

Which way do bilingual-biliterate teachers think?

Imelda Basurto

Abstract

According to the 2000 census, 18% of the school-aged students in the United States between the ages of 5 and 17 come from homes where a language other than English is spoken (Census 2000). Although educating students from non-English-speaking backgrounds has been a familiar issue in the American educational system, lots of questions remain regarding the effectiveness of bilingual literacy education for these students. The literature on the teaching of literacy in two languages often results in three distinctive theoretical views about the nature of biliteracy. One is based on behavioral theory, the other on whole language, and another on critical literacy. However, very rarely does research attempt to categorize the experiences or instructional practices of bilingual-biliterate teachers according to these three theoretical perspectives. Using a Bilingual Literacy Theoretical Orientation Profile modeled after the works of Deford (1985), Johnson (1989, 1992), and Yildirim (1993), the theoretical orientations of 34 bilingual education teachers were investigated. The results showed that the teachers in this study operated from a combined set of orientations and practices, an implication that none of the three perspectives are predominant among teachers.

Key terms: <Research> <educational research> <language research> <bilingual education> <practice teaching> <USA>

Sinopsis

Según el censo de 2000, 18 % de los estudiantes en edad escolar en los Estados Unidos entre las edades de 5 y 17 provienen de hogares donde se habla un idioma diferente al inglés (Censo 2000). Aunque la educación de los estudiantes provenientes de ambientes de habla no inglesa ha sido un problema familiar en el sistema educativo americano, hay aun muchas preguntas con respecto a la efectividad de la educación bilingüe para estos estudiantes. La literatura acerca de la enseñanza de alfabetización en dos idiomas a menudo resulta en tres posturas teóricas distintivas acerca de la naturaleza de la alfabetización bilingüe. Uno está basado en la teoría conductual, el otro en el idioma entero, y otra en la alfabetización crítica. Sin embargo, muy raramente la investigación intenta

categorizar las experiencias o las prácticas instruccionales de los maestros de alfabetización bilingüe según estas tres perspectivas teóricas. Usando un Perfil de Orientación Imaginario de Alfabetización planeado con base en los trabajos de Deford (1985), Johnson (1989, 1992), y Yildirim (1993), se investigaron las orientaciones teóricas de 34 maestros de educación bilingües. Los resultados mostraron que los maestros en este estudio operaban según un juego combinado de orientaciones y prácticas, una sugerencia de que ninguno de las tres perspectivas es predominante entre estos maestros.

Términos claves: <Investigación> <investigación educativa> <investigación lingüística> <educación bilingüe> <práctica docente> <Estados Unidos de América>

Which way do bilingual-biliterate teachers think?

Generally, bilingual children learn about biliteracy from the people who facilitate their biliteracy learning. Some of the most influential sources are the language community, the home, and their teachers, who presumably have a view of biliteracy. However, helping students to become biliterate is an undisputed goal for teachers who are bilingual and biliterate themselves. Interestingly enough, the ways in which this should be done is a matter of controversy among them (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1983). This controversy basically results in three distinctive theoretical views about what constitutes meaningful bilingual literacy education, that is "biliteracy."

The first view is based on the assumption that biliteracy is mastered by learning a functional set of literacy skills in both languages (Baker, 1996; Downing, 1987; Solomon, 1986). The second view is based on the assumption that biliteracy is mastered through a holistic interaction between language and culture (Baker, 1996; Goodman, 1986; Weaver, 1994). And, the third view is based on the assumption that biliteracy is achieved by thinking, analyzing, and reformulating one's knowledge about oneself in two languages (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1993; Friere & Macedo, 1987). These views present contrasting educational objectives, and suggest different types of instructional practices for promoting bilingual literacy.

The functional-oriented view is based on the idea that biliteracy is the ability to read and write in two languages. It suggests that biliteracy is mastered by learning a functional set of literacy skills in either language in order to be understood and accepted in school and in society. It is influenced by behavioral theory. According to behavioral theorists, students learn a sequence of discrete, sequenced skills (Baker, 1996; Downing, 1986; Solomon, 1986). Therefore, functional-oriented advocates agree that the most important finding relevant to biliteracy learning are the language and literacy skills needed to engage in routine life experiences.

In functional-oriented classrooms, bilingual literacy instruction has a common sequence; it is directly executed by the teacher and is extensively supported with much guided practice, independent practice, corrective feedback, and formal assessments. For example, a teacher may post a chart on a wall highlighting the principles of a given skill, demonstrate how to apply this skill to specific examples, and asks students to practice with additional samples. Teachers with this orientation aim towards teaching a specific set of literacy skills in both languages. Generally, these teachers have the student work through the same assignments and subject sequences. As a result, biliteracy learning occurs through drill and practice of individual skills, which are driven by the teacher and the curriculum (Fogelman, 1995; Knapp & Needles, 1991). In this teaching environment, subject-specific manuals and the teacher are the primary sources of information. Students taught by teachers with this type of orientation are expected to receive knowledge.

