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ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students in public schools of the United States has been steady in the past decades. Issues concerning CLD students such as their school failures, high dropout rates, the limited English proficiency, family poverty, and their unequal job opportunities, have caused increasing concerns from policy makers, school administrators and educators at all school levels. Various efforts to modify CLD students' social and academic disadvantages have been attempted through educational approaches, especially in the form of heritage language support in bilingual education programs initiated at the local school levels and funded by federal financial grants issued. However, since the birth of the Bilingual Education programs in the past decades, issues such as amount of heritage language, the length of its use and how to design appropriate bilingual material in instruction have aroused heated debate among policy makers, researchers and educators at all levels. Moreover, the current debate over bilingual education is becoming more politicized.

The purpose of this study is to find out what the CLD students’ parents think about heritage language use in bilingual education and what quality schools are in their perceptions. A substantial number of the recent researches on quality schools for CLD students emphasize that lying at the fundamental levels for quality schools are parents’ perceptions, and school’s improved productive partnership with the parents of CLD students and their communities. Therefore, tapping the parental perceptions about successful learning of their children and understanding their beliefs in heritage language use in instruction are crucial.
This inquiry was exploratory and a qualitative approach was used with survey and interviews as the research instruments. The population for this inquiry was selected from the parents who chose to send their children to language schools. Data were gathered from four language schools of five sites: Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew and Spanish language schools in Iowa. The settings reflected a diversity of heritage languages. The constant comparative method was used in analysis and interpretation of the data.

The survey data showed the following results: (a) oral heritage language was used by the majority of CLD student’s parents at home, except the parents from Hebrew language group, (b) the CLD students’ parents held positive attitudes toward heritage language learning, and (c) the CLD students’ parents believed that ideal quality schools for their children are bilingual schools or an instruction with extra heritage language teaching. The interview data showed the following categories as the main reasons for CLD students’ parents to maintain their children’s heritage language learning:

1. Maintaining cultural and religious heritage.
2. Strengthening family ties and family moral values.
3. Keeping connections to their own cultural and language communities.
4. Promoting bilingual skills for better job opportunities.

This qualitative inquiry into the perceptions of CLD student parents provided important resources for schools to develop an improved school educational model to meet the diverse needs of CLD students.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CLD Students and Their Schooling Experience

Linguistic and cultural diversity have been the dynamics of American society as well as the sources of controversy. In the past three decades, the growth of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) student populations in the public schools has been steady. The U.S. Census Bureau (1992) indicated an estimated 8.7 million immigrants in the United States (cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998, p. 31). As of 1990, there were 6.3 million CLD children ranging from age five to seventeen speaking a language other than English at home and the figure of school-age CLD children continues to rise (Crawford, 1997). In addition, the rapidly increasing rate of CLD students has resulted in a severe shortage of teachers qualified in skills necessary to serve them. Applebome (1996) points out that there is the “growing mismatch between the background of teachers and the students they will be teaching” (cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998, p. 7). Furthermore, many researchers have warned that CLD students are not doing quality work at schools on a large scale and the dropout rate before the 12th grade is increasing among CLD students (Baker, 1990; Crawford, 1998; Garcia, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Williams & Snipper, 1990).

Issues concerning CLD students such as their school experiences, high dropout rates, their limited English proficiency, academic underachievement, family poverty, together with the school inappropriate programs to serve them and their unequal job opportunities have attracted increasing concerns from policy makers, educational administrators, researchers, school practitioners, and social scientists at all levels (Brisk, 1998; Crawford,

**Heritage Language and Bilingual Education**

Various efforts to modify CLD students’ social and academic disadvantages have been attempted through multicultural education approaches, especially in the form of heritage language as instructional support in bilingual education programs funded by federal grants to school districts where CLD student population is high. Bilingual educational programs purport to use heritage language of the CLD students simultaneously with English instruction so as to provide comprehensible input for CLD students of limited English proficiency. The ultimate goal of most of the bilingual programs is to equip students with proficiency of two languages: heritage language proficiency and English proficiency. Bilingual education models mostly adopt a view of *pluralism* that values what CLD students bring into school environments and hold positive attitudes toward CLD students maintaining their heritage languages and cultures. Another approach for helping CLD students achieve academic success is through an English as a Second Language (ESL) program. An *assimilation* view is conveyed through ESL practice since the purpose of ESL is to focus on English instruction so that students can soon assimilate into the English predominant culture (Baker, 1996; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998). However, with the research development of heritage language literacy importance in the second language learning, the recent decades have witnessed the attitude change of ESL teachers toward the adoption of heritage language into instruction.
of ESL programs. Hence, Bilingual Education and ESL programs have been recognized as the two chief routes used by educators for addressing the needs of CLD students when striving for academic success (Baker, 1990; Krashen, 1996; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Wong Fillmore, 1991).

