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Introduction

Significance of the Issue

Emergent Bilingual students (EB students)\(^1\) are learning English as their second language in addition to developing proficiency in their native language and consequently, are on the road to becoming fully bilingual (García, 2009; Lyons, 2014). In existing literature, EB students have predominantly been referred to as English Language Learners (ELL students), English learner (EL) students, or as Limited English Proficient students (LEPs) (e.g., García, 2009). In this thesis, these students will be referred to as Emergent Bilingual students in order to make “reference to a positive characteristic—not one of being limited or being learners, as LEPs or ELLs suggest. The term emergent bilinguals refers to the children’s potential in developing their bilingualism; it does not suggest a limitation or a problem in comparison to those who speak English” (García, 2009, p. 322).\(^2\) Of the 1.3 million EB students in California’s public schools, the vast majority (84%) are Spanish-English EB students, or students who are native Spanish speakers (California Department of Education, 2017). It has been well documented that EB students’ academic performance, as measured by standardized test scores, tends to substantially lag behind that of their native English-speaking peers (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2014).

With an emphasis on improving EB students’ academic achievement, it is important to learn about EB students’ language ideologies, which are beliefs, values, and attitudes about the status of both one’s own native language (i.e., Spanish) and the dominant societal language (i.e., English). Language ideologies are hypothesized to impact both EB students’ second language

\(^1\) For this paper, the term “EB students” solely encompasses students who have previously been identified as English Language Learners, or students who are learning English as their second language. This term does not encompass native English-speaking students who are acquiring a second language.

\(^2\) The term “ELL or EL students” will solely be used when reporting findings from existing literature.
development and their academic achievement (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011). Early on in their educational trajectory, for example, EB students learn about which language(s) are and are not valued in their classrooms (Commins, 1989). Based on this knowledge, children make choices about their language usage and these choices “are likely to impact their possibilities for both language development and academic achievement” (Commins, 1989, p. 29). Students’ choices to use, or refuse to use, their native language(s) not only affects students’ academics, but also the sustainability of minoritized languages, leading to either language maintenance or language loss. Native language loss has greater negative implications for family relations and students’ social, emotional, cognitive, and educational development (Fillmore, 1991). Students’ language choices are important not only because of the educational and societal implications, but also because they embody students’ language ideologies. Although previous studies (e.g., Commins, 1989; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011) have identified a potential relationship between language ideologies and EB students’ academic achievement, this relationship has not been empirically tested.

Given the possibility that EB students’ language ideologies may impact their academic achievement, it is imperative to learn about their language ideologies during the early grades of their academic trajectory. The current study examines the relationship between the language ideologies and academic achievement of elementary-aged Spanish-English EB students in English-only and Spanish-English bilingual classrooms. Examining this relationship for Spanish-English EB students in English-only and English-Spanish bilingual classrooms may help shed light on how different programs (English-only and bilingual) impact EB students’ language ideologies and academic performance.
Background

Introduction to Language Ideologies

Language ideologies was first defined by Silverstein (1979) as the “set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p. 193). These beliefs about language, Silverstein (1979) argued, are embedded within power relations. Building off of Silverstein’s work, Woolard (1998) maintained that language ideologies are used by societal groups “to acquire or maintain power” (p. 7). Language ideologies, thus, perpetuate social hierarchies, producing inequalities for some and privileges for other social groups not only in society, but also in classrooms and schools (Shannon, 1999 in Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012).

In the U.S., for example, English is associated with “prestige and superiority,” while Spanish is “viewed as an inferior and devalued language” (Shannon, 1995). The superiority that English receives is evident in that many teachers construct their perceptions of EB students based on the idea that English proficiency itself is a “marker of academic success” (Razfar, 2012, p. 72). Regardless of the fact that the U.S. does not have a language policy that designates English as its official language, English has and continues to be considered as superior in relation to other languages (Shannon, 1995 in Razfar, 2003). The hierarchy between English and other native languages is reflected through some language ideologies, “commonly held constructs of power [that] explicitly privilege one group or language over another” (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011, p. 242). In the U.S., monoglossic, English-only language ideologies privilege English, which is perceived as the dominant language while other languages are perceived as the dominated and minoritized languages.
In the current study, language ideologies will generally be defined as “sets of beliefs (or ideas/conceptualizations) about language” that are inherent within language practices (Ajsic & McGroarty, 2015, p. 182; Gal, 1992 in Razfar, 2003). According to Bakhtin (1981), language use, particularly an individual’s choice of language, is always ideological (in Razfar, 2003). Overall, language ideologies in the U.S. social context fall under the following two broad categories: English-only (i.e., monoglossic) and bi/multilingual (i.e., heteroglossic). This study sought to identify additional nuanced language ideologies, which are dynamic and numerous (Razfar, 2005). English-only, monoglossic language ideologies “position idealized monolingualism in a standardized national language as the norm to which all national subjects should aspire” (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 151). These monoglossic ideologies promote “linguistic purity” and in doing so, are restrictive in the sense that they restrict individuals, particularly EB students, from using non-English languages in the classrooms (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 162; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011). On the other hand, bilingual, heteroglossic language ideologies “position multilingualism as the norm” and value the use of EB students’ native language(s) for learning purposes (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 154).

Unlike heteroglossic language ideologies, monoglossic language ideologies are not supported by research. English-only, monoglossic language ideologies are pervasive, as some members in the U.S. society believe that bilingual education, or the inclusion of children’s (non-English) native languages in the curriculum, is ineffective (Gutiérrez et al., 2002; Moll, Saez, & Dworin, 2001; Shannon, 1995). In contrast to this belief advocating against bilingual education, empirical evidence shows that bilingual education is more effective than English-only instruction in improving EB students’ academic achievement (Francis et al., 2006; Greene, 1997; Haubrich, 2010; Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005). Regardless of the lack of empirical support, English-
only ideologies remain influential in that they justify restrictive language education policies (i.e., California’s former Proposition 227), which can restrict EB students from using non-English language(s) in academic settings.

**Problem Statement: Political Nature of Language Ideologies**

Language ideologies are both personal and political. The political interests of individuals and groups are inherent within their personal language usage practices and their socio-political positioning, which represent and expose their language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2000 and Street, 1993 in Razfar, 2003). Language indexes individuals’ social-political status. Given the political nature of language ideologies, it is necessary to consider this study’s participants’ language ideologies in light of the current linguistic policies (particularly former Proposition 227 and current Proposition 58) in California. Recently, Proposition 58 (2016), also known as “Non-English Languages Allowed in Public Education,” overturned Proposition 227 (1998), also known as “English in Public Schools,” an initiative that curtailed the use of non-English languages in California public schools. Proposition 227 made it necessary for parents to opt to enroll their children in, not opt them out of, bilingual classrooms. This proposition required that EB students be placed in an intensive English instruction course for one year only before being placed in English-only instruction courses. With support from 73.5% of California voters, Proposition 58 over turned the strong English-only immersion emphasis, supporting the use of non-English languages in California public school classrooms.

Regardless of both Proposition 58 and empirical support for the effectiveness of bilingual over English-only instruction, the majority of EB students will continue to be placed in English-only classrooms for the foreseeable future because of the shortage of bilingual teachers (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2015; Mongeau, 2016). The inseparable
relationship between language ideologies and language politics is evident through language of instruction practices, particularly through the curtailing of native language usage in classrooms, which results from English-only policies (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011). The high enrollment of EB students in English-only classrooms and the limited availability of bilingual education makes it imperative to explore language of instruction in relation to EB students’ language ideologies, which shape their second language development (Griego-Jones, 1994).

