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ABSTRACT
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Elementary Spanish dual language immersion programs have been a popular choice for native English-speaking families, but many native Spanish-speaking families opt not to enroll their children in dual language immersion. This study used Bourdieu’s theory of capital to explore why native Spanish-speaking families, who may have the most to gain from participation in dual language immersion, chose not to participate in dual language immersion, while native English-speaking families, who already have a language advantage in the U.S., chose to enroll their children in dual language immersion. The participants in this multiple case study were four native English-speaking sixth-grade students, who participated in Spanish dual language immersion, and their parents; and four native-Spanish speaking students from various grades, who did not participate in Spanish dual language immersion, and their parents. I found that dual
language immersion programs can be sites of social reproduction where native English-speaking families accrue advantages through what the program offers to add to the social, embodied, linguistic, economic, objectified, and institutional capital of their children. Native Spanish-speaking families, who did not participate in dual language immersion, were happy with the progress their children were making toward learning English, which they felt would help their children earn embodied, linguistic, economic, and institutional capital. At the same time, however, the native Spanish-speaking families perceived that their children potentially missed out on certain forms of capital by not participating in the program. I suggest possible interventions at the administrative and policy maker level to make dual language immersion a site of equity rather than a site of social reproduction.
PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Changes in Cultural Capital for Native English and Native Spanish-Speaking Families’ Children Who Do and Do Not Participate in an Elementary Spanish Dual Immersion Program

Allen Smithee

This study is framed in Bourdieu’s theory of capital, which asserts that the choices we make are usually designed to help us become better off economically; that economic capital is, to some degree, exchangeable with other types of capital (e.g., social and cultural); and that other types of capital can be exchanged for economic capital. The purpose of this study was to understand which forms of capital native English-speaking and native Spanish-speaking families believed they would acquire by choosing to participate in or not participate in Spanish dual language immersion.

In this study I interviewed four native Spanish-speaking students who did not participate in dual language immersion, and their parents, and four native English-speaking students who did participate in dual language immersion, and their parents. I also conducted a focus group with the teachers of both the native Spanish and native English-speaking students.

I found that the native English-speaking families perceived that they were able to use the dual language immersion program to gain many forms of capital. By contrast, the native Spanish-speaking families also perceived that they gained capital by not participating in the program, but not as much as if they had participated in dual language
immersion. I suggest some ways to make participation in dual language immersion more equitable for all families.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As a fifth-grade teacher in a Spanish, dual language immersion classroom, I would ask my students each year why they decided to participate in the immersion program. I always received the same type of answers: “I don’t know. My mom put me here when I was in the first grade,” or “My big sister is in the program so my parents put me in too.” Another common reason (not attributed to their parents) was so the students could talk about people in a different language and not be understood by the people they were talking about. As a follow-up question, I asked the students why they thought their parents put them in the program. Typical answers were: “So I can get a better job,” and “I want to go on a Spanish-speaking mission for my church.”

At times, other teachers in my school gave me a hard time about my students because they were the “smart ones.” When I asked my coteachers what they meant, they told me, “Your students were all hand-picked to be in the program and could already read. The poor reading students are the ones that we have to teach.” My students themselves noticed that their peers and the teachers in the school looked at them differently. The computer, music, art, and library specialists also commented on how much better behaved the immersion students were compared to the students in monolingual classes.

One year, in the mornings on my way to bring my students into the school, I would see a little Latina first-grader in the hallway. We greeted each other in Spanish and often chatted briefly before school started. One day, I asked her who her teacher was, and
was surprised to find out that she was in a monolingual, first-grade class. I asked her, ¿Por qué no estás en la clase de español? (Why aren’t you in the Spanish class?). Her reply was, Porque ya hablamos español en mi casa. Mis padres y yo siempre hablamos español. (Because we already speak Spanish at home. My parents and I always speak Spanish).

After 7 years of teaching Spanish immersion, I had the opportunity to work at the district office as a resource for immersion teachers and administrators throughout the district. One day, while working at the district, I was invited to evaluate student projects at the high school where my dual immersion elementary students would go after junior high. The exposition consisted of projects chosen by students in the AP English class, who had prepared posters or computer surveys to illustrate what they learned from reading a novel.

As I moved around the room engaging with the project designers, I noticed some of my former dual immersion students, who were now juniors in high school, also coming to look at the projects. They chose to move in groups that were composed of their former immersion classmates, even though they came from different classes in the high school. I was able to talk to one of my immersion students, and he immediately started to point out where each of my former students was in the room. That is when I noticed that all of them were with at least one other of their immersion peers. Moreover, they were not just hanging out together, they were helping each other evaluate the projects they observed. Together they talked about the merits of the project and whether they agreed with the project creator’s understandings. I found it interesting that they worked together
to gain a more complete understanding of the projects. This experience at the high school, as well as my experience with the first-grade Latina student, caused me to wonder about the potentially long-term effects of choosing to participate or not in the immersion program.

In the elementary school I worked at, students started the dual immersion program in first grade and had to decide whether to participate or not before they finished kindergarten. Spanish/English immersion was a popular choice at my school with over 45% of the total student population participating each year. In my experience, children just finishing their kindergarten year were not capable of understanding the long-term commitment or the effort that would be required to participate in a multi-year immersion strand within the school. Because of their age, I did not believe they understood the benefits of learning two languages simultaneously, just as the little Latina first-grader did not understand the implications of learning only in English and not her native language. These children’s parents made the decision for them.

At the time of this study, 91% (52/57) of the students in the sixth-grade dual language immersion classroom in this study were from White, middle class, native English-speaking (NES) families. Only five students in this program were identified as Hispanic on school records, but four of the five “Hispanic” students spoke English at home more frequently than they spoke Spanish, and the fifth student spoke only English at home. Thus, 100% of the students in the dual immersion program spoke English as a first language, even though many families in the school’s zoning area spoke Spanish as a first language and could have opted to participate in the dual language immersion
program.

I mentioned the language background of these students to provide a context for understanding the language dynamics in this classroom. Many of the dual immersion classes in the other grades at this school were similar in composition. Last year, the administration began assigning students from Latin American countries to the dual immersion program, but previously parents could choose to place their children in an immersion classroom or in a monolingual English classroom. Most Spanish-speaking parents chose the monolingual English classroom when they had the choice. Because the Spanish-speaking families were generally new to the community, I wondered what influenced their choices?

Aldana and Mayer (2014) noted that even though “immigrants from Central America have rich linguistic and cultural heritages, most do not have access to the types of social and cultural capital that translate into additional resources in the US economy.” Did lack of access to the social and cultural capital necessary to succeed in the US influence the Latinx families’ decisions about education?

In order to better understand this phenomenon, I used Bourdieu’s (1986) theory of capital to help explain possible reasons behind why native Spanish-speaking (NSS) and NES parents decided to enroll their children in different language programs.

Bourdieu (1986) theorized that more affluent families seek educational opportunities for their children by gaining access to programs like dual language immersion, so their children will gain more skills and abilities, which can transfer to greater social influence and economic capital in the future. Put simply, parents often want
their children to acquire a high-quality education in order to increase the likelihood that they will ultimately end up in satisfying and high-paying jobs. Research (Gerena, 2011; Lindholm-Leary 2001) has shown that dual language immersion (DLI) programs build meaningful skills among the children who participate in these programs, as contrasted with children who do not participate in DLI. Thomas and Collier (2012) explained:

[Dual language] schooling has more potential for changing the lives of students, teachers, administrators, and parents than almost any other school innovation. Dual language schooling is dramatically effective when implemented well. In fact, dual language is the most powerful school reform model for high academic achievement that we have seen in all our 28 years of conducting longitudinal studies in our field. (p. 6)

Thomas and Collier (2003) also suggested that all students, regardless of language background, would benefit from a bilingual education and that dual language immersion was the best form of bilingual education.

**Problem Statement**

Bourdieu (1974) said, “Educational institutions...[are] capable of making a decisive contribution to the science of the structural dynamics of class relations, which is an often-neglected aspect of the sociology of power” (p. 72). Dual language immersion may be a site of social reproduction as defined by Bourdieu, where students that are afforded the opportunity to participate, acquire a substantial amount of personal and family capital, whereas those who do not participate are at a disadvantage. Steele et al. (2017) noted the importance of equity when selecting which students should participate in DLI in the Portland Public Schools. They said, “Promoting equitable access to these [DLI] programs seems critical to protect the integrity of [the model] but also to ensure
that academic benefits are fairly distributed within a community.”

Native English-speaking parents, in the present study, had the social connections that informed them of the existence and benefits of dual language immersion (DLI) for their children. Parents of NSS children, who oftentimes were new to the community, may not have been aware of the availability or benefits of DLI. In this school, parents of NSS students chose not to enroll their children in DLI because they believed the fastest way to learn English was for their children to only study in English (K. Turner, personal communication, August 19, 2014).

Another critical piece is the ability families have to be informed of DLI and the benefits it offers students. Eaton (2016) found that schools that have a high percentage of NSS students tend to include those students in DLI programs where available. Her findings contrast with those of Valdez, Delavan, and Freire (2016) who noted a shift in the way the news media focused its message about DLI in Utah. When Utah adopted a state model for dual immersion in 2008, the focus seemed to be on the benefits available to NSS students together with how the program could benefit all other students. They said that more recently;

We view a shift away from equity and language rights discourses in the media coverage of DL policy as representing a change in the audience to which language education programs are primarily marketed and potentially signaling a corresponding shift in who would benefit from new language education programs established in the state—from language minoritized student groups toward more privileged student groups—and in doing so exacerbating existing educational inequalities and opportunity gaps. (p. 850)

This phenomenon may perpetuate the problem of giving more capital to those already privileged. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine what forms of
capital families of native English-speaking students hoped to gain for their children by enrolling them in the DLI program as well as what forms of capital families of NSS students hoped to gain for their children by choosing not to participate. Understanding what causes NES families to want to participate, as well as what deters NSS families from taking advantage of DLI, may help stakeholders to develop community and school-based approaches that can provide equal access to capital for both sets of students.

**Research Questions**

With this end goal, the purpose of this study was to answer the following research questions.

1. What forms of capital do native English-speaking and native Spanish-speaking children perceive they have gained or will gain from participation or non-participation in the DLI program?

2. What forms of capital do parents of native English-speaking and native Spanish-speaking children hope to gain for their children from participation or non-participation in the DLI program?
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL FOUNDATION

In this section I describe the theoretical and empirical foundation for my study. I used Bourdieu’s theory of capital as the lens to help me understand why families make the choices they do about participation in elementary Spanish dual language immersion. After reviewing the literature for my theoretical foundation, I describe the elementary dual language immersion program used in Utah. Finally, I review previous empirical studies that explain why families enroll their children in dual language immersion, and I identify how my dissertation study will contribute to this body of existing literature.

Bourdieu and Capital

Bourdieu (1986) said capital is “the principle underlying the immanent regularities of the social world” (p. 46). In Turello’s words, “Even when it’s not about the money, it’s about the money” (M. D. Turello, personal communication, June 26, 2008). I believe Bourdieu would agree. He posited that all we are and all we do, although not entirely reducible to a monetary equivalent, can be applied toward the acquisition of economic capital, and economic capital is a driving force in society (Bourdieu, 1986). Although Bourdieu stated that economic capital is at the root of all forms of capital, he subdivided capital into three overarching forms: economic capital, cultural capital, and social capital. In the following section, I briefly describe each form of capital.
Economic Capital

Capital in the economic state is ready for conversion in a market system.
Economic capital includes money and other instruments commonly exchanged for goods and services. The other forms of capital are “convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47). By implication, families with sufficient economic capital can live off one parent’s income, allowing a second parent to stay home and dedicate time to helping with the education of their children. In turn, this stay-at-home parent has time to talk and read with her or his child, thereby building embodied capital in order to prepare the child for successful participation in school.

Affluent families often purchase books and educational toys with the intention of providing further advantage to their children. Archer, Dawson, DeWitt, Seakins, and Wong (2015) put it this way: “Families may deploy their resources to purchase additional benefits and advantage...to enhance and distinguish their children within the field of education” (p. 924). Families with sufficient economic resources often have the ability to choose neighborhoods with better performing schools, or schools similar to the one I worked at that offered programs like dual language immersion. Families with sufficient economic capital have more leisure time and money to devote to structured events (e.g., skiing and music classes) that broaden their children’s perspectives and interests (Lareau, 2011). Just being able to have transportation and access to libraries and bookstores may be considered as an advantage that families with economic capital have (at least as defined by dominant societal values), over those who do not.
Cultural Capital

Scott (2014) summarized cultural capital as follows: “A term introduced by Pierre Bourdieu to refer to the symbols, ideas, tastes, and preferences that can be strategically used as resources in social action” (p. 142). Bourdieu divided cultural capital into three subsets: the embodied state, the objectified state, and the institutionalized state. Although each of these states of cultural capital can be distinguished one from another, they are all interrelated and mutually reinforcing. It is important to note that the possession of economic capital influences the amount of cultural capital a person or family can acquire, thus giving those in the dominant class an arbitrary advantage over less affluent families in gaining access to educational programs and the credentials they bestow (Bourdieu, 1998).

Embodied state. This state of cultural capital is tied to our physical being (Uhlmann, 2011). Just as it takes time to grow and develop physically, embodied cultural capital takes time to accumulate. Examples of embodied cultural capital are the accent one speaks with, which can identify his or her class or upbringing; the level of vocabulary a person uses as she or he communicates; and the way a person carries him or herself. A key to the proper development of embodied cultural capital is the time available for its growth. The more time that parents can spend with their children, the more fully developed the child’s embodied cultural capital will become (Bourdieu, 1986). For example, parents with sufficient economic capital are better able to protect their children from having to work to help support the family. These children can then devote more time to their academic studies or other pursuits that in turn, help solidify their level of
embodied capital in all its forms. A key form of embodied capital, to this study, is linguistic capital.

**Linguistic capital.** Bourdieu (1977) pointed out that because there is always a dominant language, people try to master communicating in that language. It is understandable that NSS families want their children to master English as quickly as possible, because knowing the dominant language (i.e., English in the U.S.), gives people an advantage in society. Many Spanish-speaking families think that enrolling their children in English-only classrooms is the fastest way for their children to learn and master English (Gándara & Contreras, 2009).

Even with programs like dual language immersion, students feel the pull of the dominant language. Gerena (2011) conducted a study of a two-way DLI program to determine student attitudes toward both English and Spanish. She found that as children grow older, both NSS and NES children valued English over Spanish. She said:

> Even though this dual immersion program stressed an equality of languages and provided for many opportunities for students to value both languages and to become proficient in both languages, English succeeded in becoming the more valued of the two languages. (p. 68)

Bourdieu (1977) referred to the dominant language at times as the “legitimate language” (p. 663). It seems that no matter how hard teachers work to legitimatize the target language, students often adopt the perception that English has more value while they live in the U.S. The principle of linguistic capital reminds us just how difficult it is to get students to truly exert themselves in the acquisition or maintenance of Spanish when all they see around them points to the necessity of mastering English—even at the expense of Spanish for the NSS students.
A second language, like Spanish, can have benefits in certain locations or circumstances even if it is the non-dominant language. Many businesses pay bilingual employees more than their monolingual peers (Porras & Gándara, 2014). Native English-speaking families understand that knowing an additional language, such as Spanish, can bring economic benefits in later careers. Moreover, the ability to attain linguistic and other forms of embodied capital helps those with this capital to appreciate the world around them and leads to the acquisition of objectified state of capital.

_objectified state._ The objectified state of cultural capital relates to the environment a person is surrounded by as they develop. The “pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47) surrounding children are forms of objectified capital that shape their preferences and structures their activities, thereby influencing the types of embodied capital that they acquire. Although these physical objects have a monetary value that can be transferred from generation to generation, the true cultural value comes in the ability to appreciate or use the object in question. Bourdieu (1986) stated that in order to appropriate the value of objectified capital, one must have the embodied capital to do so. A person must be able to read, for example, to appreciate great works of literature. The ability to read, sing, or paint, is not the measure of cultural capital in itself. The acquired taste for classical literature, opera, or paintings from the Renaissance are examples of how physical abilities can be transformed into a form of cultural capital that distinguishes the possessor from those who do not appreciate or are not capable of understanding these things (Bourdieu, 1984).

Dual language immersion programs may build objectified capital because they
can help children learn to not only communicate in another language, but learn to appreciate the culture and richness offered by that language and the people who speak it. As students learn to master Spanish, they may then have the desire to accumulate more objects (e.g., literature in Spanish). Once Hispanic or Latin cultural items are acquired, students who participated in DLI may be able to use their embodied capital to appreciate these objects. Like other forms of capital, this appreciation can then be passed on to the next generation. Dual language immersion is also a step toward the next state of cultural capital, the institutionalized state of cultural capital.

**Institutionalized state.** This state of cultural capital is separated slightly from the previous two in that it can be earned through education or through other formal institutional channels. Universities and governments can confer degrees or honors on a person, providing them with additional cultural capital. Some institutionalized cultural capital can be converted directly to economic capital because of the competence implied when one earns institutionalized capital. A primary form of institutionalized capital is a college degree (Bourdieu, 1986; Naidoo, 2004). After a person graduates from an accredited program of study, that person is deemed competent to enter the work force at a pre-determined level of economic earnings. Someone without the same degree would not be able to compete for the same job opportunities and is, therefore, often not capable of the same level of earnings in that field.

Embodied and objectified capital can make one more prone to realizing institutionalized cultural capital. When people become proficient at speaking, comprehending, and writing in a language, they improve their chances at attending and
graduating from a university with a degree, leading them to a more profitable career. The cycle of capital begetting capital repeats itself because families with more economic capital can give education, time, and educational objects to their children, which in turn may lead to the eventual bestowal of degrees or honors on their child. Institutionalized cultural capital can also provide one with access to social connections that can prove valuable.

**Social Capital**

Bourdieu (1986) defined social capital as:

> The aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition—or in other words, to membership in a group—which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a credential which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word. (p. 51)

Membership to a group requires effort. Like all forms of capital, there needs to be a certain amount of scarcity for the capital to have real value (Bourdieu, 1998). Being a member of a group that accepts almost anyone adds no distinction to the individual. Belonging to a group that enforces strict guidelines for inclusion, such as astronauts that have landed on the moon, can bestow great amounts of capital, in the forms of social status or distinction, to the individual.

Socialization at a young age is where all forms of capital are incubated (Swartz, 1997). According to Swartz, Bourdieu theorized that the social milieu children are exposed to, and spend enough time in, shapes the level at which all subsequent forms of cultural capital are developed. At the same time cultural capital is earned (time and effort
are required), social ties are being strengthened. For example, students who are in a debate club together build social ties at the same time they are building embodied capital (the ability to give persuasive speeches). As another example, people who belong to the exclusive group of “Harvard” may often form social bonds.

Just like the examples of students who belong to a debate club or went to Harvard, students in dual language immersion can spend between 6 and 12 years learning together. Dual language immersion students spend a significant amount of time with the same group of peers working toward the same goals. The bonds a cohort of Spanish DLI students form while studying may provide them with another social network to draw from as they get older. Bourdieu referred to the location of the socialization as a field and the resulting capital gain, both for the individual and the social group involved, as habitus (Swartz, 1997).

Field. Swartz (1997) said “Fields denote arenas of production, circulation, and appropriation of goods, services, knowledge, or status, and the competitive positions held by actors in their struggle to accumulate and monopolize these different kinds of capital” (p. 117). I like to envision a field like that in a sports competition. Players use their mental and physical prowess to dominate their competitors. In other words, they use the cultural and social capital they have earned over time to gain an advantage over the other players. Fields are also a place of learning. As one gains experience, she or he will be better prepared to compete in the future. Swartz went on to say that “Field analysis calls attention to the social conditions of struggle that shape cultural production” (p. 119). The idea of struggle and the production of capital are important to the concept of field.
A field can be any context in which social interaction takes place between people. Fields are not always bounded by a physical location, but are places where players come together because of their interest in a specific activity. Embedded within each field are the forms of capital valued by the players. For example, academia is a field in which valued forms of capital are publications. Sports are a field wherein valued forms of capital are being selected to start on Varsity teams and winning tournaments. Players in each field seek to either solidify their position of power or to strengthen their position to gain additional capital.