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 allowed for the development of bilingual education programs which provided instruction through the use of heritage languages. With the Bilingual Education Act, many bilingual education models have been implemented to help CLD students achieve academic success. For example, additive models (models that maintain language development of the heritage language along with the development of English) have been shown to be most effective for CLD students both in terms of enhancing their academic success and in terms of maintaining their cultural heritage, and valuing their traditions (Brisk, 1998; Collier, 1989, 1992; Cummins, 1981, 1986, 1989, 1991, 1996; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Genesee, 1987; Gonzalez & Schallert, 1999; Hakuta & Garcia, 1989; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998).

However, since the birth of the Bilingual Education Act, heritage language use in bilingual education as the instructional support for CLD students aroused a heated debate among educators, researchers, practitioners and school leaders, leaving parents of CLD students uncertain about bilingual education. Reasons surrounding this debate are varied, ranging from issues such as rationales for pluralism and assimilation, source of funding for bilingual programs, hiring bilingual teachers, bilingual methodologies, amount and length of heritage language use in bilingual models, to issues related to social and political factors (Baker, 1996; Collier, 1992; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Crawford, 1995,
The debates are becoming more heated in the recent decades, leaving numerous public schools adopting no accommodating models to help CLD students in their learning and the parents of CLD students become confused about the meaning of bilingual education programs. Moreover, reports concerning school failure of CLD students at large are severely increasing (Baker, 1996; Crawford, 1999; Soto, 1997; Trueba & Barnett, 1985; Williams & Snipper, 1990).

Meanwhile, the weight of the research evidence in the past two decades continues to support the heritage language use in bilingual education, which has a positive influence on the long-term cognitive development of CLD students although much of the research on bilingualism and bicognitivism is still in progress. For example, a sufficient amount of research evidence indicates that there is a strong positive relationship between literacy in heritage language (the primary language) and literacy in the second language (English) because the initial language literacy plays an important role in the development of literacy in the second language (Baker, 1990; Bialystok, 1991; Cummins, 1986; Gonzalez et al., 1997). In spite of the research development in bilingual education, however, a great number of researchers concerning CLD students' academic achievement also have reported through their findings that school failure of CLD students is related to the education policy that has not promoted the heritage language and culture of CLD students (Crawford, 1998; Fishman, 1985; Freeman & Freeman, 1992, 1993; Garcia, 1991; Gonzalez & Schallert, 1999; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Macedo, 1991; Ramirez, 1992; Williams & Snipper, 1990). As Crawford (1998) points out, if heritage language access is barred to CLD students through school programs, the consequences could be tragic.
because students will underachieve (affecting the society in general) and the research achievements of the 1990s on bilingual education will be ignored by the public, including parents and educators.

Essentially, a bilingual education approach assumes that CLD children will learn well if they can understand the language and find their cultural values conveyed through instruction. The core goal of bilingual education is to continue to develop students' first language or heritage language skills while they simultaneously begin learning the second language so that CLD students with limited-English language skills can understand content knowledge conveyed and participate more effectively in school subjects (Baker, 1996; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins & Swain, 1986; Ogbu, 1992; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Treuba, 1990; Wong Fillmore, 1991; Wong Fillmore & Valadez, 1986).

The characteristics of bilingual education are "the continued development of the students' heritage language literacy (L1), acquisition of the second language, English (L2), and instruction in the content areas using both L1 and L2 (California Department of Education, 1981, cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998, p. 4). As Freeman and Freeman (1993) suggested bilingual education may take on different forms, but it must include sufficient first language instruction, for first language instruction provides the comprehensible input students need to develop academic concepts. Since bilingual education advocates a greater emphasis on recognizing the value and worth of immigrants' home cultures and the development of heritage languages that will contribute to academic success of CLD students, it is considered a preferred approach with benefits to the CLD families, the school culture and societal harmony (Bialystok, 2001; Brisk,

**Heritage Language and Second Language Acquisition Theory**

Furthermore, issues of heritage language use in bilingual education are closely related to the research evidence of second language acquisition (SLA) and English as a second language (ESL). According to Baker (1996), the two issues of bilingual education and SLA are under the same roof, a multicultural education approach, linked together as the fundamental routes for promoting multicultural learning because becoming bilingual involves a process of SLA. Extensive SLA research studies show that the previous knowledge learned in L1 of CLD students is transferable to L2. ESL is a system of instruction that enables CLD students who are not proficient in English to acquire academic proficiency in spoken and written English. Many researchers proposed that ESL assistance in instruction be combined with instruction in L1 so as to make ESL programs efficiently accessible to CLD students. Currently, ESL is an essential component of all bilingual education programs in the United States (Baker, 1996; Ovando & Collier, 1998).

