; she would like more support from the school district. She feels that the program is improving. She loves promoting the Spanish and teaching in a dual immersion program; she would like to continue teaching in the program. Veronica says,

I do love it. I think that we have so many constraints. I would love to have more support for the program. I think we are fighting an uphill battle with the district. It's hard. I think we are doing great for what we are given. I think it could be so much better, but I'm not willing to give it up yet. I love Spanish and I love teaching. It's frustrating. It definitely is frustrating. (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Veronica’s goal for teaching is to have equitable educational outcomes for all her students, especially her native Spanish-speaking population. She says, “I want to be able to provide for those students” (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013). She feels that the dual immersion program is teaching to the White, English-speaking majority. Veronica states,
Because I do feel that there is, not necessarily a bias, I don't want to call it a bias, but for lack of a better word, I think we are teaching to the majority. And the majority in this case is our English population. (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Veronica aims to better equip her native Spanish-speakers to do well in the classroom. Veronica shares, “And I want to make sure that we bring those kids in and provide the resources and bring them out and make them more competent in the classroom” (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Veronica points out that it is sometimes harder to push the native Spanish-speakers ahead because of the lack of parent involvement. She says that she works hard to “get the parent involvement as well. But it is difficult, obviously, because there's a different dynamic at home, and they don't have maybe as much support as the English speakers do” (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Nevertheless, her goal is to make sure her students are well prepared and have high academic aspirations. Veronica states,

But my goal is to have those kids, especially now in 5th grade, is to have those kids have that bigger view, like,” I want to go farther,” “I want to achieve more,” “I want to be in those high classes.” “I want to graduate from college,” and I don't think that they're there. [I want them] to have high expectations for themselves. If I can do anything this year, it's to have those kids go: “I can do it and I can get there.” That's what I want, and I want them to be confident of doing that; that's my big goal. My smaller goal within my reach, my classroom, is to make them competent in English so that they are able to get there because I don't feel like we
are preparing them enough. (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

To summarize, Veronica has concerns regarding the equitable outcomes for her students; however, she continues to believe in the dual immersion program and to push for improvement. Veronica may have many misgivings and frustrations regarding the dual immersion program at Creekside; however, she believes enough in the program to have placed all three of her children in the Creekside Dual Immersion program.

**Lola Peña**

Lola worked for several years at Creekside as the parent liaison for the Spanish-speaking community. She left that position to complete her teaching credential and now teaches fifth grade dual immersion at Main Street K-8 School. She is in her second year of teaching. Lola describes herself “Latina or Hispanic.” Her first language was Spanish, and her family moved from Mexico to the U.S. when Lola was 17 years old. She states that being an English Language Learner in U.S. schools was difficult. “I spoke zero English. I had to be enrolled in the ESL program” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). When reflecting on her own schooling experiences, she states that they were favorable; she loved school. Her parents prioritized education and made many sacrifices in order to assure that their children had a good education. She did not want to let her parents down, and she excelled in school. Lola recalls her schooling in Mexico:

We lived in a small town in Mexico, but my parents always believed in education, so they made it a priority in our lives, even by sending us to another town nearby for middle school and high school, when that was not common in our society.

Limiting themselves with other luxuries or home renovations, instead, they put all
their money into our schools. I loved school. I felt that I excelled, especially in math. It was one of my favorite subjects. It gave me a lot of rewards, bringing good grades to my parents, feeling all that pride. The fact that my parents were giving such a value to this, I couldn't not do my part. It was my way of also, showing them that I care for all their sacrifices. I loved school in general. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

Lola states she chose to teach in two-way immersion because she believes in the program. She was familiar with two-way immersion because of her previous work experience at Creekside. She enrolled her children in the Creekside Dual Immersion program. She comments, “I have a love for dual immersion programs, having previously worked at Creekside as a parent liaison, believing in dual immersion, actually having my children in the program as well” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). Lola feels that her Spanish skills help the program. She says, “I feel that I bring value by teaching in my first language, which is Spanish” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012).

Lola has 31 students. She describes her class this year as predominantly Latino, native-Spanish speaking. Lola describes her class,

They're mainly Hispanic. 99 percent of my class is Latino, Hispanic. Actually, 98. They have at least one parent that speaks Spanish at home. The minority are coming from homes where English is their only language. The minority, but that's only about two or three students. Other than that, all students speak Spanish at home. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)
Despite Spanish being their home language, most of her students code switch to English often. This constant code switching to English perplexes and frustrates her. She talks about the frequent code switching:

   However, I noticed that the tendency between them, when they talk between them, is to always switch to English, or even what we call Spanglish. They start a sentence in one language and then finish it off in the other language. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

Lola does not see the linguistic and ethnic divides at Main Street that she saw at Creekside. Rather than categorize her class as most of the Creekside teachers do, by native English-speaker/native Spanish-speakers, she categorizes her students by academics: one group is performing equally in both languages, another group stronger in one language, usually Spanish, while another group is struggling in both languages. Lola sees a correlation between the support they receive at home and the students’ academic performance. Lola describes these three groups of students:

   I have one group who the reading levels are equal in both languages, and then I have another portion, it's a small portion, but they're higher in one language than the other, and those are, again, Spanish speakers at home that the parents have pushed their Spanish language from the beginning, and this is their primary language. And even though among their peers they switch to English, they do have strong Spanish language skills, and their reading levels are higher in Spanish. Then I have the group that never seemed to really be able to
Their parents lack a formal education. They don't speak good quality Spanish at home. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

This group that is struggling in both languages is of great concern to Lola. She sees how their background and home life have impacted their academics. Some of these students may speak indigenous dialects at home. These students do not have the “schema” and “experiences” that will help them succeed at school. Lola comments,

I have a group that actually, I believe one or two their parents may have spoken dialects in Mexico, so they have certain intonations and certain usage of the [Spanish] language that needs to be corrected, and it hasn't yet. They're also struggling to learn English, so they're rating low in both languages. Then you add to that the fact that they haven't been exposed to much environment. They don't have schema, they don't have experiences to touch from, to use and to make connections to new things that are presented to them. So they struggle a lot. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

Lola notices that the students’ academics are strongly influenced by socioeconomic and parental background. She says, “I don't see an actual language division, but I see more of a socioeconomic division in my class” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012).

She describes the background of the students who are successful:

There's a group that has parents who have attended higher education or have more of a formal education. Parents who are professionals in their field, and that's a small percentage, but I see that, it's evident. It's also evident in the support that the
students get in regards to homework, tutoring, additional support for getting good grades. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

Lola feels that most students are better off participating in a two-way immersion program. The Spanish-speakers are all better off participating in the program. Lola has observed,

Spanish speakers are all better off. They're able make connections to something that they heard at home. They're able to use the language and they're able to transfer it back and forth more easily, academic language. So many words in our vocabulary lists have roots that are similar, that co-mix. They're like, "Whoa, I know that in Spanish, too." They're definitely better off, and I notice that they're able to transfer the knowledge from one language to the other more easily. (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013)

She does have a few misgivings regarding some resource native English-speakers. She asks herself, “Am truly serving them? I don't know?” (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013). Nevertheless, she feels that generally, most students benefit from dual immersion. Lola discusses two students who may not be best served by the dual immersion program. One resists engaging in Spanish, and the other is a special needs student who speaks little Spanish at home. Lola describes these two students:

In general, I feel that they're all better off. There're very particular cases, when . . . I actually have one student, maybe two, right now. The parents speak Spanish, but they don't really practice it at home. The student refuses to read it or speak it. This is a family that came late into the program. He's struggling so
much. . . . I don't know what to do with him. I keep hoping eventually, it's all going to click and he will be able to produce. We don't see results. I don't know. Another case is that resource student. The mom speaks English only. The dad speaks little bit of Spanish. Again, she's struggling. I don't want to give up on them. But I feel that. . . am I truly serving them? I don't know. So out of 32 students, I have questions with two. (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013)

A concern for Lola is that she is a novice teacher and is still learning the craft of teaching. She was eager to participate in the study because she was hoping the time collaborating with more experienced dual immersion teachers would give her support in her classroom:

I like to hear what other teachers are doing, what is working, so I can implement it in my class as well, so that we can grow as programs. Having worked at Creekside, but as a parent liaison, I wasn't really much in the classrooms. I know the dynamics outside of the classrooms, but I wanted to learn more about what everyone else is doing and what is working. (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013)

Lola also feels that she needs more backing from her school district in providing Spanish materials, guidance, and support. Nevertheless, Lola believes in the program and hopes to continue teaching in dual immersion. She refers to teaching in dual immersion as a “calling” and would not want to teach in a mainstream English-only classroom, “Dual immersion is what I want to do. I know that I could do well in English if I was forced to
be in that position. But that's not what I want to do” (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013).

**Anita Kelly**

Anita describes herself as “Mexican-American. I was born in America, but my heritage and culture is from Mexico” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012). She grew up in a bilingual home speaking both Spanish and English. Her Spanish skills were mainly conversational until she entered middle school and began to study Spanish formally. Anita grew up in a small rural town in California; she states that she likely had a “different experience than someone who may have grown in the inner city.” She describes own schooling as “favorable” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012). She grew up in a multicultural integrated ranching community and did not experience racism or segregation. Therefore, she did not think much of ethnicity and race. Anita describes her childhood community:

I was very fortunate to live in a small, rural community, which now I'm teaching in. This rural community, because we were also ranchers, I came from a ranching family, had a different type of appreciation for various cultures. In agriculture, there typically is just a mixture of multi-cultures you can have.

When I was growing up, there were not only the Mexican families. They were not just laborers; they were also ranch owners or farmers. There were the Portuguese families. There were the Swiss families. It's very multicultural. Visually, you would see white, but you wouldn't know if they were of a different ethnicity until
you started speaking to them or you saw their last names. (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)

Because she had not experienced racism Anita had not given her Mexican background much thought. When preparing to attend college, Anita was surprised that her Mexican background was now important to others.

I was probably one of the few that didn't know what prejudice was about. I didn't know what it meant to be struggling because of my background, which always confused me when people would say, "So given your background. . . ."

I didn't know what that meant until high school, and I applied for college. Somebody had said, “All right. Now you be sure, when you write down on your applications, you put your background down.” Well, that was it. I finally had to ask, “What does that mean? What are you talking about?” She goes, “Well, your background.” She was very delicate. At that time we did not have the term “Hispanic,” but we did have “Mexican-American” or “Chicano.” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)

She grew up proud to be “a Mexican-American” and did not identify with the more politicized term “Chicano” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012). In her household “Chicano” had derogatory connotations. Anita explains,

In my culture, and this is the thing, is that even within any specific ethnic background, there could be subcultures. The culture that I grew up with, “Chicano” or “Chicana” was not looked at favorably. It was not a term of endearment. It was not a term that I would ever hear in our own household or
coming from my grandmother's house, but definitely to be proud as a Mexican-American (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012).

She felt that others used her heritage to make assumptions and statements she was not comfortable with. She felt hurt that others felt she needed “protection.” Anita states,

So my growing up was a little different I think than some other Mexican-American individuals I've talked to. So when I went towards college, is that all of a sudden I found out what affirmative action was about. I came to understand what prejudice-ism was about because now for the first time somebody felt that I needed to know about it because they felt they were protecting me. I didn't feel that I needed the protection. (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)

Anita teaches sixth grade dual immersion. This is her first year teaching dual immersion. She has taught for a total of 15 years; 10 years at the college level teaching career development and 5 years at the middle school level teaching English language arts. She was hired at Main Street K-8 School two days before school started. When she applied for the job, she did not realize that the position was for a dual immersion class. After she was hired, Anita realized that she would be expected to align her teaching with the dual immersion program. Anita states:

This is my first year as a dual immersion teacher. I was not specifically told until after I was hired I was teaching dual immersion. I was asked if I had BCLAD, if I had experience with ELD, and if I had done any form of academic support in English language development. That's the criteria that they used to hire me as a
core teacher at secondary level. Once I was in the job, then it was explained to me, “Oh, by the way. We’d like you to consider teaching it as a dual-immersion program.” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)

Anita does not see herself as a Spanish teacher and does not feel comfortable teaching Spanish at advanced levels. She does not feel that this is fair to either her students or herself. Anita recounts her capability to teach advanced Spanish:

I’m not a Spanish teacher per se. I can teach a Spanish 1 class, anything past even a Spanish 2B I’m going to be a little hesitant because that’s when you start getting into literature. That’s when you get into really having to watch that expression, know how to use the academic Spanish in a really expressive manner, both communication-wise, written-wise—the whole shebang. Hmmm, I don’t think I’d do too well. It would take some work on my part. . . . Having just a BCLAD is not enough. It’s not fair to the students and it’s not fair to the teacher. (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)

Anita has 30 students, all except two are native Spanish-speakers, and most entered the program as English Language Learners. Anita is concerned that one third of her students are still not proficient based on the state accountability testing criteria. She states,

So I'm looking at these proficiency levels and I said, “Whoa, you've got 30 students in here and only 20 are proficient. These other 10 are basic and below basic and resource. I don't understand. Is this a transition class from ELD into core and you're using the bilingual as a support? I'm a little confused.” (A. Kelly,
Anita recognizes the “passion” her colleagues have for the dual immersion program, but she is doubtful that continued Spanish instruction is best for these students who are still behind in English. She is unclear of the two-way immersion model, structure, and curriculum. She needs specifics on how to teach in a two-way program. She feels that her students deserve more than just “a desire to continue the good work.” Anita expounds,

It came to my attention that the desire of DI is very, very strong. I commend the DI teachers at the elementary level. They have such passion, such desire, but I think there needs to be a clear distinction between elementary DI and the way it's taught in elementary versus what does it look like at secondary level. Nobody had established this is what it looks like, here's a model, this is what we're going to follow, here's curriculum set. Nothing was set there. There was just this desire to want to continue the good work that was started there. (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)

She sees a third of her class still struggling academically. These students had academic concerns since they first enrolled and continue to lag behind. Anita does not understand how the dual immersion program is going to serve them. She states,

My question was, however, you have 10 students who have always been struggling since the time they were at Vasco, they were always struggling. These 10 have always been either at resource level, five of which are clearly resource and meet resource requirements, and the other five are basic or below basic. I don't understand. (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012)
Anita works very long hours, putting forth effort to be the best teacher she can be for her students. She feels a strong sense of responsibility to assure that all her students are proficient and equipped to perform at high levels of academic rigor. She is concerned about the students who are behind academically. Although she feels that two-way immersion is a good program model for some students with certain criteria, she is doubtful if dual immersion is the right program for struggling English Language Learners at the secondary level.