The holistic-oriented view is based on the idea that biliteracy is to be functionally and culturally literate in two worlds. It suggests that biliteracy is mastered through the cultural heritage of the individual. It is influenced by whole language theory. According to whole language theorists, children learn through the authentic uses of language within a meaningful context (Goodman, 1986; Vacca & Rasinski, 1992; Weaver, 1994). Therefore, holistic-oriented advocates agree that while it is important to comprehend and communicate effectively in two languages, it is more important to function within two cultures.

As a result, in holistic-oriented classrooms, bilingual literacy instruction is linked to the cultural experiences, histories, and languages the children bring to school (Tharp, 1982). For example, a teacher working with Chicano-English students may begin a lesson with the language expressions familiar to these students. Following this discussion, students may be asked to record their ideas in dual-language journals. Subsequently, the students might be asked to compare

their language expressions with the language expressions said by the characters of the text they are reading.

Teachers with this type of orientation aim to integrate reading and writing with language and culture for social acceptance within two communities. Generally, these teachers structure the classroom so that heterogeneous groups of students work together to achieve a shared goal. As a result, biliteracy learning occurs through cooperative learning literacy groups. In this teaching environment, the process of becoming biliterate also has a multicultural emphasis. Therefore, multicultural literature is the primary source for teaching. Students taught by teachers with this type of orientation are expected to take on an active role in their learning to be biliterate.

The analytical-oriented view is based on the idea that biliteracy is the ability to be critically literate in two languages so that one can reformulate one's knowledge about oneself and the world around them. It is influenced by critical literacy theory. According to critical literacy theorists, students become active decision-makers when taught to ask critical questions (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1993; Friere & Macedo, 1987). Therefore, analytical-oriented advocates agree that while it is important to be understood and accepted in school and society, personal empowerment of the individual is the ultimate biliteracy goal.

In the analytical-oriented classrooms, bilingual literacy instruction includes critical reflection, analysis of issues, and propaganda evaluation. Teachers with this orientation help students obtain a critical perspective during their reading and writing. For example, a teacher hands out an editorial to all the students. The teacher facilitates a discussion and encourages the students to express their reactions in both languages. After everyone has had a chance to comment they are given the choice of writing a rebuttal or a reply in their preferred language. When the writing pieces are complete, they are mailed to the local newspaper.

Generally, teachers with this type of orientation encourage students to improve their own lives by resolving an issue or problem similar to the

issues or problems in their own communities. As a result, biliteracy learning occurs through the comparison of an issue, a problem, or a story with their own personal experiences (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1993; Walsh, 1993). In this teaching environment, social action agendas and environmental issues are the primary sources of information. Students taught by teachers with this type of orientation are expected to react and be participatory in both languages.

An illustrative comparison of the attributes of each theoretical orientation can be seen in Table 1.

Although these views possess differences in approaches to the teaching of bilingual literacy, the general orientations identified above are the most visible views reflected in the literature. However, what's not visible is research that determines if bilingual-biliterate teacher's views of biliteracy and their instructional practices are as distinctive as the views found in this literature. As a result, this study posed the following research questions:

1. Do bilingual-biliterate practitioners possess the bilingual literacy theoretical orientation divisions reflected in the literature, and are the instructional practices of bilingual-biliterate practitioners consistent with the practices connected with each theoretical orientation?
2. How do bilingual-biliterate practitioners perceive the main theoretical aspects of each theoretical orientation in teaching biliteracy?
3. Do bilingual-biliterate practitioners have a clear theoretical orientation towards teaching biliteracy, or do they have a mixed approach?

Method

Subjects

The population for this study was the entire pool of elementary teachers with a Bilingual Education endorsement working for the largest school district in the State of New Mexico. Selecting teachers with this endorsement maximized the possibility that the participants were bilingual and biliterate since one of

the requirements for this endorsement is the passing of the Four Skills Test, a Spanish language and literacy proficiency exam. In addition, these teachers had to have graduated from an accredited United States teacher preparation program. Of the 71 teachers eligible, 34 responded to the survey and the questionnaire. Most identified themselves as Hispanic American, held at least a master's degree, and had taught for five or more years.