**Habitus.** Scott (2014) defined habitus as “A set of acquired dispositions of thought, behaviour, and taste” (p. 296). These acquired dispositions are what determine how people act or react to whatever circumstance they find themselves. One’s habitus is determined by which fields one spends the most time in. Obviously, the fields of their home and neighborhood influence children. The access children have to the other fields their parents expose them to also influences the acquisition of specific dispositions that may be valuable to them as they grow and develop.

The fields children are invited to play in shape the habitus they acquire as they grow. Families with more cultural capital will have access to more fields for their children to compete in. On the other hand, children from lower social economic backgrounds, are often excluded from participating in privileged fields. Archer et al. (2012) explained it this way:

Habitus provides a framework of dispositions that guide (and set the limits of) future actions. Thus, social axes of “race”/ethnicity, social class, and gender all contribute to shaping what an individual perceives to be possible and desirable. Habitus provides a practical “feel” for the world, framing ways of thinking,
feeling, and being, such as a taken-for-granted notions of “who we are,” and “what we do,” and what is “usual” for “us. (p. 885)

Archer et al. (2012) made the connection between individual habitus and family habitus. They explained that, “While Bourdieu did not articulate a specific notion of family habitus, he does propose habitus as encompassing both individual and collective formations, such as gendered habitus and classed habitus” (p 885). An example of family habitus would be how, in many privileged families, college is “what we do” and what is “usual for us,” whereas first-generation college students may live in families that do not foster the same familiarity with college. This difference in family habitus may make it easier for some students to obtain a college degree, which can in turn facilitate the acquisition of other societally-valued forms of high-status capital. In the next section I summarize how capital relates to my study.

Summary of Theoretical Framework

The major forms of capital (i.e., economic, cultural, and social) are intertwined with the concepts of habitus and field in such a way that any change in one directly affects the others. Because dual language immersion is available to all who desire to participate, economic capital is not a direct influence determining student participation. However, economic capital does help in the formation of the appropriate dispositions that would make DLI attractive as a field of action. Students that are afforded the opportunity to play in this field can expect to gain embodied capital in the form of two languages, which (like all forms of capital) can be converted to other forms of capital.

In this study, I explored why some families chose to participate in dual language
immersion while others did not. The parents of the students in this study had to choose whether they thought investing up to 12 years learning in two languages was what was best for their families. I used capital theory to help me understand this investment. Additionally, I wanted to gain an understanding of how families who chose not to participate in dual language immersion believed they were investing their capital, what goals they had in mind, and if in their opinion their goals were reached. Having summarized how I used the theoretical foundation provided by Bourdieu to inform my study, I now explain the empirical foundation of my study.

**Description of Dual Language Immersion Programs in Utah**

Lyster (2007) said:

Immersion is a form of bilingual education that aims for additive bilingualism by providing students with a sheltered classroom environment in which they receive at least half of their subject-matter instruction through the medium of a language that they are learning as a second, foreign, heritage, or indigenous language. In addition, they receive some instruction through the medium of a shared primary language, which normally has majority status in their community. (p. 8)

Dual language immersion was originally designed to help immigrant students acquire English as a second language while at the same time improving literacy in their first language (Thomas & Collier, 2003). Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan, as cited in Freeman and Freeman (2011), said that

[Dual language immersion] programs emphasize challenging standards in the core curriculum domains while enriching students’ development in both their first and second languages. These programs aim for full proficiency in two languages, an understanding and appreciation of the cultures associated with those languages, and high levels of achievement in all core academic domains. (p. 167)

Studies have shown that being literate, or maintaining literacy, in one’s first language is
beneficial to becoming literate in a second language (Hakuta & Gould, 1987; Sparks, Patton, Ganschow, & Humbach, 2009).

Within some schools’ boundaries, there are small populations of NSS students, yet English-speaking families in the communities surrounding these schools still want to provide dual language instruction for their children. Other communities have large populations of NSS students. To account for the possible demographics in Utah communities, DLI schools in Utah use one of two variations—two-way and one-way (see Appendix A for a summary of terms related to DLI).

In a two-way DLI program (see Figure 1), NSS students are mixed with native English-speaking students with the goal of creating biliteracy skills for both groups of students (Gerena, 2011). Between one third and one half of the students in two-way, Spanish DLI classrooms must be NSS.

In a two-way DLI program, “all students learn subject matter through their native language as well as through the second language, and both language groups have the benefit of interaction with peers who are native speakers of the language they are

![Figure 1. Two-way dual immersion. There are two classes of DLI students in the same grade. In each class between ⅓ and ½ of the students must be native speakers of the target language.](image-url)
learning” (Shrum & Glisan, 2005, p. 423). One of the greatest benefits of the two-way model is that students can practice their second language with peers and not rely solely on instruction from the teacher.

One-way DLI programs are used where the student population is less than one-third native speakers of the target language (see Figure 2). The school where I taught was considered a one-way DLI school because less than 10% of the students enrolled in the DLI program were NSS.

Dual immersion programs in Utah extend through high school, with plans to make the program K-16 in coming years (J. Landes-Lee, personal communication, February 15, 2018). At the time of this study, students who had participated in elementary dual immersion programs could take advanced language classes in seventh, eighth, and ninth grades focused on preparing the students to pass the Advanced Placement (AP) language test (e.g., Spanish language and culture AP) at the end of ninth grade. Students who passed the Spanish language and culture AP would then be able to enroll in what Utah calls the “Bridge” program the last 3 years of high school. The Bridge program offers

![Figure 2: One-way dual immersion. There are two classes of DLI students in the same grade. In each class, less than 1/3 of the students may be native speakers of the target language. Often times 95%, or more, of students in each class do not speak the target language at home.](image)
upper-division college credit courses, which are co-taught by a university professor and a high school teacher.

Although not a formal part of dual language immersion in Utah, the Utah State Board of Education approved a Seal of Biliteracy (Spicer-Escalante, 2017) for all Utah students who graduate high school with demonstrated proficiency in English and another language (e.g., Spanish, French, ASL). Students who participate in DLI for up to 12 years can expect to achieve the proficiency level in their immersion language to qualify for the Seal of Biliteracy. Additionally, the state provides language testing at no cost to DLI students. Non-DLI students who wish to demonstrate proficiency in a language other than English have to pay for an exam.

Utah offers both one-way and two-way dual immersion programs with the hope that as many students as possible will choose to participate. Dual language immersion in Utah is an articulated program leading to advanced-level proficiency before high school graduation. The DLI program encourages students to take Advanced Placement exams in the target language and provides institutional recognition for those students who earn the Seal of Biliteracy (Spicer-Escalante, 2017).

**Benefits of Dual Language Immersion**

Empirical literature points to a large body of benefits of dual language immersion. According to Spicer-Escalante (2017), “The main goal of dual language immersion is proficiency in two languages” (pp. 4-5), in other words, bilingualism. As I describe in this section, the process of becoming proficient in two languages through participation in
DLI can provide cognitive and institutional benefits.

**Cognitive Benefits of DLI**

One of the purported benefits of learning in two languages is an increase in cognitive abilities. Bialystok and Craik (2010) asked the same question that many parents ask as they consider enrolling their children in a dual language immersion program, “Is bilingualism an experience with the potential to alter the mind and brain?” (p. 19). They conducted a study involving monolingual and bilingual participants from early childhood through about 80 years old. Not only did they find that their bilingual participants showed higher executive control, they noted that, “there was some evidence for larger language–group differences in older participants on executive control tasks, suggesting that bilingualism may compensate to some extent for the typical age-related decline of executive functions.” (p. 21)

A classic study comparing bilingual and monolingual adolescents conducted by Peal and Lambert (as cited in Lindholm-Leary, 2001) demonstrated that:

Intellectually, their experiences with two languages resulted in mental flexibility, superiority in concept formation, and a more diversified set of mental abilities. In contrast, the monolinguals appeared to have more unitary cognitive structures, which restricted their verbal problem-solving ability. (p. 52)

Sorge, Toplak, and Bialystok (2017) conducted a study to determine if bilingualism positively affected the executive function of elementary students. Their results found “powerful support for the role of bilingualism in children’s [executive function] development” (p. 12). As Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) explained, when a person attaches meaning to something in two languages, their ability to process and think about that idea
is increased. A bilingual person has more than one path to the information they have stored in their brains, making them more flexible in their thinking.

In his synthesis of empirical literature on bilingualism, Stewart (2005) stated, “Second language study increases a child's cognitive abilities, enhances achievement in other subjects, and is positively correlated with higher scores on achievement tests” (p. 15). A possible explanation for this increase in cognitive abilities for bilinguals is known as Common Underlying Proficiency (Cummins, 1980). Cummins speculated that if a person has academic language proficiency of a topic in their primary language, they would not have to learn the same information in the second language. In other words, if a person already has knowledge of the water cycle in English, they would not have to relearn the water cycle in Spanish. Cummins described his hypothesis using an iceberg as a model to demonstrate that both primary and secondary language systems are connected in the brain and one can learn with either language (see Figure 3). Either language path could also be used to access the information when needed.

In later work, Cummins (2000) studied the difference between cognitively undemanding communication (e.g., talking about a movie with someone who has seen the same movie) and cognitively demanding communication (e.g., talking about a movie with someone who has not seen the same movie). In the first instance, both parties in the conversation are able to negotiate meaning because they are sharing a common experience. In the latter example, the person describing the movie cannot rely on the listener’s own understanding of the same topic (Genesee, Geva, Dressler, & Kamil, 2006). Genesee et al., conducted a meta-analysis of studies related to Cummins’ (1980) hypothesis, specifically looking for the “relationship between language-minority children’s first-language and second-language oral development in domains related to literacy” (p. 153). They found that the studies they reviewed,

...suggest that different aspects of phonological processing skills measured in students’ first language (e.g., rhyme detection; phonological awareness involving segmentation, blending, and matching; phonological memory; and rapid automatized naming) and working memory correlate significantly and consistently with word-level reading skills in English. (p. 165)

Their review of the literature suggested that students that demonstrate a strong understanding and ability in their native language, are more capable of acquiring a second language.

Both NSS and NES students can gain cognitive advantages by learning in two languages. Marian, Shook, and Schroeder (2013) studied NSS and NES students who participated in a two-way immersion program as compared with a control group of NSS students participating in a transitional language program and NES students in mainstream English classrooms from first through fifth grades in both math and reading in English.
They found that both the NSS and NES students who participated in two-way immersion outperformed their nonimmersion peers in both math and English reading skills as measured on standardized tests.

The possible cognitive benefits of becoming bilingual through participation in DLI become manifest as cultural capital in the embodied state. Bourdieu explained that embodied capital must be earned and cannot be inherited or learned by delegation. Bourdieu (1986) explained it this way:

> The work of acquisition is work on oneself (self-improvement), an effort that presupposes a personal cost, an investment, above all of time, but also of that socially constituted form of libido, *libido scientiae*, with all the privation, renunciation, and sacrifice that it may entail. (p. 48)

In other words, one will not achieve the cognitive benefits of dual language immersion without putting in the requisite effort, including the willingness to undergo hardships such as struggles with a new language. Cognitive benefits are not the only desirable outcome of participation in DLI; there are institutional benefits to be realized as well.

**Institutional Benefits of DLI**

Some of the cognitive benefits of dual language immersion can be considered as institutional benefits because, in a way, they are conferred on students by their participation in a program offered in the public schools. It is important to remember that the cognitive benefits of participation in dual language immersion become embodied capital as the student grows intellectually as a result of their efforts to learn in two languages.

As students continue in the immersion program in Utah, they can begin reaping
the cognitive advantages referenced above. The most notable advantage comes in the form of better test scores. Better test scores in the secondary schools can result in more academic honors or recognition. For example, Cobb, Vega, and Kronauge (2006) examined how well students, who had participated in an elementary dual immersion program, performed on standardized tests of reading, writing, and mathematics when they reached junior high. They found that both NES and NSS students performed better on these standardized tests in junior high than a control group of students who did not participate in an elementary dual language immersion program.

Fortune and Song (2016) studied one-way and two-way Chinese immersion students’ test scores in math and found that the immersion students did as well as, and in many cases better than their peers who studied in monolingual English classes. The tests in both of these studies were administered in English and did not measure proficiency in the target language (e.g., Chinese or Spanish). Test scores can be considered a form of institutional capital because of the way these scores are used to rank and select students for future opportunities also offered by institutions of education.

Lindholm-Leary (2001) is one of the few researchers who conducted research on dual language programs that include data showing student proficiency in Spanish as well as the content areas. She compared students in various DLI programs, from kindergarten through seventh grade, with students in the same schools and grades that did not participate in DLI. She assessed math, science, history, and English language arts for NSS, NES, and control group students. Additionally, even though her study focused on English language learners, she assessed the oral language, reading, and writing
proficiency in Spanish for both NES and NSS students that were enrolled in DLI.

She found that NES students scored higher than their monolingual, English-speaking peers on English assessments, but lower than NSS students in Spanish language ability. The NSS students scored higher than other NSS students that were given traditional English language support in their schools on both English and Spanish assessments. In fact, Lindholm-Leary (2001) found that DLI programs have consistently graduated students that performed better than their peers on standardized tests. Students that score higher on national or state examinations are more competitive when qualifying for acceptance to institutions of higher learning. The combination of cognitive benefits, combined with higher results on standardized tests are two benefits both NSS and NES parents can hope to offer their children by enrolling them in dual language immersion. Both the Lindholm-Leary study and the Cobb et al., (2006) study demonstrated how participating in dual language immersion can lead to higher standardized test scores in math, science, and language arts, which can lead to more institutional capital in the form of honors and recognitions for the DLI students.

Another institutional benefit provided by the state of Utah is the opportunity to receive a Seal of Biliteracy on their high school transcript for any student who demonstrates proficiency in English and any additional language. In 2018, Utah codified the Seal of Biliteracy. Rule R277-499, of the Utah Administrative Code, states that the Seal of Biliteracy is “a recognition, awarded in conjunction with a student's high school diploma, which certifies that a student is proficient in English and at Intermediate-Mid level or higher in one or more world languages” (p. 1). The Seal of Biliteracy is available
to any student who can demonstrate proficiency in English and another world language, however, the DLI program is the only institutionally funded program with the specific goal of bilingualism for its’ participants, making this form of institutionalized capital more easily attainable for participants of DLI than for nonparticipants of DLI.

Summary of Benefits of Dual Language Instruction

In Bourdieusian terms, previous literature has pointed toward the embodied and institutional benefits of DLI. This literature included studies that measured student academic ability compared to non-DLI students’ ability (e.g., Cobb et al., 2006; Marian, Shook, & Schroeder, 2013) which can lead to opportunities in higher education (e.g., Lindholm-Leary, 2001) or to better employment because of honors conferred by the institution (Utah Administrative Code, 2018), as well as the long-term benefits of learning in two languages (Bialystok & Craik, 2010).

Reasons Parents Enroll Their Children in Dual Language Immersion

Many parents are motivated to place their children in DLI because they believe their children will learn to be better learners, be more appreciative and tolerant of other cultures, and have better future economic opportunities (Gerena, 2011). The possible cognitive benefits derived from learning two languages simultaneously (Kaushanskaya, Gross, & Buac, 2014) along with the possibility of better employment opportunities for bilinguals (Porras & Gándara, 2014) could be referred to as forms of capital (i.e., embodied and economic).
Although many parents may be aware of the cognitive and social benefits of DLI, they may also have other reasons for enrolling their children in the DLI programs as well. In this section I use a study by Whiting and Feinauer (2011) to describe some of the primary reasons parents choose to enroll their children in DLI. Next, I will summarize some additional research to shed light on what concerns parents about dual language immersion and what motivates them to have their children participate.

Whiting and Feinauer (2011) investigated a Spanish dual immersion charter school where all classes in all grades used the 50/50 two-way dual immersion model. Half of the students came from Spanish-speaking homes and the other half were from English-speaking homes. Because this charter school required all families to drive their children each day, the families were highly motivated to participate in dual immersion. The parents of all students attending the charter school were asked to complete a survey where the demographic data showed great diversity of family income, family makeup, and family educational background. The survey showed that 92% of the families stated that bilingualism/biliteracy was the primary goal of enrolling their children in this school. Other reasons stated (in order of preference) were educational experience (46%), future and career opportunities (37%), cultural immersion/diversity (27%), preserving heritage (26%), and proximity to home (10%).

Although the overwhelming majority listed biliteracy/bilingualism as the main reason for enrolling their children, family context played a role in what the motivation for having their child learn in two languages. Many parents stated that they wanted their child to become bilingual, while others specifically stated they wanted their child to
learn, or master, Spanish. Interestingly, NSS parents often stated their reasoning in conjunction with their desire for preserving their heritage. Whiting and Feinauer (2011) noted comments like “so that he/she never forget his/her mother tongue” (*Para que nunca olvide su lengua maternal*; p. 644) were common among Latino families. Other families, self-described as English dominant at home were also Latino in makeup and wanted their children to be able to communicate with grandparents and other family members in Spanish and responded with comments like “I want her to be able to communicate with extended family members who speak Spanish and I want her to appreciate her culture” (p. 644).

Almost all parents thought that participation in dual immersion would provide a better educational experience for their children (Whiting & Feinauer, 2011). The study revealed, however, that Anglo parents (57%) named this as a reason for enrollment more often than Latino parents (43%) (p. 645). Both highly educated families (parents with a bachelor’s degree or higher) as well as families with little formal education (parents that did not complete more than a junior high level of education) named educational experience as a reason for enrollment in the dual immersion program.

The Whiting and Feinauer (2011) study was conducted in Utah where the majority of families throughout the state are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (known as LDS or Mormon); however, in the study there were more families that identified themselves as Catholic than LDS. The authors found a significant difference in whether these two groups listed culture and diversity as a reason for enrollment. Only 16% of the Catholic families found cultural diversity to be an important
factor; whereas, 34% of the LDS families thought culture and diversity were important reasons for attending a dual immersion school.

Similar to the Whiting and Feinauer study, Ee (2016) studied why parents chose to enroll their children in a Korean dual language immersion program in the greater Los Angeles area of California. Ee’s study focused on both high and low SES Korean immersion schools as well as whether the families were native Korean-speaking or non-Korean-speaking. Korean-speaking parents from high SES schools considered the school’s other aspects (e.g., safe location, student diversity) as well as the DLI program, whereas Korean-speaking parents that attended the low SES schools were primarily concerned with the availability of Korean DLI. Korean-speaking parents from both high and low SES schools considered Korean DLI as a major factor in school choice. Non-Korean-speaking parents did not list the availability of Korean DLI as the primary factor in choosing a school. These parents were more interested in the other aspects of the schools to be more important (e.g., safe location, diverse student demographics).

Howard, Sugarman, and Christian (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of studies where parents of students enrolled in two-way immersion programs were interviewed and given surveys to determine what motivated them to enroll their children in an immersion program. The authors found that both NSS and NES parents showed positive attitudes toward the program. NSS parents were more concerned with maintaining the home language and learning English than NES parents. Native English-speaking parents were more likely to list cultural diversity, second-language acquisition, and future job opportunities as the major reasons they enrolled their children in immersion. Howard et
al. found that “Some NES parents were concerned that the NSS students would slow
down the academic progress of their children” (p. 45).

Unlike previous studies that examined parental motivation to place their children in dual language immersion programs, the present study examined motives for both participation and non-participation using Bourdieu’s framework to identify the different types of capital that families hoped to gain and convert to future opportunities. This framework may provide new insights on families’ motivations, such as the social advantages that come from being seen by one’s peers as a “smart kid.” This study also considered the students’ point of view to give a more complete picture of the types of capital and the advantages students felt they would gain from participating or not participating in DLI. Finally, this study provides a more nuanced, contextualized view of the phenomenon through the collection of multiple types of data from different people (e.g., teachers, students, parents) in different locations (at home and at school), as opposed to previous studies, which relied heavily on surveys or interviews administered to parents in one location at one point in time.
CHAPTER III
METHODS

In the following sections I describe the details of this study. I describe the research method, context of the study, participant selection, and the data collection and analysis procedures. I then finish this section with measures to ensure quality, limitations, and the significance of the study.