Elsa Gray

Elsa describes herself as Caucasian. She grew up speaking English and Russian at home, “Russian is my native language, but I lost it quickly in grammar school” (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012). When relating about her schooling experiences, she states that they were favorable except for her participation in Russian school. She comments that her “miserable” experience in Russian primary language schooling influenced her desire to teach in two-way immersion. Elsa states, “That's why my heart's in dual immersion” (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012). Elsa’s childhood experience with an unsuccessful primary language instruction model has motivated Elsa to promote two-way immersion. Elsa recounts her schooling experiences:

My English schooling was great. I had wonderful teachers and that was fine. But my parents put us in a Russian school on weekends and that was not so fine. It was more of four Russian speakers. By the time I was in elementary school, I had left Russian behind. It was a sink or swim situation. I sunk. It was miserable. That's why my heart's in dual immersion. It's like teaching language and content.
Where this was teaching all content in the primary language. I was not up to it. That was miserable. But other than that, my schooling, I've done well. I had teachers that were very supportive. (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Elsa began learning Spanish in high school. Elsa has taught for 19 years, 16 of those years in dual language programs. She has taught in several two-way immersion programs throughout California and taught in a two-way program in New York. She has been involved in the development of several programs, has taught several grade levels and presented at the state level Two-Way California Association of Bilingual Educators conference. Presently, she is teaching kindergarten dual immersion. There are a total of 50 dual immersion kindergarten students. She works with a partner teacher who instructs in the English component. Elsa teaches the students in Spanish. The students alternate between teachers. The kindergarten classes are fairly evenly split between native English-speakers and native Spanish-speakers. Most of the native Spanish-speakers are also English Language Learners. She chose to teach dual immersion because integration and working with two population groups appealed to her.

I was teaching in the bilingual programs, and I saw that the dual immersion, where you could affect two populations, was the way to go. Because the bilingual was so separate and not getting the kids incorporated into the regular school setting. It was a separate program, so I liked the idea of DI for everybody. (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012)
Elsa’s passion for two-way immersion is evident. Her children have all participated in dual language programs. When asked if she plans to continue to teach dual immersion she enthusiastically replies,

I'm a die-hard! Of course I will! If they took it away, I don't know what I would do because this is always what I've chosen. Every job I've had, I've sought a dual immersion program. I have gotten it. I've loved it. I've developed it at the school I've been at. (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

Elsa is feeling discouraged that some of her colleagues do not share the same belief and enthusiasm for two-way immersion education. She feels that students’ low achievement is a result of teachers not performing as they should. Since there is no coordinator for the program, support for the program goals is left to the teachers. The teachers who believe in the program have little power to assure that their colleagues are following the program aims. If a teacher does not agree, she can “shut her door.” Elsa shares her thoughts:

There're a lot of teachers who are tired. They're burned out, and they're making excuses and they're still in the program. That's where you see the kids bottoming out. I don't know what else to say. We don't have a coordinator in our program. It's all teachers, and so if you're tired of listening to the bossy teachers, Susan and Elsa saying, “This is what you need to do” if you're done, then you're just going to shut your door. (E, Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

She also worries that the naysayers’ attitude is contagious and affects the entire program. It discourages the new teachers who believe in the program goals. Lately, she has been
feeling too overwhelmed to keep pushing to maintain the integrity of the Main Street dual immersion program model. Elsa states,

   But that affects all our kids. So this is the issue. We have to get together. We have to look at what we're doing and you have to move on. You have to recreate something. That's what I'm hoping, that we can get over this hump right now. Not scare the new teachers who are so passionate and so excited to have found us. We were so excited to find them. Now it's like, “I'm too overwhelmed to help you” and, I don't want it to feel that way. (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

   Elsa feels that her belief in two-way is based on research results. She feels discouraged and questions herself when she sees students struggling academically for several years. She sees limited options for support for native Spanish-speakers and worries that if they are placed in all-English classes, they will miss out on the content. Recently, she has had to fight battles in support of the program. It has left her tired and questioning. She wonders what is best for the struggling students. Elsa relates,

   There's just some stuff that's out of our control. We can't pick and choose who's in our program. People are saying, “There's some kids who just shouldn't be in the program. They're so low in their native language.” At our school, that's the only resource that a lot of our native Spanish-speakers have. So while it's not ideal, we want the gap to be closed. It's this catch 22. We want them in there because we want to help them. So they don't miss out on all the content going into all English.
But then it really takes away from having equal levels and peers who can interact at the same level.

The struggling students don't benefit as much. They do gain some support. They get some native language support. They get content area support. But they're really not accessing the languages fully. They're not being able to go between both languages. We looked at our data yesterday. Our students up in fifth and sixth grade, who were struggling in kindergarten, first grade, have never made those gains. They've just been dragging through these years. We struggle with that. Should they continue? Should they have stayed in this program, since the beginning, when we saw them struggling? (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

Elsa was interviewed in the midst of a week fraught with battles questioning the effectiveness of the Main Street dual immersion program. Championing for the program has left her worn and questioning. Elsa expresses,

*What surprises me is just it's not getting easier. It's getting tougher to justify it. I'm doubting myself more. Maybe it's just the week you have come, that we happen to be meeting. It's been a very bad week in terms of that. Just thinking, “When will people get it?” Or, “Why am I holding onto this so much?”* Sorry. It's just one of those things [Begins to tear up, cry.]. (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

**Susan Parker**

Susan states that she is “White, Anglo.” Susan describes her own schooling
experiences positively:

For the most part, I had great teachers that cared about me, that wanted me to learn, that were concerned when I still couldn't read at the end of first grade and things like that. And then, once I did, after that I was . . . I liked school. I wanted to learn. I did well. That's a self-fulfilling cycle, right? If you like it and you do well you want to keep doing it. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

She began to study Spanish her senior year of college. She was studying French and then realized that knowing Spanish might be useful. She speaks in a fast, confident tone.

Susan is aware of how her linguistic and cultural background affects her views and actions. Susan describes herself and the cultural context of her background. She relates,

I am a *gringa*. I am a White American raised in a White family that didn't know other languages. So I don't always have the knowledge, the experience, the insight to inform kids about the Spanish language that I'm teaching and the cultural context it comes from.

So I feel limited myself, in terms of some of that. I have been a student of it. I ask people like Lola and my other partners all sorts of questions. But the way I behave and the way I approach things is very much my middle class, WASP-y person that I am. And I think knowing that is already a good thing. Because that helps me recognize, “OK, this might be a different way to behave. Or there might be other ways.” (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)
Susan lived for several years in France. She has much personal experience with cultural misunderstandings. She is very cognizant that language fluency is insufficient in communication. Understanding cultural norms is also necessary. Despite her best efforts, she may still fail to behave in culturally appropriate ways. Susan describes her experiences with the French and the difficulty she sometimes has conforming to another country’s cultural norms. She relates that experience to her involvement working with Latino students and parents.

My husband is French, from France. I lived there two years before I ever met him, and then we lived there for four years. My daughters were born there. I gave birth there. I got married there. I did an awful lot of things in France. I still go through those interactions very aware that my way of responding was the American way. I could camouflage and assimilate, acculturate to the French way. But it wasn't my instinct.

It wasn't the way I would behave naturally. So I just look at that for how I can't inform them about Latino culture, in a way that a person born into it, growing up in it could. So the French are still mystifying me at times. Or I'm still rubbing them the wrong way, because I react in my way. So I just look at that and going, “Wow, with all the years of experience and my level of fluency and everything I still can't just do it their way,” kind of thing. And so, I look at that and think, “OK. This is just one of those that we're always, always learning.” (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)
Susan has taught for 13 years, nine in dual immersion. She has presented with Elsa at the state level Two-Way California Association of Bilingual Educators conference. She enrolled her two daughters in the Main Street Dual Immersion program. Last year she taught fourth grade, but this year she is teaching first grade. She works with a partner teacher who teaches in English; Susan teaches in Spanish. The first grade dual immersion has a total of 52 students in two classes. The classes are fairly evenly divided between native English-speaking and native Spanish-speaking students. Most of the native Spanish-speaking students were originally identified as English Language Learners; some have been now been reclassified as former limited English proficient (FLEP). Susan states the reason that she chose to teach in two-way immersion: “I was always part of bilingual ed, since starting, and then I loved the idea of the two-way and really felt like, ‘Hey, this can benefit both groups’” (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012). When she started teaching two-way immersion what surprised her most was that it really worked. Susan stated,

So what surprised me? Really dorky insight, but it was one of those I needed to see it to believe it. I knew intellectually it should and could. I had no doubts that Latino students, Spanish-speaking students, could learn English. But I hadn't yet really seen English-only speakers learn Spanish. I had to see that to go “oh, of course it can happen both ways.” The whole two-way part of it was one of the bigger surprises to me, because I intellectually knew it, but I hadn't seen it. (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013)
Susan feels that most students benefit from participating in dual immersion. Perhaps some of the native English-speakers may not acquire the Spanish to great levels of proficiency but they had exposure to the language, attained cognitive benefits, and gained cross-cultural understanding. Susan said,

In general, most students are better off. Even if they maybe didn't acquire that target language to a great level of proficiency, they were exposed to it; their brain was exposed to it. They spent time not being a part of the dominant language culture, and they got a chance to just see what diversity is. Even if maybe their linguistic achievements weren't outstanding. And there’s the whole social and cultural and socioeconomic dynamics. Cognitively it does good things for them. There've been a few kids who didn't benefit, and they are struggling learners. (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013)

Susan sees that the native Spanish-speakers gain the greatest benefits from the program. Dual immersion maintains their Spanish and helps keep them connected to their families. Susan explains,

I think it is an advantage for most of the Spanish speakers, a little bit more than some of the English speakers, in that it helps them keep up their Spanish, and that helps them stay connected to their families. Because I know way too many kids who, past age 12, they never answer their parents again in Spanish. And then, think about the parenting challenges in teenage years, staying connected, in that way, I think it's an advantage. (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013)
In addition to helping Spanish-speaking students maintain connections with their families, dual immersion provides primary language instruction. The primary language foundation will help the Spanish-speakers advance in English. She sees the Spanish speakers making the greatest language gains; more Spanish-speakers excel in English than English-speakers excel in Spanish. Susan said,

Then I think it still gives them that primary language instruction; whereas, I've seen some English-only kids go through the program. They were strong enough in English to be proficient, but they never really got their Spanish up to parity with their English. Whereas I see a lot more of the Latino students, Spanish speakers, get their English up to parity. They may still have a little bit of an accent. They may still make grammatical errors, but we know that they get very close and they're able to function at both levels. So that's what I see. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Susan feels passionate about teaching in the dual immersion program and plans to continue: “I don't want to teach if I can't teach DI” (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013).

Elizabeth Brooke-Garza

I conclude with myself, the principal investigator. I was a co-participant of the study and shared my views and insights with the study participants. My background and views may have influenced what was said or not said. As the principal investigator, it is important that my position, background, and experiences be clearly revealed. I am a Latina, Mexican American. My father was an American who grew up in Mexico, and my
mother was Mexican. Spanish was my first language. My family moved to the U.S. the summer before I entered first grade, and I entered the U.S. school system as a non-English speaker. I remember being scared and confused. Throughout my early years of elementary I struggled academically. I knew I was in the “low group” and never felt very smart. Many people never realized that I was a Mexican, English Language Learner; my Anglo surname—Brooke, fair skin and freckles threw them off. I did not “look Mexican.”

I grew up in a home where education was a priority; our Mexican heritage was a source of pride. My mother demanded that we maintain our Spanish. Culturally and linguistically, I identify with my Mexican background. I am also cognizant that I have had privileges available to me because I looked White, American and could navigate between the two languages and cultures with ease. People would listen to me speak Spanish, be surprised, and praise me for my Spanish fluency. I wonder if I had a different surname and a darker complexion, would I be applauded for my English?

I originally fell into teaching in bilingual education because I had the Spanish skills and I needed the job. Once I entered the bilingual classroom, I saw the urgency to support and advocate for my students. I have dedicated my career to working with language minority students. I have taught in various programs: transitional bilingual, developmental bilingual, ESL pull out, ELD push in, a self-contained mainstream English-only classroom designated to receive the English learner students who enroll, and dual immersion. After personally experiencing and teaching in the various programs, I have seen my Latino English learner students in the two-way immersion program make the greatest gains. I have believed enough in the program to enroll my own son in two-
way immersion. The program model and implementation is far from perfect. There are many issues to be addressed. I struggle as a middle school dual immersion teacher to implement the two-way immersion aims. I hope to gain insight into how to strengthen a program model that is demonstrating gains in the educational outcomes of Latino English language learners.

Summary

**Purpose of relating participants’ story.** The purpose of this section was to tell each participant’s story. Relating each teacher’s narrative allows the reader to discern factors influencing the research questions of this study. A teacher’s background, experiences, and attitudes influence his or her understanding of cross-cultural competency, perspectives that affect what a teacher sees or ignores when describing social dynamics and practice, and what practices he or she feels are important to employ.

**Themes.** Through relating these stories some common themes emerged. All of the participants, including the principal investigator, have had the experience of living in a country where they spoke the non-dominant language. All the participants asserted the importance of promoting equitable educational outcomes for Latino English Language Learners, and all expressed that it was important to be watchful that the native Spanish-speaking students were benefiting from the program. Seven of the eight participants expressed a strong belief in the program and explicitly stated that they would like to continue to teach in dual immersion. Interestingly, all except one participant has demonstrated the greatest buy-in and faith in the dual immersion program--enrolling his or her own child in the program.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher practices that promote cross-cultural competency in the two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) classroom. The data included over 30 hours of individual interviews and focus group conversations. This discourse was recorded and transcribed. Later, the transcriptions were analyzed using the HyperResearch qualitative analysis software. The process of analysis involved multiple readings of the transcriptions, applying codes to the participants’ responses, and examining these codes for themes. The extensiveness of the data warranted dividing the findings into two chapters: participant profiles and content analysis. In the previous chapter I related each participant’s background, experiences, and attitudes and the common themes in the participants’ profiles. In this chapter I present a summary and an analysis of the data.