Instruments

Generally, theoretical orientation studies (Deford, 1985; Johnson, 1989, 1992; Yildirim, 1993) are done using self-report scales that measure beliefs toward a specific type of instruction with the choices viewed as indicative of a specific type of orientation. Both Kagan (1990) and Pajares (1992) contend that theoretical orientation studies cannot rely solely on self-report scales and must arrive at conclusions based on the combination of what participants say and what their intentions are. Suggesting that if we are truly to understand bilingual-biliterate practitioners beliefs and their theoretical assumptions about teaching literacy in two languages we must include the language that teachers actually use to describe their own theoretical orientation. As a result, teachers' views towards bilingual literacy were investigated through a Bilingual Literacy Theoretical Orientation Profile (Deford, 1985; Johnson, 1989; 1992, Yildirim, 1993).

This profile was designed to gather information about teacher's theoretical views across two separate measures. This included a survey containing 24 statements based on the bilingual literacy theoretical positions reflected in the related literature and a questionnaire eliciting a self-descriptive account of each teacher's theoretical stance.

Materials and Procedures

Biliteracy Survey. The Biliteracy Survey (see Appendix A) was a survey questionnaire that included 24 statements based on the theoretical positions reflected in the related literature. Orientations were presented in the form of item statements for teachers to

endorse on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagrees to strongly agree. Item statements 1-8 were functional-based statements, 9-16 were holistic-based statements, and items 17-24 were analytical-based statements.

In functional-based statements, skill-based teaching was emphasized. With holistic-based statements, whole language-based teaching was emphasized, and in analytical-based statements, critical literacy-based teaching was emphasized. The survey questionnaire was pilot tested at a national conference. As a result, nineteen of the 24 statements received 100% agreement and five statements were reworded. Teachers were assigned a score based on the number of skill-based, whole language-based, and critical literacy-based statements they selected.

Based on the responses, reliability of the items measuring theoretical orientations to teaching biliteracy was assessed using a correlation matrix of Pearson r's. Values of the total scores of each of the theoretical orientations were used to determine the internal consistency of the survey questionnaire. For this purpose, three sets of scores were established. The first set of scores contained the items measuring the Functional Theoretical Orientation, the second set of scores contained the items measuring the Holistic Theoretical Orientation, and the third set of scores contained the items measuring the Analytical Theoretical Orientation. These scores were then calculated to determine overall item reliability, resulting in $r=.998$ for Holistic and Functional, and $r=.999$ score of Analytical and Functional, and $r=.999$ score for Holistic and Analytical. These scores suggest that the items used to measure each of the theoretical orientations are very consistent as a group with one another. An indicator that perhaps this instrument has the potential to show a high level of reliability; however, the significance of these scores is diminished by the fact that the sample size was relatively small.

Biliteracy Questionnaire. The Biliteracy Questionnaire (see Appendix B) allowed teachers to self-characterize their theoretical positions and to describe the ideal bilingual-biliterate classroom in terms of what they did to teach literacy to bilingual

students. The questionnaire contained four questions. It asked the teachers to provide a biliteracy definition, to explain what they did in the classroom to promote biliteracy, to describe an event in their class that exemplified their biliteracy beliefs, and to list their biliteracy goals for the students in their class. Their answers were then coded as Functional, Holistic, and Analytical. These answers were then validated by two independent raters based on decision rules generated from the characteristic features of the theoretical orientations towards biliteracy. Raters were also given the option of coding the answers in another category if they felt the responses did not reflect any of the orientations.

Answers that defined biliteracy as the ability to read and write only, and promoted skill driven activities in the classroom were identified as Functional. Those that mentioned biliteracy as the ability to understand and communicate across cultures and promoted whole language activities were categorized as Holistic, and those that involved the idea of thinking critically in both languages and promoted social issues were coded as Analytical.

Both measures, the Biliteracy Survey and the Biliteracy Questionnaire, were configured to answer the research questions: Do bilingual-biliterate practitioners possess the bilingual literacy theoretical orientation divisions reflected in the literature, and are their instructional practices consistent with the practices connected with each theoretical orientation? How do bilingual-biliterate practitioners perceive the main theoretical aspects of each theoretical orientation in teaching biliteracy? Do bilingual-biliterate practitioners have a clear theoretical orientation towards teaching biliteracy, or do they have a mixed approach?

Results

Functional

Advocates possessing a Functional Theoretical Orientation believe that biliteracy is mastered by learning a set of skills under the direction of the teacher, a notion that encourages teacher's to break down what is to be learned into properly

sequenced parts (Baker, 1996; Downing, 1987; Solomon, 1986). Two statements underlying this notion were included in the survey. Half of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed with those statements: "Biliteracy is the ability to master certain skills in relation to other skills within each language" (53%); "Biliteracy is pronouncing words accurately when reading" (53%). Respondents were in less agreement with the statement, "Biliteracy assessment should include standardized testing in both languages" (0.6%). They were also equally divided in their responses to the following statements: "Biliteracy is spelling words correctly in both languages" (18%) and ("Biliteracy involves relying on a dictionary to determine the meaning of new words" (18%) (See Table 2).