**Theoretical Orientation**

The current study is grounded on Vygotsky’s (1978) Sociocultural Theory, which posits that “children learn through social interactions” (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986 in Sullivan et al., 2015, p. 342). Vygotsky’s theory particularly focuses on how social interactions influence children’s academic, cognitive, and linguistic development, which is “best understood within the cultural, social, and historical contexts in which it occurs” (Berk & Winsler, 1995 in WIDA, 2013, p. 3). All of the students in this study share a similar cultural context in terms of their native language: they are all native Spanish speakers who are acquiring English as their second language. EB students in this study, however, are exposed to different social contexts. Informed by Vygotsky’s theory, the current study particularly focuses on two social contexts in which EB students learn: school (influenced by language of instruction) and home (influenced by language use and value of native language). While 9 EB students are in English-only classrooms, 9 are in bilingual classrooms. These students’ learning experiences may differ given that they have different language(s) of instruction. The English-only classrooms, for example, foster a subtractive bilingualism environment, which fails to acknowledge EB students’ linguistic capital. On the other hand, bilingual classrooms foster an additive bilingualism environment through which EB students’ linguistic capital is acknowledged and valued. The current study extends Vygotsky’s
theory by focusing on how children acquire not only academic content, but also language ideologies, in different social contexts (particularly at home and school). It is important to understand how social contexts influence students’ acquisition of language ideologies because the acquisition of language ideologies, like academic content, occur within a sociocultural environment.

Objectives

It is imperative to learn about EB students’ language ideologies given that these ideologies may impact these students’ academic achievement (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011). Informed by the hypothesis that language ideologies, which are beliefs, values, and attitudes about the status of both one’s own native language (i.e., Spanish) and the dominant societal language (i.e., English) (Ajsic & McGroarty, 2015), impact both EB students’ second language development and their academic achievement (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011), this study addresses the following research questions:

1. How do second-grade Spanish-English EB students describe their language ideologies, particularly as they pertain to bilingualism and the value of their native language (Spanish)?

2. What are their academic achievement outcomes, as assessed by English and Spanish tests of achievement? (2a) How, if at all, do students’ achievement in English and Spanish tests differ by classroom (English-only and bilingual)?

3. What are the relationships, if any, between their language ideologies and academic achievement outcomes? (3a) Are there different relationships for EB students receiving instruction in English-only versus bilingual classrooms?
Literature Review

Language Ideologies

Internalization of English-only Language Ideologies

As a result of the prevalence of both English-only language ideologies and deficit perspectives toward bilingual education, some EB students “internalize the negative societal attitudes toward Spanish, toward bilingualism, and toward their ethnic groups” (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Moll et al., 2001, p. 445). The negative societal attitudes toward Spanish, which devalue the use of Spanish in academic settings, are evident not only in English-only classrooms, but also in bilingual classrooms whose sole purpose is to develop EB students’ English proficiency. By internalizing these negative attitudes, EB students feel ashamed of their Spanish language and refuse to speak it even in bilingual classrooms (Griego-Jones, 1994; Moll et al., 2001). Commins (1989) found that native Spanish speaking fourth and fifth grade students in a bilingual classroom internalized “the inferior status of Spanish,” maintaining that English is more valuable than Spanish in academic settings (Shannon, 1995, p. 183). Children in English-only classroom, for example, are exposed to English-only ideologies on a daily basis and as a result, internalize the idea that “the home language [i.e., Spanish] is nothing; it has no value at all” in academic settings (Fillmore, 2000).

Academic Achievement

EB students’ academic achievement has been primarily measured through English standardized tests. Based on standardized tests in English, scholars have found that there is an achievement gap between EB students and their native English-speaking peers (Lyons, 2014). It has been well-documented that starting in kindergarten, EB students’ academic performance, particularly on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), substantially lags
behind that of their native English-speaking peers (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009 in Rumberger & Tran, 2010). In 2013, the NAEP scores indicated that the majority (69% for reading and 41% for math) of EB students scored below basic in both reading and mathematics assessments (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013 in Bailey & Heritage, 2017).

While many studies have documented the underachievement of EB students, others have questioned this underachievement by acknowledging the “critical challenges in assessing ELs [EB students] in their nondominant language [in this case, English]” (Tellez & Mosqueda, 2015, p. 88). Research has shown that English exams may not be an accurate indicator of EB students’ academic proficiency (Bailey & Butler, 2003; Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003; Tellez & Mosqueda, 2015). Tellez and Mosqueda (2015) claim that “requiring emergent ELs [EB students], for instance, to take an achievement test in English (and only in English) is illogical” because these students have not yet acquired full proficiency in English (p. 93). In English standardized tests, it is unclear whether their performance is an indicator of their content-area knowledge or of their English language proficiency (Bailey & Butler, 2003). Given these linguistic challenges that arise from English standardized tests, and the inadequacy of such assessment tools for EB students, the achievement gap has been reframed as the “opportunity to learn” gap (Lyons, 2014, p. 17) or the linguistic gap (August et al., 2005). While several studies have advocated for assessing EB students in both their native language and English, not many studies have assessed EB students in both languages (Griffin et al., 2018; Tellez & Mosqueda, 2015).

**Assessing EB Students Through English and Spanish Assessments**

Given the inadequacy of English standardized tests for validly inferring the academic performance for EB students, several scholars have advocated for assessing EB students in both
their native language and English, but only a couple of studies have assessed EB students in both languages (Escamilla et al., 2017; Griffin et al., 2018; Tellez & Mosqueda, 2015). Through a longitudinal study of both EB and native English-speaking students in a dual language immersion classroom, Griffin et al. (2018) assessed these students in both English and Spanish, finding that by first grade, these students’ English and Spanish outcomes were at or above the average test norms. These assessment scores not only indicated that these students were successfully progressing towards becoming fully bilingual, but also that the dual language immersion program was successful in fostering academic achievement in both languages.

Similarly, another longitudinal study assessed the English and Spanish writing skills of 44 4th and 5th grade EB students who were in a dual language program (Escamilla et al., 2017). In this study, students’ performance on the English and Spanish assessments were compared with their performance on the English standardized test, which was normed on monolingual English children, not on Spanish-English EB students. Escamilla et al. (2017) found that solely from the English standardized test scores, “children will be viewed as less proficient and less capable than they actually are,” but through the bilingual assessments, it is evident that students’ Spanish and English writing skills are increasing together. In other words, students who have higher Spanish writing skills also have higher English writing skills. Both these studies (Escamilla et al., 2017; Griffin et al., 2018) posit that assessing EB students in both English and Spanish provides a more comprehensive and accurate measure of these students’ academic achievement (Escamilla et al., 2017; Griffin et al., 2018; Lewis et al., 2016; Tellez & Mosqueda, 2015).

**Language Ideologies and Academic Achievement**

While research studies have proposed that a potential relationship exists between EB students’ language ideologies and their academic achievement, further work is needed to analyze
the actual relationship (Commins, 1989; Griego-Jones, 1998). Students’ language ideologies are hypothesized to shape EB students’ second language development (Griego-Jones, 1998). In a mixed-methods study of 400 Polish-English and Norwegian-English EB students, Scheffler, Horverak, Krzebietke, & Askland (2017) measured these students’ language beliefs towards their respective native language and English. Through an online questionnaire and interviews, Scheffler et al. (2017) found that “both groups of learners [EB students] see their native languages as important for cognitive support” (Scheffler et al., 2017, p. 208).