I have divided this chapter into three sections, following the order of my operational questions. The first section presents the participants’ descriptions of the social dynamics between the cultural capital of the native Spanish-speakers and the native English-speakers. The next section reveals the participants understanding of cross-cultural competency. The final section reports on the organizational routines that the participants used to promote cultural capital in their classrooms.
**Student Social Dynamics**

The participants’ descriptions of the social dynamics between the native Spanish-speakers and the native English-speakers revealed four predominant themes. The participants noted that the native English-speaking students experienced more of the social supports considered valuable and legitimate in the educational system than the native Spanish-speaking students. As it is well known, our society and educational system favors students who come to school equipped with the linguistic, cultural, and family background that are aligned with American norms. Additionally, the native English-speaking students were predominately middle class; whereas, the native Spanish-speaking students were mainly from the working class. The participants reported that this socio-economic difference had a stronger influence on the social dynamics and cultural capital between the native English-speakers and the native Spanish-speakers than did linguistic and ethnic factors. The participants also revealed that the linguistic balance and student integration that TWBI aims to achieve does not always occur--English dominates as the language of status; native English-speaking students dominate classroom participation; students often continue to be socially segregated. Lastly, the teachers at Creekside noted more disparity in the cultural capital between the student groups than did the Main Street teachers.

The native English-speaking students experience the social supports that the educational system values. The participants often commented that overarching social forces affected students’ attitudes in the classroom. They spoke of a society that placed a higher value on English and rewarded American cultural norms. All of the teachers
stressed the crucial role that students’ home life plays in their success at school and their integration with peers. The family structures from native English-speakers background were often seen as more favorable in a school setting. The teachers stated that the native English-speaking parents knew how to advocate for their children and, as a result, the school and teachers more often catered to the native English-speaking students’ needs.

All of the teachers spoke of a society that placed a greater esteem on English and American norms. Both the Creekside and Main Street dual immersion programs were strands within a school. The surrounding culture in the community and the school favored English and American culture. Assemblies, support classes, visitors, announcements, testing, many of the “important” aspects of school life, are in English. Students receive messages of which language and culture is valued. Susan stated that it is difficult to fight against the society and culture that surrounds us:

So one of the dynamics is that just English is the language of interaction in the school, on the playground. It's really hard to fight that tide, and in some ways it's what the culture is around us, the society. So we get that, so I see that. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Elsa pointed out that native English-speaking students are more at ease and confident with the social norms and participation patterns at school. She used the word “invited” when describing how these culturally adept students may feel. Elsa stated,

It's the English speakers who have so much to say because they've been invited.

They just had a different conversation growing up as kids. I'm not saying our
Spanish-speaking families are not loving and not nurturing. (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

All of the teacher participants commented on the importance of a student’s home life and parental support. The teacher participants agreed that parental support is key to educational success. Parents help their children by providing the funds of knowledge that schools value. Parental guidance is central to instilling a desire to do well in school, establishing education as a priority, and setting up structures so that their children can do homework, and go to school well rested, fed, and prepared.

Homework is a cultural norm of our school system that did not always align well with the participants’ native Spanish-speaking students. Five of the participants shared that they considered homework important. They also spoke of their frustrations with some of the Spanish-speaking parents who did not reinforce homework completion. Veronica was bothered that at the fifth grade level she still needed to conference with some of her Spanish-speaking parents and explain the importance of homework completion. Veronica states,

The parents are not putting out. Their kids. . . I can't empower them all. I try, I can, but every morning when I say, “Where's your homework,” and it's not coming back to me. . . . How do I help you if you don't want to help yourself? (V. Bell, personal communication, December 19, 2012)

Four other teachers shared similar impatience with their Spanish-speaking parents who seemed unable or unwilling to follow through and support their child’s homework completion. Three of the Latina teachers spoke of how as parents, they, themselves,
struggled with busy schedules yet carved out the time to make sure their own children did their homework. Lola pointed out that when her child struggled academically, she helped her with her homework. Lola states, “On a daily basis all throughout the year [completing] homework activities. Even if I was balancing my checkbook or anything else, that kid sat by my side to complete her homework on a daily basis” (L. Peña, personal communication, December 19, 2012). However, Lola recognized that her social class provided the attitudes and cultural capital that facilitated her ability to support her children with their homework. Lola continues the conversation and states, “My children are privileged. They are from middle class. They have an educator at home, who cares about school, as a parent. . . . They’re privileged because they have all that extra support” (L. Peña, personal communication, December 19, 2012). Lola acknowledged that she understood the value that the schools placed on homework because of her social class. Her children benefit from privileges available to them because of their middle class background.

Parents also help their child navigate the school system and advocate for their child. Because the native English-speaking parents are more confident, knowledgeable, and savvy, the school and teachers are more likely to meet their child’s needs. Ana Lucia shared how the native English-speaking parents, who are “typically better off socioeconomically” help provide the funds of knowledge valued by the school system:

Their parents tend to be college-educated, [and] . . . they come from a background where education is important. They read to their kids, they talk to their kids, they
teach them rich vocabulary. They take them to museums, on vacations. (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)

Luis also commented on how the native English-speaking parents were savvier and better able to understand the school system and “ask the right questions”:

When it comes to academic performance, there's so much parent involvement from the English-only students that their parents are aware of what's going on in the class. They ask the right questions. I come upon Spanish-speaking families where they ask the wrong questions. They'll ask, “How is my student behaving? How's my son or daughter behaving?” Instead of asking, “How is my son or daughter doing academically, and how can I help them?” That's a big difference between the two groups. (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

Elsa shared how she has seen the school and teachers “tip toe around” and cater to the “eggshell parents” demands (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2103). She states that sometimes a teacher may not discipline a native English-speaker because the English-speaking families carry more power. In order to attain the 50:50 language ratios, the teachers in the program make great efforts to attract and keep more English-speaking families. They may accommodate the English-speaking students more so as not to have them leave the program. Elsa related,

Whereas the other ones [the native English-speaking students] you're like, "OK, let's tip-toe around this." Maybe their behavior is horrible, but some teachers might turn an eye. Whereas the other ones [the native Spanish-speaking students] you are right on top of them. I'm just talking in generalities, what I've seen in our
program.

It's like the eggshell parents, and then the ones who are bare bones. This is how it is, and I hate to say that. That's what I see trending, and we try to avoid that. Because you don't want them to feel like, “Well, they get away with this” because you want to keep them in the program, because they're the parents who are like, "Well, we're leaving.” You want to hold on to them, and it's horrible, because that might change how teachers are treating some of the kids. You always try and keep them. Then you also get frustrated. (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013)

The teacher participants noted that parental support and home life influenced the cultural capital that the students brought with them to school. The native English-speaking families, who were usually of a higher socioeconomic level, were more likely to possess the knowledge and advocacy skills required to gain advantages for their child.

The students’ socioeconomic class had a stronger influence on the classroom social dynamics and cultural capital distribution than their linguistic and ethnic background. The TWBI goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism focus on the integration of students from two language and cultural upbringings. Because the focus is on integrating students from the two language groups, educators view differences through the lens of categorizing students into groups by native language. The assumption is that cultural differences between students would be most evident from the students’ linguistic and ethnic background. A predominant theme that emerged from the teacher discussions is that socioeconomic background was the strongest factor to consider when categorizing
students based on social dynamics and cultural capital. The greatest differences between students’ backgrounds were not their heritage or primary language but their parents’ economic and educational background.

Most of the participants, seven of the eight, expressed that the chief influence on socially valued linguistic and cultural competencies was the socioeconomic background of the students. The teachers emphasized that socioeconomics affected how students negotiated cultural capital in the classroom. Lola explained that the predominate division she saw in her classroom is not linguistic but rather socioeconomic:

I don't see an actual language division, but I see more of a socioeconomic division in my class. There's a group that has parents who have attended higher education or have more of a formal education. Parents who are professionals in their field, and that's a small percentage, but I see that, it's evident. It's also evident in the support that the students get in regards to homework, tutoring, additional support for getting good grades. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

Anita did not state that socioeconomic differences were the primary influence on the social dynamics in her classroom, yet she noted that her classroom demographics were very homogeneous linguistically, socioeconomically, and ethnically.

Staff, students, and families make assumptions regarding the socioeconomic status of the entire group. At Creekside and Main Street, most of the native English-speakers are middle class and the majority of the native Spanish-speakers come from lower income backgrounds. At these schools, the Latino ethnic/linguistic group is frequently associated with a lower socioeconomic class. Although language and heritage
do not necessarily determine one’s social class, students receive many messages from society, their homes, and their peers that connect Spanish and Latino with poor. Ana Lucia related a recent experience that exemplifies these generalizations that associate linguistic/ethnic background with socioeconomic class:

I was having a talk with my students. . . . We got to the point where I told them that before the Spanish came, the real Mexicans knew how all the planets moved and they had a perfect calendar system. Then they asked, “Then why are the Mexicans so poor?” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Isabel also told of how her students noticed that the native Spanish-speakers have fewer financial resources. Isabel hears and sees students commenting on which students’ families can afford to have internet access and which families cannot afford internet access and must receive a print copy of the announcements. Isabel related,

I think that there definitely exists knowledge that there is in the Spanish-speaking group. I even hear the kids mention it. Sometimes when I'm passing out . . . Wednesday folders, a lot of the kids get the electronic copy. My Spanish speakers don’t have access to the internet, so they get the hard copy. I'm passing them out and they say, “Oh, did you notice those are all for the Mexican kids?” I even hear it. I hear it from the kids. (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012)

Because most of the native English-speaking students in the Creekside and Main Street dual immersion programs come from a middle class socioeconomic background, they enter school with more advantages than their poorer classmates. This gives them more clout with their peers and makes them look “smarter.” The native English-speakers
have the background information, experiences, and access to resources that will help them succeed in the American school system. Isabel commented on how the socioeconomic status of the native English-speakers provides advantages:

   I think it's all tied into socioeconomics. . . . I see that the dominant English group, for the most part—there are exceptions—but for the most part are just at a higher socioeconomic range. They have access. They go on vacations. They travel more. They have more background information. They're just more experienced, in general, overall. Sometimes they have more help at home. They have access to tutors; they have lots of support systems in place.

   I find that my native Spanish-speakers are really lacking in that area. Often their parents don't have the ability to provide the tutoring, to provide all the extras that the other group provides. That's what I find. (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012)

The teacher participants often commented on how the more affluent students, usually the native English-speakers, arrived to school better prepared to succeed academically. Although the socioeconomic status was often aligned with a student’s language background, the teachers were cognizant that heritage and language background were not the predominant factors that advantaged the native English-speakers—their families simply had the money or educational background necessary to provide the foundational knowledge that schools require. The native English-speakers had resources to acquire additional support to stay ahead. All of the participants recognized that the school system was not “an even playing field” (L. Peña, personal communication,
January 30, 2013). The two language groups were expected to perform equally, but they had very unequal resources and support systems upon which to draw from. Luis commented on the resources available to the native English-speakers to get ahead in school:

They have the resources to either get tutoring or their parents are able to read with them in English; whereas, the native Spanish speakers don't necessarily have that support at home. That's what I've noticed. (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

Ana Lucia also shared that financial recourses are the reason the native Spanish-speakers do not achieve at the same academic levels as the native English-speakers:

Our Spanish speakers, lots of times their parents have lack of education and they're just trying to struggle to survive. They don't have money to put them in Kumon and all the extra classes and to have a tutor. And so, it's financial and educational. I mean, your background determines for the most part how you will do in school. (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)

Strong academic skills can boost a student’s cultural capital. Their teachers look favorably upon students who excel academically. Other students view them as smart and knowledgeable. These students gain confidence in their abilities. Veronica related how students who feel confident in their academic skills are more likely to participate in class and risk voicing their thoughts. When asked why some native Spanish-speaking students do not participate, Veronica answered,
I honestly think that because their academics are not as high, and they don't feel like they may be contributing. . . I think it's a combination of things. I definitely think that the fact that they don't feel like they are at the same level as my English speakers, they are not as confident, they're not as aggressive, there's definitely a series of things. If they feel comfortable with a subject, they'll definitely participate. (V. Bell, personal communication, December 3, 2012)

Although TWBI often categorizes student groups by language and heritage background, the teachers in this study expressed that a student’s cultural capital was more strongly influenced by socioeconomic differences

**TWBI classrooms do not always achieve linguistic balance and student integration.** Another theme that emerged from the teacher description of social dynamics between the native Spanish-speakers and native English-speakers was that linguistic integration does not always occur; English dominates as the language of status, and students often continue to be socially segregated.

Seven of the eight teachers noted that despite the teachers’ efforts to establish equal status of both languages and to avoid code switching during Spanish instruction, maintaining student-to-student conversations in Spanish was a constant battle. The pull to English was strong. The teachers stated that even native Spanish-speaking students with strong Spanish skills would revert to English often. This code switching to English was a source of frustration for the teachers and they were eager to find solutions. The focus group conversations would frequently entail the sharing of strategies to maintain Spanish
during peer conversation. Susan shared her exasperation with the constant switch to English in her classroom:

I see that and it just makes me crazy, and I'm sure we all see it. Even in here, the minute I stop teaching, and they start working, unless I've set up a specific pair share sentence stem, they use English. It drives me nuts, man! So I'm telling them, “So-and-so, you can say anything you want to your neighbors. You can talk all you want if you say it in Spanish.” Uh! And then they can't. (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013)

Elsa also shares the difficulties she has with the students switching to English:

English comes out. It's not even so much their choice, but our native Spanish-speakers, it's a status thing, and our second grade teachers have commented that they start choosing their language. They see which one is more powerful. (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Most of the teachers, seven of the eight participants, stated that generally, the native English-speakers dominate classroom participation and teacher attention. Ana Lucia expressed that she sees her native English-speakers controlling classroom discussions while her native Spanish-speakers are quiet and shy:

Well, definitely my English speakers are aggressive, dominating, outspoken, control classroom discussions. My Spanish speakers are passive, pretty much as a whole, passive, aren't outspoken. I don't think that they see themselves as quote unquote American, so I think that kind of affects that they don't see themselves as equals in some ways. I also think that there's an awareness of who has what, and
that does affect how they act in the classroom.