These results indicate that teachers acknowledge the importance of learning a specific set of literacy skills in both languages. However, they were split in terms whether or not the dictionary and the correction of misspelled words should be a part of that bilingual literacy sequence, and they were less certain if skills like those should be measured by a standardized test.

Functional-oriented researchers recommend that students should work through the same assignments and subject sequences (Downing, 1986; Solomon, 1986). In other words, all the students work through the same skills at the same time. This characteristic is consistent with the questionnaire findings. Most teachers seemed to teach reading then writing in one language or the other. In addition, many of them confirmed teaching bilingual literacy through isolated activities like spelling work sheets, working on letters, or having students read one at a time. These findings concur with the teachers who agreed/strongly agreed (32%) that "Biliteracy involves round-robin reading, labeling words, and those who felt that literacy was "answering questions at the end of the story" (41%) (see Table 3).

These findings show that the teachers in this study use drill and practice to teach individual bilingual literacy skills. Students taught under a rote

memorization method generally are placed in a passive role and are expected to receive knowledge.

Holistic

The holistic-based orientation was addressed using five whole language-based statements. The ideas most consistent with the whole language philosophy are the “assessment of comprehension rather than skills in isolation” and the “construction of meaning in two languages”. In both cases, the teachers’ agreed/strongly agreed (59%) with these ideas. In addition, it was clear that they acknowledged an acceptance for a biliterate reader to “substitute words with similar meanings with the printed word” (53%). Whereas a little more than one fourth (21%) agreed/strongly agreed that a “child does not necessarily need to know the letters of the alphabet in order to learn to read.” Very few (9%) agreed/strongly agreed that “readers should go on reading after the reader has guessed the word” (see Table 4).

These results indicate that the teachers endorsed some of the whole language based statements, but were divided on others. Perhaps these results can be related to the assumption that these choices may not have been realistic options for their practice. Thus making the respondents feel that some students may need to focus on bilingual literacy skills and others on comprehension.

Holistic-oriented advocates also believe that biliteracy is developed through the integration of read and writing with language and culture (Baker, 1996; Campos & Keating; 1984). This idea suggests that knowledge is socially constructed (Poplin, 1993). Consequently, teachers with this view use cooperative learning to teach literacy in two languages. This characteristic is consistent with the questionnaire findings. In addition, the questionnaire also showed that some of the teachers promoted the use of literature in two languages in their classrooms. This is compatible with those that agreed/strongly agreed (53%) that “Biliteracy classrooms should be primarily filled with “ethnic” or “heritage” literature from both cultures.”

These findings indicate that the teachers in this study encourage their students to socially construct their bilingual literacy knowledge and expect them to take on an active role. These ideas are also consistent with those respondents who wrote that they used literature circles and book talks to teach biliteracy on their questionnaire.

The relationship between culture and language is also highlighted in the holistic orientation through the instructional choices teachers make to teach biliteracy (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1993). The survey contained two statements to measure how teachers perceive this issue: “Biliteracy gives the students the freedom to choose whatever they want to read from either culture” and “Biliteracy is editing what is written using one’s own dialect.” Whereas more than half (56%) agreed/strongly agreed with the former statement, only one-third (32%) agreed/strongly agreed with the latter. These results suggests that teachers are undecided when it comes to the instructional choices of culture and language (see Table 5)

Analytical

The analytical view suggests that biliteracy is the ability to critically think so that one can better formulate their world and the world around them (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1993; Freire & Macedo, 1987). More than half of the respondents’ (56%) agreed/strongly agreed with the statements reflecting this point of view. The findings were as follows: “Biliteracy is the ability to learn and interpret the world from a global point of view” (56%); “Biliteracy authorizes the changing of lives, situations, and communities” (59%); “Biliteracy is strictly for the personal empowerment of the individual” (53%) (see Table 6).

These results indicate that the majority of teachers truly believe that becoming literate in two languages contributes to the understanding of oneself, and that it also contributes to the development of the individual within the broader social context.

Because critical literacy theorists are interested in the processes and practices of everyday

life as well as the political and social system, analytical-oriented advocates encourage students to question the information that texts and schools present (Cummins, 1993). This would begin with the willingness to question taken-for-granted assumptions. Interestingly enough, less than half (44%) of the respondents surveyed agreed/strongly agreed that biliteracy necessitates “reading between the lines.” This result may suggest that the teachers in this study may not devote enough attention to the explicit teaching of inferences that a critical literacy based approach calls for.