Qualitative Research Approach

My research questions required me to look at both native English-speaking students who participated in dual language immersion and NSS students who did not participate in DLI and the cultural capital they perceived they were acquiring, as a result of this choice. Because I wanted to better understand the capital both groups believed they were gaining, I chose multiple case study (Stake, 2006) as my qualitative research method. Yin (2014) described a case study, in part, as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the case) in depth and within its real-world context” (p. 16). A multiple case study differs from a single case study because it uses more than one case to describe a specific phenomenon from different perspectives or points of view (Stake, 2006).

A key concept in multiple case studies, as explained by Stake (2006), is the idea of the *quintain*. Stake described it like this:

In multicase study research, the single case is of interest because it belongs to a particular collection of cases. The individual cases share a common characteristic or condition. The cases in the collection are somehow categorically bound
together. They may be members of a group or examples of a phenomenon. Let us call this group, category, or phenomenon a “quintain.” (pp. 4-6)

A quintain, then, is the overarching phenomenon being studied and the individual cases are all somehow tied to the quintain. The quintain in this study was the perceived capital gained by participating or choosing not to participate in DLI.

In order to better understand how families perceived they gained capital by choosing to participate or not in DLI, I studied eight separate cases, divided into two groups of cases. Each student participant and his or her family was one case. The first group of cases was comprised of four native English-speaking families who chose to participate in DLI. The second group of cases was made up of four NSS families who chose not to participate in DLI. In the NSS group of cases, I did not gather data from the parents of one case study due to missed appointments. The cases were bounded (Glesne, 2011; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2014) by where the students attended school, the ability the students had to choose to participate in dual language immersion, and the primary language spoken at home. This study lasted approximately nine weeks, giving me time to conduct initial interviews, focus groups, observations, and follow-up interviews.

Context of the Study

This study was conducted in West Side School District (all names of places and people are pseudonyms). West Side was the largest school district in the state with over 78,000 students in the 2015-2016 academic school year (Brigham Young University 2013). The student population in this district was overwhelmingly White with 87.3% of the total student population. Hispanics represented 8.7%, while Pacific Islanders (1.5%),
Asians (1.2%), Blacks (0.8%), and American Indians (0.5%) made up the remaining 4% of minority groups. About 5% of the district’s student population was made up of students who did not speak English fluently. Most of these students in our district were Hispanic. An alarming statistic from the BYU report showed that only 55% of Hispanics and 45% of ELL students graduated from high school.

**Community and School**

The setting for this study was Teton Elementary in the western part of the district. The town where Teton is located had a population of nearly 23,000 people. The U.S. Census Bureau (2013) estimated that 92.8% of the population was White, with less than 1% Black and 5.8% Hispanic or Latino.

Teton Elementary had a similar population with 91% White, 1% Black, and 4% Hispanic or Latino (Greatschools, 2015) among the 918 students enrolled at the end of the 2015 school year. Within Teton Elementary, there was a one-way, Spanish DLI strand. Each grade, from first to sixth grade, had two classrooms of immersion students. In first grade, each of the two classes started with 35 students. As the students progressed, there was usually some attrition due to families moving out of the area, leaving between 27 and 34 students per class in sixth grade.

At the end of the 2014-2015 school year, there were 383 students enrolled in the DLI strand. Of the students enrolled in DLI, 33 were reported as Hispanic on the district roles. Of these 33, only 19 came from homes where Spanish was the language spoken most often by the parents.
Researcher

I am a White, middle-class, native English-speaking male. I was the fifth-grade, Spanish-side DLI teacher at Teton Elementary for 7 years. At the time of this study, I served as the dual language immersion specialist for West Side School District. Before becoming a teacher, I spent almost 24 years in the U.S. Army, where I served for a period of 9 years in Latin America and gained an appreciation for the language and culture. During the study, I served in a leadership position in a Spanish-speaking congregation of a church in the community where I taught. Because of my role at church and at school, I was familiar with many of the Spanish-speaking families in the area. I believed that my position as an educator and as a religious leader helped me gain the confidence of the families that participated in this study and allowed me the candid access I needed.

Participant Selection

For the first group of cases, I selected four native English-speaking students from the sixth-grade DLI classroom. All of these students had participated in dual language immersion for almost 6 years; they started immersion in the first grade. These were students who spoke English as their first language and who continued to speak English as their primary language at home. Likewise, the second group of cases was comprised of four NSS students who chose not to participate in DLI. These students’ first language was Spanish, and Spanish was the dominant language in their homes.

The NSS group included three cases plus the participation of a fourth NSS student in the focus group. The native English-speaking group consisted of four separate cases.
Each case was comprised of one student and both of the student’s parents. I ensured that the NSS students, not participating in DLI, were students who had the option of enrolling in DLI when they came to Teton Elementary. I interviewed several teachers at Teton Elementary who did not teach DLI to help select the best NSS candidates for the study.

Table 1 shows selection criteria for each study question, as well as the data collected.

Table 1

*Overview of Research Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research question one</th>
<th>Research question two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Four NES students currently participating in the DLI 6th-grade classroom.</td>
<td>Parents or guardians of the four NES students currently participating in the DLI 6th-grade classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four NSS students who do not participate in the DLI program.</td>
<td>Parents or guardians of the four NSS students who are not participating in the DLI program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Initial interview with each student selected for participation.</td>
<td>Interview with each NES parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group with NES students.</td>
<td>Interview with each NSS parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group with NSS students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher observation logs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group with the teachers of the student participants after they finished observing the student participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up interview with each student selected for participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic methods</td>
<td>Transcripts of the interviews and focus groups were coded for analysis using Bourdieu’s (1986) framework of types of capital as a priori superordinate codes.</td>
<td>Transcripts of interviews were coded for analysis using Bourdieu’s (1986) framework of types of capital as a priori superordinate codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within this framework, new codes of capital specific to DLI were developed using a modified form of constant comparative analysis.</td>
<td>Within this framework, new codes of capital specific to DLI were developed using a modified form of constant comparative analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Sources for Research Question One

I interviewed each of the NSS and NES students individually. I also conducted two focus groups: one with the four NES students and one with four NSS students. All interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in the students’ language of choice, including in a mix of Spanish and English at times. These data sources were audio recorded and transcribed for coding. The following section describes the procedures by which the data were collected in more detail.

Initial Student Interviews

I chose to use interviews because I wanted to understand the lived experience of the participants. Seidman (2006) said, “At the very heart of what it means to be human is the ability of people to symbolize their experience through language” (p. 8). Seidman went on to say, “At the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 9). I have observed dual language immersion students for years. I wanted to talk with them and let them use their voice to help me put their actions into a context that could explain why they did what they did.

In order to maintain a conversational tone to the interviews, I used a semi-structured interview approach (Longhurst, 2016). In a structured interview, the researcher asks all participants the same pre-prepared set of questions in the same order. A semistructured interview is similar to a structured interview in that a set of questions is prepared before the interview, but the researcher has the latitude to change the order of
the questions and to ask follow-up questions if more probing is desired (Longhurst, 2016).

I conducted initial interviews for each NSS and NES student participant (see Appendices B and C) in order to identify the capital that students perceived they gained from participating or not participating in DLI. The initial interviews lasted approximately 25 minutes each. I used both English and Spanish in my interviews depending on which language was more comfortable for the participants. At times I used both Spanish and English to make sure the student understood the questions and that I understood the answers. All interviews took place at Teton Elementary.

I developed interview protocols using the main tenets of Bourdieu’s (1986) theory of capital. The initial interview questions helped me understand the economic, cultural, and social capital that a student and his or her family already possessed, in addition to the types of capital that the student believed he or she may have been gaining from participation or non-participation in the DLI program. Along with interviews, I also conducted focus groups.

**Focus Groups**

Longhurst (2016) said, “A focus group is a group of people who meet in an informal setting to talk about a particular topic that has been set by the researcher” (p. 145). The focus groups gave me the opportunity to gather everyone in a specific group together and facilitate a conversation where the participants could add to what others were saying. The focus groups provided additional insights, beyond the individual interview data, because comments by a peer often sparked memories or awareness of
issues that may not have been recalled in individual interviews. Focus groups helped participants “consider and reflect upon aspects of their daily life that [were] usually taken for granted (Acocella, 2012, p. 1126).

I made sure that the focus groups included active involvement from all of the participants since, as Kitzinger (1994) said, “the distinguishing feature of focus groups is supposed to be the use of interaction” (p. 104). I encouraged all of the participants to express their feelings and point of view. The focus groups shed light on how these students felt about their participation, or lack of participation, in DLI and helped me see how the students interacted with their peers. This information was invaluable when combined with the data gathered from the individual interviews. Each focus group lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes.

**Student focus groups.** I conducted two student focus groups, each lasting about 45 minutes. One focus group was comprised of the NSS students (see Appendix D) and the other focus group was made up of the native English-speaking students (see Appendix E). I invited each group to the school to eat pizza and talk about school and the students’ interests. Getting students with similar backgrounds together (Acocella, 2012), without their parents’ influence, helped me understand the habitus of the students as well as the capital they were, or believe they were, developing at school.

**Teacher focus group.** I recruited the teachers of each student participant to observe the students for approximately 5 weeks. Included in this group of teachers were both sixth-grade dual language immersion teachers who taught the four NES students and three English-only teachers who taught the NSS students. I explained the study to them,
provided them with examples of teacher logs, and answered their questions about what I wanted them to observe and how to record their observations. Specifically, I asked them to record their observations of students’ social interactions, students’ academic and linguistic practices, and students’ quotes that could indicate they were aware of the capital they thought they are gaining (e.g., “my friends think I’m smart,” “my teachers said I am learning English very well”). I provided a notebook for each teacher, so they could record their observations.

At the end of the observation period, I collected the notebooks to help me refine the questions I had already developed for the teacher focus group (see Appendix F). I returned the observation notebooks to the teachers before I conducted the focus group with them and asked that they use their notes to help them remember specific observations. I chose to use a focus group rather than individual teacher interviews because I thought that the teachers would add more detail if they heard what their colleagues had to say. The teacher focus group lasted about 45 minutes. The results were moments of candid dialogue among the teachers that helped me get a feel for the capital these teachers perceived that their students, and their families, were acquiring while attending Teton Elementary.

**Student Follow-Up Interviews**

The purpose of the follow-up interviews was to ask clarifying questions that arose from the first interview and to ask additional questions based on findings from other data sources. For example, when Tom’s mother told me about a time that he used Spanish with a family while on vacation, I asked Tom to tell me about the experience in his own
words. Asking clarifying questions in the follow-up interviews helped me better understand both the parent and student point of view of the same experience. I developed questions for the follow-up interviews after interviewing the parents and other student participants, reading the teacher observation logs, and conducting the student and the teacher focus groups. These interviews were semi-structured. I prepared a set of questions that I asked all of the student participants (see Appendices G and H). Additionally, during the follow-up interviews, I asked different questions to some of the students to fill in gaps of information having to do with only that student. In the follow-up interviews I was able to get a better understanding of each student and the capital they felt they were gaining by participating or not participating in dual language immersion.

**Data Sources for Research Question Two**

I interviewed the parents of the NES and NSS students selected for research question one. Just as hearing from the students about how participation or non-participation in DLI affected them on a personal level, interviewing the parents of these students was vital to understanding the larger picture of the perceived family capital being earned by the choices the parents made for their children to participate or not. I wanted to understand which forms of capital parents hoped to realize for their children and families. These interviews included both parents and were conducted in the family’s home (Tenery, 2009). The interviews were semistructured (see Appendices I and J) and were conducted in the language(s) most comfortable for the participants. The interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes.
**Study Timeline**

The study was conducted over a period of 9 weeks. In week one, I conducted the initial interviews with students. During weeks one through six, the teachers conducted observations of the students. I visited the teachers weekly and offered help to them when they had questions about specific student behaviors. In weeks two and three I conducted the parent interviews. I collected the teacher observation logs at the end of week six and conducted the focus group with the teachers during week seven. In week nine, I conducted the follow-up interviews with the students. I began transcribing the initial interviews and focus groups as soon as they were completed, and I continued to transcribe and code the interviews and focus groups as soon as I finished each one, allowing me to develop the follow-up interview questions for the students.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

I used Bourdieu’s forms of capital as superordinate codes to organize the data. Specifically, I used Bourdieu’s social capital; economic capital; the embodied, objectified and institutional states of cultural capital; and linguistic capital. Linguistic capital is normally part of the embodied state, but I treated it separately because the focus of this study was the capital available through participating or not participating in a program that led to the acquisition of a new language. I transcribed the interviews and focus group discussions and looked for the data that fit in to each area of capital (i.e. embodied, objectified, institutional, economic, linguistic, and social).

I used constant comparative analysis (Fram, 2013) to help me reduce the data
through constant recoding. Constant comparative analysis, as a method to create theory, passes through four stages:

1. Comparing incidents applicable to each category.
2. Integrating categories and their properties.
3. Delimiting the theory.

This method of coding—looking for connections as I coded new material, searching for meaning in the connections, and distilling and changing codes—helped me come to a more complete picture of the perceived capital being earned by participation or non-participation in DLI in a holistic way.

I looked at the data from two perspectives (Saldaña, 2016) as I searched for meaning. First, I maintained the participants’ view by using their words to help me understand the way they saw themselves as they lived the experience of learning at Teton Elementary. I used the data collected from the four native English-speaking students to create an in-depth understanding of what they believed they would gain from participation in DLI. I also used the data collected from the four NSS students and families to better understand why NSS families chose not to participate in DLI, from their point of view. In addition, I looked at the data from a Bourdieusian point of view. I was an informed observer because I was familiar with both dual language immersion and Bourdieusian theory. Combining participant views, my own viewpoint informed by Bourdieusian theories, and teacher observations, I was able to analyze the data and make comparisons to help explain the data.

An example of how I coded is as follows: A native English-speaking parent told me that she felt more comfortable having her children play with other immersion students
because she perceived other immersion students and families as being more scholastically minded than non-immersion students and families. I assigned that data point with the superordinate code of *social capital*, which was an a priori code taken from Bourdieu’s theories of capital. I assigned this code to this data excerpt because the parents perceived their child obtained a high-status social position within the school field by being grouped along with other scholastically minded students.

In addition to assigning that data excerpt to a priori code “social capital,” I then further coded the comment into the subordinate, inductively-developed code *friendships*, because this data point indicated that parents hoped their children would obtain particular types of peer-to-peer relationships through participating in the immersion program. I sought to identify points of contrast and comparison among the superordinate and subordinate codes that I developed and applied to NSS and NES students and their families (see Table 2). I developed a system of codes related to Bourdieusian theories of capital to dual language immersion among different populations, and I used my “theoretical framework at the abstract level using relative theories and definitive concepts as comparisons to gain understandings in order to describe, explain, or predict [the] social phenomena” (Fram, 2013, p. 7) of dual language immersion.

**Ensuring Research Quality**

I used several methods of ensuring quality throughout the data collection and analysis process. This reliability, or trustworthiness (Glesne, 2011), was obtained by adhering to set procedures designed to help me find the best interpretation of the data I
Table 2

**Definition of Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Code</th>
<th>Example from NSS Families Not in DLI</th>
<th>Example from NES Families in DLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital:</strong> <em>The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced, or limited their status or membership in social groups.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: Parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc., who can provide resources or encouragement to the student participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of capital: The NSS parents believed their children were no longer able to communicate effectively with Spanish-speaking family members of their extended family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of capital: Some of the NES students had family that spoke to them in Spanish. This type of support encouraged the NES students in their studies. NES parents stated that extended family members that spoke Spanish were more engaged with their children because of the opportunity to speak Spanish with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church: Members of a religious group where the student participants could get support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not found in Data set.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of capital: NES students thought that participating in DLI would increase their ability to contribute in their church through serving a Spanish-speaking mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships: Deep, lasting friendships and social networks formed for student participants and their families based on their participation or non-participation in the DLI program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of capital: Some NSS students mentioned that they no longer play with some immersion students even if they are neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of capital: Some NES parents and students mentioned how they feel more comfortable with other immersion students/families, who they perceived were more scholastically minded than non-DLI families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied Capital: <em>The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced, or limited the child’s durable bodies of knowledge, skills, dispositions, or behaviors.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy: The ability to understand others on a personal level through similar or learned experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not found in data set.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of capital: NES parents thought that their children were acquiring the ability to understand others who were “not like them” through participation in DLI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Code</th>
<th>Example from NSS Families Not in DLI</th>
<th>Example from NES Families in DLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Cognitive Benefits: An enhanced ability to think and reason.</td>
<td>Gain of capital: NSS parents believed that their children already spoke Spanish and therefore would be more capable learners across academic content areas after they learned English in school.</td>
<td>Gain of capital: NES parents referred to “studies” in which learning a second language from a young age helped students’ “brains learn better.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Capital: <em>The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced or limited the child’s linguistic abilities in a dominant or non-dominant language.</em></td>
<td>Loss of capital: NSS parents stated that they sometimes tried to have their children read in Spanish but usually gave up because their children couldn’t comprehend what they read in Spanish as well as they could understand in English.</td>
<td>Gain of capital: Teachers of NES students stated that these students were very capable readers in English even though they dedicate half of their time in school to reading and studying in Spanish. NES Students said that they prefer to read in English, but they were confident in their ability to transfer the strategies they used to comprehend English to their Spanish reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Two Languages: The ability to read and comprehend in both Spanish and English.</td>
<td>Loss of capital: NSS students stated that they learned new things in English at school that they were not able to talk about in Spanish because they lacked the academic vocabulary. This lack of growth in Spanish academic vocabulary limited the students’ ability to effectively communicate orally in Spanish in an academic register. Gain of capital. The NSS parents perceived that their children gained linguistic capital through intensive practice speaking academic English.</td>
<td>Gain of capital: NES students felt that because they were taught through content areas (e.g., math, science, social studies) they were confident in their ability to communicate about almost any conversation that they could be exposed to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Two or More Languages Proficiently: This required students to be able to demonstrate a high level of competence in speaking more than one language.</td>
<td>Loss of capital:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Code</th>
<th>Example from NSS Families Not in DLI</th>
<th>Example from NES Families in DLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Capital: The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced or limited their ability to make or save money.</td>
<td>Gain in capital: NES parents talked about the savings for college studies because their children would be able to take most of their college Spanish classes while still in high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving Costs: When families do not have to pay as much for university studies.</td>
<td>Not found in data set.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Earning Potential: When students acquired skills that increased their ability to obtain a higher paying job as adults.</td>
<td>Gain of capital. NSS parents thought that their children would earn more money if they were proficient in spoken and written English as the dominant language in the US.</td>
<td>Gain in capital: NES students and parents believed the students could earn more in the workforce because they would be bi-literate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectified Capital: The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced, or limited their ability to appreciate artifacts and literature from specific cultures.</td>
<td>Gain in capital: NES parents stated that they had several books in Spanish and hundreds of books in English for their children to read.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books: The number and lexical level of books made available to students in their homes.</td>
<td>Not found in data set.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Capital: The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced, or limited their ability to earn awards, degrees, honors, or other designations that institutions confer upon individuals.</td>
<td>Gain in capital: NES parents cited the Utah state dual immersion program’s course articulation where their children would be able to graduate high school a few credits short of a minor in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class selection: The ability to participate in advanced courses or take advanced placement tests in junior and senior high that offered college credit before leaving the public-school system.</td>
<td>Not found in data set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

collected. Creswell (2013) said that a researcher should use at least two validation procedures to ensure the interpretation of the data is sound.

Yin (2014) defined reliability in qualitative research as “the consistency and
repeatability of the research procedures used in a case study” (p. 240). Quality research was important in both the data collection phase and the data analysis phase of the study. Here, I have outlined what steps I took to ensure research quality while collecting and analyzing the data.

**Data Collection**

Following Creswell’s (2013) advice, I selected two methods to ensure the data I collected were reliable and could be analyzed with confidence.