If they think, “Oh, this person has so much money, and they live in this big huge house, and I live in this little apartment, then I may not be as special, or as important.” I think especially my English speakers, they get built up by their parents, and are taught to be outspoken, and to question. My Spanish speakers, I don't see them doing that. I don't think that's part of the cultural norms at home, to be outspoken, and to dominate. (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Luis also commented on his observation of native English-speaking students feeling entitled and dominating classroom participation:

One of the biggest differences between the EOs [English only] and the native Spanish speakers is that they are much more vocal. The EOs are very vocal. They're eager to raise their hand and participate. In comparison to their counterparts, they almost have this sense of “I can do no wrong.” (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

Susan finds it perplexing that even during Spanish instructional time when the native-Spanish speakers have the linguistic advantage the native English-speakers are more verbal. Susan shared,

It's funny because you would think maybe, “OK, it's Spanish, so all the Spanish speakers are going to participate.” But they're not always the strongest participants. A lot of the native English-speakers are also high socioeconomics that talk a lot. Some of them are terrible blurters. I've got to try to get them to tone
it down. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Six teachers commented that Latino students do sometimes take on dominant roles and participate actively in class activities and discussions. The native Spanish-speaking students who are confident and participating are those whose parents have developed the social capital that is aligned with the American culture. Elsa noted that the native Spanish-speaking students who are vocal and actively participate are the Spanish-speaking students whose parents have passed on more cultural capital:

I've found that the Latinos in our class that do participate are the ones who are kind of . . . they're newer generation, but their families have clued in on the Anglo system. They're very verbal. The families are taking them everywhere. They're participating. Kind of what we are used to in this culture here, and so those are the kids who are also dominating. So it's not just our Anglo kids. It's the very verbal, communicative Latino family. (E. Gray, personal communication, December 3, 2012)

Veronica noted that native Spanish-speakers who were confident and participating have parents who instilled the dominant cultural norms and helped the students feel comfortable with the school structures. The participation was not due to linguistic or ethnic background, but rather feeling confident and possessing cultural capital. Veronica stated,

I found that participation is a problem for my Latino kids. If you're comfortable with a subject, you are going to participate. So I don't see it as much as they're dominating. In my class, for instance, I have a boy who is always participating,
always, but he is very confident. But I do have Latino kids that are participating that come from families that are supportive, that they are on them, that they're reading. They're participating. They're more academic. . . . I think it's not so much Anglo/Latino. (V. Bell, personal communication, December 19, 2012)

The teachers expressed that as students advanced onto the upper elementary grades, the social groupings become more ethnically segregated. Latino students socialize with other Latinos; Anglos socialize with other Anglos. Isabel stated what she witnesses, “I see in the playground. They're playing together in groups. At the lunches, they all sit together in the same group. There definitely is a divide for sure” (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012). Although the fifth grade students often segregate themselves, this is not always the case. Veronica notes some exceptions; her academically stronger Spanish-speaking Latinos who identify more with their native-English-speaking peers:

I would say that definitely my kids tend to stay within the group. My Latinos are with my little Latinos. They tend to migrate and stay in their comfort zone because they are speaking Spanish with each other. Definitely within the recess, always see them pair up. This is key for me, I think. I do have two kids who are doing great academically. Those are the kids that are associating themselves with the English-speakers.

I think it's a matter of confidence. All of them speak English well. I think it's a comfort level. I think the two kids that are actually out there playing with my native English-speakers are very confident, are very academically high. Versus
the kids that are struggling in class are also basically just hanging out with the other kids who are struggling, outside. (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Teachers expressed that their students preferred English. They also shared concerns regarding equitable participation patterns and integrated social interactions.

**The teachers at Creekside noted more disparity in the cultural capital between the student groups than did the Main Street teachers.** Although all teachers described concerns with the disparity between the cultural capital of the native English-speakers and the native Spanish-speakers, the Creekside teachers more often vocalized these concerns. In our focus group sharing, the Main Street teachers appeared to have more successes than challenges.

The demographic make up of the school site impacted the participants’ description of cultural capital disparity. The two school sites studied had very different demographics in the dual immersion classrooms. Although the kindergarten and first grade classrooms at Main Street had attained the desired population mix of 50 percent of students from each language group, the fifth and sixth grade classrooms were very homogeneous. The majority of the students in the Main Street fifth and sixth grade classrooms were Latinos who had entered the program as English Language Learners and were from a lower socioeconomic class. The Creekside classroom demographics differed from the Main Street classroom demographics. The Creekside dual immersion fourth and fifth grade classrooms consisted of mostly White, native English-speaking, middle class students with less than 25 percent native Spanish-speakers. The participants noted that
the linguistic, ethnic, and socioeconomic make up of their classrooms influenced which students assumed central roles in social interactions and classroom participation. The Creekside classroom consisted overwhelmingly of White, native English-speaking students. As a result, the Creekside teachers witnessed more disparity in cultural capital between the two student groups. The majority of the native Spanish-speaking students experienced less clout in the classroom. They often lacked the cultural and linguistic norms and the social supports that the school system rewards. Therefore, they experienced more academic challenges and took on less central roles in the classroom. The majority of the native Spanish-speaking students were from a lower socioeconomic class than the predominately middle class native English-speaking students. The participants reported that the middle class native Spanish-speakers did not experience these social and academic disparities. These native Spanish-speakers behaved more like their native English-speaking counterparts. The power dynamics in the classroom were more aligned with social class than with ethnic and linguistic background. Diluting the ratio of native Spanish-speaking students in the classroom exacerbated cultural capital discrepancy. The teachers with classrooms comprised of greater ratios of native Spanish-speakers reported fewer challenges in elevating the cultural and linguistic status of their students. Native Spanish-speaking students already confront linguistic, cultural, social, and socioeconomic challenges. Reducing their ratios in the two-way immersion classroom increased these challenges.

Participant Understanding of Cross-Cultural Competency
Teachers understanding of and commitment to cross-cultural competency influences their response to the social dynamics in the classroom. The teacher participants in this study defined their understanding of cross-cultural competency and made references to aspects of cultural competency when framing specific attitudes, behaviors, and advocacy. The participants articulated a definition of cross-cultural competency. They described their attitudes, behaviors, and advocacy.

All of the participants defined cross-cultural competency as an ability that goes beyond participating in celebrations. Elsa articulated the views of the other participants when she defined cross-cultural competency as running deeper than shallow multicultural celebrations. She emphasized the word understandings. Elsa stated that cross-cultural competence “is an understanding of culture that goes beyond the fluff and the decorations. It's an understanding of who people are and what they come from. You don't have to do just holidays. You can do understandings.” (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Ana Lucia stressed that defining cross-cultural competency by simple cultural celebrations is at “the very lowest level of cultural experience” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9 2012). She states:

You have to go beyond multicultural fairs, the parties and things like that, but our school, that's the only place where our school is. . . .I mean, you can't really bring a culture to a school besides like, “Oh, we're going to have ballet folklórico or go see mariachis.” It is the fiestas. It's the very lowest level of cultural experience for them. (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)
All of the participants understood cross-cultural competency as moving beyond “light, fluffy” cultural celebrations (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012). Although these teachers grasped that cultural competency was more than “tamales and enchiladas,” they also noted that celebrating and recognizing traditions, holidays, and events was an important initial step toward developing awareness, appreciation, and mutual understanding (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013). The key was to move beyond token celebrations and to be able to work together effectively.

Elsa, Susan, and Lola’s example of the Main Street Dual Immersion Nights elaborated on their definition of cultural competency. They described a celebration that aimed to develop deeper appreciation of cultures. E. Gray (personal communication, November 11, 2012) stated these events moved students and their families beyond the “trite and trendy” and to a deeper purpose. The goal was to “draw them in... something that grabs people’s attention... they think it is interesting... People hold onto that” (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012). The teachers developed themes that showed commonalities and connections. Susan stated that this shared learning resulted in increased mutual understanding and interactions; families “are starting to bridge more” (S. Parker, personal communication, December 3, 2012).

Isabel underscores that a goal of cross-cultural competency is to interact in a respectful manner and learn from each other. “Hopefully that encourages respect and a lot of other skills. It's when both groups learn from each other. That's what the goal is. That's the ultimate goal, for them to intermingle and learn, basically, not be so isolated” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013). The participants expressed their desire
to promote mutual understanding among their students. Three participants specifically stated that they preferred to teach in a two-way program as opposed to a developmental bilingual program because of the opportunities to create appreciation, bridges, and camaraderie among different ethnic/linguistic groups. They viewed the two-way model as a way to break down social, cultural, and linguistic barriers. Lola expressed that she opts to teach in a two-way immersion classroom because of the goals to advance linguistic and cultural understandings between both student populations. Lola stated, “I would prefer dual immersion. Definitely. I'd like to see the progress from both groups. I want for them to be able to experience that, cross-culturally and with language. That's such a special setting” (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013).

All of the participants emphasized that “respect” was central. Anita noted, “It's a lot of mutual respect. . . . It doesn't even matter the culture. You just treat your neighbor with mutual respect. That's what you do” (A. Kelly, personal communication, February 4, 2013). Seven of the participants specified that cross-cultural competency encompasses openness to learning of other cultures. Luis comments, “Open to other cultures. . . respectful and open to hearing others kinds of opinions” (L. Vera, personal communication, February 1, 2013). When defining cross-cultural competency, six participants stressed an equitable valuing of other people’s culture. Lola says, “To come together: to give value to the culture, language and traditions. To be supportive: no putdowns, no lookdowns. An even playing field.” (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013).

Susan elaborated on her definition by describing a cross-culturally competent
classroom with equitable interactions:

In the classroom, the students are using the language of the day, of the classroom, or whatever. Whatever the language is. They are using it comfortably. They're interacting with each other in a friendly, comfortable manner, and they're doing shared, collaborative work, and nobody's top dog. The dynamics are equitable. (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013)

To summarize, all of the teacher participants articulated a definition of cross-cultural competency as an awareness, appreciation, and understanding of others’ backgrounds that went beyond multicultural celebrations. They highlighted that cross-cultural competency encompasses fostering mutual respect and enabling shared learning. Six of the participants elaborated on their definition of cross-cultural competency to include giving value to others’ cultural backgrounds and equitable interactions.

The participants’ understanding of cross-cultural competency includes their attitudes. Within this sphere of attitudes two prominent themes emerged from the data—the participants consider cross-cultural competency important and valued and the participants felt a responsibility to promote cross-cultural competency.

The value and importance of cross-cultural competency in the two-way bilingual classroom resonated with all eight participants. Although the participants often bemoaned the realities of having to focus on standardized testing and pushing forward with curriculum, none of the participants dismissed the cross-cultural or bicultural component of two-way immersion. All the participants desired their students to gain more than just linguistic and literary competency in both languages. The teachers wanted students to
gain an understanding, appreciation, and respect of the various backgrounds that the
students brought with them to the classroom. All shared the attitude that a cross-culturally
competent classroom was necessary in order to have a smooth-flowing, truly integrated
environment where both languages were equally utilized.

Ana Lucia discussed how significant teaching cross-cultural competency was for her. “There's a lot of just little anecdotes that I bring because for me that is like the most
exciting thing that I do in my classroom, is teaching cultural competency” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). She continued that cultural competency
was important to her. “When I was getting my master's and I learned about cultural
competency, I think it was super valuable. . . . [I]t was really enjoyable. . . . It's a very
interesting topic, and I think I'm a better teacher because of it” (A. Reyes, personal
communication, November 9, 2012). Ana Lucia felt that the community of Ridgeline
lacks cultural competency and that dual immersion is a means to bring cultural awareness
into the community. She referred to the results of a survey (“encuesta”) that she did for
her master’s program. She was upset that the Creekside staff devalued the Spanish
language and Latino background. She stated that the staff needed to see the value in
cultural competency. Ana Lucia shared,

I think Ridgeline, in terms of cultural competency, there is total major
institutionalized racism. It's looked at as, “We need to get these brown kids
integrated in every single way that we possibly can. We need to get them
assimilated” . . . But I think the fact is that they don't know the research. There's
no cultural competency. There is no seeing that number one. There's value there.
Then that it's something that, if you'd look at the research, it's supportable by the research. This program exists because of that. That, in terms of talking about cultural competency, or cultural proficiency, or cultural incompetency, in terms of administration and teachers. I did this whole encuesta stuff, survey, teachers' survey. They wrote, overwhelmingly, at this site, where there is a dual immersion school, that it is a hindrance just to come with a second language. Just to come.

(A. Reyes, personal communication, December 10, 2012)

Isabel shared how she desired her students to go beyond linguistic and academic learning. She felt badly when she did not see the cultural component of two-way immersion taking hold with the students. She saw students clinging to an image of Spanish as a language of lower status. Isabel thought that cross-cultural competency was important and that she and others needed to work to counter that mindset. Isabel shared,

The students think that they're learning this language so that they can talk to the workers, the housekeepers, the gardeners. I have heard that, and that hurts me to the core. That's the image. That's what they think. That shows me that there's a lot of work to be done here, that they're not valuing Spanish. They're not giving it the status that it deserves. They're not really seeing beyond that, unfortunately. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

All the teachers shared the attitude that the teacher is responsible for playing an active role in establishing the climate and understanding in his or her classroom. They demonstrated a desire to create a culturally competent classroom. None felt that cultural understanding should be left to chance.
Isabel spoke of teachers’ need to take on the responsibility and be purposeful in finding ways to incorporate culturally relevant curriculum:

You have to be completely cognizant and aware that this is the focus, and you're trying to do that. It's not in our curriculum. Unless you are purposefully looking for those examples and pulling them in. If you don't feel it in your heart, if you don't feel like it is important in your heart, and you don't feel that way yourself. You are not going to transmit that to your students. You're not going to be that model. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

Isabel also commented, “There is work to be done” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013). She saw that reaching higher levels of cultural competency requires effort:

I just feel like all they think about is the tamales and the enchiladas. . . .It's just a very limited view of the language and how to use it. I do. Unfortunately that exists. There's work to be done. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

Susan stated that teachers cannot blame the students or the students’ families for what they bring to the classroom. Teachers are accountable for what the students do during the time that they are with the teacher. It is the teacher’s job to create a climate where students succeed and their backgrounds are valued.

Right now that's what we need to do as teachers. We need to focus on our practice, what we're doing for the kids, and elevate the Spanish language. We have to elevate the status of those students and not blame families for coming.
They didn't know. They don't have anyone to work with.