Several of the answers from the questionnaire seemed to indicate that the teachers did in fact use political, community and environmental current events in the classroom. However, this outcome contradicted the finding that only one fifth (38%) agreed/strongly agreed with the idea of using “social action agendas.” As a matter of fact, the teachers were even less supportive (12%) of the idea of strictly using “essays” to assess biliteracy. Yet interestingly enough, a little more than half (56%) agreed/strongly agreed with the idea of “criticizing issues in either language.” While a third (32%) agreed/strongly agreed that biliteracy develops “analytical thought.” (see Table 7). These results suggest that although some of the teachers might operate from an analytical perspective, they are not always able to apply the principles or use the instructional practices that under gird this orientation in their classrooms.

What is biliteracy anyway?

Finally, despite the number of experts and publications on the subject of bilingual literacy, functional-, holistic-, and analytical-oriented researchers have a clear disagreement on what exactly “biliteracy” means. In the functional view, biliteracy means reading and writing in two languages (Cummins, 1993; Langer, 1991). The holistic view sees biliteracy as the ability to be literate in two cultures (Baker, 1996; Diamond & Moore, 1995) and in the analytical view, biliteracy is the ability to use the written language as a tool to empower action and thinking (Cummins, 1993; Wells & Chang-Wells,

1992). Three statements provide data on how teachers perceive this issue. Many teachers’ (59%) agreed/strongly agreed with the statement that “Biliteracy is the ability to construct meaning in two languages.” Some teachers (56%) agreed/strongly agreed that “Biliteracy is the ability to learn and interpret the world from a global point of view,” whereas half (53%) agreed/strongly agreed that “Biliteracy is the ability to master certain skills in relation to other skills within each language” (see Table 8). These results indicate that the teachers are divided on the issue of what biliteracy means, as are the researchers in these areas. These findings are consistent with the number of teachers who identified themselves as possessing one theoretical orientation.

To identify a teacher’s theoretical orientation, orientation sub-scale scores were created for each respondent (Yildrium, 1993). Multiplying the scales by the number of items created sub-scale scores. Because there were 8 items per orientation, the scales were multiplied by eight to simplify the interpretation. The sub-scales were then divided into high and low values. This procedure generated four theoretical orientation profiles. Half of the respondents (44%) surveyed had a score of 40 or higher in two of the three orientations, indicating a mixed orientation; the other half (45%) indicated a single theoretical orientation. Out of that 45%, 9% scored 40 or above on the Functional sub-scale, 21% scored 40 or above on the Holistic sub-scale, and 15% scored 40 or above on the Analytical sub-scale, indicating a clear functional-, holistic-, or analytical theoretical orientation. The remaining 11% possessed an unidentifiable theoretical orientation.

These results suggest that none of the bilingual literacy theoretical orientations identified by the literature were dominant among the teachers. Rather, the teachers valued certain beliefs and instructional practices of all three orientations, thus consolidating them into an “eclectic” or a mix of theoretical orientations.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to determine whether bilingual-biliterate teacher's views of biliteracy and their instructional practices fell into three distinctive bilingual literacy categories. The survey results indicate that the majority of teachers who participated in this study do not fall neatly into the categories identified by the literature. Suggestive of the idea that teachers operate from a combined set of orientations and practices; an implication that each bilingual literacy theoretical orientation division is a related entity and that teachers in general possess an eclectic perspective for teaching biliteracy.

Those teachers accepting a Functional Theoretical Orientation believe that biliteracy is the result of learning a specific set of literacy skills in two languages through instructional procedures that require fill-in-the-blank activities. They believe that subject specific knowledge is an effective way to teach bilingual literacy. At the same time, these teachers possess a Holistic Theoretical Orientation by treating all aspects of biliteracy as part of interrelated whole. A whole that places bilingual literacy teaching within an environment that mirrors the culture of those learning to read and write in two languages. While these teachers agree that biliteracy is the ability to construct meaning as it resides within each culture, their goal is to help their students understand the personal and social worlds in which they live by developing their analytical abilities; hence, subscribing to an Analytical Theoretical Orientation.

In addition, the teachers were not as accepting of some of the aspects of all three theoretical orientations. With regard to a Functional Theoretical Orientation, they were split on the issue of specifically which instructional practices specifically constitute a particular set of subject sequences for teaching bilingual literacy. At the same time, they were indecisive when it came to the instructional choices best suited for teaching biliteracy within a Holistic Theoretical Orientation, and were undecided about which Analytical Theoretical Orientation assessment should be used to measure critical thought in two languages.