- Multiple means of data development (Glesne, 2011). I developed a plan to collect data from the students, their families and their teachers, who participated and who did not participate in DLI. This plan included interviews of students and parents; focus groups of students and teachers; and observations by teachers that helped me get a complete picture of how the students and their families perceived that capital operated within dual language immersion.

- Develop a case study protocol for interviews and focus groups (Yin, 2014). I did not find any previous studies that investigated how capital affected the choice of enrolling or not enrolling students in a dual language immersion program. There were studies that measured motivation (e.g., Gerena, 2011; Whiting & Feinauer, 2011), of families that participated in DLI, but I did not find any studies that investigated the link between capital and the choice to participate or not to participate in DLI. Thus, I was unable to modify previous interview questions to fit this study. However, in order to ensure quality for my interview protocols (Walther, Sochacka, & Kellam, 2013), I vetted them with a committee of five experts in educational research.

**Data Analysis**

After carefully recording, safeguarding, and transcribing the data, I analyzed it to form a theory of how capital did or did not play a pivotal role in the decisions families made to participate or not to participate in dual language immersion. I used the following procedures to ensure the trustworthiness of the data.
- Triangulation (Glesne, 2011; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2014) or crystallization (Creswell, 2013) across multiple cases. By identifying themes that emerged across more than one case, I was able to compare and contrast the lived experiences of the participants in order to better understand the phenomena.

- Member checking (Creswell, 2013; Glesne, 2011). I shared my findings with the participants and ensured that my reported findings accurately reflected their point of view as they lived the experience of participating or not participating in dual language immersion.

- Coding (Smagorinsky, 2008). I developed codes using Bourdieusian theory to help me organize the data into meaningful pieces. The codes I developed were not “static or hegemonic, but rather serve[d] to explicate the stance and interpretive approach” (Smagorinsky, 2008, p. 399) that I brought to the data.

- Peer review and debriefing (Glesne, 2011). I shared my data with an expert in Bourdieusian theory (Amy Wilson-Lopez) who ensured that my codes were confirmable.

- External data audit (Creswell, 2013). An external researcher audited portions of my data and confirmed that there was an appropriate fit between the assigned codes and the data excerpts.

**Limitations**

This study was conducted in a school that served a predominantly NES population. Because Teton was a one-way immersion school, there were limitations in the transferability of the findings to schools that served a more diverse population. However, I felt it was important to conduct the study in a school that used the one-way DLI model in order to better understand how it impacted both families who participated as well as those families who chose not to participate in DLI. Fully understanding how the DLI strand at Teton affected both NES and NSS students was a first step in understanding how capital influences family choice about DLI enrollment.

Another possible limitation was that my position in the community as a religious
leader of Latino families might have influenced the responses I received from the
participants. I was aware that if any member of my religious congregation participated, I
would have to take care not to put them in a position where they felt obligated to tell me
what they thought I wanted to hear. I sought to minimize this power differential by letting
the families know that their participation in the study would not affect my perception of
them, and I offered them the option of being interviewed by someone who was not a
religious leader in the community.

Finally, the theoretical lens I used for this study could be a limitation as well. I
recognize that Bourdieu might be considered as promoting deficit views of non-dominant
groups, because he primarily identifies dominant capital that is valued by society at large,
versus forms of capital held by minoritized people that might not be valued by dominant
groups. I chose to use Bourdieu because the NSS families mentioned the pre-eminence of
dominant forms of capital (e.g., money), in their decision-making process. Moreover,
despite its limitations, Bourdieu’s theory of capital can be used to theorize and advance
equitable educational practices (Wilson-Lopez, Sias, Smithee, and Hasbún, 2018).

Unrau and Alvermann (2013) said “theory and theoretical models have the power
to cast both light and shadow on our understanding” (p. 47). I want to be upfront about
the weaknesses of using Bourdieusian theory as the framework for this study. Bourdieu
sheds light on the dominant forms of capital while casting a shadow on the forms of
capital possessed by minoritized groups of people. This study used the light cast on the
dominant forms of capital, identified by the participants, to gain an understanding of what
the NSS and NES families had in common, but my use of this framework may have
resulted in “shadow” in the sense that I might have missed the participant’s forms of capital that fell outside of Bourdieu’s framework.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

In this section I used excerpts from the interviews and focus groups I conducted with the students, their parents, and their teachers to explain the forms of capital I identified in this study. I organized this chapter according to Bourdieu’s major categories of capital (i.e. social, embodied, linguistic, economic, objectified, and institutional), followed by my inductively developed subordinate codes (as seen in Table 2, in the Methods chapter). The category of linguistic capital is normally a subcategory of embodied capital within Bourdieu’s theory of capital. I chose to use it as a superordinate code because of the importance language had on the families involved in the study. Each family chose to place their children in a monolingual English classroom or in a Spanish dual language immersion classroom with the specific goal of gaining language abilities. The importance of learning a second language, to me, seemed significant enough to make linguistic capital a superordinate code rather than a subordinate code.

Within the subordinate codes, I highlighted what perceived gains or losses of capital the students or families experienced until now (coded as present capital) and what perceived gains or losses of capital the students or families expected to realize in the future (coded future capital). Within each subordinate code, I presented the NSS students and families followed by the native English-speaking students and families. In some of the interviews, there was no mention of present or future capital of certain codes discussed in this chapter, or there may have been times when either the NSS or NES families did not make comments that related to Bourdieu’s categories of capital. When no
mention of future or present capital was evident in my interviews, I did not include the present or future capital section in the chapter. In the following sections, I explain my findings in each of the areas of capital identified in the study.

Social Capital

The students and their parents perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled or enhanced their social capital (coded as a perceived gain in social capital) in some ways, while they also believed that participation or non-participation limited their status or membership in social groups (coded as a perceived loss in social capital) in other ways. I identified three forms of social capital: family, church, and friendships. I elaborate more on these three categories below.

Family

Families were the most important social group mentioned as I interviewed the students and their parents. The students and their parents made many references to immediate and extended family members. The NSS and NES families talked about how their ability to communicate in Spanish helped make or strengthen bonds within the family. The NSS families used Spanish as a way to communicate with relatives. The native English-speaking families used Spanish as a way to strengthen family ties with some extended family members who spoke Spanish, at the same time that these family members’ abilities to speak Spanish provided the NES students a means to practice their new language.

Present capital. In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the
NSS and NES families.

Native Spanish speaking. In some ways the NSS families perceived that their children’s monolingual English education resulted in a loss of social capital because their children were losing the ability to communicate with extended family in Spanish. Some of the NSS students found that even though they spoke Spanish at home, their ability to communicate with extended family in Spanish was getting more difficult as they got older. This difficulty in communication limited the meaningful contact and supports that extended family like grandparents, aunts, and uncles could have offered to these students.

An example of a loss of family capital came from a conversation I had with Francisco’s parents. I asked Francisco’s parents if they would have liked to have him in the dual language immersion program. They both told me that they thought it was a good program and that Francisco would have benefitted from it. However, they did not learn about the program until Francisco was in the second grade, and most students started participating in the program in first grade. They chose not to place him in the program because they were worried that it might be too much for him since he was already more comfortable in English than Spanish. Still, Francisco’s parents wanted him to improve his Spanish because his grandparents and some other family members on his father’s side still lived in Mexico and only spoke Spanish. Because of their desire to have Francisco communicate with his family in Mexico, they tried to help him with his Spanish at home. To this end, they attended a Spanish-speaking church as a family. They hoped that, by doing this, Francisco would have more opportunities to speak Spanish to others and would have had more opportunities to read in Spanish as he studied lessons from church.
Francisco’s parents also stated that they had not encouraged him to write in Spanish.

As a result, Francisco, a sixth-grader in the monolingual English program at Teton, did not practice writing in Spanish. When I asked his mother about opportunities for Francisco to text or email in Spanish, she said:

[Francisco] always texts in English. Well actually, sometimes his aunts will do family… Like [my husband’s] sisters will do family texts and they’re in Spanish. He’ll read them, and he understands them, but sometimes he doesn’t… “Mom, how do I respond to this?” He’ll understand, “She’s asking me this, but how do I respond? I don’t know how to text her in Spanish.”

This quote was an example of a perceived loss in family capital for Francisco because he was unable to effectively communicate in writing with his Spanish-speaking relatives.

Francisco’s parents tried to maintain his Spanish abilities at home, but they did not believe they were successful in helping him communicate in written Spanish.

Native English speaking. In contrast to the NSS students, the NES parents perceived a gain in family capital for their children because some extended family that spoke Spanish took special interest in these students and strengthened their ties by practicing Spanish together. Most of the NES students had grandparents, cousins, or aunts and uncles who learned Spanish serving Spanish-speaking missions for their church. The parents leveraged this family capital to provide opportunities for their children practice their Spanish. An example came from a conversation I had with Tom’s parents.

Tom, a NES student in the sixth-grade DLI class, used his newly learned language to communicate with family members that spoke Spanish. When I asked Tom’s mother if he had any opportunities to use Spanish outside of school, she said, “Well that’s just it.
His grandfather and two of his uncles speak it. We’ve asked them to only speak to our kids in Spanish.” Tom gained family capital because he had the opportunity to practice Spanish with family members and, therefore, he perceived he formed a tighter bond with them. According to Tom, his grandfather and uncles shared stories with him in Spanish and talked about when Tom could use Spanish in the future, like they did when they were missionaries.

**Future capital.** I found no instances of anticipated capital, in the forms of strengthened or weakened family relationships in the future, in the data set for NSS and NES families.

All of the participants in the study were members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and attending church regularly was an important part of their lives. These families actively attended church on Sundays and at least one evening during the week.

The majority of families in this part of Utah were also members of this church (88.7%; The Association of Religion Data Archives, 2010), so attending church here was a way of forming bonds within the community and of sharing information among families. In talking with the students and their parents, references to church membership and culture were very common. All of the families talked about their relationships with other members of the church and the possibility of the children serving proselyting missions in the future for the church.

**Present capital.** In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.
Native Spanish speaking. Nonparticipation in dual language immersion or the language spoken at church was not an indicator of a gain or loss in perceived church capital for the NSS families. All of the NSS families took their children to church and felt connected to other members within the church, irrespective of their child’s participation in the DLI program.

The NSS families chose to attend church either in Spanish or English depending on what they perceived to be best for their families. For example, Francisco’s parents chose to attend church in Spanish to help him maintain his Spanish abilities because they knew him to be more fluent in English than in Spanish. Pedro’s parents, on the other hand, chose to attend church in Spanish because neither the parents nor their children understood English very well (they arrived in the U.S. from Mexico less than a year before this study) and would not be able to understand what was being said in an English ward (the local unit of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints). They felt the need for the family to understand what they learned at church was more important to them than the opportunity to practice English.

Maria’s parents chose to take their family to an English-speaking ward because Maria and her older sisters understood English better than Spanish. Even though Maria told me that her mother did not speak English very well, Maria’s parents wanted their daughters to go to church in the language they understood best. In all of these cases, the parents of the NSS students chose to have their families attend church in the language that would help them the most in their lives—Maria and Pedro because it was the language they best understood and Francisco because his parents wanted him to be
exposed to more Spanish.

Native English speaking. Some of the NES families believed that participation in the DLI program enhanced their social connections with people in their church congregations. I coded this perceived enhancement as a gain in social capital under the church subcategory. For example, Tom told me that he used Spanish “with our friends that are in our ward. Sometimes they only speak Spanish.” Just like the bonds formed, or strengthened, in the families of the NES students, bonds with members of the church who spoke Spanish were strengthened by the ability the NES students had to speak Spanish. This was an increase in social capital for Tom since he was able to communicate with Spanish-speaking members in his congregation, and he felt more connected with them.

Future capital. In this section I describe the future capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

Native Spanish speaking. None of the NSS students or parents talked about how speaking English or Spanish could affect their future in the context of religion.

Native English-speaking. Participation in dual language immersion was perceived as a gain in future church capital for the NES students. All of the NES students mentioned the possibility of serving a Spanish-speaking mission for their church in the future as a positive result of participating in Spanish dual language immersion. Serving a Spanish-speaking mission would also be a way to improve the student’s Spanish-speaking ability and further add to the linguistic capital she or he was gaining by participating in the dual language immersion program. Gary told me how serving a Spanish-speaking mission helped his father in his work:
Interviewer: Do you think being bilingual will be a benefit to you in the future?

Gary: Yeah. I might go on a Spanish-speaking mission, and that would really help to learn a language. My dad (who teaches seminary for the church), he’s known Spanish. He has some students who are native Spanish speaking, and they can’t speak English. They don’t know it. He talks to them personally in Spanish. That would help.

Gary saw how serving a Spanish-speaking mission for his church helped his dad make personal connections with some of his seminary students.

The NES students believed that, even if they did not serve a Spanish-speaking mission in the future, the DLI program would still aid their work as future missionaries. According to the students, one of the benefits of becoming bilingual is that it would make learning a third language easier, as they had had already mastered the ability to transfer knowledge between two languages. Betty, a sixth-grade DLI student at Teton, thought that by already speaking two languages, she might be able to serve a mission for her church where she would have the opportunity to speak a third language:

Interviewer: Do you think being bilingual will help you in your future?

Betty: Yeah.

Interviewer: How?

Betty: If I serve a mission, then since I already know two languages, then it might be easier to learn French, because French is similar to Spanish.

Each of these examples demonstrated an anticipated gain in future social capital, under the church sub-category, because these students believed being bilingual would give them better opportunities to serve their church in the future.
Friendships

Participation or non-participation in dual language immersion seemed to determine the social groups with which students played or associated with at school and sometimes outside of school. Unlike the students in the monolingual program, students who participated in DLI spent the first six years of their public education with the same group of peers while in class. The DLI teachers reported that they had years where students in the DLI program played exclusively with other students in the program at lunch and at recess. Other years, there were occasional neighborhood friends that joined the immersion group for recess, but that was the exception, not the norm.

Present capital. In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

Native Spanish speaking. The NSS parents believed that their children had opportunities to make friends in the local community (which was primarily English speaking) because they spoke better English as a result of participating in a monolingual English program. An example came from an interview with Maria’s parents:

Interviewer: ¿Sus hijas juegan mucho con los niños de aquí de este vecindario? (Do your girls play much with the children in your neighborhood?)

Mom: Sí. (Yes.)

Dad: Sí. (Yes.)

Interviewer: ¿Saben si juegan más con niños que están en inmersión o los que no están en inmersión? (Do you know if they play more with children that are in immersion or with children that are not in immersion?)

Mom: Fuera de inmersión. (Not in immersion.)

Interviewer: ¿Las chicas tienen mucha interacción con gente que solo habla
Do the girls have much interaction with people that only speak English?)

Dad: Pues, sí. Todo en la escuela para las chicas. (Well, yes. Everything for the girls at school.)

Interviewer: Entonces, cuando juegan, me imagino que juegan más en inglés que en español. (Then, when they play, I imagine they play in English more than in Spanish.)

Mom: Mm-hmm. (Mm-hmm.)

In Maria’s case, there were several immersion students who lived near her home, but she chose to play with children who did not participate in dual language immersion. This choice could have been a result of the isolation the dual immersion students created with their playmates at school extending itself to play after school. Maria’s mother perceived that, because Maria played primarily with English-speaking students who did not attend the immersion program, Maria strengthened her ability to communicate effectively in English. In turn, Maria’s mother felt that the ability to communicate in English simultaneously strengthened Maria’s ability to form friendships with other children in the community, most of whom were native English speakers.

Native English speaking. The NES parents perceived that their children formed close friendships as a result of participating in the dual language immersion program. I coded this perception as a gain in social capital under the sub-category of friendships. An example came from the interview I conducted with Betty’s parents. Her father talked about their experience with Betty’s older brother who also participated in the dual language immersion program at Teton Elementary.

Interviewer: What benefits did you think your children would receive out of the immersion program when you first put them in?
Dad: I thought that it was a thinly veiled accelerated learning program. I had thought that they would be challenged more. I thought that they would be with kids whose parents cared more about education and saw a benefit to that. They naturally gravitated to a tighter group of kids.

Interviewer: How about you?

Mom: The same. We wanted them, especially [Betty’s brother], he was our first. He was a genius, so we wanted him to be in the advanced program.

Dad: Well, it had benefits that we didn’t really foresee. [Betty’s brother] has been able to stick with the same kids, and he has deeper friendships than I ever had growing up. I think that’s a benefit that we didn’t even think about.

Betty’s parents perceived that their children acquired social benefits from being with a tight-knit group of students in the “advanced” program whose parents “cared more about education” than the parents of children in the monolingual program. The NES students had spent 6 years in a cohort of dual language students together with other high-status students, and they were on track to study in advanced Spanish courses with these same students for 6 more years. The NES students developed deep, lasting relationships with others who were perceived as being in a group with desirable characteristics (e.g., coming from families who cared about education).

The teachers of the student participants (both NSS and NES) had an interesting conversation about the perceived social status gained by families who participated in dual language immersion.

Interviewer: Do you think that kids that choose to participate or not to participate in the immersion program—is that associated in any way with higher or lower status for kids in the school?
Mrs. S: What do you mean by…

Mr. J: Absolutely.

Mrs. S: …higher or lower status?

Interviewer: Do people in general, in your opinion, think that maybe those who are in the program…

Mr. J: Are more privileged?

Interviewer: …are more privileged or have a higher status than the kids that don’t.…

Ms. A: Absolutely.

Mr. J: Or even more so the status of the parents being able to say, “My kid is in Spanish immersion.” Whether the kid is excelling or not, I think it is more for the parents to say, “My kid.”

Ms. A: I still feel like there is still a privileged—there is a hierarchy, there is a perception that dual immersion kids are upwardly mobile, their families are upwardly mobile, they are going places and the regular education kids just aren’t. They are not bound for success the way that dual immersion kids are.

All of the teachers, both DLI and non-DLI, agreed that participation in the dual language immersion program at Teton was a way to increase social capital—specifically because of the feelings of privilege and potential felt by the immersion students. The teachers in this study perceived that the non-immersion students in the school felt as if they were not of the same academic caliber as the immersion students. The social capital gained by the immersion students extended beyond the school and to the home. Immersion parents enjoyed the perceived status of being parents to one of the “smart kids” at school.

**Future capital.** In this section I describe the future capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.
**Native Spanish speaking.** The NSS students in this study did not participate in dual language immersion; however, they did have the chance to form deep, lasting friendships with the English-speaking peers in their monolingual English classes. They did not have the same chance of moving from grade to grade with the same set of peers like they would have had they participated in DLI, but they did have opportunities to play at recess and after school with the friends of their choice. The NSS students did not mention specific examples of how forming friendships in elementary school would affect their future social capital.

**Native English speaking.** The NES students who participated in dual language immersion and their parents did not explicitly mention the future of their relationships with others who participated in the program or how they thought present relationships would affect the future. I felt, during the interviews, that the students and their parents did expect the students’ peers to continue in the immersion program through junior and senior high school and took for granted the fact that they would have continued association with them.

**Summary of Social Capital**

The NES parents perceived that their children gained social capital in all three categories (family, church, and friendships) because participation in the DLI program enabled them to strengthen their relationships or status in relation to family, other church members, and friendships. By contrast, the NSS parents perceived a gain in some categories of social capital (church and friendships) but potential losses in another category (family capital) because their children were not actively learning how to
communicate fully with extended family members in Spanish. Importantly, though NES and NSS parents both perceived that participation and non-participation led to their children having more friends, only the NES parents believed their children had high-status friends. Specifically, they believed the that DLI program marked their children as belonging to the “upwardly mobile” and “advanced” group, but those in the monolingual program did not enjoy the same status. In summary, the research participants perceived that the DLI program offered a range of substantial social advantages for those who attended it, whereas non-participation in the program offered mixed social results.

**Embodied Capital**

Education is a means to enhance the embodied capital students can acquire. Both the NSS and NES students and family groups anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced, or limited the student’s durable bodies of knowledge, skills, dispositions, or behaviors. In this section I have described two subsections of embodied capital that the participants perceived they gained by participating or not participating in dual language immersion: empathy and general cognitive benefits or academic achievement.