What are we doing with their time when they're with us? That's the most important thing at every level. Where are the gaps? How do we fill those gaps? That is what we need to focus in on right now. (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013)

Teachers understanding of cross-cultural competency also encompasses their behaviors. Within this category of behaviors I uncovered three major themes. First, participants maintained that they must first understand and master cross-cultural competency within themselves. Second, they believed that reflection is an important step in the process of understanding and mastering cross-cultural competency. Third, they felt that they needed more support and training to become more adept in implementing a cross-culturally competent classroom environment. Their participation in this study was due in part to their search for more guidance and learning.

Five of the eight teachers mentioned that gaining a personal understanding and awareness of cross-cultural competency was the first step towards establishing cross-culturally competent classrooms. Ana Lucia’s comments reflected many of the participants’ views. Ana Lucia felt that too many teachers lack cultural competency. She described educators who believe that non-English language skills are detrimental to students. This deficit thinking upset her. She felt that these teachers needed training. Ana Lucia stated,

There're a lot of educators out there that don't have any cultural competency, they don't. They think that kids that come with a second language are handicapped.
That somehow it's a negative, that they're not bringing something extra, which they most certainly are in terms of language knowledge. (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Without a basic foundational understanding within yourself, many of the participants argued, how can you pass cultural competency on to your students? Ana Lucia related the importance of teachers educating themselves and having a “baseline” understanding of cultural competency. Teachers cannot affect change without a strong personal understanding of cultural competency. Ana Lucia asserted,

I would suggest an educator who doesn't know anything about cultural competency; I would think I would start there. Educate yourself on what that even means. Read articles about what cultural competency [means]; just have a baseline of what that is. I think that that's really important. If you don't get that, there's no way that you can affect any change in your classroom--if you don't even get the basic concept of cultural competency. (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

The teachers recognized that becoming culturally competent requires support and training. The participants were interested in developing cultural competency within themselves. All the teachers in the study stated that they needed more opportunities for additional training and networking with other two-way immersion teachers. All eight teachers expressed a strong desire to network with and learn from other teachers as a goal of participating in the study. Lola stated she would like to gain learning from other teachers. “I’d like to hear what other teachers are doing, what is working, so I can
implement it in my class as well” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). Seven teachers indicated that they did not feel that they were adequately supported by their administration. They hoped that participation in this action research study would help them learn of ways to promote equity within TWBI and help the native Spanish-speaking students. Susan stated that she was aware of the challenges of implementing an equitable classroom environment, and she wanted to learn solutions from other TWBI teachers. Susan said,

I feel like we're pretty aware of our challenges. We need to just tweak and take it up to the next level. I'd love to know somebody who's found a way to tweak it and be effective, or to take it up to that next level. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Elsa also expressed her desire to increase her learning so as to better serve her students. She viewed forming a community of learning and support would strengthen her teaching. Elsa’s comment summarized the feelings of the participants:

I want to know what other schools are doing. I want to know how to do the best for all students and not be pressured by the external what it looks like. But actually what's good for the kids. Really focus on the true meaning of, “This program is about the kids and what their experience is.”

Not who you're pleasing on the outside. To engage in conversations with other bilingual educators is huge for me, because I just don't feel we have the opportunity. Something like this would be that opportunity. “What are you
doing?” “What can I do?” “This is what I've done.” (E, Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

In addition to first developing cross-cultural competency from within through training and networking, five of the participants noted the importance of reflection as a step in the process of understanding cultural competency. Ana Lucia commented on the importance of reflecting on one's personal bias first. Without this inner understanding a teacher cannot effectively access the strategies to promote cross-cultural competence. Ana Lucia said,

I think most [important] by far is reflecting, examining one's cultural bias because if you can't do that, you can't get to getting strategies. If you're not even aware of your own biases and your own cultural competency or lack thereof, you can't even get to the strategies. (A. Reyes, personal communication, December 10, 2012)

The participants emphasized that they sought to develop their capacity to promote cross-culturally competent classrooms through personal understanding, training, networking, and reflection. They wanted to gain skills in order to advocate for their native Spanish-speaking students. Integrated within the understanding of cross-cultural competency are the policies and advocacy a teacher feels compelled to undertake. A prevailing theme that emerged from the data was the importance of promoting cultural competency through teacher modeling.

Seven teachers spoke of the importance of establishing classroom policies that promoted cultural competency such as sharing their own backgrounds and of modeling culturally competent behaviors. The seven teachers shared that they were cognizant that
they were role models for their students. Veronica spoke of how she models cultural competency in the classroom: She demonstrates pride in her Latina background, is a strong Latina role model, and works towards building up the cultural capital of her Latino students. Veronica shared that she makes a point of telling students about her Spanish and Latina background. Veronica shared the views of these seven participants when she stated,

The way that we address it in the classroom, and to me, cultural capital, it's obviously where you are coming from, where you're able to share their things. We place such value on it in my classroom because I am from another country. So I'm always making sure that I mention where I am from or when I was growing up. I always model it, and so those little kids get the opportunity to go this is how we do it. We have that kind of connection, and they're able to show off that there's something different. That's what you do, that's wonderful. And then the kids will be, my English speakers, will be like: “I didn't know that.” There's knowledge here, my little White kids know, and I shouldn't be saying that [laughs]. It's actually nice. I bring it on though, I celebrate it, and I think I give them a voice.

(V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Isabel also shares the importance of teacher modeling. She believes that by being a compelling Latina model she builds up capital and gives power. Isabel states,

We have to be the number one model for them, to be the example for them. Make them feel proud and encourage them. Give them that, and be the number one model for that, and it is really important. We have to bring those examples. We
have to bring those stories. Talk about those incredibly smart people that come from Spanish speaking countries, and highlight them. Build that capital. Give that power. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

The participants had developed understandings of cross-cultural competency that encompassed a deeper awareness and appreciation of cultures. They also sought to foster mutual respect, enable shared learning, give value to others’ backgrounds, and advance equitable interactions. All of the participants valued cross-cultural competency, considered it was important, and felt a deep sense of responsibility. They believed that they needed to act, to improve their skills, and to internalize behaviors. They wanted to become culturally competent individuals themselves and in turn model that competency to their students. They hoped that by becoming forceful models themselves they would instill stronger cultural competencies in their students. They sensed that they played a role in combating the social inequities that they witnessed and sought learning and insight to develop cultural competency within themselves and their students.

**Teacher Organizational Routines to Promote Cultural Capital**

All the participants shared a desire to improve their practice to promote cross-cultural competency in their two-way classroom. This section discusses the participants’ responses to the third research question of the study: What organizational routines do teachers use to promote cultural capital in the TWBI classroom? Organizational routines do not refer to strategies or activities that are occasionally tried but rather to regular, repeated, habitualized actions that the teacher chooses to employ in response to the social situations in the classroom (Becker, 2004). The participants were eager to share ideas and
support each other. They sought to learn and develop specific practices. A prevailing theme from the data was teacher eagerness to learn. All the participants conveyed that they did not feel adequately trained or supported by their district and administration and they sought collegial support. The teachers emphasized the desire to share insights and practices.

When reviewing the transcripts, I coded almost 70 practices that the participants described utilizing. For clarity, I consolidated and organized the organizational routines into six major themes: (a) Take responsibility, (b) Promote the cultural capital of the native Spanish-speakers, (c) Manage participation and grouping, use “experts”, (d) Teach cultural competency, (e) Involve families, and (f) Maintain high expectations. Below I describe each practice and the teacher implementation.

**Teachers should take responsibility and not leave equitable learning environments to chance.** An overarching theme that emerged was that promoting cultural capital and establishing an equitable learning environment should be a purposeful endeavor. The participants expressed that a teacher should be responsible for the climate in his or her classroom. Teachers need to assume, regularly and consistently, the responsibility of assuring each student’s background is valued. Teachers should be cognizant of the social interactions in the classroom and be ready to intervene. Ana Lucia stated that if left alone and unmanaged, the class could become a “dog eat dog classroom” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Ana Lucia elaborated on the need for teachers to take on the responsibility to build up the Latinos, “to create a space for them,” and acknowledge their worth:
I think it's super important for the type of program that we're in. There's this huge need to build up our Latinos and teach them that they have a voice and that it's important. It needs to be heard and that there needs to be a space for them created by teachers, because oftentimes I think teachers don't create it for them. They think if they don't speak up, then oh, well. You know, it's a dog-eat-dog classroom. (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013)

Luis emphasized that what occurs and what is taught depends on the teacher. The teacher has much control and needs to be responsible. Luis stated,

Biculturalism, I think, depending on the teacher and how much time they spend on culture and introducing it to the kids and getting the kids saturated with the culture. I think that just kind of like depends on the teacher. (L. Vera, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

Elsa commented that focusing on practices to promote cultural capital takes thought and effort on behalf of the teacher. The teacher needs to take on the responsibility to incorporate building cultural competency and promoting the cultural capital of the native Spanish-speakers. Elsa remarked, “You try and incorporate everyone's everything into your plans. . .sit down and plan. It just falls on a teacher. Who they are and what they believe in drawing in” (E, Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013).

Promote the cultural capital of the native Spanish-speakers. The participants discussed the importance of the teacher to develop routines that were mindful of ways to promote the cultural capital of the native Spanish-speakers. The goal was not a one shot lesson or activity, but rather, incorporating a mindset and climate where the Spanish-
speakers background is continually validated, and students are encouraged to learn and value each others’ background. They felt the organizational routine of habitually noticing and promoting the cultural capital of the Spanish-speakers was powerful. Some specific practices the teachers mentioned were incorporating authentic Latino literature, using appropriate curriculum that highlights the students culture and emphasizes the accomplishments of Latinos, adapting the curriculum to spotlight cultural aspects or accomplishments of Latinos, making connections with the curriculum, validating the use of Spanish, advocating for the Spanish-speakers to be leaders, having the Spanish-speaker be the “expert,” honoring students’ backgrounds, bringing in the students’ stories, including different perspectives, and holding events and activities that celebrate and acknowledge the Latino culture.

Veronica spoke of incorporating authentic, non-translated literature in Spanish. “Definitely bringing other countries' cultures into the classroom by bringing literature from other countries” (V. Bell, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Susan related how she adapted social studies to include different perspectives. “Sometimes what we try to do is through social studies, what can we do and talk about the different perspectives. So just talking about what we celebrate and how we celebrate it” (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012). Ana Lucia also discussed teaching history thorough a non-Eurocentric lens. She stated,

Even today, I was talking about the imposition of European ideology on groups of people. I didn't specifically bring it down to their level. But just talking about how groups of people have come to certain regions of the world and forced the belief
upon the indigenous culture that they were better and that they know better. (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012)

Lola spoke of how she constantly looked for ways to validate the Spanish. Because the dual immersion program is a strand within the school, many of the support services are in English, and some staff speak only English. Instead of having the English-only speaking librarian always read a book in English, Lola alternates and reads a book in Spanish every other visit. Lola has also instructed her student helpers to answer the phone first in Spanish then follow up with an English translation if necessary.

Lola looks for ways to honor her students’ backgrounds. She holds “appreciation meetings.” Lola described the meetings:

I also have what we call it appreciation meetings, and students share. We have them twice a month, if I can, more often, at least once a week, and I'll alternate the language. We basically pass a ball, and if you catch it you have to say something that you appreciate about that week... and it has to do nothing with monetary or material things. It's more about relationships... being grateful that your grandparents came from Mexico. (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013)

Lola also described how she validated students’ backgrounds and allowed them to tell their story. She related an experience:

Recently, one of the native English speakers traveled to Washington, and he brought us a PowerPoint presentation of all the pictures he took of the White House and museums and the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument.
He showed the presentation, and everyone was like, “Wow!”

Then my student from Michoacán, Mexico also spent the winter break down there and took a few days extra, too. He came back with another, not as elaborate PowerPoint, but still a lot of pictures showing a small town, rural Mexico, and the kids were just like, “Wow!” The same thing. Looking at her on top of a donkey in a farm setting it was just as amazing to them as the trip to Washington. They were just as excited. (L. Peña, personal communication, January 30, 2013)

**Teachers need to purposefully manage student participation and grouping, and spotlight Spanish-speakers as “experts.”** Some key organizational routines the participants discussed were actively managing student participation and grouping. They also spoke of the significance of highlighting native Spanish-speakers as the “experts.” The teachers spent much time sharing specific strategies that they utilized to manage the participation, grouping, and validating students as “experts.” Most of the teachers had participated in Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) training. They stated that their participation in Project GLAD had been very helpful and had provided many ideas for grouping and participation strategies. They had incorporated many of the GLAD strategies into their regular classroom practice. During the focus group sessions, the teachers discussed and reminded each other of GLAD strategies they were using successfully in their classrooms.

The teachers spoke of the importance of using cooperative learning table groups. Teachers were very strategic when forming the groups and were mindful of balancing the groups with students of various backgrounds and academic strengths. The teachers also
included much partner sharing. They were careful to utilize different strategies to equalize student participation. If participation was left unmanaged, the teachers felt that the native English-speakers would dominate.

Susan shared how student table groups were deliberately planned: “So seating's not random and seating's not just about behavior. It's about structuring it for language, for partner talk and for . . .language models” (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012). Elsa discussed how she is intentional and deliberate with the partner sharing set up and instructions:

We do the “turn to your partner and share,” and then we give them frames of “partner A speaks, partner B speaks,” so that they're speaking back and forth. We try and hook them up so they have a native Spanish and native English-speaker, just to promote that conversation. (E. Gray, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

The teachers also discussed the importance of setting up structures while students worked cooperatively in order to achieve the desired outcome. Ana Lucia shared,

One way to encourage the communication between the English-speakers and Spanish-speakers is, when they're doing independent work, it doesn't become independent work. They do work in partners and you take away a workbook, so they have to talk back and forth in whatever language it is, and that is something that I do. . . .They have to work in that language, whatever the language is. (A. Reyes, personal communication, December 3, 2012)

The teachers stated that they were careful to control participation. They conversed
about several strategies. Some of the strategies discussed were pulling numbered popsicle sticks, Smart Board programs, and call on all students in all areas of the classroom (“side, side, back, back, side, side, front”) (A. Kelly, personal communication, February 4, 2013). The main consideration, Susan pointed out, is not to leave participation to chance or to the most vocal students. Susan stated,

Participation really needs to be something that you, as a teacher manage. You're not just leaving it up to always-raised-hands. It is, again, using the teams and the numbers. Talk to your elbow partner first. That means both people should be talking and saying something. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

The participants also expressed the importance of validating the native Spanish-speakers as “experts.” Ana Lucia remarked that during Spanish instruction she tells the native Spanish-speakers, “You're the expert right now” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). She establishes them as the Spanish language authorities and sends the native English-speakers to get help from the Spanish experts. Ana Lucia states, “I make a big deal about how they're the experts. This is their language. They are the knowledgeable people” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). She is also purposeful in managing student participation so that the Spanish-speaking experts can shine. Ana Lucia states, “I'll go out of my way to call on them, when other kids are speaking out. I go out of my way to ignore the loudmouths, the ones who are always dominating” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). She makes a concerted effort to acknowledge the native Spanish-speakers and tell them that
“what they say is valuable, and to please share more” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Isabel also stated that she gave power to the native Spanish-speakers, “highlighting their worth and their intelligence and really encouraging” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013). During group work she assigned the Spanish-speakers as leadership roles. Isabel commented, “They are the experts. Demonstrating that, modeling that. . . . Every group has a Spanish-speaker, and they're the expert, they're the leader of that group” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013).