Commins (1989) was one of the first to identify the relationship between language ideologies and academic achievement. The participants in Commins’ (1989) study held an English-only ideology in school. When asked about their language usage preferences, the students acknowledged that they liked speaking both English and Spanish, but that they “thought English was the language for school” (Commins, 1989, p. 33). By leaving Spanish out of the school setting, “a setting where they could have used it to full advantage to facilitate academic achievement, they unconsciously restricted their own language development” (Commins, 1989, p. 35). Their English-only ideology, which influenced their decision to solely use English in the classroom, limited their opportunities for the transfer of language skills between English and Spanish to occur. As a result of leaving Spanish out of the school setting, children begin losing proficiency in their native language, which not only affects their academic performance but also their family relations (Fillmore, 2000).

As mentioned, English-only ideologies impact not only people’s perceptions on language of instruction, but also language practices and learning in the classroom (Razfar, 2012). The pervasive English-only ideologies, for example, impact language of instruction, positing that English-only, not bilingual, instruction should be used to teach EB students. In a study on
literacy strategies, Razfar (2003) found that English-only language ideologies, or ideologies that posit that EB students’ native language(s) should not be used as a tool for learning, “serve to undermine not only learning a language such as English but also learning in general” (p. 249). As opposed to English-only ideologies, research has found that bilingual education is more effective than English-only instruction in improving EB students’ academic performance (Francis, Lesaux, & August, 2006; Greene, 1997; Haubrich, 2010; Rolstad et al., 2005). Bilingual education has been found to be more effective particularly because EB students’ native language skills transfer and positively contribute to their English language skills (Hakuta, 1990; Bailey, Osipova, & Kelly, 2015; Yopp & Stapleton, 2008). Thus, when EB students are restricted from using their native languages in the classroom, using Spanish as a “mediational tool” is no longer an option and thus, their learning is negatively affected (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011).

Research Gap

Most studies have independently explored the language ideologies and academic achievement of EB students. Although some studies have already evaluated the language ideologies of EB students, these studies have limitations, which will be addressed through the proposed study. An overarching limitation lies in that these aforementioned studies’ methodologies primarily consist of classroom, observations, field notes, classroom surveys, and students’ classwork, effectively excluding students’ perspectives. Studies that do incorporate interviews (i.e., Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Griego-Jones, 1994) are limited in that they are dated or target the unique population of EB students who have been Re-classified as Fluent English Proficient (R-FEP). Through the individual interviews, this study gives students the agency to voice their language ideologies. Another prominent limitation is that most studies have focused on EB students either in English-only or bilingual classrooms. In order to examine the
relationship between language of instruction and language ideologies, it is necessary to incorporate the language ideologies of EB students in both English-only and bilingual classrooms, comparing how their language ideologies converge and differ. Lastly, most studies have incorporated EB students in upper-elementary (5th and 6th grade) and high school grades, excluding the perspectives of young children. It is important to learn about the language ideologies of young children as early as possible. Given the possibility that EB students’ language ideologies may impact their academic achievement, it is important to learn about their language ideologies early during their educational trajectories.

In recognizing the linguistic obstacles of English standardized tests, this study assessed all EB students, regardless of whether they were in the English-only or bilingual classroom, in both English and Spanish (their native language). While some studies have focused either on EB students’ language ideologies or their academic achievement, others have noted the importance of identifying the relationship between language ideologies and academic achievement, but none of these studies have empirically explored that relationship (Banes, Martinez, Athaneses, & Wong, 2016; Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012). This study contributes to the literature by exploring the potential relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement. It is imperative to explore this relationship because language ideologies, which are “flexible” and “dynamic,” can be used to maximize language ideologies’ influence on EB students’ academic achievement (Banes et al., 2016, p. 180).

**Positionality**

Looking back at my elementary school experience, I recall a pivotal moment in fourth grade that shaped my understanding of EB students like myself. I was sitting here in my fourth grade classroom feeling anxious about Mr. E pulling me out of class. I wished I could be with
my classmates, who were cheerfully running back into the classroom, feeling proud of their California Standards Test (CST) scores. Having studied more for the CSTs that year, I was hoping that my scores would be better than last year’s. The thought of my low scores from the previous years kept weighing me down. As I continued to sink in my chair, I finally heard Mr. E call my name. I walked out of the classroom slowly. Mr. E informed me that it happened again. Once again, I had scored below basic on the CST. Once again, I was labeled as a dumb student. Once again, I was disappointed and hopeless in my capacity to both develop proficient English linguistic abilities and attain academic success. As an elementary school student, the dominant English-only curriculum and my poor performance on English standardized tests led me to internalize the idea that my native language (Spanish) was an impediment to my academic success. My experiences as a Spanish-speaking EB student are important because they constitute “experiential data” in my study. Experiential data consists of the researchers’ “technical knowledge, research background, and personal experiences” related to the topic of study (Maxwell, 2013, p. 45). It is imperative for me to integrate my “cultural subjectivity” within my study through the use of my personal experiences (Maxwell, 2013, p. 45). My experiences as an EB student fueled my interest in investigating the relationship between language ideologies and academic achievement, advocating for and ensuring that current EB students do not feel ashamed of their native language nor hopeless about their academic performance.

**Research Aims and Research Questions**

To accomplish the aims of this study, I embraced a transformative and pragmatic orientation characterized by a mixed-methods approach, empowering and collaborating with EB students, while also acknowledging the problems (including native language loss and academic achievement gap) that EB students face throughout their educational trajectory (Creswell &
Plano Clark, 2018). This concurrent mixed methods\textsuperscript{3} study seeks to understand the relationship between the language ideologies and academic achievement of second-grade Spanish-English EB students in English-only and bilingual classrooms at ABC Elementary School\textsuperscript{4}. A concurrent mixed methods design is a type of design in which qualitative and quantitative data are collected simultaneously and analyzed both separately and jointly (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

In this study, one-on-one interviews with 18 second-grade Spanish-English EB students explored these students’ language ideologies, particularly as they pertain to bilingualism, the value of their native language (Spanish), and language of assessment preferences. Quantitative data consisted of English and Spanish tests of achievement scores. Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory, which posits that social contexts (including home and school) impact EB students’ learning in terms of their academic achievement, was used to interpret the academic achievement results (Vygotsky, 1978 in Sullivan et al., 2015). It is important to collect both qualitative and quantitative data because while the qualitative data give us access to students’ voices, allowing them to provide insight into their language ideologies, the quantitative data provides us with a statistically measurable assessment of EB students’ academic achievement in English and their native language. The two forms of data bring greater insights into the relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement than would otherwise be obtained by either type of data separately (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

\textsuperscript{3} Referred to as “convergent parallel mixed methods design” in Creswell & Clark, 2018); also referred to as simultaneous triangulation, parallel study, convergence model, concurrent triangulation, concurrent study (Creswell & Clark, 2018)

\textsuperscript{4} pseudonym
Methods

Figure 1
Overview (Visual Map)-Concurrent Mixed-Methods Design

Context

The current study was conducted at ABC Elementary School (ABC, pseudonym), a public elementary school in the greater Los Angeles area. 73% of its students are learning English as their second language (GreatSchools.org). ABC Elementary School was chosen as the designated site for this study because a majority of its population are Spanish-English EB students, which reflects the population in California public schools where Spanish-English EB students also constitute the majority (84%) (California Department of Education, 2014). ABC’s population predominantly consists of Hispanics5 (98%) and low socioeconomic status students (90%) who receive free and reduced lunch. As measured by the California Assessments of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP), about two-thirds of students at ABC nearly met or are below the math, English, and science standards, whereas only about one-third of students met or exceeded these standards (StartClass.com). The student to teacher ratio is 22:1. Most

5 terminology used by the school’s website.
(95%) of the teachers at ABC have 3 or more years of teaching experience. ABC offers both English-only and bilingual instruction for students starting from Kindergarten until fifth grade. The language of instruction that children receive is determined by their parents. Students in English-only classroom receive all instruction in English. Students in bilingual classrooms receive 50% of instruction in English and 50% of instruction in Spanish.