I did not include linguistic capital in this section, even though Bourdieu categorized it as a form of embodied capital (Bourdieu, 1977). I chose to create a separate section specifically for linguistic capital because both NSS and NES families primarily desired linguistic capital as a result of participating or not participating in the DLI program. All of the forms of capital observed in the present study were directly
influenced by the opportunity to learn a second language at Teton Elementary. For these reasons, I separated linguistic capital from embodied capital to give it needed individual attention.

**Empathy**

The term “empathy” when first appropriated for psychological purposes was defined as “the process by which we come to know other people” (Davis, 2018, p. 4). Davis compared empathy to the passive way of understanding others—sympathy. Empathy, said Davis, is “a more active attempt by one individual to get ‘inside’ the other, to reach out in some fashion through a deliberate intellectual effort” (p. 4). In other words, empathy is the ability to understand others on a personal level through similar or learned experiences. Being empathetic, therefore, is also the ability to accept others and understand them even though they are different, after making an effort to understand what it is that makes them different. The NES students were learning about the varied cultures of the Hispanic world as they studied in the DLI program. By actively seeking to understand cultures unlike their own, the NES students had the opportunity to develop empathy for people different than themselves. As described in more detail below, the NES parents believed that their children were gaining embodied capital, in the form of greater empathy, by participating in the DLI program.

**Present capital.** In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** The data set did not indicate that the NSS families perceived their children gained greater empathy toward others by not participating in DLI
at Teton Elementary. All of the NSS students stated that they played with children who only spoke English, but they did not make any comments that demonstrated they were learning any skills that helped them understand others better. Because there was no specific mention of empathy or learning to become empathetic by the NSS students and their parents, I cannot conclusively state that they perceived that they gained or lost capital in this category.

**Native English speaking.** The parents of the NES students perceived that their children gained empathy as a result of participating in dual language immersion. An example of an NES student learning how to be empathetic came from an interview I had with Betty’s parents:

Interviewer:  Do you have anything else you’d like to add about the immersion program?

Dad:  Yeah. One thing that I thought of was that maybe some of our kids are a little more accepting of people who look differently or talk differently. I know that there’s a girl up the street that has a bit of a speech impediment.

Mom:  Really, I can’t understand her.

Dad:  She has a really hard time playing with other kids, but for some reason, our two kids welcome her in. They play, and they’ve never even commented to us that it’s hard for them to understand her. They’re really accepting. There’s another girl that I’ve heard has a harder time developing friendships because of alopecia. It’s a hair loss disorder. She’s always over. They have a welcoming, open relationship with them. They’ve developed some great friendships.

Mom:  It’s not us.

Dad:  Their barriers are down on who they take into their group.

This example demonstrated how Betty’s parents believed that learning to be empathetic
was a positive thing in their daughter’s life. Betty’s parents were happy that she was adding to her embodied capital by learning to become more empathetic, and they attributed this character development to participation in the DLI program.

**Future capital.** In this section I describe the future capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** The NSS parents did not mention how not participating in DLI would affect the future level of empathy in their children.

**Native English Speaking.** The parents of the NES students perceived that their children would benefit in the future by being more empathetic. Tom and his parents provided the following example:

Interviewer: What are some of the benefits you thought Tom would get out of immersion?

Dad: I like the culture aspect of it too, kind of getting to learn—I mean, learning a different language, we both did that through high school and stuff. Getting to understand the different cultures and things as well, outside of Utah, you didn’t get to pick that up. He’s getting to pick up stuff that took me ‘til college and late high school to do. I thought that was real important too.

Mom: He’s a really good helper. All of his teachers have said that what they love about him is that he notices what needs to be done and he just does it. They’ve all said how they can rely on him, to especially help out [a boy in a wheelchair] all the time, where he notices, “[The boy] is going to have trouble with that in his wheelchair.” He just takes care of it.

Dad: I think it can shape what he may choose to go into too, where he may choose to go into business, and having that background in a separate language could help understand how culturally what’s different.

Mom: This is a fairly white community. I like that my kids are in school with a whole bunch of little brown kids. Not that we’re racist at all, but it’s for their cementing, doesn’t matter what color you are.
Tom’s parents asserted there were benefits of learning about different cultures through language immersion at a young age. They hoped that the DLI program would “cement” the idea that “everybody’s the same,” and they believed this mindset represented a positive and accepting approach to others. Tom’s dad mentioned specifically that empathy, or understanding of people from different cultures, could “shape what he may choose to go into” in the future. Empathy is a desirable trait in anyone, but Tom’s dad recognized the possibility that empathy might influence Tom’s future profession, thereby potentially having a lasting economic impact as well. The parents perceived that participation in dual language immersion was changing Tom’s habitus. According to them, Tom was learning to be more empathetic as an elementary-school student, and that empathy could positively change the course of his future.

In an interview with Tom, I asked him about how speaking Spanish might help him in the future. Interestingly, Tom answered my question with a story from his past.

Interviewer: In what ways do you think speaking Spanish is going to help you in your future?

Tom: I have a story about speaking Spanish. There was this time we were playing kickball at a family reunion. There was this other family that looked really sad and was eating small sandwiches. They kept on looking at us. My mom’s like, “Tom, go over there and ask them what’s wrong, and if there’s something wrong.” When I went over there and asked them what, they’re like, “We don’t have very much money. We would like to play with you guys.” I’m like, “Okay. Sure, you guys can come over and play.”

Interviewer: This was all in Spanish?

Tom: Yeah. My mom thinks it [the ability to speak Spanish] could help me cheer up people, make people happier than what they might be
because they don’t speak English.

Tom recognized the value his family placed on helping others. His mother felt that speaking Spanish would be a vehicle through which he could understand Spanish-speaking families and “make them happier” in the future. This example underscored that the NES parents felt that the DLI program made their children more empathetic, in the sense that they were better able to ascertain other people’s emotions and experiences, and work to alleviate their hardships. The NES families perceived that dual language immersion fostered empathy by making students more aware of others’ needs and better able to relate to them on a personal level. The NES parents asserted their children were gaining embodied capital, in the form of empathy, which could be useful in their futures.

Although it is beyond the scope of this study to critically analyze these interview excerpts in relation to intersections of language, class, and race, it is important to note their potentially problematic aspects. For example, this NES family embraced a doctrine of color-blindness in the sense that they felt that skin color “doesn’t matter” and that “everybody’s the same.” They also presented the Spanish-speaking family without “very much money” as being sad, and they presented the English-speaking person (who was presumably wealthier and accustomed to bigger sandwiches) in the position of cheering them up. In this sense, the NES family may have implicitly positioned themselves as superior. While I condemn attitudes that are overlain with undertones of linguistic or racial superiority, I sought to analyze the data in accordance with the purpose of my study, which was to identify perceived gains in capital, and the NES parents did perceive that participation in the DLI program made their children better able to understand and
serve people from “different cultures.” They also perceived that the program made their children more empathetic in general, such as when they had developed a desire to help those with physical disabilities.

**General Cognitive Benefits and Academic Achievement**

One of the desired outcomes of any formal education is higher cognitive functioning for the students. As described in the theoretical foundation section, learning in two languages may enhance students’ cognitive abilities by making them more mentally flexible and able to construct complex understandings (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The NES parents believed that their children’s cognitive capacities and academic achievement improved as a result of learning two languages.

**Present capital.** In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** The NSS families did not comment on enhanced cognitive abilities in our conversations. The NSS students believed they were becoming bilingual because they already spoke Spanish at home and were learning English at school, as highlighted in the comments Maria made during the focus group I held with the NSS students. Maria was very confident in her present ability to speak Spanish:

**Interviewer:** ¿Qué opinan ustedes del programa de inmersión? (What do you guys think about the immersion program?)

**Maria:** Nosotros no estamos en el programa de español porque yo nací hablando español y aprendí inglés en pre-school. Entonces mis primeras palabras eran en español. Hablé todo en español en la casa. Mis hermanas y mi papá son los únicos que saben inglés. Pero ahora yo sé hablar en inglés. Mi mamá todavía no sabe inglés. Su
acento es un poco fuerte. Yo ya hablo español en la casa. Mi mamá dice que cuando no estoy en la casa, es inglés. Pero cuando hablo con mi tío y mi tía y estoy en mi casa es todo español. (We’re not in the immersion program because I was born speaking Spanish and I learned English in pre-school. So, my first words were in Spanish. I spoke everything in Spanish at home. My sisters and my dad are the only ones who speak English. But now I speak English. My mom still doesn’t speak English. She has a strong accent. I speak Spanish at home. My mom says that when I’m not at home, it’s English. But when I talk to my aunt and uncle and I’m in the house it’s only Spanish.)

Maria perceived a gain in embodied capital, although not necessarily a gain in cognitive abilities. The gain in capital Maria perceived was more of a gain in linguistic capital, described in more detail below. There could still have been some cognitive benefit for the NSS students because they were able to apply their Spanish language ability as they learned new concepts in English. Thinking in two languages could have helped the NSS students access their knowledge via both languages and demonstrate some of the cognitive benefits of being bilingual (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994), but the NSS families did not explicitly mention cognitive benefits in any of my interviews with them.

Native English speaking. While the NSS parents did not comment on potential cognitive benefits of being bilingual, the NES parents perceived that their children gained greater cognitive benefits by learning two languages, as opposed to the benefits they would have gained in a monolingual program. In Bourdieusian terms, they believed that the program provided their children with enhanced embodied capital in terms of general cognitive increase. Unlike Maria’s comment, Tom’s mother said that she chose to place him in DLI specifically for the mental challenge it promised to provide for students while learning a second language.
Interviewer: Before you put Tom in the program, what kind of benefits did you think he would get out of it?

Mom: They passed out a flier to the kindergarteners at the elementary school where we were. It had some information about the studies that had been done, the benefits the kids received from doing it. Then I looked up some of the studies, and my hope, when we registered him, was that he would excel in not only the language development but that it would kind of challenge his mind and open it up to where he would succeed in math, and English, reading, and other things just because he was being challenged.

This quotation demonstrated that Tom’s parents enrolled him in DLI in part because it would support his academic success in general, and not just because it would build his linguistic capital. Specifically, Tom’s parents thought that participation in DLI would enhance Tom’s achievement in mathematics, English, and reading. In other words, the parents perceived that DLI would enhance Tom’s general cognitive abilities, leading to greater academic achievement in school across content areas.

**Future capital.** In this section I describe the future capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** From the conversations I had with the NSS parents, I inferred their desire was that their children would learn English as quickly as possible. The concept of enhanced cognitive abilities was not something they talked about. The NSS parents and students did not comment on the possible cognitive benefits of their choice to study exclusively in English at school. The students did believe that the better they got at English, the easier it would be to learn academic content in the future, thus increasing their future academic achievement. A conversation I had with Pedro highlights the NSS students’ belief:
Interviewer: ¿Tú crees que esto te va a afectar cuando tomas clases en la secundaria? ¿Crees que te va a ayudar más, o lo mismo? (Do you think [learning English] will affect which classes you take in high school? Do you think it will help you a lot or will it be just the same?)

Pedro: Me va a ayudar más. (It will help me more.)

Interviewer: ¿Por qué? (Why?)

Pedro: Porque mientras más hablo inglés, más voy aprendiendo. (Because the more I speak English, the more I will learn.)

Pedro perceived that mastering English would enhance his ability to do well in junior and senior high school. Although not realized yet, Pedro looked forward to academic success as a result of being able to speak English. Like his parents, Pedro believed he was going to learn English faster if he studied in the monolingual English class.

Native English speaking. The NES parents understood some of the possible cognitive benefits of learning Spanish in the dual language immersion program. The NES parents hoped that as a result of the possible enhanced cognitive abilities, their children would do better in school, resulting in increased chances at getting into better universities, finding better employment, and enjoying a better quality of life. Tom spoke to his mother’s perception of increased opportunities academically, socially, and economically in the focus group with the NES students. I asked the NES students why they thought their parents enrolled them in the immersion program. Tom explained it this way:

My mom wanted me to learn it because it could help me get a better job. It could help me have a better life and more friends than just the English-speaking ones I could have. I could get a better learning experience. It expands your knowledge, technically. It challenges you. It can be used for more than just one thing.

Tom touched on many forms of capital in this quote (i.e., economic, social, embodied).
Tom perceived that he could find a better job, helping him to be more secure economically. He linked having a better job to having a better quality of life. Tom mentioned the social capital possible by having more friends than if he had not participated in DLI. Tom talked about having “a better learning experience,” and specifically included the challenge that learning in two languages offered and the link to better academic abilities. As a sixth grader, Tom perceived that learning Spanish in DLI offered much more than linguistic capital. He was already talking about how learning a second language could affect many other forms of capital, including embodied capital which would “expand his knowledge” and enhance his academic experiences in general.

**Summary of Embodied Capital**

The parents of the NSS and NES students in this study sent their children to Teton Elementary with the hope that they would increase their skills, dispositions, and behaviors in order to form durable bodies of knowledge that would benefit them throughout their lives (embodied capital). The NES parents perceived that their children increased in both empathy for others and in their general cognitive capacity and academic achievement as a result of participating in the DLI program. Although the NSS students presumably should also reap cognitive benefits from speaking two languages, the NSS parents did not cite increased cognitive capacity as a benefit of the monolingual program. The NSS parents also did not perceive that their children increased in empathy as a result of the monolingual program. In summary, the NES families perceived that participation in the DLI program led to multiple forms of embodied capital beyond linguistic capital, whereas the NSS families did not mention other forms of embodied capital beyond
Linguistic capital. The following section describes how the two sets of families perceived linguistic capital.

**Linguistic Capital**

Linguistic capital is usually a subcategory of the embodied state of cultural capital. In this study, the parents of the student participants had the stated goal of bilingualism for their children. I separated linguistic capital from the embodied state of cultural capital because it is the form of capital that influences all of the other forms of capital observed in this study.

I would like to make note of something I found as I interviewed the NSS families that seemed to permeate all of our conversations. The NSS parents and children believed that they were bilingual, or becoming bilingual, because they already spoke Spanish at home. Their thinking was that Spanish would always be part of who they are and that their children would always be able to use Spanish in their lives. For example, Maria’s parents not only believed their daughter would be able to speak Spanish and English; they hoped she would learn additional languages in the future.

**Interviewer:** Entonces, ¿escogieron ponerlas en el programa de puro inglés por el beneficio de aprender el inglés más rápido, o mejor o . . .? (So, you chose to put your daughters in the English-only program, so they would learn English faster, or better, or . . .?)

**Dad:** Para usar el tiempo en otras materias. (So, they could use the time studying other things.)

**Mom:** Mm-hmm. Mi lógica fue de que, a pesar de que hablaron español todo el tiempo desde pequeña, igual iban a aprender el inglés en escuela, entonces pues, es más bueno que lo hagan en inglés y seguimos hablando español casa y otras oportunidades de aprender
This example illustrated the feeling I got from each NSS family as I spoke to them. This was true for all of the forms of capital we talked about. Even when the parents perceived that their children were not realizing a gain in a specific form of capital, they believed that their children were always going to have the Spanish language as a tool they could use.

The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in the DLI program enabled, enhanced or limited the student’s linguistic abilities in a dominant or non-dominant language. Specifically, for this study, the abilities to read and write (biliteracy) or speak and listen (bilingualism) were highlighted in the data.

**Reading in Two Languages**

The native English and NSS families both commented on how participation or non-participation in the DLI program influenced their children’s abilities to read in two languages.

**Present capital.** In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** The NSS parents perceived that their children did not acquire the ability to read in Spanish as much as they might have if they had participated in the DLI program. According to the parents, the NSS children were not working to improve their Spanish reading ability to the same extent that they worked to improve
their English reading ability. Most of the NSS students were able to read in Spanish, but they did not actively work to improve their Spanish reading ability because reading in English seemed more important to them. From the NSS students’ point of view, reading in English was required of them because all of their schoolwork and homework was assigned in English. In addition, when I spoke to the NSS students about what they liked to read for pleasure, most of them told me about books in English. The NSS parents were concerned that their children seemed to be losing their interest and ability to read in Spanish and each family was trying to do something to help their children with their Spanish reading. In my interview with Maria’s parents, we talked about reading as well as speaking Spanish.

Interviewer: *Usted mencionó algo en antes, creo, que ustedes hacen algo para mantener su español aquí. ¿Qué hacen?* (You mentioned before, I think, that you do some things to maintain her Spanish here. What do you do?)

Dad: *Bueno, aquí esta prohibido ellas hablar en inglés. Ellas tienen que hablarnos en español todo.* (Well, they’re not allowed to speak English here. They can only speak to us in Spanish.)

Interviewer: OK. *¿Y en cuanto a lectura?* (OK. What about reading?)

Dad: *En cuanto a lectura usualmente lo único que leemos juntos es las escrituras. Y tomamos turnos.* (For reading, usually the only thing we do is read the scriptures together. And we take turns.)

Interviewer: ¿*En español?* (In Spanish?)

Mom: *Un día inglés, un día español, un día inglés.* (One day English, one day Spanish, one day English.)

Interviewer: *Oh, OK.* (Oh, OK.)

Mom: *Para que puedan comprender más. Porque el idioma español lo hablan, pero entenderlo como el inglés, no. De esta manera estamos...*
From this interview, I understood that maintaining the significance of Spanish in Maria’s life was important to her parents. Maria’s parents were helping her with her Spanish reading, but they perceived that her Spanish reading abilities were not as strong as her English reading abilities. Maria’s mom stated that her daughter was not able to understand what she read in Spanish at the same level as what she could read in English. Had Maria participated in DLI, she would have had more opportunities to read in Spanish, but she was accomplishing her parents’ goal for her by learning to, and choosing to read in English.

The library at Teton Elementary had a section dedicated to Spanish books on all levels to support the Spanish-speaking students at the school, both native Spanish-speakers and dual language immersion students. The NSS students seemed to choose to read in English even when Spanish books were accessible as highlighted in my conversation with Maria.

Interviewer: ¿A ti te gusta leer? (Do you like to read?)

Maria:  

Um-jum. (Um-hmm.)

Interviewer: ¿Entonces cual será tu libro favorito o quizás tu autor favorito? (Which book is your favorite, or maybe your favorite author?)

Maria:  Diary of a Wimpy Kid.

Interviewer: ¿Inglés o español? (In English or Spanish?)

Maria:  Ingles. Una vez lo hice en español, no terminé el libro. Está aquí en la biblioteca. (English. One time I tried in Spanish, I didn’t finish the book. It’s here in the library.)
As I spoke with the other NSS parents, I found that, like Maria’s parents, they found that their children did not often read and comprehend Spanish at home. However, their children did gain practice in reading and writing in English at school, and their children also read for a variety of purposes in English at home. Thus, they felt the monolingual program met their goals of teaching their children to read and write in academic English.

**Native English speaking.** The NES parents perceived that their children were gaining linguistic capital because they were reading in two languages regularly. Like the NSS students, the NES students preferred to read in English when given a choice. The students in the dual language immersion program were required to read in both languages at home every day. All of the NES parents told me that they had a selection of Spanish books for their children to read. However, they admitted that the availability of English books at home was vastly superior to those available in Spanish in both number and lexical level.

When talking to the NES students about reading in Spanish a typical answer was like Betty’s:

**Interviewer:** How much effort do you put into getting better at Spanish when you are outside of Spanish class? How much effort do you think you put into that?

**Betty:** Um, I read in Spanish and I do, like there’s this website online that I use where you read and then you answer questions about the story. I do that after school.

Although the NES students did their required Spanish reading at home, they indicated that they did not read in Spanish for pleasure or to learn new things. By contrast, the NSS students read in their second language (English) for a variety of purposes, beyond what
was required of them at school.

**Speaking Two or More Languages Proficiently**

The goal of both the NSS and NES parents was that their children would learn a second language (English for the NSS students and Spanish for the NES students). To that end, the NSS parents chose to enroll their children in the monolingual English program. The NSS parents perceived that their children were becoming bilingual because they still spoke to them in Spanish at home and they could see that their children were able to speak to English-speaking people outside of the home.

The NES parents chose to enroll their children in Spanish DLI so that they could learn Spanish while still learning half of the school day in English. The NES parents perceived that their children were improving in both their English and Spanish speaking abilities as they continued to speak English in and out of the home, and as they received proficiency reports from their teachers for their ability to speak Spanish. They wanted their students to obtain a level of competence in academic language in both Spanish and English in order to be considered bilingual.