This acceptance and non-acceptance of certain characteristics of each bilingual literacy theoretical orientations is indication that teachers in general have a tendency to assimilate the core values and instructional practices of each theoretical orientation. One reason for this, may be due to the possibility that each theoretical orientation is incomplete on its own and that teachers must accept aspects of all three in order to legitimize the most salient aspects of their thinking and teaching. Another reason might be that perhaps a mixed theoretical orientation represents teachers who unconsciously do not have a clear vision of their theoretical orientation or may not be grounded in a thorough understanding of these theories. And, while many of the teachers in this study utilized the instructional practices representative of each orientation, the descriptive evidence of the qualitative nature of the literacy instruction suggest that teachers are diverse in their approach to teaching biliteracy. Perhaps this is because teachers are more concerned with how students learn rather than which theoretical orientation their instructional practices are operating from.

Since so many of the teachers possessed a mixed theoretical orientation, one could speculate that subscribing to one bilingual literacy theoretical orientation alone may not be a realistic choice for classroom practice. After all, the teacher is in the best position to discern the results of different ways of teaching literacy in two languages. In that sense, researchers might examine teachers' classroom practices and their perspectives about teaching bilingual literacy in order to improve their theories.

Another implication of this study is that perhaps bilingual-biliterate teachers need to be better informed about these theories. Pre-service and in-service bilingual literacy teachers should have the opportunity to explore all four orientations during their professional development so they can clarify their own views in regards to these theories. Perhaps the goal of bilingual literacy education teacher preparation programs should be to expose students to the implications of all the views, then courses and experiences that emphasize a host of theoretical

orientations could be required of all students enrolled in those programs.

Although this study may have begun the process of providing an insight into the relationship between the beliefs and instructional practices of bilingual-biliterate teachers and the bilingual literacy perspectives found in the literature, it also generates a variety of research questions, which need further investigation. Such as “What is the relationship between other facets of teachers’ belief systems and the nature of their instructional practices?” or “To what degree do the instructional literacy programs used by these teachers reflect the bilingual literacy theoretical orientations identified by this study?” And finally, “What is the relationship between theoretical divisions of bilingual literacy and the social, cultural, or political aspects of a teacher’s belief system?”

Finally, two limitations must be acknowledged in this study. In dividing up a bilingual literacy theoretical orientation into Functional, Holistic, and Analytical, we lose the diversity of life experiences, personal beliefs, and abilities that make

up an individual and the richness of the interactions of the teachers with the students. The idea of a mixed theoretical orientation implies that biliteracy is a much broader construct than the perspectives implied in the simple contrast of Functional, Holistic, and Analytical. Secondly, the strength of the relationship found between each of the theoretical orientations may have been largely due in part to the small sample size. As a result, further research must be done on larger samples of bilingual-biliterate teachers in a variety of instructional contexts before meaningful generalizations can be made.

In conclusion, this study has extended the discussion of bilingual-biliterate teacher’s views and their instructional practices of biliteracy. Overall, the findings of this study recognize that Functional, Holistic, and Analytical Bilingual Literacy Theoretical Orientations are indeed a part of teacher thinking during biliteracy instruction. However, further research is now needed to test the findings generated by this study on a much larger scale.

Referencias

- Baker, C. (1996). Foundations of bilingual education. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters Ltd. Census 2000 Supplemental Survey Summary Tables. United States Census.
- Bureau. <http://factfinder.census.gov>.
- Cummins, J. (1993) Empowerment through biliteracy. In Tinajero, J. & Ada, A. (Eds.), The power of two languages. (pp. 9-25). NY: Macmillan.
- Deford, D. (1985). Validating the construct of theoretical orientation in reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 351-367.
- Diamond, B. & Moore, M. (1995). Multicultural Literacy. Whiteplains, NY: Longman Publishers.
- Downing, J. (1987). Comparative perspectives on world literacy. In D. Wagners (Ed.). The future of literacy in a changing world. (pp. 25-46). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Fogelman, S. (1995). Across case analysis of middle school reading teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Louisiana State University.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). Literacy: Reading the word and the world. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Goodman, K. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Johnson, K.E. (1989). The theoretical orientations of English as second language teachers: The relationship between beliefs and practices. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Syracuse University.
- Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. Journal of Reading Behavior, 24, 83-108.
- Kagan, D. (1990). Ways of evaluating teacher cognition: Inferences concerning the Goldilocks principle. Review of Educational Research, 60, 419-469.
- Knapp, M. & Needles, M. (1991). Review of research on curriculum and instruction in literacy. In Knapp, M. & Shields, P. (Eds.), Better schooling for children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom. (pp. 85-119). Berkeley, CA: MrCutrhan Publishing Corporation.
- Langer, J. (1991). Literacy and schooling: A sociocognitive perspective. In Hiebert, E. (Ed.). Literacy: For a diverse society. (pp. 9-27). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teacher's beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, 302-332.
-

Poplin, M. (1993). Making our whole language bilingual classrooms also liberatory. In Tinajero, J. & Ada, A. (Eds.), The power of two languages.