**Participants**

Eighteen second-grade Spanish-English EB students (9 from English-only classrooms and 9 from bilingual classrooms) from ABC Elementary School were included in this study. These students are comparable in that they are all second-grade Spanish-English EB students. They are native Spanish speakers who are acquiring English as their second language. These students differ in terms of their language of instruction, while 9 are in English-only classrooms, 9 are in bilingual classrooms. These students are also exposed to different language environments at home. During the interviews, students self-reported the language(s) their parents spoke at home. Of the 9 students in the English-only classroom, 3 reported that their parents solely spoke Spanish at home, 1 reported that his parents only spoke English, and 5 reported that their parents spoke English and Spanish. In contrast to the parents of students in English-only classrooms who predominantly spoke both languages at home, the parents of students in Bilingual classrooms were predominantly monolingual Spanish speakers. Of the 9 students in the Bilingual classrooms, 7 reported that their parents solely spoke Spanish at home, 1 reported that his parents only spoke English, and 1 reported that his parents spoke English and Spanish.

**Sampling Plan**

Given that the current study attempts to explore the relationship between EB students’ language ideologies (qualitative data) and academic achievement (quantitative data), it is
important to use *identical samples*, that is, comparable individuals, for both the qualitative and quantitative data collection procedures (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007 in Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). EB students from both English-only and bilingual classrooms were included in this study through purposeful sampling, particularly maximal variation sampling, “in which diverse individuals are chosen who are expected to hold different perspectives on the central phenomenon” (p. 176). While EB students in English-only classrooms are exposed to a subtractive environment that fails to acknowledge their linguistic capital, EB students in bilingual classrooms are exposed to an additive environment through which EB students’ linguistic capital is acknowledged and valued. Based on these different environments, it is expected that EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement may differ by classroom (i.e., English-only or bilingual). It is particularly important to learn about the language ideologies and academic achievement of EB students in both English-only and bilingual classrooms because these language programs are the most commonly available for these students.

**Data Collection**

All data for this study were collected during Fall 2017 of the EB students’ second grade year. The one-on-one interviews (discussed below) regarding the EB students’ language ideologies were conducted during October, 2017. After all interviews were collected, students, regardless of their language of instruction, were tested in Spanish in November. The English test of achievement was conducted during December to provide a two-week gap between the English and Spanish tests. The two-week gap between the English and Spanish tests was determined based on prior studies, which also provide a two-week gap between the English and Spanish tests of achievement (Lewis et al., 2016). This two-week gap prevents too much additional growth to
occur between the two parallel assessment sessions. Students were systematically given the Spanish test first and then the English test because due to the small sample size, counterbalancing was not meaningful. I conducted all interviews and assessments individually in an empty classroom at ABC Elementary School. Interviews lasted approximately 20-30 minutes and the tests of achievement lasted approximately 45 minutes.

**Data Collection Strategies**

**One-on-One Interviews**

At the beginning of the interviews, I informed my participants that like them, I also spoke English and Spanish. In an attempt to undermine the power differential that exists between the interviewer and participants, I gave my participants the agency to choose whether they wanted to speak with me in English, Spanish, or both (Olson, 2011, p. 29). Of the 9 students in the English-only classrooms, 2 chose to speak in both English and Spanish during the interview and 7 chose to speak solely in English. Of the 9 students in the bilingual classrooms, 3 chose to speak in both English and Spanish, 5 chose to speak solely in English, and 1 chose to speak solely in Spanish during the interview (See Table 1 below). The duration of the interviews ranged from about 10-30 minutes \(^6\), with an average of 14 minutes. All of the interviews were conducted in a quiet room with no distractions at ABC Elementary School. I pulled students out of class and interviewed them on an individual basis.

---

\(^6\) Time of interview (not accounting for the duration of the drawing).
Table 1
Language and Duration of Interview (without drawing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Language of Instruction</th>
<th>Duration of Interview</th>
<th>Language of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>13 min.</td>
<td>Spanish, English, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alondra</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>16 min.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>12 min.</td>
<td>Spanish, English, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>16 min.</td>
<td>Spanish, Spanish/English, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>11 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>13 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenia</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>12 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>11 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>13 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nallely</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>21 min.</td>
<td>English, Spanish/English, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>31 min.</td>
<td>Spanish/English, English, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>13 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>12 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>12 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>12 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>11 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>12 min.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one-on-one interviews consisted of the following three sections⁸:

(1) Semi-structured interview about students’ language environment at home

At the beginning of the interview, students were given 5-7 minutes to make a drawing of where they live and who they live with. Beginning the interview with a drawing, which is an age-appropriate task, is “child empowering” (Clark, 2010, p. 86) and provides the means to facilitate initiating conversations with young children (Schensul & LeCompte, 2013). The drawing is purely a warm-up task and thus, was not coded. After the drawing was completed, students were asked about their language preference and language usage practices at home. It is

---

⁷ To protect the identity of my participants, all names are pseudonyms.

⁸ These measures are new and have been piloted with the same students in this study but in an earlier grade.
important to ask students about their language exposure and language use at home in order to
“better understand the language abilities of DLLs [EB students]” (Lewis et al., 2016, p. 480).

(2) Age appropriate Likert-type rating scale activity about language environment at school

Students were given two scenarios. The first scenario was about an EB student in an
English-only classroom and the second scenario was about an EB student in a bilingual
classroom. Following each scenario, students were asked to circle one of the following feelings:
very unhappy, unhappy, in-between, happy, or very happy. The first scenario, for example, stated
the following, “Alejandro (Alejandra)\(^9\) knows how to speak both English and Spanish. He/she is
in a classroom where he/she is taught only in English. His/her teacher only speaks English. How
do you think he/she feels about being in this classroom?” After rating how they thought another
student would feel in both an English-only and bilingual classroom, students were asked about
their own feelings. For the first scenario, for example, students were asked, “How would you feel
if you were Alejandro (Alejandra)?” This section also incorporated items regarding students’
language of instruction and language of assessment preferences.

(3) Students’ perceptions on language of instruction and Spanish-use in classrooms

This section of the interview contained 6 statements for each language ideology (English-
only and bilingual)\(^10\). Students were asked to circle “yes” if they agreed with the statement and to
circle “no” if they did not agree with the statement. A statement that students were given, for
example, was the following, “Students should be in a classroom where their teachers only speak
English.” Half of these statements were pro-bilingual and the other half were pro-English-only.

\(^9\) Matched with participant’s gender.

\(^10\) Two additional statements were removed from the analysis because they were difficult for students to
comprehend.
Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement and Woodcock-Muñoz Bateria III Prueba de Aprovechamiento

Academic achievement was measured through the Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement and the Woodcock-Muñoz Bateria III Prueba de Aprovechamiento (Mather & Woodcock, 2005; McGrew, Schrank, & Woodcock 2007; Muñoz-Sandoval, Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2005; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001, 2007). All of the participants took the following subtests in both the English and Spanish tests: letter-word identification, spelling, applied problems, word attack, editing, and quantitative concepts (concepts and number series). These subtests provided a comprehensive understanding of EB students’ reading and math proficiencies. In recognizing the linguistic obstacles of English standardized tests, this study assessed all EB students, regardless of whether they were in the English-only or bilingual classroom, in both English and Spanish (their native language). Although EB students in the English-only classrooms were not receiving native language instruction, it is still important to measure their Spanish proficiency because their home language environment may have been fostering native language maintenance.