**Present capital.** In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

*Native Spanish speaking.* The NSS parents perceived a gain in linguistic capital by not enrolling their children in dual language immersion. They reasoned that, by not spending half of the school day in Spanish, the NSS students could use all of their time at school to learn English, the dominant language in the U.S. For example, Pedro, a third-grade, NSS student, spent the previous school year in an English-only classroom. Pedro
and his family moved to the Western US from Mexico during the summer before the school year started. Pedro attended school in Mexico and learned to read and write, at his level, in Spanish before coming to the U.S. During the interview for this study, I asked Pedro’s father why they had chosen not to enroll in DLI. Pedro’s father said:

Para nosotros es una gran oportunidad de que ellos van a hablar los dos idiomas. Esto es nuestro deseo que nuestros hijos aprenden los dos. Ahorita la prioridad es que aprenden el inglés, pues, en la escuela. (For us it’s a great opportunity that they [our children] will speak both languages. This is our wish, that our children learn both. Right now, the priority is English, at school at least.)

Pedro’s parents were aware of the role English would have in their children’s future, so they made learning English a priority for Pedro’s education. They felt that the fastest way for Pedro to learn English was to have him spend all of this time at school learning English, rather than spending half of the time studying a language he already knew.

Native English speaking. An example of how the NES families felt they were gaining linguistic capital came from a story Betty’s mom related to me about a trip they took to Spain.

I think [our children] speak Spanish better than we ever thought they would. We took Betty to Spain and she was our translator; we got to test it out, her ability. Also, I think it’s [being in DLI] helped their English a lot. They understand English grammar better than I ever did at that age. Maybe better than I do now, and I teach English.

Betty’s mom told me how Betty helped her buy souvenirs in the market when the vendor did not speak any English at all. Betty’s parents perceived that she and her older brother spoke better English and Spanish than they expected, even though they only spent half of their school day in each language.

Future capital. I asked both the NSS and NES students why they thought it
might be good to speak either Spanish or English in the future, and they all said that it would be good to speak both languages so that when they met someone who only spoke English, they could speak to them in English, and when they met someone who could only speak Spanish, they could speak to them in Spanish. When I gave the students specific examples like college or work they recognized the benefit of being bilingual, but they had a hard time thinking of future benefits of bilingualism on their own.

**Summary of Linguistic Capital**

The NES parents perceived that their children learned how to speak a second language by participating in the DLI program, while the NSS families likewise perceived that their children learned how to speak a second language by participating in the monolingual program. However, the NSS families felt that their children did not progress as much as they could have in terms of the ability to read and write in their first language, whereas the NES parents knew that their children were still supported in reading and writing in their first language. In this sense, the NES participants perceived that participation in the DLI program offered many advantages in the domain of linguistic capital, whereas the NSS participants perceived that non-participation in the DLI program led to mixed results in the domain of linguistic capital.

**Economic Capital**

I found two categories related to economic capital: saving costs and increasing earning potential. I outline how NSS and NES families perceived or hoped for gains in these two categories below.
Saving Costs

There are many ways that K-12 students can minimize the costs of college, including through taking Advanced Placement (AP) courses, such as AP Spanish or AP English. A cost-saving advantage unique to the DLI program are the bridge courses offered to 10th-, 11th-, and 12th-grade students. Students participating in the DLI program can earn upper-division college credits that, at the time of this study, cost only $5 per credit.

**Present capital.** Neither the NSS nor the NES students and their parents mentioned current economic savings by enrolling or not enrolling their children in dual language immersion. The cost to the parents to enroll their students in dual language immersion was the same as the cost for parents who did not enroll their children in DLI.

**Future capital.** In this section I describe the future capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

*Native Spanish speaking.* The NSS parents and their students did not mention future cost savings in the interviews I conducted.

*Native English speaking.* The NES parents perceived a possible gain in future economic capital because they felt their children would start college having already completed several university-level Spanish credits while in high school. Tom’s parents spoke to the cost savings possible to students enrolled in dual language immersion:

Dad: Tom can proceed and go to college and get college credits in Spanish. He’s been speaking it for twelve years. This is going to be easy for him. It will help progress his college career.

Mom: Save money.
Dad: Save money and stuff like that.

This response was exemplary of what the NES parents felt about their DLI students. These parents were keenly aware that if their children passed the AP Spanish exam in the ninth grade, and then went on to take upper-division university Spanish courses while still in high school, they would not have to pay for those credits when they got to college. I coded this data excerpt as a perceived gain in future economic capital because the parents saw participation in the DLI program as a way to save money at the university.

**Increased Earning Potential**

Both the NSS parents and the NES parents perceived economic advantages for their children if they could speak a second language fluently. The NSS parents considered the future benefits for their children if they could master English. The NES parents were certain their children would master English, so their focus was on the possibilities open to their children in the future if they could master Spanish while in school. For both sets of parents, the hope was that their children would acquire a skill that increased their ability to obtain a higher paying job as adults.

**Present capital.** Neither group of students or their parents mentioned earning potential in the short term.

**Future capital.** In this section I describe the future capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** The NSS families believed their children would have an increase in economic capital if they could dedicate all of their time to learning English
in school and not spending half of the day speaking a language they already spoke at home. The NSS parents felt that their children would earn more money in the U.S. if they spoke English. Their focus was not on how Spanish would help them earn more money in the future. An example came from a conversation I had with Pedro’s parents:

Interviewer: ¿Cuáles son algunos de los beneficios que ustedes creen que sus hijos van a recibir por haber estudiado en puro inglés en las escuela cuando sean adultos? (What are some of the benefits you believe your children will receive from having only studied in English in school when they are adults?)

Dad: Pues que puedan tener un mejor trabajo. Van a poder comunicarse mejor. (Well, they can get a better job. They’ll be able to communicate better.)

This example demonstrated that the NSS parents hoped that monolingual English education would lead to a gain in economic capital in the future, in the sense that this type of education would help their children get better jobs.

Native English speaking. The NES parents also believed that their children would increase their earning potential by studying a second language. Specifically, they felt their children would have more opportunities for better employment as a result of having studied Spanish in the dual language immersion program. An example of this thinking came from a conversation I had with Tom. I asked him why he thought his parents enrolled him in the dual language immersion program at Teton Elementary. Tom said, “My mom wanted me to learn it (Spanish) because it could help me get a better job.” Comments like this from Tom came from some of the other NES students as well, demonstrating that they had internalized their parents’ message that they might be able to get better jobs by knowing Spanish.
Summary of Economic Capital

Both the NES and NSS parents believed that their children would eventually earn more money by being fluent in a second language. This desire for increased economic capital was, in part, what motivated the NES parents to enroll their children in the dual language immersion program, while this same desire is what motivated the NSS families to stay out of the same program. However, while both families cited earning potential as a reason behind their enrollment decisions, only the NES families cited saving money in college as a potential benefit. They were familiar with institutional recourses (e.g., the potential to earn college credit while in high school), and they planned early so they could take advantage of these cost-saving institutional resources through the DLI program.

Objectified Capital

I made visits to the homes of each of the families in the study to interview the parents. One of the things that I noticed is that some families had bookcases full of books that the students could use when they wished, and others did not appear to have many books at all. Being able to own, use, and appreciate literature is a form of objectified capital. There were many ways to show that a person or family possessed objectified capital (e.g., books, paintings, machinery, etc.), I chose to use the availability of books in either Spanish or English as an indicator that a family possessed objectified capital in relation to the DLI program because the program encouraged reading at home and Teton Elementary offered Spanish and English books to the students.
Books

The number and lexical level of books available to students in their homes could have been an indicator the importance families placed on reading, or it may have been an indicator of the economic ability a family had to provide leisure-reading opportunities for their children. By offering books written in both Spanish and English, families can expose their children to the authors’ cultures. Books written in Spanish could be a window into the rich culture and the lived experiences of people from Latin America, just as many books written in English help the reader identify what is culturally important to people who speak English. As with all types of capital, being able to appreciate literature takes time. Bourdieu (1984) said that when a person is able to “consume” the books available to her or him, then she or he would develop the cultural competence to appreciate their value. The families that could make books available to their children offered them a particular type of objectified capital.

Present capital. In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

Native Spanish speaking. Three of the four NSS families did not have books in English or Spanish in their homes (with the exception of scriptures); this observation was confirmed through interviews. Only Francisco’s family had books in English, but not Spanish, in their home. This finding dovetails with my earlier finding that NSS parents perceived their children did not read well in Spanish, which might be attributed to the fact that they did not read Spanish books at home or at school. Thus, the NSS students may have gained more linguistic capital, in the form of knowing how to read advanced
Spanish literature if they had attended the DLI program, which required them to read books in Spanish. Additionally, they might have been able to learn about the experiences of different Spanish-speaking peoples through books (a form of objectified capital) if they had received practice with and instruction on how to read in Spanish.

Native English speaking. The NES families showcased books in both English and Spanish in their homes. I could see books in both languages on the shelves of the living rooms in the homes of the NES families, and the parents mentioned more books in other parts of the home (e.g., the children’s rooms, offices, and family/play rooms). Some of the NES parents also mentioned using the public library as a source of up-to-date Spanish and English books for their children. Two examples came from conversations with Gary’s parents and with Betty’s mom and dad:

Gary’s Dad: We have a library membership. He always has a book from the library.

Gary’s Mom: That’s true, he checked out three yesterday.

Interviewer: Do you have a lot of books in Spanish for the kids to use at home?

Betty’s Mom: Yeah, we have a collection now.

Betty’s Dad: And different levels. I think as they move up in difficulty, we have fewer.

Betty’s Mom: We started getting them on the Kindle.

The priority the NES parents put on getting books from the library either in the traditional way or in electronic versions demonstrated the families’ objectified capital. The students were learning the value of reading in two languages and they had the opportunity to appreciate literature in Spanish as well as English.
Based on what I saw in the home visits and what I learned from parents in the interviews, I found that Bourdieu’s (1986) theory that economic capital can be converted to other forms of capital held true. The NES families with enough economic capital, like Betty’s in this study, were able to afford both books in print and on the kindle device. As the NES students read these books, their parents perceived that they gained linguistic capital in the form of increased ability to consume literature in two languages.

**Future capital.** There were no examples of how owning or having access to books in the future would help the students gain or lose objectified capital in the interviews I conducted.

**Summary of Objectified Capital**

In this study books were an indicator of possible objectified language-related capital for the NSS and NES families. The NSS families did not have many books in Spanish at home, but the NES students had Spanish and English books at home. Thus, the NSS students were not exposed to Spanish literature and were, therefore, unable to learn to consume Spanish literature. The NES students were given more exposure to Spanish literature at the same time they were learning about English literature. The NES students, who participated in DLI, had the opportunity to learn to consume books in both Spanish and English. The NSS students, who did not participate in DLI, were not given the same opportunity to learn to appreciate both Spanish and English literature.

**Institutional Capital**

The participants anticipated or perceived that participation or non-participation in
the dual language immersion program enabled, enhanced, or limited their ability to earn awards, degrees, honors, or other designations that institutions confer upon individuals.

In looking for examples of institutional capital in the interviews I conducted, I found only one category of institutionalized capital: enrollment in quality courses. Institutions (e.g., schools) confer the right to attend Honors, concurrent enrollment, or Advanced Placement courses to some students while denying this right to other students; thus, the ability to attend these courses is a form of institutional capital. In the following section, I describe how families perceived participation or non-participation would lead to this type of institutionalized capital.

**Quality and Variety of Class Selections Available**

In this section I defined quality and variety of class selections as the ability to participate in advanced courses or take Advanced Placement tests in junior (junior high in Westside School District includes ninth grade) and senior high that offered college credit before leaving the public-school system. I talked with the students and their families about what they had done while in elementary school that would directly impact the future. Because institutional capital, for these students, would not be realized until the future I have combined present and future capital into one discussion.

**Present and future capital.** In this section I describe the present capital perceived by the NSS and NES families.

**Native Spanish speaking.** The NSS parents perceived that non-participation in the DLI program would better prepare their children for succeeding in middle and high
school courses, but they did not mention opportunities to attend additional or advanced courses in the interviews I conducted. In my interviews with the NSS parents, there was a sense that if their children did well in their English-only classes in the elementary, they would be more prepared for the courses they would take at the secondary level, as mentioned by Pedro’s dad.

Interviewer: ¿Creen que, si se queden en las clases de puro inglés, esto les va a afectar mucho los curso que puedan tomar en la secundaria? (Do you think, that if your children stay in the English-only classes, that this will have an effect on which courses they will be able to take in the secondary?)

Dad: Posiblemente, pero ellos, a lo mejor, van a aprender más rápido el inglés para adaptarse a las clases de la secundaria. (Possibly, but they, I imagine, will learn English faster so that they will be ready to take secondary courses.

Pedro’s dad believed his son would have a gain in capital by studying in a monolingual, English class because he should have learned English faster and have been more prepared for his secondary courses.

Native English speaking. The NES parents perceived that participating in the DLI program would lead to a gain in institutional capital in the future. The NES parents were aware that dual language immersion offered advanced courses for their children if they stayed in the program. Some of them, like Tom’s parents, spoke specifically to that.

Interviewer: You mentioned a little bit about future education. Could you elaborate a little bit more on what kind of benefits do you think will help him for his future education, because he’s in an immersion program?

Mom: I went to that parent meeting for the middle school where they talked about how some of the classes he’ll be taking in eighth or ninth grade will be allowing him to take high school classes that are actually college credit. That’s kind of what we meant when basically
being able to have the credit for the college classes and have it shown, but you don’t have to pay the tuition fee.

Dad: I think it can shape what he may choose to go into too, where he may choose to go into business, and having that background in a separate language could help understand how culturally what’s different.

Mom: Or going into medicine and being able to … A lot of the demographic here only speak Spanish and being someone in a hospital that is able to communicate…..

Dad: I think it opens the door wider for possibilities for him, both in schooling and a future career.

Mom: It makes him more marketable.

This discussion demonstrated the perception Tom’s parents had that participation in dual language immersion would provide an increase in future capital for Tom by giving him a skill that he could leverage to enter any number of professions and be “more marketable”.

The opportunities provided by participation in DLI gave Tom a chance to take Advanced Placement courses, which would eventually mean paying less money for university courses in the future. I found in this example a direct link between institutional capital, the ability to take advanced courses worth university credit in high school, and economic capital. Tom’s parents perceived that learning a second language while taking advanced courses would not only save money but give him better economic opportunities in his future. Larry’s parents also mentioned a benefit of dual language immersion for his future education:

Interviewer: Do you think that him participating in the immersion program is going to have a big influence on his future education, the type of courses he takes and the things that he can do with his education?

Dad: I would say yes. More so because having a language behind him, it’s going to open up time for other things, rather than, okay I want to get
a second language, and having to do it in high school. This is now all taken care of if you will. It will open it up for other classes.

Larry’s father understood one value of the institutional capital offered his son: the ability to have more choices in university coursework because of the time saved by taking advanced courses at the secondary level. He connected “having a language behind him” (linguistic capital) to the institutional capital (the ability to take other classes). In this case, other forms of capital (i.e., social, economic, embodied) were being earned while progressing through the program provided to the DLI students by the institution. All of the NES parents were aware of the advantages provided by the institution (school) for their students because they participated in DLI.

**Summary of Institutional Capital**

Advanced courses were available to all students, not just those who participated in DLI. The difference is that the DLI program, which continued via intensive language maintenance programs in high school, included advanced courses and the opportunity to earn college credit in high school as part of the articulated program. Dual language immersion students only had to enroll in the next course offered by the program to be given the chance to earn the college credits. Non-immersion students could also participate in the advanced courses and earn college credit in high school, but they would be required to take additional tests to demonstrate proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing in Spanish before they would be admitted into the advanced courses. Most non-immersion students take two-to-three years of secondary Spanish before they are able to enroll in the Advanced Placement Spanish course, making it impossible to
participate in the bridge courses offered to immersion students who had passed the AP Spanish test. The possibility of obtaining the institutional capital found in this study seemed much more accessible for those students who participated in DLI.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I divided Bourdieu’s forms of capital (i.e., social, cultural, and economic) into subcategories. Some of the sub-categories were defined by Bourdieu (embodied, objectified, and institutional states of cultural capital) and some of the sub-categories I generated inductively as I coded the transcripts from interviews (i.e., family, church, and friendships under social capital; empathy and general cognitive benefits or academic achievement under the embodied state; reading and speaking in two languages under linguistic capital; cost savings and increased earning potential under economic capital; books under the objectified state; and the quality and variety of class selections available under the institutional state).

I found as I spoke with the parents of both native Spanish and NES students that they were trying to make the best choices for their children that they could to ensure their success in the future. The NSS families felt a very real pressure to have their children master English as quickly as possible because of English’s dominance in the community and in the society at large. The NES students and families did not feel the same urgency to learn Spanish since these students already spoke English fluently and were continuing to learn to read and write with fluency in school.

Based on the research I read preparing for this study, I felt that both NSS and
NES students would possibly gain more of most of these forms of capital if they participated in dual language immersion. What I found was not what I expected.

The NSS families were sure they were gaining capital by not participating in DLI because these students were immersing themselves in English every day. The NSS families were certain, even when they acknowledged their children were not progressing as much as they could have in their ability to read and write in Spanish, that their children were and would always be bilingual. What I would consider a loss in capital (e.g., not being able to communicate effectively with extended family in Spanish), was in some ways perceived as a gain in capital by the students and parents because they were learning to read, write, and speak English.

At the same time, I could see that NES students who were enrolled in DLI were not necessarily gaining as much capital as they might. These NES students knew that they did not need to master Spanish to be successful in their community. There was no external pressure to succeed in Spanish like there was for the NSS students to succeed in English. Most of the NES students did not show any initiative to study outside of school or to look for opportunities on their own to speak Spanish. If they had an assignment for school, or if their parents asked them to speak Spanish they would comply, but not usually out of a desire to improve on their own.

Overall, the NES families perceived gains in more types of capital through participating in the DLI program than the NSS families perceived from not participating in the DLI program. The NES parents perceived increased cognitive abilities, empathy, social status, and specific mechanisms for saving and earning money in the future,
whereas the NSS families did not mention these things. However, the NSS families perceived that their children accelerated their ability to learn English, which they tied to future economic success and the ability to succeed in future classes.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In the previous chapter, I used the participants’ words to identify which forms of capital could have been influenced by a family’s choice to participate or not to participate in DLI. As I reflected over the major and subordinate forms of capital I identified in this study, I noticed two themes of interest: The perceived implications of choosing to participate or not in DLI had on the present and future capital of the students and families; and the role social reproduction played at Teton Elementary. In this chapter, I discuss future capital and social reproduction in connection with dual language immersion. I explain how linguistic capital became a focal point for earning other types of capital, and then I discuss the implications for the field.

Discussion

The idea that capital is something that can be used now and, in the future, seems easy to understand; like money that I earn now can be spent on today’s needs or saved for use in the future. What I found in conducting this study was that both NSS and NES parents made the decision, when their child was five years old, whether or not to enroll them in DLI for the rest of their time in public education. I thought of the enormity of the task of deciding for a 5-year-old what she or he would study for 12 years. This thought led me to consider the investment parents asked their children to make for possible gains in capital—not capital that is immediately exchangeable, but capital that may or may not be used in some future opportunity. This line of thinking brought me to consider what I
I searched for an explanation as to why so many NSS families chose not to enroll their children in DLI, when dual immersion was originally designed to help NSS students as they learned English (Thomas & Collier, 2003). More and more NES students are enrolling in DLI, giving them even more advantage over their NSS peers. I think that Bourdieu’s view of social reproduction may help frame the inequity I observed in this study.