**Teachers need to be in the habit of teaching cultural competency.** The participants expressed that teachers should not assume that the students would simply absorb cultural competency. Teachers need to take deliberate steps to explicitly teach and guide students towards cultural competency.

Isabel expounds on the importance of teaching students to be culturally competent:

Sharing with students other parts of the little ins and outs of culture. . . . different cultures and opening their eyes to that. It is really important. Just motivating them, just overall engaging them, motivating them, making it challenging, so that it's engaging for them to want to learn more. (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013)

Ana Lucia emphasizes the responsibility of the teacher to intervene when there are “micro-assaults” and to explicitly instruct students in culturally competent ways to respond
So teaching about cultural identities and things like that, yeah, because the kids don't come in to school with that kind of stuff. Then it's my job to teach them about that. When there are micro-assaults or micro-insults in my classroom, to stop it immediately, address it, and give them the right terminology to use. (A. Reyes, personal communication, December 3, 2012)

Susan also sees a teacher’s role to teach her native Spanish-speaking students the cultural competencies they will need to access the White, American culture power structure. She states that she explicitly teaches students about their “public persona” and how to “act classy” so that they will be equipped to successfully navigate in the dominate power structures (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012).

Susan relates,

Then it feels like I have cultural traits from the power structure: middle-class WASP person, college educated. The way I expect you to behave and respond and talk and interact is OK because that's what your workplace is going to ask from you. That's what your bosses are going to ask from you. But it's not done without any sensitivity or love or any caring.

It's helping them to see themselves. I said, “You guys, we're well-behaved, we're good citizens.” We talk about being good citizens. That whole, when we're out in public, this is how we behave. We are polite, and I don't know if that really goes with any one culture, but at least for the middle class White American culture by the power structure, to be seen, you have to act a little classy. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)
Regularly involving families and students beyond the school day is important. In the focus group sessions the participants shared successes they had experienced the prior week. A routine that became evident was the importance of consistently involving families and students in activities that took place beyond the school day. The Main Street teachers spoke of the effectiveness of outreach programs. Lola pointed out the importance of these after school programs. Students who were “lower academically, lower socioeconomically” benefitted from the additional academic support, participation in extra curricular activities, and opportunities to engage families at school events (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). Lola found the supplementary academic support for her students valuable. She emphasized that the after school programs helped the students. Lola stated,

My school has many supports. They offer a lot of programs, after school programs for homework clubs, additional support for tutoring. The district actually is trying to get free tutoring for several weeks for certain students. That is all helpful. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

Main Street participants expressed that it was important for the school to reach out beyond the school day. They also spoke of the benefits of the school-sponsored extra curricular activities. They described how the after school ballet folklórico and mariachi groups added to the value of the Latino heritage. Lola told of the pride and confidence these events evoke:

We have a folkloric group. All students that participate in that folkloric group are so proud. We have a mariachi group. I'm not only saying that only the Hispanic
background children participate in those. I have my African American, Anglo students, my French student in the folkloric dance, in the folkloric group and the mariachi. There's so many extracurricular activities offered to them and the community embraces those. They feel proud of their culture. We have a special event for the Day of the Dead. We have altars and we talk about the cultural components of all these celebrations. (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012)

The participants also spoke of the importance of welcoming families to participate in school activities. Main Street had events such as the monthly Dual Immersion Night that attracted large family participation from both language groups. Students saw their families taking pride in their culture and engaging in learning about culture in a fun, relaxed manner. The Main Street participants shared that these events created bridges that led to greater cultural understanding and esteem for the Latino culture and language. Susan added that although families might at first stay within their comfort zone and mingle with their own language group, connections and understanding were forged and families began to integrate more. The Main Street teachers agreed that these out of school events were “successes” that fostered greater cultural capital for the Spanish-speaking students. Susan described the event:

It's really good, because we play in one language, we play in the other, and the families talk together. We have some bilingual families that are sort of the bridge between groups, but the English-speaking families tend to talk to the English-speaking families and the Spanish-speaking. . . .But that's OK, we're all in our
comfort zone, and that's all right. But the kids get together, and then the adults; we play as a family together. So, those are a really good way to just get things, everybody used to it.

Then outside, especially in the younger grades, we have most parents picking up and dropping off kids, and so those bilingual people interact between the different groups and help translate and convey the information. The English-speaking parents that are here tend to be pretty sensitive to the fact that we need to translate, we need to make sure we know, and the Spanish-speaking parents. So, everybody knows when they go to some sort of parent presentation or teacher thing that we're going to be doing both languages. (S. Parker, personal communication, December 10, 2012)

Susan and Elsa also pointed out that the Dual Immersion Night was a means to extend cultural understandings to the families of both student populations.

Five participants also expressed the importance of reaching out and encouraging their native Spanish-speaking parents to be active participants in their child’s education. They spoke of the importance of communicating often with the parents and creating opportunities for the Spanish-speaking parents to volunteer in the classroom. Ana Lucia stated that she made an effort to contact the Spanish-speaking parents to keep them informed on how to support their child. Ana Lucia shared how she offered supports for her native Spanish-speaking students, “Contacting their parents, and having close communication with them about what their child is having difficulty with” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). Susan spoke of reaching out to parents to
keep them involved in various aspects of their child’s development. She stated how she facilitated communication between parents who spoke different languages so that two students could continue their friendship over the summer break.

I noticed that two little girls were really good friends, and for the summer last year in one of my classes I told their parents. I said, “Your child's really good friends with so-and-so; see if you guys can't get them together this summer to hang out. And I said, “If you need somebody to make the phone call, I'll help you.” They just get along so well, and it'd be really cool for them to see each other. So that was one of those cross-language friendships that I wanted to make sure could happen. (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012)

Maintaining high expectations for the native Spanish-speakers is fundamental. Some of the teacher participants expressed in passionate, urgent tones of voice, the necessity of upholding high expectations for their native Spanish-speaking students. They felt that an essential routine to build cultural capital was to empower their students by continually taking steps to assure that they were high achieving. Veronica is Latina and is upset that others assume her native Spanish-speakers who have limited opportunities will perform at lower levels. She feels compelled to push her native Spanish-speaking students. She stated,

Sometimes I feel like they don't have the same opportunities and they're not expected to do as well. I push them harder. To the point where I say to them. . . . I'm like, “You are going to perform in my class. I'm not going to let go of that. So you either come willingly or I'm going to drag you. But you are going to do well
in this class.” I get the like, “But I'm stupid. I don't know as much.” And I'm like, “No, you're not. That's just an excuse. You are smart. You are going to be able to do it.” All my Hispanic students are bringing in their homework. I'm checking with their parents. I think that there's a lack of . . . almost you need to go more with that group, because there's a different dynamic at home. (V. Bell, personal communication, November 5, 2012)

Anita continued the conversation and remarked that high academic expectations were most important. Teachers needed to do what it takes to get their native Spanish-speakers to achieve.

You know what? That's what it's all about. It's having that passion to not give up, because I'm sorry, I know they can do it. I know they can do it, and this is digressing, going back to what you first started with, is that, “Take out the fluffy multicultural sensitivity.” What it is, is demand the rigor, demand what you want in terms of curriculum and core content standards, because that's how we got to where we are.

Nobody said, “Hay la Anita, ¿sabes que tienes las trenzas tan bonitas?” [Oh, Anita, did you know that you have such pretty braids?] I always call that fun, food, and fiesta. That's not what it's about, it's not about fun, food, and fiesta. (A. Kelly, personal communication, December 19, 2012)

**Conclusion**

The teachers in this study all reported inequitable social dynamics within society and their classrooms. This bothered them. They could not make racism, classism,
poverty, hegemony, and inequity disappear but they did feel that they could impact the students in their classroom. As Isabel stated, “There’s work to be done” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2012). All the participants expressed that, as teachers, they played a role in promoting more equitable outcomes for their Latino, native Spanish-speakers. They regarded equitable power distribution important, valued cross-cultural competency, and endeavored to implement practices that develop cross-cultural understanding in their students.

Seven of the participants viewed two-way immersion programs as a prospect for change. They did not see TWBI as ameliorating all the inequities, and they were cognizant of flaws in the program. Nevertheless, they saw TWBI as a program that offered hope. They believed in the two-way immersion core tenants of integration, balance, and equity. These participants valued this promise and sought to elevate the linguistic and cultural status of their native Spanish-speakers. They embraced the cross-cultural goal of TWBI but struggled with its implementation. They searched for learning opportunities so that they could implement practices and incorporate routines that would better equip their native Spanish-speaking students. The participants highlighted organizational routines that emphasized teacher responsibility, advocacy, purposeful management of instruction and student participation, outreach to families and students, and high expectations. Seven of the teachers were in two-way immersion because they believed that the goals of TWBI could combat inequities—through the two-way bilingual immersion model they believed they could do “the work.”
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study brought together a cadre of two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) teachers who worked toward improving the educational experiences and outcomes of their Latino native Spanish-speaking students. The study’s participants were involved in a plan to implement new awareness and learning and to gain insight into the attitudes and behaviors that lead to more equitable learning environments. Educators may not be able to change the social, political, cultural, and racial inequities of an entire society. However, teachers can control the practices that they choose to implement in their classrooms. The goal of this study was to explore the participants’ practices that promote cross-cultural competency so as to foster stronger, more socially just two-way bilingual immersion programs.

This final chapter presents my conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions section begins with an overview of this study’s theoretical framework. I later discuss the factors that influence the social dynamics within the TWBI classroom and the impact these social dynamics have on the participants’ attitudes and practice. I close this chapter with my recommendations.

Conclusions

The theoretical framework grounding this study was that two-way bilingual immersion (TWBI) is a sound program model for Latino English Language Learners. A substantial body of research bears out the success of the TWBI model in improving
Latino English Language Learners’ educational outcomes (Block, 2007; Christian et al., 2004; Gold, 2006; Howard et al., 2003; Kohne, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002). Central to TWBI objectives are high academic achievement in two languages, raising the status of the minority language and culture, and promoting integration and cross-cultural competence (Howard & Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Despite the effectiveness of the TWBI model in raising the educational outcomes of Latino English Language Learners, the TWBI programs examined were not free from inequities and concerns. The programs in my study harbored asymmetrical language and culture status that favored English and the students experienced inequitable power balance. Participants in the study struggled with implementing the third component of two-way immersion, cross-cultural competency, because of the overarching societal forces that influence the classroom social dynamics. Bourdieu (1977, 1984, 1991), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Coleman (1988), and Putnam (2001) explained these unbalanced social dynamics through their theories of cultural, social, and symbolic capital. Establishing organizational routines that promote the cultural capital of Latino English Language Learners strengthens cross-cultural competency, therefore leading to more equitable and effective TWBI programs (De Jong & Howard, 2009).

In my study, it appears that socioeconomic background has a stronger influence on social dynamics and cultural capital than do linguistic and ethnic factors. Isabel emphasized, “[I]t's all tied into socioeconomics. . . .I see that the dominant English group,
for the most part—there are exceptions—but for the most part are just at a higher socioeconomic range” (I. Cruz, personal communication, November 1, 2012).

Certainly, throughout the study’s findings, participants stressed that the imbalance of power and participation in the classroom was more closely associated with class than with linguistic or ethnic background. Lola described her classroom academic and power dynamics divided by class status. She stated, “I don't see an actual language division, but I see more of a socioeconomic division in my class” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). The participants did not negate the impact of societal attitudes towards race and English dominance. In fact, the participants repeatedly pointed out their efforts to combat depreciating societal attitudes towards Latino culture and Spanish language. They felt that racism, Euro-centrism, and English dominance were prevalent forces to contend with. Nevertheless, they emphasized that a student’s social class had a greater impact on the students’ classroom social interactions and academic outcomes.

In the classrooms studied, the majority of the native English-speakers shared a middle class background; whereas, most of the native Spanish-speakers came from a lower social class. Language and ethnicity were often linked with socioeconomic status. Students from a higher social class, usually the native English-speakers, displayed more confidence and, if left unmanaged, dominated classroom participation. Ana Lucia described her native English-speaking students. “My English-speakers are aggressive, dominating, outspoken, control classroom discussions. My Spanish speakers are passive, pretty much as a whole, passive, aren't outspoken. . . . .They don't see themselves as equals in some ways” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). The
participants pointed out that the Latinos’ passivity was not due to ethnic factors but to class distinctions. Native Spanish-speaking students from educated, middle class families also dominated and took on central roles in classroom interactions. As Veronica stated, “I do have Latino kids that are participating. . . . It's not so much Anglo/Latino” (V. Bell, personal communication November 5, 2012). Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977) theory of habitus—internalized self-perceptions and demeanor, influenced by an individual’s social relations, class status and cultural capital—explained these social dynamics. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) posited that schools perpetuate the culture and preeminence of the dominant class. The dominant social classes possess the linguistic and cultural competence that is considered legitimate and valued in the educational system. Through social interactions, a student internalizes her subordinate status; she develops an identity, behavior patterns, and aspirations in response to her social class and expected role in society. Thus, the Spanish-speakers submissive demeanor fit Bourdieu and Passeron’s theories of social class dynamics.