Data Analysis

**RQ#1**: How do second-grade Spanish-English EB students describe their language ideologies, particularly as they pertain to bilingualism and the value of their native language (Spanish)?

Data analysis of the one-on-one interviews was conducted after all 18 interviews had been collected, transcribed, and printed. Although data collection for this research question was purely qualitative, I implemented both qualitative and quantitative methods for data analysis. For the qualitative data analysis phase, an inductive coding approach was used. Qualitative research has heavily integrated inductive analysis, which is when researchers explore their data from a
“bottom up” approach, “inductively, developing newly identified codes/analytic categories” (Bazeley, 2013; Creswell, 2014; Maxwell, 2013; Schensul & LeCompte, 2013). To inductively explore the data, I used In Vivo coding because this data analysis technique allowed me to use my participants’ words and phrases as thematic codes. As part of my research objectives, it is important for me to retain EB students’ voices and represent their language ideologies in their own words (Bazeley, 2013).

In order to provide a comprehensive exploration of language ideologies, it is important to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative data analysis approaches: “qualitative methods to understand meanings, functions, goals, and intentions” and “quantitative methods to understand the prevalence of particular practices, behaviors, and beliefs” (Yoshikawa et al., 2008, p. 346). Quantitative data analysis constitutes a deductive approach through which data is explored “top down” and researchers use “predefined coding categories for analysis” (Schensul & LeCompte, 2013). The predefined codes that were used in this study are the following: personal preference of language use, language awareness, English-only ideology and bilingual ideology. These a priori codes were derived from a study I conducted with this same group of EB students last year. Magnitude coding, in particular, was used through this quantitative data analysis because this approach serves “as one way of transforming or ‘quantitizing’ qualitative data” (Saldaña, 2016, p. 86). Students’ yes/no responses in section 3 of the interview allowed for a quantitative analysis of students’ language ideologies, which is important for understanding the prevalence, consistency, and strength of students’ language of instruction ideology (Yoshikawa et al., 2008). Lastly, descriptive statistics, particularly frequencies, proportions, and counts by classrooms, will be provided in order to quantitatively account for the recurrence of themes and language ideology stances by classroom.
RQ#2: What are second-grade Spanish-English EB students’ academic achievement outcomes, as measured by English and Spanish tests of achievement?

RQ#2a: How, if at all, do students’ achievement in English and Spanish tests differ by classroom (English-only and bilingual)?

With a larger sample size, an ANOVA would be the appropriate quantitative analysis for determining whether there is a statistically significant difference between students’ English and Spanish tests of achievement outcomes. Given the smaller sample size in this study, analyses of the quantitative data consisted of correlations between EB students’ English and Spanish test results. These correlations were initially conducted for all EB students as a group without differentiating between the classrooms (English-only and bilingual). Using the entire sample for these correlations may potentially provide the power necessary to state correlational significance. Correlational analyses provided insight on the relationship between EB students’ English and Spanish acquisition, revealing the association between the acquisition of a second language and native language loss or maintenance, a problem that many EB students experience (Fillmore, 2000).

Descriptives of each classroom informed research question #2a. The norm scores for the English and Spanish tests of achievement were used as reference points. Within each of the classrooms (English-only and bilingual), students were described as being below, at, or above the norm for both the English and Spanish tests. Such descriptive analysis allowed for the identification of any outliers. Patterns of English and Spanish performance were also be noted by classroom.
Integration of Mixed-Methods

RQ#3: What are the relationships, if any, between Spanish-English EB students’ language ideologies and their academic achievement outcomes?

RQ#3a: Are there different relationships for EB students receiving instruction in English-only versus bilingual classrooms?

Data analysis for the third research question allows for the integration of both the qualitative and quantitative data. To explore the relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and their academic achievement outcomes, students were identified as having either a strong, moderate, or weak ideology towards bilingualism and the use of Spanish in classrooms and assessments. Students were characterized as having a strong, pro-bilingual ideology if they (1) were willing to use both languages to communicate with individuals at home, (2) preferred to speak in both English and Spanish during the interview, (3) believed that they would perform better in English and Spanish, rather than English-only, tests, (4) preferred to take tests in English and Spanish, (5) preferred to be in a bilingual, rather than English-only, classroom, and (6) agreed with the six pro-bilingual statements and disagreed with the six English-only statements in section 3 of the interview (see Appendix A). Based on these above-mentioned language beliefs, practices, and preferences, I created a language ideologies scale that ranged from -18 to 18. Every student received one point for every pro-bilingual response (responding “no” to English-only items and responding “yes” to Bilingual items) and a negative point for every pro-English-only response (responding “yes” to English-only items and responding “no” to Bilingual items). An overall score of 18 indicates that the student holds a strong pro-bilingual ideology, whereas a score of -18 indicates that the student holds a strong pro-English-only ideology. No students received a score below 0, indicating that none of them had weak,
moderate, or strong English-only ideologies. A score between 13 and 18 indicates a strong bilingual ideology. A score between 7 and 12 indicated a moderate bilingual ideology. A score between 1 and 6 indicates a weak bilingual ideology.

Overall, students were categorized as having a strong, pro-bilingual ideology towards language of instruction if they agreed with the six pro-bilingual statements, disagreed with the six English-only statements, were willing to speak both languages at home and during the interview, preferred to be in a bilingual classroom, and preferred to take tests in both English and Spanish. EB students’ expressed ideology was merged with their English and Spanish achievement results through descriptive statistics, including frequencies, counts, and patterns by expressed language ideology. Given that the relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement has not been empirically tested before, the data analysis was exploratory.

Findings

RQ#1: How do second-grade Spanish-English EB students describe their language ideologies, particularly as they pertain to bilingualism and the value of their native language (Spanish)?

Bilingual Ideology:

EB students’ bilingual language practices (Section 1 of the interview). As previously mentioned, language ideologies are inherent within language practices (Gal, 1992 in Razfar, 2003). According to Bakhtin (1981), language use, particularly an individual’s choice of language, is always ideological (in Razfar, 2003). EB students’ practice of using both languages to communicate with individuals at home depicts their bilingual language ideology. EB students in this study demonstrate the ability to not only identify the language(s) that other individuals
speak, but also to match their spoken language to that of other individuals. EB students’ bilingual language ideology is exemplified by Ana and Alondra, both second-graders in bilingual classrooms, who mention that they speak Spanish with their parents because their parents “no saben inglés” [don’t know English]. Based on their perception that their parents are not proficient in English, Ana and Alondra consciously choose to speak with them in Spanish, a language that they share proficiency in. While some individuals have the choice to speak either English or Spanish, others are monolingual and can only communicate in one language. Cassandra, for example, acknowledges that she speaks Spanish at home because “all my family speaks Spanish.” She acknowledges that Spanish is the shared language at home and thus, speaks Spanish to successfully communicate with her family members.

Similar to the above-mentioned students, 7 of the 9 EB students in the bilingual classrooms and 6 of the 9 EB students in the English-only classrooms in this study demonstrated an ability to adjust their language usage so that it matched with the language usage of others. Students demonstrated an awareness of other’s language proficiencies and this awareness shaped their language usage practices. Victor, a second-grader in a bilingual classroom, states “a veces mi mama me habla en español porque casi no sabe en inglés pero si ella me habla en español, yo le hablo español, si me habla inglés, yo le hablo inglés” [Sometimes my mom speaks with me in Spanish because she doesn’t know too much in English but if she speaks with me in Spanish, I speak with her in Spanish, if she speaks with me English, I speak with her English]. Victor’s language usage shifts between English and Spanish are informed by his awareness of his mother’s language usage and choice. His language usage practices are conditional upon the language(s) that his mother (and others) choose to speak. Through their flexibility in alternating their language practices on the basis of the language(s) that other individuals speak to them in,
these students not only facilitated their communication with, but also addressed the linguistic needs of, a variety of people, including English monolingual, Spanish monolingual, and Spanish-English bilingual individuals. Similar to these findings, Martinez (2010) found that the linguistic switches of bilingual Latina/o sixth graders at a middle school in East Los Angeles “were contingent upon an awareness of their respective audiences” (p. 136). In this study, we see that as early as second grade, EB students possess this audience awareness, a skill that “could be effectively leveraged as a resource for their academic writing” (Martinez, 2010, p. 139).