Solomon, R. (1986). Literacy and the education of the emotions. In Castell de, S. Luke, A. & Egan, K. (Eds.), Literacy, society, and schooling. (pp. 37-58). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tharp, R. (1982). The effective instruction of comprehension: Results and description of the Kamehameha Early Education Program. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 503-27.

Vacca, R. T & Razinski, T. V. (1992). Case studies in whole language. Fortworth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Walsh, C. (1993). Becoming critical. In Tinajero, J. & A. Ada, (Eds.), The power of two languages. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Weaver, C. (1994). Reading process and practice. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.

Yildirim, A. (1993). "Teachers' theoretical orientations toward teaching thinking." Journal of Education Research, 88, 28-36.

Wells, G. & Chang-Wells, G. L. (1992). Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Appendix A
Biliteracy Theoretical orientation Profile
Part A - Biliteracy Survey

Directions: Please read the following statements, and circle the response that best indicates the relationship of the statement to your feelings about biliteracy, i.e., literacy in two languages.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 = Strongly Agree (SA)

SD	2	3	4	5	6	SA	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1. Biliteracy involves "round-robin" reading.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2. Biliteracy is spelling words correctly in both languages.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3. Biliteracy assessment should include standardized testing in both languages.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4. Biliteracy involves relying on a dictionary to determine the meaning of new words.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5. Biliteracy is being able to label words according to their grammatical functions.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6. Biliteracy is pronouncing words accurately when reading.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7. Biliteracy is the ability to master certain skills in relation to other skills within each language.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8. Biliteracy is answering the questions at the end of the story.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9. Biliteracy allows a reader to go on reading even after the reader has guessed the word.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10. Biliteracy involves editing what is written using one's own dialect.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	11. Biliteracy does not require a child to necessarily know the letters of the alphabet in order to learn to read.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	12. Biliteracy instruction does not correct a child when he or she substitutes a word that has a similar meaning to the printed word.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	13. Biliteracy assessment should focus more on comprehension, than skills in isolation.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	14. Biliteracy classrooms should be primarily filled with "ethnic" or "heritage" literature from both cultures.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	15. Biliteracy is the ability to construct meaning in two languages.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	16. Biliteracy gives students the freedom to choose whatever they want to read from either culture.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	17. Biliteracy necessitates "reading between the lines".
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	18. Biliteracy develops analytical thought.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	19. Biliteracy involves the use of social action agendas.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	20. Biliteracy assessments should always be in essay format.

SD	2	3	4	5	6	SA	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	21. Biliteracy is the ability to learn and interpret the world from a global point of view.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	22. Biliteracy is criticizing issues in either language.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	23. Biliteracy is strictly for the personal empowerment of the individual.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	24. Biliteracy authorizes the changing of lives, situations, and communities.

You have been asked to respond to statements that indicate your feelings about biliteracy, i.e., literacy in two languages, are there other statements which better describe your feelings about this area? If so, please write them on this form:

Appendix B
 Biliteracy Theoretical Orientation Profile
 Part B - Biliteracy Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability:

1. How do you define biliteracy?
2. What instructional practices do you use in the classroom to promote biliteracy?
3. What are your biliteracy goals for the students in your class?
4. Please describe an event that best exemplifies your biliteracy beliefs:

Table 1. Bilingual Literacy Theoretical Orientation Attributes.

	Functional Theoretical Orientation	Holistic Theoretical Orientation	Analytical Theoretical Orientation
Theoretical Stance	Biliteracy is the ability to read and write in two languages so that an individual can engage in routine life experiences.	Biliteracy is the ability to be literate in two cultures so that an individual can be accepted in two social communities.	Biliteracy is the ability to be critically literate in two languages so that one can reformulate one's knowledge about themselves and the world around.
Educational goal	To teach a specific set of literacy skills in two languages.	To develop an understanding and appreciation of one's own culture and the culture of others.	To promote the personal empowerment of the individual in two languages.
Most common instructional practices	Drill and practice of individual literacy skills. Students work through the same assignments and subject sequences in either one of the two languages.	The integration of reading and writing with language and culture for the teaching and learning of another language.	Collectively work on social justice or controversial issues in two languages.
Evaluation	Language and literacy evaluation is made through standardized, or tests requiring one correct answer.	Language and literacy evaluation is made informally through observation, anecdotal records, and portfolios.	Language and literacy evaluation is made through essay format.
Primary Materials	Subject-specific bilingual or monolingual manuals	Bilingual and/or multicultural literature	Bilingual or monolingual texts with social action agendas and environmental issues
Role of the teacher	Leader	Director	Facilitator
Role of the learner	Passive	Active	Proactive

Table 2. Degree to Which Teachers Agree with Statements that Reflect the Beliefs of a Functional Theoretical Orientation.