**Dual Language Immersion and Future Capital**

The NES parents used the DLI program as a long-term, specific plan to help their children earn future capital. The NES parents perceived that if their children continued from elementary school immersion through advanced language courses in junior high to the concurrent enrollment classes in high school, their children would reap the benefits touted (Utah State Board of Education [USBE], 2011) by DLI: To become bilingual and biliterate (linguistic capital), increase their cognitive abilities with higher scores on standardized tests (embodied capital), become culturally literate (objectified capital), and improve their employment opportunities (economic capital). In addition to the forms of capital promised for participating in DLI, the NES parents perceived that their children were gaining social capital by building deep, lasting friendships; that they were gaining social capital by being part of the self-termed “upwardly mobile” group; and that they were gaining institutional capital from the opportunity to graduate from high school with a Seal of Biliteracy and almost a minor in Spanish.
The NES parents perceived that their children needed only to apply themselves and they could earn all of the future capital discussed so far. The NES students only needed to invest the time and effort in the program in order to become more successful in life. Bourdieu (1986) stressed the importance of “time which must be invested personally by the investor” (p. 48) for students to develop or embody certain forms of capital. The NES families perceived that students had the opportunity to develop capital over time in ways that accrued advantages to them as opposed to if they had not participated in DLI.

The NSS parents were as concerned for the future capital of their children as were the NES parents for their children. The NSS parents perceived that if their children could master English, as quickly as possible, they would have increased economic opportunities. The NSS parents perceived that their children could also form friendships (social capital), learn a second language (linguistic capital), have improved employment opportunities (economic capital), and graduate from high school (institutional capital). The NSS parents perceived that not enrolling their children in DLI was the best way for their children to prepare for a successful future. Learning a second language turned out to be the key for both the NSS and NES parents’ goals for their children.

Dual Language Immersion and Social Reproduction

I always thought that education was the great equalizer among people. In theory, everyone in our country is given the opportunity to study in schools provided by the government to ensure an educated populace. I understood the importance of doing well
on entrance exams if I chose to go beyond secondary school in my own education, and I
believed that anyone who put in the appropriate effort could be successful in that
endeavor. When I observed the different level of educational opportunities afforded to
two different groups of students within the same elementary school, however, I started to
wonder if everyone did receive the same opportunities. Hard working, non-DLI students
(both NSS and NES) were not provided with the opportunity to gain the same perceived
forms of capital as the DLI students. For example, NSS, non-DLI students were not
considered part of the so-called “advanced” and “upwardly-mobile” group of DLI
students, even though they, too, spoke two languages. This line of thinking brought me to
Bourdieu’s (1990) take on social reproduction. Swartz (1997) stated:

Bourdieu sees the educational system as the principal institution controlling the
allocation of status and privilege on contemporary societies. Schools offer the
primary institutional setting for the production, transmission, and accumulation of
the various forms of cultural capital. (p. 189)

Swartz went on to say that schools tend to reinforce, not redistribute cultural capital
among students. I saw this phenomenon in the DLI program because it seemed that the
families who already enjoyed more capital were the families that were taking advantage
of DLI as a means to gain current and future capital.

In this study, the White, middle-class, English-speaking families strategically
used DLI as a tool, which they intended would result in greater acquisition of social,
embodied, linguistic, objectified, economic, and institutional forms of capital. The NES
families had a long-term plan, which included enrollment in specific courses in high
school, college savings, and encouraging their children to be around other children
“whose parents cared more about education” (to use their words) with whom they could
form lasting friendships.

Why were the middle-class, English-speaking families able to use DLI to accrue additional capital? According to Bourdieu (1986), economic capital is the root of all other forms of capital. The NES parents had sufficient economic capital to be able to support their children as they studied in the DLI program, including through transporting them to school and through buying Spanish and English books for them. Some NES families lived outside of the school boundaries and had to transport their children each day to and from school. In three of four NES families, only one parent worked outside of the home, enabling the parent to drive the children to and from school and to the library. The economic capital enjoyed by the NES families made it possible for them to provide transportation for their children and spend additional time with their children (cf., Bourdieu, 1986). The NES families were also able to leverage their social capital to learn about DLI in the first place. The same NES families who learned of DLI from friends then told others in their social group about the program helping to ensure that the program would be filled with similar families.

The role of social reproduction in nonparticipation in DLI for the NSS students is not as clear as is the role of social reproduction for the participating NES students. Why did the NSS families in this study choose not to use DLI to accrue additional capital? The NSS parents wanted their children to learn English. They believed that learning in a monolingual English class would help their children learn English faster than if their children spent half of their school days learning in Spanish. In my conversations with NSS parents, I found that they were completely satisfied with the education their children
were receiving outside of the DLI program. Each of the NSS parents talked about their child’s future in a positive way and perceived that their child was doing the single-most important thing to prepare for their future—learn English.

In Utah’s DLI program, students are not able to enter immersion after the second grade. Essentially, when parents decide not to enroll their child in DLI, they generally cannot enter at a later date. In my study, I found common findings across families that suggests that NES DLI parents perceived that their children had started their journey on the path to bilingualism/biliteracy, enhanced cognitive abilities, advanced language studies, strengthened social networks, and better-paying employment opportunities. Simply stated, DLI may provide families who come to school with higher levels of certain forms of capital with the opportunity to gain even more capital than their non-DLI peers in the same school.

A difficulty I have had with social reproduction is that it seems deterministic. I do not want to believe that the institution will only help the “haves” get more. It is possible that a NSS student who did not participate in DLI could achieve similar benefits to those offered the NES students in DLI, but the NES students were provided with an institutionally formalized path that non-DLI students did not have. Moreover, the DLI program offered students the status of being part of the so-called “advanced” and “upwardly mobile” group. Participation and nonparticipation in DLI both led to perceived increases of capital, but participation in DLI led to perceived increases of more types of capital. The one common goal of both NSS and NES families in deciding to participate or not in DLI was that of learning a second language. Linguistic capital became the focus of
the participant families in this study.

Moving Beyond Conceptions of Dual Language Immersion as Linguistic Capital

The NSS parents chose to add English to the Spanish their children already spoke at home in the way they perceived to be best: by having their children study in a monolingual English class. In the same light, the NES parents chose to enroll their children in DLI with the goal of having them add Spanish the English they already spoke at home. In the interviews I conducted with both NSS and NES parents, the first reason they stated for the choice they made always had to do with learning the second language. Other reasons like future employment or serving a mission for their church were mentioned, but always after the primary goal of learning a new language. Both sets of parents believed that, as the students improved their second language ability, their chances of earning more capital increased. Therefore, to the families, linguistic capital became a means of gaining financial security in the future.

Although NES and NSS parents both focused on linguistic capital, this study suggests that or participation or nonparticipation in DLI should be conceptualized in terms of other forms of capital as well. Specifically, this study suggests that DLI offered other perceived benefits. These benefits included strengthening family ties and lasting friendships, becoming part of the self-designated “advanced” group in the school, becoming more empathetic and understanding of others, earning more money, becoming culturally literate, and earning institutional accolades.

Participation in DLI provided a way for the NES students to increase social
capital by solidifying family ties with extended family members who spoke Spanish on their missions. Dual language immersion also provided an environment that ensured that the NES students would study with the same group of peers for the first six years of their education, with anticipated continued contact through high school graduation, allowing them the time necessary to form deep, lasting friendships.

The NES parents credited the DLI program for helping their children learn to be more empathetic and understanding of others who were different from them. They also thought that their children would derive additional cognitive benefits from learning in two languages. On an institutional level, the DLI program included advanced language courses at the junior high level for the NES students that the NSS students were not permitted to take (USBE, 2017).

The DLI program also offered economic advantages for its participants. Students who participated in DLI were expected to continue taking advanced Spanish courses, including concurrent enrollment college courses, through twelfth grade that were only offered to students who had participated in DLI as elementary students (USBE, 2017). Dual language immersion students were expected to graduate high school with advanced Spanish proficiency in reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. As a second example of economic advantage provided by the DLI program, students who could function at an advanced level of bilingualism/biliteracy could expect to earn more money through enhanced employment opportunities in the future.

Dual language immersion participants were not the only ones who could benefit from being bilingual, but they did enjoy certain advantages. One advantage was the
possibility of receiving the Seal of Biliteracy offered by the Utah State Board of Education. Utah provided an official Seal of Biliteracy to students who could prove competency in English and in another language. Dual language immersion students, because of their academic preparation in two languages, were expected to be able to earn the Seal as they completed the DLI program. An additional economic advantage provided by the DLI program was that the state immersion program paid for both the testing in Spanish and for the assessment of English (e.g., the ACT) for the DLI students. Although the state paid for the same English assessment for the non-DLI students as the DLI students, the state did not pay for a Spanish assessment for not-DLI students. Non-DLI students would have to prepare for and pay for a test in Spanish on their own. In turn, the Seal of Biliteracy could have helped a student get a higher paying job even if the student chose not to attend college. The Seal of Biliteracy was proof to an employer that a student possessed the skill of being bilingual and biliterate in English and Spanish.

Dual language immersion students were exposed to both Spanish and English literature and art, and their parents perceived that they became more capable consumers of the Hispanic (Iberian as well as Latin American) culture. The NES students in this study also acquired objectified capital in the sense that they were able to understand and consume Spanish books, including Spanish literature. In contrast, the NSS students in the study were not provided Hispanic cultural education in their monolingual classes.

The institutional capital offered by participation in DLI has already been examined in our discussion of the other forms of capital offered to participants in DLI. Earning college credits in high school and receiving a Seal of Biliteracy are just two
examples of institutional capital offered as an extension of the DLI program. Any non-DLI student could attain the same institutional honors, but they would not be provided as part of a program built for them.

**Discussion Summary**

In this section I discussed the idea of future capital and how it relates to the choice to participate or not in DLI. I also discussed the role social reproduction by an educational institution played for the families of DLI and non-DLI students. Finally, I discussed many of the possible advantages provided by the institution for DLI participants.

The parents of both NSS and NES students wanted their children to have the best opportunity to become successful in the future. Specifically, they wanted their children to become economically secure. The NSS parents’ first concern was that their children learn English. For this reason, they were positive about their children’s future because of the choice not to enroll them in DLI. The NES parents understood the purported benefits of DLI and purposefully strove to ensure their children were able to participate. Both sets of parents desired future forms of capital for their children and believed they made the best choice for their children early in their academic lives. The NSS parents were not well informed of all of the possible benefits of DLI when they made their decision not to enroll, but once the decision was made, the DLI program perpetuated that one group of students would have more institutionally-designated opportunities to gain future capital than the other.

Teton Elementary became a site of social reproduction by the way it implemented
the DLI program. The NES parents had already formed a social network that ensured information was shared with other families similar to the majority of families at Teton. The NSS families did not receive the same access to information about the possible benefits of DLI, such as knowledge of the research studies that detailed possible cognitive benefits of learning in two languages, which were cited by the NES families. The NES students were placed in a pipeline of courses that could lead to complete bilingualism, advanced university language credits, a Seal of Biliteracy, and self-designated “advanced” social networks that set them up for financial success in their future.

Perhaps because they did not receive the same information as the NES families, the NSS families did not enroll their children in the program. The NSS students could still become successful, and their parents perceived that they were becoming so, but they may have had more high-status social and institutional opportunities, had they participated in DLI. The NSS parents and students considered themselves bilingual, but they did not have equal access to DLI. The NES students got access to DLI and were able to become bilingual in a program that offered more than just a second language.

Learning English was the primary goal of the NSS students. The NSS students saw the importance of speaking English for their futures, as did their parents. What the NSS parents did not know is that NSS students who participate in DLI generally become fluent in English two years earlier than NSS students who do not participate in DLI (Steele et al., 2017). The NES students used their opportunity to learn Spanish as a way to earn many other forms of capital. This study showed that the NES parents perceived
that their children were afforded more opportunities to gain other forms of capital that the NSS students because they participated in DLI. In the next section, I discuss the implications of having a program that helps those that already have, get more. I also discuss what may be done to create greater equity.

**Implications**

The demand for DLI in Utah seems to be growing daily. Everyone I speak to who knows about the program agrees that dual language immersion is a program that could benefit almost all students. Something that got my attention was that very few NSS parents ask me about how to get into DLI. And when I have talked to NSS parents about getting into the program, they inevitably say something similar to, “Pero si no logramos entrar el programa, todavía hablamos español en casa.” (But if we don’t get in, we still speak Spanish at home). Many NSS families are still not convinced DLI is right for them. As more school districts across the nation add DLI as an option for their students, some districts have noticed a trend toward White families becoming the most representative group in the DLI classrooms. In some instances, two-way immersion programs are being replaced by one-way immersion programs where almost all of the students served are White (Williams, 2017). My findings, together with the trend toward privileged families enrolling in DLI, hold implications for DLI administrators, policy makers, teachers, and future DLI research. In the following sections, I outline some implications for practice (what administrators, policy makers, and teachers could do to make DLI more accessible to NSS families) and implications for future research.
Implications for Practice

Making sure all students have equal access to DLI is a primary responsibility of educational administrators and policy makers. In this section I discuss what school and district-level administrators might do to help NSS families make informed decisions about enrolling their children in DLI, what changes policy makers might affect to ensure DLI is a desirable option for NSS families, as well as what DLI classroom teachers might do in their classrooms to help their NSS students take full advantage of DLI.

Implications for school and district administrators. This study indicates that participation in DLI programs may result in many benefits beyond the accrual of linguistic capital. Consequently, NSS families, many of whom do not enroll their children in DLI programs, should be informed of these potential benefits as well. Leaders of DLI schools should actively seek out NSS families and engage them in a way that ensures they are informed of the benefits DLI could offer for their children. Relying on mass emails, or even regular mail, to invite parents to learn about DLI is not enough. Administrators should make extra efforts to invite NSS students to participate in DLI. For example, principals could organize community meetings with the purpose of explaining to the NSS parents in Spanish, English, or a mix of the two, what DLI is, how it works at a specific school, what the short-term and long-term benefits are to the students; what the costs are (if any), and how the school intends to support the parents at home while their child is in the program.

Administrators in districts and principals at DLI schools could provide a setting where the school community could meet together and discuss the benefits of DLI for all
students if the NSS students participated. The meetings would be bilingual to provide the best opportunity for NSS families to participate. Spanish-speaking parents in the community, especially those looked up to by NSS families, could be invited to present on the benefits of DLI for their Spanish-speaking children. Principals could invite former students to testify of the benefits of DLI, including the enduring friendships and improved test scores possible through DLI. Spanish-speaking families could also be informed of research, including studies that indicate NSS students learn English better in a dual language program versus a monolingual program.

It is important for DLI administrators to anticipate the needs of NSS parents and be prepared to explain to them that even though their child speaks Spanish, the DLI program could provide multiple forms of future capital. Explicitly describing the forms of capital available to the NSS students and families is paramount. Administrators could explain the institutional benefits of participating in DLI (i.e., university credit and the Seal of Biliteracy), the economic benefits (better potential employment), and the cognitive advantages promised. By understanding the NSS population in the area and the capital they bring with them to school (Yosso, 2005), the DLI principal should be able to explain to them how the NSS students could build on that capital by participating in DLI. As a result of the community outreach, the NSS parents would better understand how their child could benefit from participation in DLI and how that could help them in the future.

**Implications for policy makers.** This study demonstrated how schools with DLI programs can become sites of social reproduction. To counter this trend, policy makers
could seek to ensure that DLI sites promote equity in at least two ways: By choosing the right site for an immersion school and by conducting lotteries in a way that balances the number of NSS students with NES students in the classrooms.

Policy makers could use the demographic maps at their disposal to choose schools that have the best opportunity of serving a larger portion of NSS families. Extensive outreach could be designed and implemented to prepare the community where a DLI school is to be started. Both NSS and NES parents should fully understand the benefits of mixing NSS and NES students in the program.

Once the community is ready to accept a DLI program and there is enough support by both NSS and NES families, a lottery might be designed that does not favor NES families over NSS families. If the idea is that mixing the two native languages is best for all students, all parents should support a lottery designed this way. Another problem that many families have in participating in DLI is that if the DLI school is not their neighborhood school, the district does not provide transportation. Car ownership is a reflection of economic capital, as are stay-at-home parents who can take their children to school. Thus, school districts should be conscious of issues related to transportation as a core equity issue. District leadership could consider making transportation to out-of-area DLI schools within their district available to families who do not have the means to provide it for themselves.

**Implications for teachers at DLI schools.** Classroom teachers have a major impact on what students are exposed to while at school. Teachers in DLI classrooms, both the English and the target language teachers, could challenge power structures in
DLI programs. Immersion teachers could help their students become more cognizant of their own privilege and status related to language, class, and educational opportunities. For example, these teachers could read and discuss stories that highlight the intersections between language background and educational quality (e.g., Tonatiuh, 2014). Finally, non-DLI teachers could also encourage their NSS students to continue to read books in Spanish and could also teach literature that celebrated and highlighted Latino cultures. These instructional approaches might help to challenge the hierarchies that exist between immersion and non-immersion students, while promoting the maintenance and celebration of home languages and cultures for NSS students, regardless of their participation in the DLI program.

**Implications for Future Research**

I suggest three types of studies for future research into DLI: A longitudinal study, studies that apply interventions, and studies that take a more critical view of DLI than Bourdieu.

**Future studies.** This dissertation study highlighted the types of capital that students and their families anticipated that they would receive in the future, but future studies could follow the participant students and families for the next five to ten years to determine which forms of capital were actually affected by choosing to participate or not in DLI. A longitudinal study of the same, or similar, students could add to current research on the benefits of DLI by identifying the forms of capital attained as students graduate high school and then several years later to see if the capital gained by the students was passed to their children. Did the social reproduction provided by DLI make
a lasting change in the lives of the DLI students? If so, how can that opportunity be replicated so NSS students can enjoy the same long-term benefits?

Moreover, these longitudinal studies could expand the participant pool to include NSS students who did participate in DLI and NES students who did not participate in DLI. By selecting more cases to study, researchers could obtain a better understanding of the long-term (future capital) benefits of DLI participation for both NSS and NES students and ascertain if there are more, or different, benefits for DLI participants than non-participants. Following the students for several years could help researchers understand if the friendships developed through DLI are more or less significant in the lives of participating students than for those who did not participate, or if the future academic, employment, and church service opportunities were affected by participation or non-participation in DLI.

**Interventions.** In this study, I did not attempt to intervene in the DLI program; only to describe the perceived capital gained or lost and the ways in which it contributed to social reproduction. Future studies, however, can seek to disrupt inequitable social reproduction through carefully-designed interventions. Possible interventions include those suggestions from the implications for principals, for policy makers, and for teachers. A DLI school site or district should be chosen where better community outreach and education for NSS families—coupled with research-based site selection, lottery management, and transportation options—are implemented. This type of study would point toward ways that DLI programs might be sites where equity, rather than social reproduction, is promoted. Even if my previous suggestions failed, they could still
generate “lessons learned” that could work to advance the goal of equity. Equity in this case is more than an equal opportunity to participate in DLI, it is an equal opportunity for the NSS families to gain future capital.

**Critical view.** Finally, researchers might consider conducting studies of families’ participation and non-participation in DLI using different theoretical lenses. I consider Bourdieu to be a critical theorist because he identified how inequitable power structures are maintained through reproduction. However, some scholars, drawing from critical race theories, have taken a critical view of Bourdieu’s theories. Yosso (2005), for example, used critical race theory to identify the forms of community cultural wealth possessed by youth of color and their families. These forms of wealth have typically gone unrecognized by researchers, but they may also result in particular advantages for minoritized students. Looking at DLI more critically may help researchers understand what changes could be made to make DLI a more equity-based field of play.

**Significance of the Study**

This study illuminated how DLI programs can act as sites of social reproduction. Many studies of DLI have focused on the cognitive benefits DLI offers students (e.g., Cobb et al., 2006; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2001) or sought to understand what motivated parents to enroll their children in DLI (e.g., Gerena, 2011; Whiting & Feinauer, 2011). Most of these studies determined that the cognitive benefits were a large motivating factor for parents to enroll their children in immersion. Unlike other studies, this study used Bourdieu’s theory of capital as a way to describe a broader
range of perceived and anticipated outcomes associated with participation and non-participation in a DLI program.

NES parents learned about DLI and then took steps to ensure their children were able to participate in the program. This study describes what parents hoped their children would become as a result of participating or not participating in DLI. Hoping or believing that a child can learn better, develop deep friendships with other students who will help them continue in their studies, become culturally sensitive and empathetic, develop native-like second language skills, graduate with a head start toward college, and be more marketable in the workforce are all representations of the capital hoped for by the parent of a five-year-old child.