**The value of learning Spanish in bilingual classrooms (Section 2 of the interview):** In the second section of the interview, students were asked about (1) their belief regarding whether they thought they would perform higher in an English-only or a bilingual classroom and (2) their preference for being either in an English-only or in a bilingual classroom. Most students rationalized their preference for bilingual classrooms through their desire to learn, and the importance of maintaining proficiency in, both English and Spanish. Alondra, a student in a bilingual classroom, states that she would prefer to stay in a bilingual classroom rather than in an English-only classroom “¡porque para que aprenda más inglés y más español!” [because so I could learn more English and more Spanish]. Similarly, Eric, who is also in a bilingual classroom, justifies his preference for being in a bilingual classroom with the following: “so I could know more Spanish.” EB students in English-only classrooms also justify their preference for being in a bilingual classroom because “then I could learn both” [Elizabeth] and because “I can learn a bunch of, I can learn more Spanish words” [Eduardo]. These students demonstrate their belief that being in a bilingual classroom will satisfy their desire to learn and consequently, be more proficient in, both English and Spanish. Victor, a student in a bilingual classroom, is aware that he is losing his Spanish proficiency as he gains proficiency in English, claiming that
he wants to remain in a bilingual classroom “*porque debo de aprender un poquito más español*
*porque antes tenia mucho español pero lo estoy empezando a perder y el inglés lo estoy agarrando más*” [because I need to learn a bit more Spanish because before, I had a lot of Spanish but I am starting to lose it and I am starting to learn more English]. Victor acknowledges the importance of not only learning English, but also maintaining proficiency in his native language. These students associate “knowing both languages” with doing better, and learning more, in school, which leads them to value bilingual classrooms.

**Ideology: Speaking a language increases one’s proficiency in that language (Section 1 of the interview).** In section one of the interview, students were asked the following: “When you’re at home, do you like using Spanish or English better and why?” In response to this question, students in both the bilingual and English-only classrooms demonstrated an awareness of their own language proficiencies, particularly in regards to their spoken language. This awareness, particularly of whether they possessed or lacked proficiency in English and Spanish, influenced these students’ language usage practices. Nallely, a second-grader in an English-only classroom, stated that she preferred using Spanish at home because “it [speaking Spanish] helps me learn more in Spanish.” Nallely acknowledges that she needs to “learn more,” or acquire more skill in, speaking Spanish. Similarly, Alejandro, who is also in an English-only classroom, mentioned that he preferred using Spanish “because I need to practice talking Spanish.” Alejandro’s use of the term “need” demonstrates a meta-awareness of the importance of practicing spoken Spanish so as to acquire or maintain proficiency in it. Elizabeth, another student in an English-only classroom, mentions that although she prefers using Spanish because she “needs to practice more in Spanish,” she should also speak English “because then if I speak only Spanish, I’m not going to learn in English.” For these students in English-only classrooms,
while it is important to practice speaking Spanish in order to increase their proficiency in that language, they agree that they must also continue speaking English in order to maintain their proficiency in that language.

This pattern of speaking a language in order to increase one’s proficiency in that language is evident in the responses not only of students in English-only classrooms, but also of students in bilingual classrooms. Alondra, a student in a bilingual classroom, states that she prefers to speak English at home “porque estoy aprendiendo un poco más de inglés” [because I am learning a bit more of English]. Victor, a student in a bilingual classroom, also prefers to speak English at home “porque estoy platicando con mi hermano y el, y así es como estoy aprendiendo y ya me esta gustando más el inglés” [because I am talking with my brother and he, and that’s how I am learning and I am starting to like English more]. Both Alondra and Victor use the phrase “estoy aprendiendo” [I am learning], which indicates that they are still in the process of acquiring the English language. While they have not yet reached full proficiency in English, they speak English at home in order to increase their proficiency in English.

It is important to note the pattern by language of instruction evident in these students’ responses: While students (Nallely, Alejandro, and Elizabeth) in English-only classrooms felt less proficient in Spanish and acknowledged that they need to practice more in Spanish, students (Alondra and Victor) in bilingual classrooms felt less proficient in English and acknowledged that they need to practice more in English. Students in the English-only classrooms, for example, may feel more inclined to practice speaking Spanish at home because they do not have the opportunity to do so in school. On the other hand, students in bilingual classrooms feel the need to practice their English a bit more potentially because both their home and school environments foster their Spanish language skills. After acknowledging their perceived lack of proficiency in a
language, these students mentioned that they had to practice speaking the language in order to increase their proficiency. These students were intentionally speaking the language that they felt they lacked proficiency in. A salient theme, thus, is that practicing a language, by speaking it, will increase one’s proficiency in that language.

**Ideology: Language is tied to both physical space, particularly the nation one’s parents are born in/reside in, and identity, particularly one’s nationality (Section 1 of the interview).** EB students’ belief that physical space is tied to language is evident through their rationalization/ reasoning for why they choose to speak Spanish with their parents. In particular, these students identify that the nation in which one is born in determines the language(s) one speaks. During section 1 of the interview, students were asked the following question: “Do you speak with your parents in English, Spanish, or both?” followed by “why?” In response to the first question, 5 of the 9 students in the English-only classroom and 3 of the 9 students in the bilingual classrooms attributed their choice of speaking Spanish with their parents to the fact that their parents were born in a Spanish-speaking country, such as Perú and México. Alondra, a student in a bilingual classroom, for example, states that she speaks Spanish with her parents “porque ellos son de Perú” [because they are from Perú]. Similarly, Carlos, a student in an English-only classroom, states that “my grandma, my grandpa don’t speak English because they didn’t learn how to speak English because they lived in México and they only speak Spanish.” The conjunction “because” indicates that this student’s grandparents only speak Spanish solely for the reason that they resided in México. The tie between language and place is further evident in that Erica and Eduardo prefer to speak Spanish at home “because my parents were born in México and they talk Spanish” and “because my parents are from México” respectively. The striking similarity in responses reveals a common implication that because their parents were
born in a Spanish-speaking country (Perú and México), they not only prefer to speak Spanish, but are most likely monolingual Spanish-speakers.

Similar to how the above-mentioned students acknowledge that others speak Spanish because they either live or lived in a Spanish-speaking country, Eric acknowledges a change in his Spanish proficiency and associates that change to having visited México. Eric states “I didn’t know Spanish, I went to México […] so I learned Spanish.” The conjunction “so” reveals that his acquired Spanish proficiency resulted from both going to México and having access to this Spanish-speaking country.

EB students’ belief that identity, particularly one’s parents’ nationality, is tied to language is exemplified by Carlos’ response, through which he states that he speaks “Mexican,” particularly with his parents who were born in México, and “American,” particularly with his siblings and friends who were born in the U.S. The terms “Mexican” and “American” are national origin labels that provide insight into the identity of a person, particularly the nationality of a person. Through his response, Carlos uses the terms “Mexican” and “American” to symbolize both one’s identity and one’s language. Though “Spanish” is the official language of México, Carlos claims that his parents speak “Mexican,” highlighting that the type of Spanish that his parents speak is heavily influenced by their place of birth. He rationalizes that because his parents were born in México, they speak and are “Mexican.” Similar to the students quoted above, Carlos also embraces the ideology that one’s language is tied to the nation that one is born in and consequently, one’s nationality.