Statement	SD	D	SLD	U	SLA	A	SA	Mean	N
Biliteracy is spelling words correctly in both languages	8.82	23.5	26.52	20.6	3.0	11.76	5.8	3.44	34
Biliteracy assessment should include standardized testing in both languages	20.6	26.47	20.6	17.65	8.8	2.94	2.94	2.88	34
Biliteracy involves relying on a dictionary to determine the meaning of new words	20.58	29.4	8.82	8.82	14.7	11.8	5.8	3.02	34
Biliteracy is pronouncing words accurately when reading	5.88	5.88	20.58	8.8	5.88	32.4	20.58	3.70	34
Biliteracy is the ability to master certain skills in relation to other skills	3.0	8.8	8.8	11.76	14.7	44.12	8.82	4.94	34

Note: SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, SLD=slightly disagree, U=undecided, SLA=slightly agree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree.

Table 3. Degree to Which Teachers Agree with Statements that Reflect Functional Theoretical Orientation Instructional Practices.

Statement	SD	D	SLD	U	SLA	A	SA	Mean	N
Biliteracy involves Round-robin reading	14.7	29.4	11.76	8.82	3.0	23.5	8.82	3.61	34
Biliteracy is being able to label words according to their grammatical functions	14.7	26.50	14.0	5.8	5.8	20.5	12.0	3.70	34
Biliteracy is answering the questions at the end of the story	5.88	20.6	11.76	11.76	8.8	32.40	8.8	4.29	34

Note: SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, SLD=slightly disagree, U=undecided, SLA=slightly agree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree.

Table 4. Degree to Which Teachers Agree with Statements that Reflect the Beliefs of a Holistic Theoretical Orientation.

Statement	SD	D	SLD	U	SLA	A	SA	Mean	N
Biliteracy allows a reader to go on reading even after the reader has guessed the word	29.5	8.8	8.8	17.65	26.47	5.88	2.9	3.32	34
Biliteracy does not require a child to necessarily know the letters of the alphabet in order to learn to read	8.8	14.7	32.40	17.65	5.88	17.65	2.9	3.67	34
Biliteracy instruction does not correct a child when he or she substitutes a word that has a similar meaning to the printed word	8.82	11.76	8.82	3.0	14.7	38.2	14.7	4.76	34
Biliteracy assessment should focus more on comprehension, than skills in isolation.	2.94	5.9	8.82	14.7	8.82	35.3	23.52	5.2	34
Biliteracy is the ability to construct meaning in two languages	3.0	3.0	8.82	17.64	8.82	35.32	23.52	5.56	34

Note: SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, SLD=slightly disagree, U=undecided, SLA=slightly agree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree.

Table 5. Degree to Which Teachers Agree with Statements that Reflect the Holistic Theoretical Orientation Instructional Practices.

Statement	SD	D	SLD	U	SLA	A	SA	Mean	N
Biliteracy involves editing what is written using one's own dialect	8.8	8.8	11.8	20.6	17.65	17.65	14.7	4.52	34
Biliteracy classrooms should be primarily filled with "ethnic" or "heritage" literature from both cultures	2.9	2.9	5.9	11.76	20.7	17.64	38.2	5.5	34
Biliteracy gives students the freedom to choose whatever they want to read from either culture	8.82	11.76	11.76	11.76	20.6	20.6	14.7	4.52	34

Note: SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, SLD=slightly disagree, U=undecided, SLA=slightly agree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree.

Table 6. Degree to Which Teachers Agree with Statements that Reflect the Beliefs of an Analytical Theoretical Orientation.

Statement	SD	D	SLD	U	SLA	A	SA	Mean	N
Biliteracy is the ability to learn and interpret the world from a global point of view	2.9	3.0	8.82	11.76	17.64	29.41	26.47	5.32	34
Biliteracy is strictly for the personal empowerment of the individual	5.88	5.88	3.0	20.58	11.76	29.4	23.5	5.08	34
Biliteracy authorizes the changing of lives, situations, and communities	2.9	11.8	8.8	5.88	11.8	32.35	26.47	5.14	34

Note: SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, SLD=slightly disagree, U=undecided, SLA=slightly agree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree.

Table 7. Degree to Which Teachers Agree with Statements that Reflect an Analytical Theoretical Orientation