Spanish-speaking Latinos encompass a broad range of social class, racial, and ethnic makeup; TWBI educators may consider Latino native Spanish-speakers as one group and do not note and respond to the differences within this student population. Acknowledging and responding to these differences does not entail ignoring common goals and creating divisions within the Latino community. Nevertheless, TWBI educators often use a native English-speaker/native Spanish-speaker lens to monitor and make instructional decisions. This two-way lens may not reveal the predominant distinctions between the student groups. As a result, TWBI educators may not be sufficiently
cognizant of the impact of socioeconomic differences on disparity and equity concerns. Awareness of socioeconomic influences will provide TWBI teachers greater clarity to fine-tune their instructional decision-making.

The participants noted that an important organizational routine to promote cultural capital in the TWBI classroom was to involve parents and students beyond the school day. Prelow and Loukas (2003) found that economically disadvantaged Latino youth who were involved in extracurricular activities experienced increased academic achievement. Gándara (2010) noted that the high Latino drop out rate was due, in part, to Latino students feeling detached from school and that extracurricular engagement mitigated this sense of not belonging. The Main Street participants pointed out the effectiveness of the after school support programs that the school site provided. Lola stated that academic support, participation in extra curricular activities and opportunities to engage families at school events were especially “helpful for students [who were] lower academically, lower socioeconomically” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). The Main Street participants indicated that these programs contributed to student academic success, connectedness with school, sense of cultural pride and confidence. Lola stated, “There's so many extracurricular activities offered to them and the community embraces those. They feel proud of their culture” (L. Peña, personal communication, November 7, 2012). The dual immersion teachers at Main Street took an active role in promoting these activities and involving families. The monthly Dual Immersion Nights were an example of a family event that was organized and conducted by the dual immersion teachers.
Ana Lucia noted that economically disadvantaged Latino families did not have the access to expensive classes, extra curricular activities, and tutoring that advantaged many of the native English-speaking students. Ana Lucia stated, “They don't have money to put them in Kumon and all the extra classes and to have a tutor. And so, it's financial and educational” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). The participants identified family and student outreach as an important organizational routine that promoted cross-cultural understanding, built students’ cultural capital, and minimized the discrepancies between the students with different financial resources. The participants realized that to achieve equity between all of their students the teachers, school, and district needed to cast out a net that reached beyond their classroom walls.

Two-way bilingual immersion is a powerful tool in combating the discouraging educational outcomes of Latino English Language Learners. TWBI tackles hegemonic mindsets in our educational practices and demands social and racial inequity. The superior results of Latinos in TWBI programs demonstrate that strong program models make a difference. Well-equipped and dedicated teachers also impact student outcomes. Nevertheless, TWBI although a significant component, is only one tier in the many supports Latino English Language Learners will require to reach educational parity. Poverty and social injustice is too monumental for classroom teachers and educational programing to combat alone. Gándara (2010) has stated that no one “silver bullet or single program can close the enormous gap between Latino students and their peers with respect to academic achievement and attainment” (p. 30). Remedying inequitable
educational outcomes will require multiple layers of support and collaborative efforts between schools and social service agencies.

The demographics of the students in the classroom impacted their interactions. This in turn affected the participants’ concerns and practices. The participants’ practices were a response to what was happening and what required their attention. The participants in the predominantly Latino classrooms, which were largely homogeneous socioeconomically and ethnically, witnessed less cultural capital disparity, and the Latino students displayed more pride in their language and background. Therefore, these participants felt less of a need to intervene to manage social dynamic inequities and promote Latinos’ cultural capital. In classes with increased ratios of White, native English-speaking students the participants saw more disparity and felt a greater responsibility to manage inequitable power balance.

As the percentage of native English-speaking students grew, the participants felt pressured to cater to the needs of the native English-speakers at the expense of the native Spanish-speakers. This situation would appear to support Valdés’ (1997) position questioning the benefits of two-way programs for the native Spanish-speakers and her advocacy for developmental bilingual programs sans the White native English-speakers.

The teacher participants in this study, however, believed in countering these pressures. They acknowledged that attaining an equitable classroom environment that did not favor the native English-speakers was a challenge; they often vocalized their struggles and frustrations with trying to offset this push to cater to the English-speaking community. Nevertheless, they were willing to confront this disparity. The TWBI goals
of balanced integration pushed the participants to notice the asymmetry in language and culture status. They believed that teacher action could promote more equitable outcomes and they sought to advance the TWBI goals of integration. The participants wanted both student groups to learn from each other. As Susan stated, she wanted native Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students and families “to bridge more” (S. Parker, personal communication, December 3, 2012). Three participants specifically stated that they preferred the TWBI model as opposed to the developmental bilingual approach because it offered opportunities to break down social, cultural, and linguistic barriers. Isabel stated, “It's when both groups learn from each other. That's what the goal is. That's the ultimate goal, for them to intermingle and learn, basically, not be so isolated” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013).

Fostering cross-culturally competent environments where native Spanish-speakers are validated and develop competencies to navigate between both cultures would better equip them to hold their own in the White, Eurocentric society. Susan’s comments on the importance of teaching the native Spanish-speakers on how to access the White power structures emphasizes two components of cultural competency for TWBI classrooms: legitimize and raise the status of the linguistic and cultural background of the native Spanish-speakers and empower the native Spanish-speakers with a grasp of the skills that they will need to access American power structures. Susan explained that she taught her students how “to act a little classy” so that her students would be “seen” by the White American middle class power structures (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012). The cross-cultural competency TWBI
aims to promote works both ways—both student groups develop capacity to share central roles. Achieving this balance may entail giving up or assuming centrality—that is, native English-speakers yield space for the native Spanish-speakers and the native Spanish-speakers see themselves as capable academicians and assume central roles. Separating students linguistically/ethnically, as Valdés (1997) suggested, would deny students the opportunity to develop power-sharing capability.

Furthermore, this study revealed that the power structures at Creekside and Main Street that proved most divisive were not ethnic and linguistic rather socioeconomic. Limiting TWBI educators’ perspective to an ethnic/linguistic frame to attend to power and cultural capital inequities in two-way programs does not suffice. Socioeconomic status is a significant factor in the asymmetrical power dynamics in TWBI classrooms. Dividing students solely by ethnic/linguistic backgrounds negates the need to address class issues. The effect of poverty and class distinctions on students’ habitus and classroom social dynamics adds a powerful layer of concerns to address. TWBI integration is, in fact, a three-fold concern. Separating students linguistically/ethnically does not deal with the entire issue.

Participants in this study articulated a belief in the TWBI’s tenants of power balance and integration; they desired both groups of students to work together equitably. Susan described the classroom environment she tried to foster, “They're interacting with each other in a friendly, comfortable manner, and they're doing shared, collaborative work, and nobody's top dog. The dynamics are equitable” (S. Parker, personal communication, February 8, 2013). They sought to develop practices to empower and
build up the native Spanish-speakers cultural capital. The participants often repeated that cross-cultural competency was a valued and essential component of TWBI classrooms and that it contributed to equitable working relationships. The participants demonstrated an understanding of cultural competency that went beyond shallow treatment of multicultural themes. They felt a personal responsibility to reflect and master cultural competency within themselves and then to model and convey that capability with their students. Isabel stated the importance of internalizing cultural competency and then transmitting it to her students saying, “We have to be the number one model for them, to be the example for them. Make them feel proud and encourage them. . . . Build that capital. Give that power” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013). The participants sought ways to create “an even playing field” in their classrooms. This commitment and sense of responsibility positively impacted the participants’ teaching practice.

The participants incorporated organizational routines that promoted the cultural capital of their native Spanish-speaking students into their practice. By taking responsibility for their teaching practice, they took steps to counter the societal forces that led to inequitable classroom social dynamics and contributed to unfavorable Latino educational outcomes. These routines focused on teacher accountability, awareness, and advocacy. The participants recognized that if left to chance, inequitable power dynamics would take over. As Ana Lucia stated, it could become “a dog-eat-dog classroom” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). The participants acknowledged their role in assuring that a culturally competent environment was nurtured; they needed to be
cognizant of unbalanced situations and be willing to intervene. Cross-cultural competency required constant vigilance, monitoring, and implementation. These teacher participants believed that they played a role in advocating for and managing equitable social interactions.

Despite this strong commitment, the participants struggled. They were mindful to adopt effective routines into their practice, yet they saw that they did not always reach their goals: English ruled as the language of status, native English-speaking students dominated classroom participation, and students often continued to be socially segregated. The participants felt that they needed more support. Most had received some training. Project GLAD was specifically identified, and the participants had implemented the concepts and strategies they learned, yet they felt they continued to require additional instruction. The participants voiced needing more professional development in improving their practice to develop cross-cultural practices. Their voluntary participation in this study indicated their active search for more training.

Most of the participants shared a high degree of motivation to seek training, implement new learning, and modify their practice. The participants were interested in an opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in order to improve their teaching. Several of the participants related how their background and experiences had prompted them to teach in a two-way program. They may have fallen into teaching in a two-way program because they had the language skills, but they continued to teach in the program because of a strong commitment to the goals of TWBI. All eight participants had the experience of living in a country where they spoke the non-dominant language. Six were Latinos(as).
They possessed similarities in ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds that may have led them to be sympathetic to the difficulties that Latino, English Language Learners experience. Once in the TWBI classroom, the participants were assigned the task to carry out the TWBI goals. These goals challenge society’s inequities. TWBI demands balance and equal status for all student groups. As Susan stated, “nobody is top dog” (S. Parker, personal communication, November 11, 2012). Confronting the difficulties of establishing the balance required by TWBI pushed the participants to take on advocacy roles.

TWBI tenants force educators to see linguistic, cultural and social imbalances and to confront the messy business of integrating. Thus, many TWBI teachers possess the personal experiences that provide a fertile ground. Witnessing social, cultural, and linguistic imbalance, and struggling to ameliorate this inequity plants the seeds for the creation of teachers who become advocates. The demands and challenges of implementing TWBI equity goals may lead TWBI teachers to develop greater awareness and assume much needed advocacy roles on behalf of their students. Educators seeking to champion social justice for Latino English learners may want look to TWBI teachers as a potential pool of advocates.

**Recommendations**

The findings from this study have implications at the school site, district, state and federal levels. First, this study has highlighted the need for TWBI educators, administrators, and policymakers to be attuned to the factors that influence the social dynamics among students in the two-way bilingual immersion programs and the impact
these interactions would have on student educational outcomes. When making program decisions, distributing resources, and fine-tuning instructional practices, TWBI educators would need to discard the traditional two-way lens that categorizes the student groups by language and heritage background; TWBI educators should consider and address socioeconomic factors as well. Furthermore, policymakers, educators, and social justice advocates need to muster the political courage to develop multi-facet approaches to Latino student education that entail social supports that extend beyond the school walls. Second, educators need to pay specific attention to the demographical makeup of the students in the program and assure that imbalances in program populations do not dilute and disadvantage the native Spanish-speaking students. I also recommend researchers continue to explore ways to strengthen the cultural competency component of TWBI, study how student demographic affect TWBI program social dynamics, and educational outcomes, and extend this study to include larger numbers of participants, school sites, and different demographical combinations. Third, district, state policymakers, and teacher education programs need to recognize the effectiveness of TWBI programs in combating the inequitable educational outcomes for Latino English Language Learners and seek ways to develop TWBI programs, strengthen program components, and support two-way immersion teachers.

The participants in this study expressed that student social dynamics were more strongly influenced by socioeconomic differences. TWBI educators need to be mindful of the variations of class, racial, and ethnic makeup within each language population. The participants also commented how the social class gap negatively impacted many of the
native Spanish-speaking students’ demeanor, confidence, participation, and academic success. A core belief in TWBI is to seek balance between the two language groups and to challenge English and Eurocentric superiority. TWBI is in the business of balancing more than languages and heritage; it also integrates the social classes. Although student language/ethnic background and social class usually converged in the classrooms studied, this confluence may not always be the case. Social class distinctions exist within the native Spanish-speaking population. In order to see with greater clarity the predominant factors impeding equitable power balance and integration, TWBI educators need to reconsider the two-way lens and put on trifocals.

I recommend that TWBI educators acknowledge and address the effects of the social class gap in the TWBI programs. Differences in socioeconomic status influence the social dynamics and validation of cultural capital. Educators need to be cognizant of how this may play out in the classroom and address it with professional development and training that focuses on meeting the needs of low-income students. Furthermore, policymakers and educators need to recognize that teacher classroom practices will not make the many consequences of poverty disappear. Federal, state, and district policymakers need to dedicate resources to cast a wider net of support for economically disadvantaged native Spanish-speakers. The “even playing field” that the participants kept struggling to achieve in their classrooms will unlikely occur until all students are able to come to school healthy, well fed, and with equitable enrichment experiences. Schools and social agencies need to assure that low-income students have adequate food, shelter, and healthcare. Additionally, social agencies, and federal, state, and district
offices need to dedicate resources to parent and early childhood education, and student extra curricular and academic support programs. TWBI is a strong, effective educational model, yet it is only one piece of the puzzle needed to form a complete picture of Latino student support.

I also recommend that district and site staff make greater efforts to balance TWBI program demographics. Both the Main Street and Creekside programs identified themselves as “two-way immersion” and made efforts to attract students of each language group in order to balance the language background demographics, yet neither program attained the desired ratios in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade classes. An imbalance of student language background ratios affects the social dynamics and cross-cultural competencies within a program. The Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard & Lindholm-Leary, 2007) recommends that the ratios should never drop below one-third for any language group. Because of the strong Eurocentric, English dominant power imbalance in our society, it is especially important to assure that the imbalance does not result in a greater percentage of native English-speakers. The overarching power structures in our society already favor the White native-English-speaking students.

Establishing a two-way classroom where the percentage of the native Spanish speakers is diluted to less than 50 percent accentuates this power imbalance. If any demographic imbalance must occur, it should be in favor of a greater percentage of native Spanish-speakers.

The Creekside participants experienced more struggles with inequitable power dynamics. This school had a demographically unbalanced program with a greater
percentage of native English-speakers. The Creekside classrooms studied were comprised of less than a fourth native Spanish-speaking students. Creekside has had long waiting lists of native English-speaking students seeking entry into the program, and there has been strong pressure to have spots available for these native English-speakers. At Creekside, and at other two-way schools with similar uneven student demographics, balanced demographics must be a priority. I recommend that school districts take more seriously the importance of balanced demographics in TWBI programs. Balancing student demographics may entail lowering the number of classes in the program so that the ratio of native Spanish-speaking students is not reduced below 50 percent, conducting surveys investigating why native Spanish-speaking families are not enrolling their children or are leaving the program, noting patterns of attrition, and planning accordingly during initial enrollment stages, intensifying recruitment efforts, saving spots for native Spanish-speaking families who frequently do not enroll their students until shortly before school starts in the fall, meeting with stakeholders to brainstorm particular factors affecting enrollment ratios within the community, and searching for solutions.