**RQ#2: What are their academic achievement outcomes, as assessed by English and Spanish tests of achievement? How, if at all, do students’ achievement on English and Spanish tests differ by classroom (English-only and bilingual)?**
**Descriptive Statistics:**

Each student’s Woodcock-Johnson-III and *Batería-III* scores on the six subtests (Letter-Word Identification, Spelling, Applied Problems, Word Attack, Editing, and Quantitative Concepts) were entered into the Riverside Publishing Database. After I input all of this data, I generated score reports for each student. These score reports indicated whether students were below, at, or above the norm (depending on their age and grade level) for the following overarching academic domains: (1) Brief Achievement, (2) Basic Reading Skills, (3) Math Reasoning, and (4) Basic Writing Skills.

For the Woodcock-Johnson, the mean scores indicated that EB students in bilingual classrooms outperformed EB students in the English-only classrooms in all four domains. Whereas the mean was above the norm in all four domains for EB students in bilingual classrooms, the mean was below the norm in most (except Basic Reading Skills) domains for EB students in English-only classrooms. The highest mean performance for students in both bilingual and English-only classrooms was in Basic Reading Skills, while their lowest mean performance was in Math Reasoning. Similar to the Woodcock-Johnson results, the *Batería* mean scores indicated that EB students in bilingual classrooms, on average, outperformed EB students in the English-only classrooms in all four domains. Although EB students in bilingual classrooms performed better, on average, than EB students in English-only classrooms, for “Math Reasoning,” all students in this study were either at or below the norm. For EB students in English-only classrooms, the mean scores for all four domains were below the national norm.

Overall, for both the Woodcock-Johnson and the *Batería*, EB students in bilingual classrooms, on average, performed higher than EB students in English-only classrooms and often also performed above the national norm (see Tables 2 and 3 below). Although the sample size in
this study does not provide enough power to establish statistical significance, these mean scores patterns highlight the academic benefits of being in a bilingual classroom. These findings dispel the myth that EB students in bilingual classrooms do not acquire proficiency in both languages. Students in bilingual classrooms in this study are, on average, not only performing above the norm in English, but also in Spanish, maintaining proficiency in their native language while also learning a second language. On average, EB students in bilingual classrooms are performing above the norm in most domains for the English and Spanish (except Math Reasoning) tests of achievement. As opposed to EB students in bilingual classrooms, EB students in English-only classrooms are, on average, performing below the norm in most domains for the English (except in Basic Reading Skills) and Spanish tests of achievement. These results indicate that whereas EB students in bilingual classrooms are emerging as bilingual students, with proficiency in both Spanish and English, EB students in English-only classrooms are not only losing their native language, but are also not acquiring English proficiency as effectively as EB students in bilingual classrooms. Similar to Griffin et al.’s (2018) study, which found that EB and native English-speaking students in dual language immersion classrooms had English and Spanish outcomes that were at or above the average test norms, the assessment scores for this study not only indicated that these students were successfully progressing towards becoming fully bilingual, but also that the dual language immersion program was successful in fostering academic achievement in both languages.

**RQ#3: What are the relationships, if any, between their language ideologies and academic achievement outcomes? Are there different relationships for EB students receiving instruction in English-only versus bilingual classrooms?**
For EB students in bilingual classrooms, there was a positive relationship between having a strong or moderate bilingual ideology and performing nearly at or above the norm for both English and Spanish outcomes. Of these students, 4 held a strong pro-bilingual ideology (Ana, Alondra, Diego, Victor), 4 held a moderate pro-bilingual ideology (Andrea, Kenia, Eric, Sergio), and 1 held a weak pro-bilingual ideology (Luis) (see Appendix B). Luis was the only one to not only have a weak pro-bilingual ideology, but also to perform above the norm for all the domains in English and below the norm for all the domains in Spanish. For Luis, his weak pro-bilingual ideology might have impacted his below the norm performance on the Spanish assessment, or vice versa (his low performance in Spanish might have shaped his weak pro-bilingual ideology).

For the remaining students, having a strong or moderate pro-bilingual ideology correlated with performing above the norm in most of the domains for both the English and Spanish assessments. Those with a strong pro-bilingual ideology performed barely below the norm (1-9 points below the norm), whereas those with a moderate pro-bilingual ideology were more likely to perform more than 10 points below the norm. Sergio, who held a moderate pro-bilingual ideology was identified as an outlier. Based on his moderate pro-bilingual ideology, we’d expect that he would perform above or slightly below the norm, but he scored above the norm in only one domain and scored below the norm for the remaining three domains in both the English and Spanish assessments.
Table 2
Students in Bilingual Classrooms WJ-III and Batería-III Performance\textsuperscript{11}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Language Ideology</th>
<th>Woodcock-Johnson (English)</th>
<th>Batería (Spanish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For EB students in English-only classrooms, the relationship between their language ideologies and academic achievement was not evident. Of these students, 2 held a strong pro-

\textsuperscript{11} A score of 100 is the norm. Any score above 100 is above the norm, any score at 100 is at the norm, and any score below 100 is below the norm. Reported scores are scale scores.
bilingual ideology (Nallely and Elizabeth), 3 held a moderate pro-bilingual ideology (Erica, Oscar, Eduardo), and 4 held a weak pro-bilingual ideology (Carlos, Juan, Cassandra, Alejandro) (see Appendix C). Regardless of their language ideology, most students scored more than ten points below the norm on most domains in both English and Spanish. Carlos, Juan, and Oscar scored below the norm in all of the domains for both English and Spanish. The potential relationship between language ideologies and academic achievement for students in English-only classrooms may be disrupted by the fact that although some of these students express a strong/moderate language ideology, they are exposed to a conflicting English-only ideology in their classrooms. It may also be possible that the English-only program itself was not meeting these students’ linguistic needs and consequently, their overall English and Spanish performance lagged behind that of their peers who were in the bilingual classrooms.

Table 3
Students in English-Only Classrooms WJ-III and Batería-III Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Language Ideology</th>
<th>Woodcock-Johnson (English)</th>
<th>Batería (Spanish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nallely</td>
<td>Strong pro-bilingual</td>
<td>Brief Achievement: 99</td>
<td>Aprovechamiento Breve: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: 104</td>
<td>Lectura: 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math: 80</td>
<td>Matemáticas: 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing: 108</td>
<td>Escritura: 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Strong pro-bilingual</td>
<td>Brief Achievement: 102</td>
<td>Aprovechamiento Breve: 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: 112</td>
<td>Lectura: 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math: 89</td>
<td>Matemáticas: 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing: 108</td>
<td>Escritura: 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Moderate pro-bilingual</td>
<td>Brief Achievement: 105</td>
<td>Aprovechamiento Breve: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: 106</td>
<td>Lectura: 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math: 95</td>
<td>Matemáticas: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing: 110</td>
<td>Escritura: 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Weak pro-bilingual</td>
<td>Brief Achievement: 88</td>
<td>Aprovechamiento Breve: 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: 95</td>
<td>Lectura: 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math: 83</td>
<td>Matemáticas: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing: 78</td>
<td>Escritura: 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Weak pro-bilingual</td>
<td>Brief Achievement: 88</td>
<td>Aprovechamiento Breve: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: 96</td>
<td>Lectura: 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math: 85</td>
<td>Matemáticas: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing: 79</td>
<td>Escritura: 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As expected, students in bilingual classrooms held stronger bilingual ideologies than students in English-only classrooms. This difference may be explained by the fact that EB students in bilingual classrooms have a consistent exposure to bilingual environments both at school and at home. Most of these children (7 of the 9) indicated that their parents only spoke Spanish at home, while their siblings spoke English. Students in the English-only classroom have less consistency not only in their reported ideologies, but also between their home and school environments. While these children are exposed to an English-only environment at school, they are exposed to a bilingual environment at home. The consistency, or lack thereof, between students’ home and school environments may impact the consistency they demonstrate regarding their language of instruction ideologies. Regardless of the discrepancies in students’ language ideologies, all students agreed with the statement “It is good to speak English and Spanish,” revealing that, in general, these students acknowledge the importance and necessity of speaking both languages.
Discussion