The present study serves as a baseline from which to launch future studies and programs designed to support the attainment of present and future capital for all students. I mentioned before that, for me, theories of social reproduction can be too deterministic. What if we could implement a program that offers an increase in almost all forms of capital to NSS as well as NES students? Then DLI would shift from a site of social reproduction for those that already have more than others, to a site of equity for those who have been historically underserved by school systems.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Definition of Terms
Definition of Terms

*Dual Language Immersion (DLI).* An educational program where students are taught in two different languages. Content area instruction (i.e., math, science, and history) as well as language instruction is provided to the students in both English and the target language (e.g., Chinese, French, Portuguese, and Spanish).

*Native Spanish-speaking (NSS).* A person whose first language is Spanish and who predominately speaks Spanish at home.

*Native English-speaking (NES).* A person whose first language is English and who predominately speaks English at home. In this study, NES students had no Spanish ability or training prior to participation in the DLI program.

*Target Language.* The non-English language studied by students in DLI. The target language of the school in this study is Spanish. Students spend half of their instructional time in class with an English-speaking teacher and the other half of their time with a Spanish-speaking teacher. While with the Spanish teacher both students and teacher are prohibited from speaking English and all classwork is done in Spanish (USBE, 2014).

*50/50 Model.* Each student has two teachers and spends half of the instructional day with each teacher. One teacher provides content and language instruction in English and the other teacher provides content and language instruction in the target language (Palmer, 2007; Potowski, 2004; Whiting & Feinauer, 2011).

*Two-Way Immersion.* One-third to one-half of the students in the immersion classroom are native speakers of the target language (Gerena, 2011; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Whiting & Feinauer, 2011).

*One-Way Immersion.* Less than one-third of the students in the immersion classroom are native speakers of the target language (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

*Capital.* What a person possesses (physically, intellectually, or socially) that can be exchanged, like commodities, for position or influence in relation to and with other people (Bourdieu, 1986).

*Cultural Capital.* “A term introduced by Pierre Bourdieu to refer to the symbols, ideas, tastes, and preferences that can be strategically used as resources in social action.” (Scott, 2014)

*Embodied Capital.* The state of cultural capital tied to our physical being (Bourdieu, 1986).
Linguistic Capital. “Fluency in, and comfort with, a high-status, world-wide language which is used by groups who possess economic, social, cultural and political power and status in local and global society” (Morrison & Lui, 2000).

Social Capital. “The types of relations that exist between individuals as located within both families and communities, and that are said to exert a strong influence on levels of educational achievement.” (Scott, 2014)

Institutional Capital. Degrees, honors, licenses, etc. bestowed upon a person by a recognized agent (e.g., university, city/state government). Institutional capital gained through education is a way of moving beyond a person’s class or social status at birth.

Habitus. “An embodied socialized tendency or disposition to act, think, or feel in a particular way.” (Scott, 2014)

Field. Arenas of production, circulation, and appropriation of goods, services, knowledge, or status (Swartz, 1997).
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Initial Interview Questions for Native Spanish-Speaking Students
Initial Interview Questions for NSS Students

Background

1. What grade are you in?
2. Who is your teacher?
3. How many brothers/sisters do you have?
4. What do your parents do for work?
5. What is your favorite thing about school?
6. What do you like to do after school?

Cultural

1. Do you like to read?
   a. What is your favorite book (or author)?
2. When you play at recess, do you speak Spanish or English?
3. Who do you play with after school?
   a. Do you play in Spanish or English?
4. Do you like to speak Spanish or English most?
   a. Do you speak more Spanish or English at home?
   b. Who else at home speaks English with you?
5. Do you feel like you understand everything that goes on in class?
   a. On the Spanish side?
   b. On the English side?
6. Who helps you with your homework?
7. What do you want to be when you grow up?
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a. Why do you want to do that?

b. What special training or education do you think you will need?

c. Do you think being bilingual will benefit you in your future?

8. Do you think it is important to speak Spanish?
   a. Why?

9. Do you think it is important to speak English?
   a. Why?

10. Which language is most important to you?
   a. Why is it more important than the other language?

Social

1. Who is your best friend?

2. Do you play more with kids that speak Spanish, or with kids that speak English?

3. Are most of your neighborhood friends in immersion?
   a. How many of your neighborhood friends are in immersion?
   b. How many of your neighborhood friends are not in immersion?

4. How many of your parents’ friends are immersion families?

5. Would you say that your family has more friends that are immersion families or are not immersion families?

6. How many extended family members live near here?
   a. What kind of work do they do?

7. Is anyone in your family a super fan of a university?
   a. Why?
General

1. Do you think being in the monolingual program will affect the classes that you take in middle school or high school?
   a. How?

2. Do you think you will use Spanish as an adult?
   a. If so, how?

3. Do you think you will use English as an adult?
   a. If so, how?

4. What is the benefit of knowing Spanish?

5. What is the benefit of knowing English?
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Initial Interview Questions for Native English-Speaking Students
Initial Interview Questions for NES Students

**Background**

1. What grade are you in?
2. Who is your teacher?
3. How many brothers/sisters do you have?
4. What do your parents do for work?
5. What is your favorite thing about school?
6. What do you like to do after school?

**Cultural**

1. Do you like to read?
   a. What is your favorite book (or author)?
2. When you play at recess, do you speak English or Spanish?
3. Who do you play with after school?
   a. Do you play in English or Spanish?
4. Do you like to speak English or Spanish most?
   a. Do you speak more English or Spanish at home?
   b. Who else at home speaks Spanish with you?
5. Do you feel like you understand everything that goes on in class?
   a. On the English side?
   b. On the Spanish side?
6. Who helps you with your homework?
7. What do you want to be when you grow up?
   a. Why do you want to do that?
   b. What special training or education do you think you will need?
   c. Do you think being bilingual will benefit you in your future?
8. Do you think it is important to speak English?
   a. Why?
9. Do you think it is important to speak Spanish?
   a. Why?
10. Which language is most important to you?
    a. Why is it more important than the other language?

Social
1. Who is your best friend?
2. Do you play more with kids that speak English, or with kids that speak Spanish?
3. Are most of your neighborhood friends in immersion?
   a. How many of your neighborhood friends are in immersion?
   b. How many of your neighborhood friends are not in immersion?
4. How many of your parents’ friends are immersion families?
5. Would you say that your family has more friends that are immersion families or are not immersion families?
6. How many extended family members live near here?
   a. What kind of work do they do?
7. Is anyone in your family a super fan of a university?
   
a. Why?

**General**

1. Do you think being in the dual immersion program will affect the classes that you take in middle school or high school? How?

2. Do you think you will use Spanish as an adult? If so, how?

3. What is the benefit of learning Spanish?

4. What is the benefit of knowing English?
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Native Spanish-Speaking Focus Group Questions
Native Spanish-Speaking Focus Group Questions

I have asked you to come here today so we can talk about your experiences here at Teton Elementary. Each of you is a native Spanish speaker, but you are learning English here at school. In this session, I want to make sure that each of you has a chance to share your ideas. This is not like a classroom where you will be graded on what you say or do not say. This is not a test. To make sure that everyone has a chance to say what they want to say, let’s go over some rules to help us have a good experience. First, let’s try to only have one person speaking at a time. It will be easier for us to be understood if we are not speaking at the same time. Since there are only four of you, you can just raise your hand when you want to add something to the conversation. Second, we need to make sure that we respect each other. It won’t help us to criticize each other. Everyone has their opinion and I want to hear them all. It is ok to disagree with each other, but we need to do so in a respectful manner. If at any time you feel uncomfortable about a question or what someone has said, please let me know so we can change the topic to something we can all talk about. And most importantly, enjoy the pizza.

I have already talked to each of you individually, so I know a little bit about you. Now I’d like to ask a few questions to the group to see if I can learn some more from you.

1. What is a typical day like for you here at school?
2. Do you ever speak Spanish to your friends here?
   a. Do you speak Spanish with any of the immersion students?
      i. Why/Why not?
3. What do kids that don’t speak Spanish do or say when you speak Spanish?
   a. How does that make you feel?
4. What do you think of the dual immersion program here?
   a. Why do you think that?
5. What do you think about the Spanish immersion students?
   a. Do you like the class you are in?
      i. Why/Why not?
   b. If you could, would you like to be in the immersion class?
      i. Why/Why not?
   c. What do others say about the immersion students?
      i. Do you agree?
1. Why/Why not?

6. What do you think about the kids who are not in the dual immersion program here?
   a. Why do you think that?

7. Do you ever wish that you were in the dual immersion program?
   a. Why or why not?

8. Why do you think your parents did not want you to be in the dual immersion program? OR How do your families feel about the dual immersion program?

9. Do you ever think about how speaking Spanish might help you in the future?
   a. In what ways do you think it might be helpful?

10. For you, which language is more important—Spanish or English?
    a. Why?

11. How confident are you in English right now?

12. How do you usually communicate with your parents?
    a. Do you think you understand each other well?
       i. Why/Why not?

    b. Do you have grandparents or aunts and uncles that you communicate with regularly?
       i. How do you communicate with them?

13. What is the best thing about being a Spanish speaker?

14. Is there anything that you don’t like about being a Spanish speaker?
    a. What?

15. What do you want to be when you grow up?
    a. Do you plan to go to college or some other type of training in the future?

I really enjoyed our time together. Do any of you have anything else you’d like to add? Thank you for talking with me today.
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Native English-Speaking Focus Group Questions
Native English-Speaking Focus Group Questions

I have asked you to come here today so we can talk about your experiences here at Teton Elementary. Each of you is a native English speaker, but you are learning Spanish here at school. In this session, I want to make sure that each of you has a chance to share your ideas. This is not like a classroom where you will be graded on what you say or do not say. This is not a test. To make sure that everyone has a chance to say what they want to say, let’s go over some rules to help us have a good experience. First, let’s try to only have one person speaking at a time. It will be easier for us to be understood if we are not speaking at the same time. Since there are only four of you, you can just raise your hand when you want to add something to the conversation. Second, we need to make sure that we respect each other. It won’t help us to criticize each other. Everyone has their opinion and I want to hear them all. It is ok to disagree with each other, but we need to do so in a respectful manner. If at any time you feel uncomfortable about a question or what someone has said, please let me know so we can change the topic to something we can all talk about. And most importantly, enjoy the pizza.

I have already talked to each of you individually, so I know a little bit about you. Now I’d like to ask a few questions to the group to see if I can learn some more from you.

1. What is a typical day like for you here at school?
2. How much Spanish do you speak with your friends here?
   a. Do you speak Spanish with any of the Latino students who are not in immersion?
      i. Why/Why not?
3. What do kids that don’t speak Spanish do or say when you speak Spanish?
   a. How does that make you feel?
4. What do you think of the dual immersion program here?
   a. Why do you think that?
5. What do you think about the kids who are in the dual immersion program here?
   a. Why do you think that?
6. What do you think about the kids who are not in the dual immersion program here?
   a. Why do you think that?
7. Why do you think your parents wanted you to be in the dual immersion program?
8. What do people who are not in immersion say about the Spanish immersion
students?
   a. How does that make you feel?
      i. Do you agree?
         1. Why/Why not?
   b. Do you like the class you are in?
      i. Why/Why not?
   c. If you could, would you like to be in a class that wasn’t immersion?
      i. Why/Why not?
9. Do you ever think about how speaking Spanish might help you in the future?
   a. In what ways do you think it might be helpful?
10. How confident are you in Spanish right now?
11. How often do you practice Spanish outside of school?
   a. Who do you speak with?
      i. Do you think you understand each other well?
         ii. Why/Why not?
12. What is the best thing about Speaking Spanish?
13. Is there anything that you don’t like about speaking Spanish?
   a. What?
14. For you, which language is more important—Spanish or English?
   a. Why?
15. What do you want to be when you grow up?
   a. Do you plan to go to college or some other type of training in the future?
I really enjoyed our time together. Do any of you have anything else you’d like to add? Thank you for talking with me today.
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Teacher Focus Group Questions

Thank you for helping me with this study. Today I want to talk to you about the observations you have been making of the NSS and native English-speaking students in my study. I want you to be open and frank with your comments, and I want this time to feel like a conversation where you have the opportunity to chime in and build off of each other’s comments. I want to make sure everyone has the opportunity to participate. Please share whatever you think may be important and feel free to disagree if necessary.

1. What interesting things did you notice from the logs that you kept in regards to the students you observed?

2. Did you notice any commonalities across the students you observed?
   a. Please describe them.

3. Did these students make any comments about the DLI program?
   a. If so, what were they?

4. Do you think participating or not participating in the DLI program is associated with high or low status in the school?
   a. Why or why not?

5. Based on your observations, do you think that DLI students typically interact with non-DLI students in the school?
   a. What do you think are the consequences of this interaction or non-interaction?

6. Have you heard other people (community members, parents, middle school teachers) talk about the DLI program here?
   a. What do they say about it?
      i. Do they think that participation in it is positive, negative, or neutral?
      ii. Why do they think that?

7. How much does your student struggle with academic English?

8. How do you think your student feels about their ability to participate or complete assignments?

9. Who does your student usually play with?
   a. Why do you think they chose that student?
10. Who does your student usually go to for help in the classroom?
   a. Why?

11. Does your student speak Spanish in the classroom?
   a. If so, with whom?

12. Which language does your student prefer at recess?

13. When you see your student with a parent or sibling, which language does he or she use?

14. How do the non-Spanish-speaking students treat your student?
   a. Do you think language has anything to do with why they act this way?

15. Does your student have a problem with regular attendance?
   a. If so, what do you think contributes to the problem?

16. What kind of books does your student read when they have time?

17. Does your student have any special skills or talents?
   a. Do they get a chance to show these skills or talents to others here?

18. Do the families of your students have any special skills or talents that you know of?

Thank you for your time and participation. If you think of anything you want to add, please let me know.
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Follow-Up Interview Questions for NSS Students

The last time we talked, you told me that you feel that both Spanish and English are equally important. You said that Spanish is important when you talk to people who don’t speak English and that English is important when you talk to people who don’t speak Spanish. Now I want to ask you about writing in two languages instead of speaking in two languages.

1. Do you think it is important to write in English?
   a. Can you give me an example of when it might be important to write in English now and when you are older?

2. Do you think it is important to write in Spanish?
   a. Can you give an example of when it might be important for you to write in Spanish now and when you are older?

3. Can you give examples of people you talk to in English and in Spanish?

4. In the future, can you give examples of people you might talk to in Spanish?
   a. In English?

5. What are the benefits of writing in both Spanish and English?

6. After thinking about all of this, do you still think that reading and writing in Spanish and English are equally important?
   a. Why?
   b. Why not?

7. Your mom and dad told me that you mostly speak Spanish at home, what do you do to maintain your ability to read and write in Spanish?

8. How much effort do you put into learning and getting better at English?

9. How much effort do you put into learning and getting better at Spanish?

10. Why is there a difference?
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Follow-Up Interview Questions for Native English-Speaking Students
Follow-Up Interview Questions for NES Students

The last time we talked, you told me that you feel that both Spanish and English are equally important. You said that Spanish is important when you talk to people who don’t speak English and that English is important when you talk to people who don’t speak Spanish. Now I want to ask you about writing in two languages instead of speaking in two languages.

1. Do you think it is important to write in English?
   a. Can you give me an example of when it might be important to write in English now and when you are older?

2. Do you think it is important to write in Spanish?
   a. Can you give an example of when it might be important for you to write in Spanish now and when you are older?

3. Can you give examples of people you talk to in English and in Spanish?

4. In the future, can you give examples of people you might talk to in Spanish?
   a. In English?

5. What are the benefits of writing in both Spanish and English?

6. After thinking about all of this, do you still think that reading and writing in Spanish and English are equally important?
   a. Why?
   b. Why not?

7. You speak English almost exclusively when you are not in school. How much effort do you put into getting better at Spanish when you are not in Spanish class?

8. How much effort do you put into learning and getting better at English?

9. Why is there a difference?
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Interview Questions for Native English-Speaking Parents
Interview Questions for NES Parents

Background

1. How long have you lived in our area?
2. How many children do you have?
3. How many of your children are enrolled in this school?
   a. Multiple: Are all of your children in the immersion program?
      i. Yes: What grades are they in
      ii. No: Why did you decide to enroll one/some and not all?
   b. One: What grade is your child in?

Cultural

1. Do you (either of you) work outside of the home?
2. Does anyone in your home speak Spanish?
   a. Native?
   b. Learned?
      i. Where/how learned?
3. What is your level of education?
4. What benefits did you think your child would receive from participation in the immersion program before your child began the program?
   a. Where did you learn about these benefits?
5. As your child progressed through the program, how did your expectations of the program change?
   a. Better?
   b. Worse?
6. What does your child’s teacher tell you about your student?
7. What does your child say about their participation in dual language immersion?
8. Do you own books in Spanish that are available to your child?
   a. If so, about how many?
9. Do you own books in English that are available to your child?
   a. If so, about how many?

10. Do you talk to your child about future opportunities that may be available to him or her because they will speak Spanish?

Social

1. How did you hear about the immersion program?

2. Please describe your interaction with other families in the immersion program.

3. How is your interaction with families of students that are not in the immersion program?

4. When your child plays after school, how much of his/her time is spent with other immersion program students?

5. How much time is spent with students who are not in the immersion program?

6. Does anyone in your family interact with others that speak Spanish?

7. Does your child communicate via text or email with anyone in Spanish?

8. Do you notice any benefits your child may receive from playing with immersion or non-immersion students? If so, what?

Institutional

1. Do you think participation in the immersion program will influence the classes that she or he will take in middle school and high school?
   a. If so, how?

2. Do you think participation in the immersion program will influence your child’s life beyond high school?
   a. If so, how?

General

1. Do you have anything else to say about the immersion program?

2. Do you have anything else to say about the benefits of speaking Spanish?
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Interview Questions for Native Spanish-Speaking Parents
Interview Questions for NSS Parents

**Background**

1. How long have you lived in our area?
2. How many children do you have?
3. How many of your children are enrolled in this school?
   a. Multiple: What grades are they in?
   a. One: What grade is your child in?
4. Where is your family from?
   a. If outside of the U.S.: Which country/countries?
   b. If from the U.S.: Where does the family get its Hispanic heritage?
5. What language is used most at home?
   a. Spanish: Do the children usually respond in Spanish, or English?
   b. English: How often is Spanish used?
      i. Is Spanish mostly used among adults?
      ii. How much Spanish is spoken to/with the children?

**Cultural**

1. What is your level of education?
2. Do you (either of you) work outside of the home?
3. What do you know about the Immersion Program at Teton Elementary?
   a. Nothing:
   b. Some knowledge: Why did you choose not to enroll your child/children in the immersion program?
4. What benefits did you think your child would receive from being in an English-only classroom?
   a. Did anyone advise you to enroll your child in the English-only classroom?
   b. Did anyone try to get you to enroll your child in the immersion class?
5. What does your child’s teacher tell you about him/her?
6. What does your child tell you about school?
7. Do you talk to your child about future opportunities that may be available to him or her because they will be able to speak English?
8. Do you ever talk about how to maintain their Spanish communication abilities?
9. Do you ever talk with your child about the benefits of being bilingual?

Social

1. Please describe your interaction with other families at Teton Elementary.
2. How is your interaction with families of students that are in the immersion program?
3. When your child plays after school, how much of his/her time is spent with students from Teton Elementary?
4. How much time is spent with students who are in the immersion program?
5. Does anyone in your family interact with others who speak only English?
   a. Who?
   b. How much?
6. Does your child communicate via text or email with anyone in English?
   a. Spanish?
7. Does your child get any benefits from playing with immersion students or students that only speak English?

Institutional

1. Do you think your child’s participation in the monolingual program will influence the classes that she or he will take in middle school and high school?
   a. If so, how?
2. Do you think participation in the monolingual program will influence your child’s life beyond high school?
   a. If so, how?

General

1. Do you have anything else to say about the immersion program?
2. Do you have anything else to say about the benefits of speaking Spanish or English?
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