Additionally, I recommend researchers continue to explore ways to strengthen the cultural competency component of TWBI. This study can be extended to include larger numbers of participants, school sites, and different demographical combinations. I also suggest that researchers study the effects of the student demographical make up on the social dynamics and educational outcomes of TWBI students. The demographic mix should take into account socioeconomic class in addition to language and ethnic background. Studies analyzing the social dynamics and cultural capital of students when
the majority of the Latino native Spanish-speakers are of a higher socioeconomic class than the native English-speakers may shed more light on the role of social class in TWBI social dynamics, cultural capital and cultural competency.

When examining program options for English Language Learners, I recommend district and state policy makers consider implementing two-way bilingual immersion programs as a powerful tool in addressing Latino English Language Learner educational needs. Policymakers and district administrators should be cognizant of the research supporting the effectiveness of additive bilingual programs and adopt a long term approach to educating Latino English Language Learners. Too often, program decisions are made based on politics, personal bias, and hegemonic mindsets that push Latino English Language Learners into subtractive English-only programs that fail to produce the long term positive educational outcomes demonstrated by TWBI (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). District administrators must also be mindful of the research supporting the long term gains of additive bilingual programs (Thomas & Collier, 2002) and not bow to No Child Left Behind pressures to eliminate primary language instruction for the native Spanish speakers. Ana Lucia noted several of her fourth grade Latino English Language Learners remained on the dual immersion class roster but due to Program Improvement pressures, left the classroom during Spanish instruction in order to participate in all-English remediation classes. Ana Lucia stated, “Dual immersion does not exist for those kids anymore. They're getting all English. So, there's no advantage for those kids to be in a dual immersion program” (A. Reyes, personal communication, November 9, 2012). Administrators at the school site and district level need to adhere to
the TWBI program structures, be abreast of the research substantiating the long term benefits of primary language instruction, and resist knee-jerk reactions to state standardized test scores.

I further recommend that when implementing these TWBI programs school site and district administrators be well informed of TWBI aims, make careful hiring decisions, and support new TWBI teachers. The participants in this study shared that they must balance many facets of TWBI. They are expected to maintain high academic standards in two languages, assure that their student attain high levels of bilingualism, counter social and cultural bias that favor English and Euro-centric culture, promote cross cultural competency and encourage equitable social interactions. Successful programs need skilled, motivated teachers. Hiring decisions need to take into account the many components the teachers will need to balance. Administrators also need to assure that teachers have the necessary literacy skills in Spanish. Anita, did not feel comfortable teaching high levels of Spanish to her sixth grade dual immersion students; she stated that although she grew up bilingual, had conversational Spanish skills, and rudimentary Spanish literacy skills, she did not feel capable of teaching advanced levels of Spanish. She commented, “Having just a BCLAD is not enough. It’s not fair to the students and it’s not fair to the teacher” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012). Nevertheless she was assigned to teach in a dual immersion program. She stated, “Once I was in the job, then it was explained to me, ‘Oh, by the way. We'd like you to consider teaching it as a dual-immersion program’” (A. Kelly, personal communication, November 27, 2012). Many of the participants also commented that when first hired, they
were left to sort out the particulars of teaching in a TWBI program on their own. Ana Lucia stated, “they didn't really know what I was doing. I wasn't told, ‘Here's the curriculum, here's what subjects you teach in English, here's what you teach in Spanish’” (A. Reyes, personal communication, February 6, 2013). New TWBI teachers need guidance and support regarding TWBI specific program structure and goals, instructional strategies, curriculum, and classroom management strategies. District and site administrators need to assure that teachers receive this support.

The support for teachers should be continuous. Schools should provide ongoing professional development for TWBI teachers. All the participants in this study indicated their desire for more training. They also indicated a strong desire to learn from and collaborate with other TWBI teachers. As Elsa stated, “Peer work is just the most powerful. That to me is professional development. That is a thing worthy to take up my time. That's something I want” (E. Gray, personal communication, February 7, 2013).

Districts and schools need to provide frequent and relevant professional development for TWBI teachers. Professional development should also include opportunities for teachers to meet, share insights, and collaborate.

TWBI takes on many educational challenges. It grapples with many facets of educational inequities. Latino English Language Learners in TWBI programs are experiencing more favorable educational outcomes than their peers in regular mainstream programs (Block, 2007; Christian et al., 2004; Gold, 2006; Howard et al., 2003; Kohe, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002). Nevertheless, there is much more room for further study and program
improvement. Confronting social inequities, promoting native Spanish-speakers cultural
capital, and nurturing culturally competent classroom environments are ambitious
endeavors. Isabel’s statement, “It's the most challenging assignment ever known on the
face of this Earth” (I. Cruz, personal communication, February 1, 2013) rings true.
Promoting cross-culturally sensitive environments where children of different races,
ethnicities, and classes work together in an equitable, balanced, and understanding
manner is a formidable task. As Isabel states, “There’s work to be done” (I. Cruz,
personal communication, February 1, 2013). Two-way bilingual immersion aims to do
this work.
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Appendix A
Teacher Focus Group Protocol

1. Greetings.

2. Discuss agreements regarding confidentiality, review purpose of study, go over projected time commitments, point out that participation is optional, can decline to participate at anytime, can choose not to answer any questions or comments.

3. Teachers share a “success” from journal.

   Something that went “well”. Why? How can I build on this, use this experience in the future?

4. Focus group comments/appreciations/discussion

5. Teachers share a “challenge” from journal.

   Something that fell short of my intentions, ideals or was difficult for me. Why?
   How can I build on this, use or learn from this experience in the future

6. Focus group comments/appreciations/discussion

7. Mini-lesson, PowerPoint presentation on a reading

8. Focus group comments/discussion/ plan of action

9. Set up action plan for implementation of a component of culturally responsive teaching component (or other, as decided by group)

10. Other reflections, comments?

11. Appreciations, schedule next meeting. Good-bye.
Appendix B

Teacher Interview Questions: Initial Interview

(Interview to be semi-structured.)

Preliminary interview

Background information

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. How long have you been teaching in DI?
3. Why did you choose to teach?
4. Why did you choose to teach in DI?
5. What language did you first speak?
6. What languages did you speak at home growing up?
   - Do you consider yourself English or Spanish dominant?
   - Possible follow up: What language did you speak when entered U.S. schools? Age? Any language struggles when entered school?
   - Possible follow up: what language(s) do you speak at home now?
7. When did you first begin to speak/learn Spanish/English?
   - Possible follow up: why pursued Spanish?
8. How would you describe your ethnicity?
   - Possible follow up: why? Parent/family background?
9. Think back on your own schooling (U.S.) experiences, can you describe if overall they were they favorable, unfavorable? Why?

Dual Immersion teaching experiences

10. Describe your class this year.
11. Think about your class, categorized into groups. On what basis would you “divide”/categorize the groups? How would you describe each group?

- Elicit general information re: academic performance, participation, discipline etc.
- Possible follow up: If state discrepancies, ask Why do you think that is?
- Does one group have more advantages than the other group? What kinds? (Why do you think that is?)
- Does the DI program advantage one group more than the other? (Why do you think that is?)
- In your opinion, are some students worst off or better off for participating in DI? Who is worst/better off? (Why do you think that is?)

12. How do you work with struggling students in your class?

- Possible follow up: Describe how would work with a struggling student from each of the groups.

13. Describe some routines, strategies or actions you take to assure that all students feel valued and appreciated.

14. According to much of the literature on dual language programs authors repeatedly say that the goals of dual immersion are “bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism for all students.” Describe what that looks like in the classroom.

15. Of these components “bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism for all students” which is the hardest to achieve? Why do you think that is?


17. What would you like to gain from this study? How can I make it more relevant, helpful to you? Any additional thoughts, comments?
Thank you for participating. (Discuss scheduling: what is convenient? Where, how often, journaling, what to expect, OK to quit at any time.)
Appendix C

Teacher Interview Questions: Final Interview

1. Did this process of inquiry, reflection help/influence your teaching? How?

2. Did it raise your awareness on any issues? What? How?

3. What worked what did not work?

4. Is this something you would want to continue? Why?

5. Would you be interested in leading a focus group?

6. What suggestions do you have for future inquiry action projects? (What went well, what would your change?)

7. In your opinion, are some students worst off or better off for participating in DI? Who is worst/better off? (Why do you think that is?)

8. Of these components “bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism for all students” which is the hardest to achieve? Why do you think that is?

9. According to much of the literature on dual language programs authors repeatedly say that the goals of dual immersion are “bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism for all students. Describe what that looks like in the classroom?

10. How do you describe cross-cultural competency in the TWBI classroom? (Did this change? Stay the same? What do you think you need to understand this?)

11. How do describe the social dynamics between cultural capital of NSS and NES in the TWBI classroom? (Did this change? Stay the same? What do you think you need to understand this?)

12. How do you work with struggling students in your class? (Did this change? Stay the same? What do you think you need to understand this?)
13. What organizational routines do you use to promote cultural capital in the TWBI classroom? (Did this change? Stay the same? What do you think you need to understand this?)

14. Did anything surprise you about teaching in DI?

15. Do you think you would continue to teach in DI?

Would you like to learn more about…

Next steps…. 
Appendix D

Teacher Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

DEVELOPING TEACHER PRACTICES TO PROMOTE SOCIO-CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC EQUITY IN THE TWO-WAY BILINGUAL IMMERSION CLASSROOM

A. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND
The purpose of this study is to examine Two Way Bilingual Immersion (TWBI) teachers' awareness and attitudes of power balance among their students and the instructional practices that they use to promote socio-cultural and linguistic equity in their classroom. I will focus on the attitudes, reflections and practices upper grade dual language teachers use to develop a culturally responsive classroom environment and to ameliorate inequitable distribution of linguistic and cultural capital.

The researcher, Betsy Brooke-Garza (Saldinger), is a graduate student at California State University East Bay conducting research for a doctoral dissertation.

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are a 4th-6th grade dual immersion teacher.

B. PROCEDURES
If you agree to participate in this research study, the following will occur:

- You will be interviewed for approximately 30-45 minutes about your background, teaching experiences and reflections. You will also be asked questions regarding your attitudes and descriptions of practices you use to promote equitable linguistic and social interactions among students attitudes.
- The interview will be audiotaped to ensure accuracy in reporting your statements.
- The interview will take place at a time and location convenient to you.
- You will also participate in 2-4 focus group meetings. From September to December 2012. The number, length of time, location and date of focus group meetings will be mutually decided upon by the teacher participants. Each focus group meeting will last approximately 45-60 minutes.
- The focus group meetings will also be audiotaped to ensure accuracy in reporting members’ statements.
- You will also be asked to journal a few quick notes at the end of each school day. (See attached journaling protocol) This should be brief approximately 1 minute (please, not more than 3 minutes) reflection. You will have a choice to record the journaling, use borrowed voice recognition software, or jot down a few quick notes. Whatever is most convenient for you.
- I will observe you in your classroom, at a time that is convenient for you for approximately 45 minutes.
- You will also be asked to participate in a final interview of approximately 20-30 minutes.
- The study will take place from September to December 2012.
• Approximate total time commitment will be 3-8 hours.

C. **RISKS**
There is a risk of loss of privacy. However, no names or identities will be used in any published reports of the research. Only the researcher will have access to the research data. The participant can answer only those questions he/she chooses to answer, and can stop participation in the research at any time. Measures will be taken to protect each participant’s privacy. The researcher will begin the focus group by asking the participants to agree to the importance of keeping information discussed in the focus group confidential. She will then ask each participant to verbally agree to keep everything discussed in the room confidential, and will remind them at the end of the group not to discuss the material outside.

Only the researcher will have access to the data collected. Any tapes and transcripts of the focus group will be destroyed after one year or at the end of the study. If any tapes or data are saved for future research, all identifying information will be removed.

D. **CONFIDENTIALITY**
The research data will be kept in a secure location, and/or password protected program. Only the researcher will have access to the data. At the conclusion of the study, all identifying information will be removed and the data will be kept in a locked cabinet or office.

At the end of the study all data and audio tapes will either be destroyed a year after the study is completed or saved for future research purposes. If the data is saved for future research, the research would be consistent with the original purpose of this study and all data will be de-identified (all identifiers removed, including coding.)

E. **DIRECT BENEFITS**
There will be no direct benefits to the participant. A potential benefit may be that participation in the study that may aid and develop individual teaching practices and support. Another benefit is that participants will experience a community of professional inquiry, action and reflection.

F. **COSTS**
There will be no cost to you for participating in this research.

G. **COMPENSATION**
There will be no compensation for participating in this research.

H. **ALTERNATIVES**  
   N/A

I. **QUESTIONS**  
If you have any further questions about the study, you may contact the researcher Betsy Brooke-Garza by email at betsysaldinger@hotmail.com or esaldinger@pleasanton.k12.ca.us or phone at .  
Questions about your rights as a study participant, or comments or complaints about the study, may also be addressed to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (510) 885-4212.

J. **CONSENT**  
You have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.  
**PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY.** You are free to decline to participate in this research study, or to withdraw your participation at any point, without penalty. Your decision whether or not to participate in this research study will have no influence on your present or future status at California State University East Bay.

Signature _____________________________ Date: __________

Research Participant

**Teacher Journaling Protocol**  
To be written, or recorded (Participant can choose what is more convenient: written notes or voice recognition software)  
Each day at the end of the school day please spend just a short moment (30 seconds to a minute) reflecting on the following questions. These are just ideas, thoughts; you don’t need complete sentences. Later in the focus group you will look over your reflections and choose one or two to share and discuss. Please don’t spend too much time on this. These are just brief notes to jog your memory for our focus group discussions.  
Thank you for participating.

1. **A success:** What went “well” today. Why? How can I build on this, use this experience in the future?
2. **A challenge:** Something that fell short of my intentions, ideals or was difficult for me.

   Why? How can I build on this, use or learn from this experience in the future