Summary of Findings

Second-grade EB students at ABC Elementary School in both English-only and Bilingual classrooms demonstrated not only an overall bilingual language ideology (ranging from weak to strong, depending on the individual student), but also more nuanced language ideologies (including the beliefs that speaking a language increases one’s proficiency in it and that language is tied to, and influenced by, space). The English and Spanish outcomes of EB students in bilingual classrooms were not only at or above the average test norms, but also higher than the outcomes of EB students in English-only classrooms. For EB students in bilingual classrooms, there was a positive relationship between having a strong or moderate bilingual ideology and performing nearly at or above the norm for both English and Spanish outcomes. For EB students in English-only classrooms, such relationship between language ideologies and academic achievement was not evident.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The study solely focuses on how language of instruction (English-only and bilingual) and language environment at home may shape EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement. Since it was useful to merge both qualitative and quantitative data, the sample size remained fairly small, limiting the “kinds of quantitative analyses that can be conducted due to low statistical power” (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2018, pp. 188-189). Nevertheless, for the purpose of this study, it was important to collect both qualitative and quantitative data from the same participants, making it easier to converge the data. It is important to also note that external factors, such as parents’ attitudes and education, quality of instruction, and generational status, may influence these students’ language ideologies.
and academic achievement (Bailey & Osipova, 2016). Additionally, there may also be some limitations for using the Woodcock-Johnson-III and Bateria-III tests of achievement. Other academic achievement measures, such as formative assessment, may be used to more accurately measure, and provide a more comprehensive understanding of, EB students’ English and Spanish learning outcomes (Bailey & Heritage, 2017). In spite of its limitations, this study significantly contributes to the research discourse regarding the education of EB students by empirically investigating a hypothesized relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement; a relationship that may have positive implications for the educational trajectories of EB students.

Implications

These findings contribute to the existing literature by adding a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and language practices; a relationship that had been hypothesized, but not empirically tested by existing literature (Commins, 1989; Griego-Jones, 1998; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011). In this study, the relationship between EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement differed by classroom. For EB students in bilingual classrooms, a strong bilingual ideology correlated with above the norm performances in both the English and Spanish tests of achievement. For EB students in English-only classrooms, however, there was no stable relationship between their respective language ideology and their English and Spanish outcomes. Regardless of their expressed language ideology, EB students in English-only classrooms overall performed below the norm in both the English and Spanish tests. Given these patterns, it can be hypothesized that language of instruction (in addition to language ideologies) influence EB students’ English and Spanish outcomes. These findings highlight importance of language of instruction and its impact
on EB students’ language ideologies and English and Spanish academic achievement. It may be the case that English-only language of instruction interferes with the positive relationship between bilingual language ideologies and high academic achievement in both English and Spanish. Given that this relationship is only evident for EB students in bilingual classrooms, it can be concluded that bilingual language ideologies can be fostered to increase EB students’ Spanish and English academic performance. To add more nuance to the impact that language ideologies have on the academic achievement of EB students’ in English-only classrooms, future research should incorporate language of instruction as a factor that may impact this relationship.

This study has implications regarding the language(s) of instruction and language(s) of assessment available to better address the linguistic needs of Spanish-English EB students. By incorporating EB students from both English-only and bilingual classrooms, the current study reveals the impact that language programs have on EB students’ language ideologies and academic achievement. In this study, second-grade EB students in bilingual classrooms held a stronger bilingual ideology and achieved higher Spanish and English outcomes than EB students in English-only classrooms. Whereas EB students in bilingual classrooms are developing their English and Spanish skills simultaneously, EB students in English-only classrooms are not only losing proficiency in their native language, but also not acquiring English as effectively as their peers in bilingual classrooms. Through these findings, researchers, policy makers, and educators should advocate for greater availability of bilingual instruction, which better improves the English and Spanish academic achievement of EB students.

This study also has implications for the language of assessment available for EB students. Assessing students in both languages not only provides a better understanding of EB students’ comprehensive academic achievement, but also sends a signal to students that both languages
have value in academic settings. Taking tests in both languages may in turn bolster a bilingual ideology in young EB students and in doing so, (1) result in native language maintenance rather than language loss and (2) positively impact their academic achievement (Fillmore, 2000). Examining the relationship between language ideologies and academic achievement outcomes of EB students in English-only and Spanish-English bilingual classrooms sheds light upon the feasibility of using language ideologies and language of instruction to foster higher academic achievement and consequently, narrow the achievement gap between EB and native English-speaking students. Through these English and Spanish achievement tests, not only are EB students’ English and Spanish development equally valued, but their reading and mathematics academic achievement is also more accurately measured (Escamilla et al., 2017; Griffin et al., 2018; Tellez & Mosqueda, 2015). Based on these analyses, this study’s findings could serve to advocate for bilingual language of instruction and bilingual language ideologies, both of which more effectively increase EB students’ English and Spanish academic achievement and in doing so, provide EB students with more opportunities that will positively impact their educational trajectories.

**Conclusion**

While the dominant language ideologies in the U.S. “explicitly privilege one group or language over another” (i.e., English over Spanish; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2011; p. 242), EB students in this study challenge these monolingual language ideologies through their bilingual language practices, valuing the use of both languages. Existing evidence, which solely consists of English standardized tests, report that EB students tend to score below basic in both reading and mathematics assessments (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013, in Bailey & Heritage, 2017). With results from the English and Spanish tests of achievement, the current
study jeopardizes the long-held notion that EB students are not performing well academically, adding a more nuanced view of EB students’ English and Spanish outcomes. Students in bilingual classrooms outperformed students in English-only classrooms in both the English and Spanish tests of achievement. The Spanish and English skills of EB students in bilingual classrooms in this study are increasing simultaneously. EB students who have higher Spanish skills also have higher English skills.
## Appendix A

### English-only and Bilingual Language of Instruction Items

#### Section 3 of the interview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English-Only Statements</th>
<th>Bilingual Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is bad for students to speak Spanish in school.</td>
<td>It is good for students to speak Spanish in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be in a classroom where their teachers only speak English.</td>
<td>Students should be in a classroom where their teachers speak both English and Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should learn how to read and write only in English.</td>
<td>Students should learn how to read and write in English and Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English should be used in classrooms.</td>
<td>Spanish and English should be used in classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is bad to speak English and Spanish.</td>
<td>It is good to speak English and Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For students to do well in school, they must forget Spanish.</td>
<td>For students to do well in school, they must know Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

Students in Bilingual Classrooms-Language Ideologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Ideology Score</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strong Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alondra</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strong Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strong Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strong Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Weak Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

### Students in English-Only Classrooms-Language Ideologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Ideology Score</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nallely</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strong Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strong Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Weak Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weak Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moderate Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak Pro-Bilingual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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