Based on SLA theories, comprehensive input is crucial for all language learners. Krashen (1985) argued that individuals acquire language when they receive comprehensible input, messages that they understand. Therefore, to learn a second language, students need to have an understanding of what they hear or read. The more L1 or heritage language literacy is developed, the more potential there is for literacy in L2 to develop (Cummins, 1991; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Freeman & Freeman, 1993; Genesee,
The background knowledge learned in the heritage language is crucial for cognitive development in L2. Hence, those who do not have L1 literacy are thought to be handicapped in their L2 literacy development (Bialystok, 1987, 1991; Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Roberts, 1994).

Additionally, concepts learned in one language transfer to a second language since language and thinking are regarded as interrelated. For example, Cummins (1981) found that students can learn in one language and discuss what they have learned in another because the concepts themselves learned from the primary (heritage) language can form the basis for second language learning, a phenomenon Cummins labeled common underlying proficiency. This explains why it is so essential for CLD students to fully develop their primary, or heritage languages. If students stop developing their heritage language proficiencies, when they enter school and begin using English, they will suffer from learning difficulties due to the lack of concept support from the heritage language which enables them to develop their general linguistic proficiency in the second language. Hence, Cummins emphasizes that heritage language can help CLD students develop concepts, negotiate meaning, and help read and write in the second language.

Research Development in Heritage Language

The most influential research on the importance of heritage language in the 1950s by a group of research experts organized by United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The reports supported the 'mother language' as the best initial medium of instruction for children educated in their second language schools (cited in Brisk, 1998). Additionally, researchers have provided additional evidence of the

In addition, many researchers have found effective bilingual programs are those that emphasize the use of heritage language of CLD students in instruction and value the L1 literacy as the cognitive basis for students' long-term academic achievement. Research evidence strongly demonstrates that students' cognitive development in L1 is closely connected to cognitive development in L2 and this interrelatedness between L1 and L2 is considered crucial to enhance CLD students' academic learning (Baker, 1996; Bialystok, 1991; Cummins, 1986; Cummins & Swain, 1986; Diaz, 1985; Gonzalez & Schallert, 1999; Hakuta, 1990; Lambert, 1977). For example, Peal and Lambert (1962) found that bilingual children showed superior performance on verbal and nonverbal standardized intelligence tests, and had a more heterogeneous pattern of intelligence than monolingual children. Compared to monolinguals, bilingual students demonstrated advantages of cognitive flexibility, creativity, concept formation, and metalinguistic abilities (Lambert, 1977; Peal & Lambert, 1962).

Additionally, a variety of studies have reported that heritage language use in bilingual education can serve as the bridge to a cohesive, culturally unified society
because diversity does not contradict with unity (Baker, 1996; Collier, 1998; Fishman, 1985; Gonzalez et al., 1997; Macedo, 1991; Taylor, 1991; Williams & Snipper, 1990). As Slonim (1991) states, a society's culture reflects extensively its citizens' efforts to construct meaning about both individual and collective values, beliefs and actions of those who are different from them. In fact, cultural understanding and its role in all aspects of education and language are fundamental in promoting peace and harmony among people of diverse backgrounds because culture serves as a "continuing reference point through which people construct their perceptions about and reactions to the environment" (Swick, Boutte, & Scoy, 1995/96, p. 75). Bilingual education programs reflect the heritage cultural values CLD students have brought into the school environment through curriculum. Therefore, many researchers have supported the view of heritage language importance, emphasizing the fact that when CLD students learn in a learning environment where their culture is represented, their motivation and self-esteem will be greatly raised because their social identities are reflected in such school contexts. Hence, bilingual programs have been offered in many states in the United States and have been proven effective in helping CLD students to gain academic success.

Debate on Heritage Language Use in Bilingual Education

However, the issue of accommodating non-English-speaking CLD students by means of bilingual education programs has long been controversial since its official recognition in the 1960s in the United States. Issues surrounding the bilingual education debate are becoming more complex as the new century begins, where factors of social, political, and ethnic rights enter educational arguments on choices of bilingual
methodologies, assessment tools and bilingual models (Collier, 1989; Crawford, 1998; Gonzalez et al., 1997; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Padilla, 1981; Porter, 1996; Soto, 1997; Taylor, 1991). As Hurn (1993) stated “cultural diversity has made education more controversial and politicized” (p. 192). The conflicts aroused from bilingual education models have mirrored this perspective. The period from the late 1980s to the 1990s, in particular, has witnessed the most contentious debate between the current English-only movement proponents and the English-plus advocates, most of whom are educators determined to promote individual and ethnic groups’ rights to use their heritage language in learning (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1986; Hakuta, 1990; Williams & Snipper, 1990). English-only proponents think bilingual programs are threatening the unity of the United States and should be removed from public schools because they consider heritage language as barriers for CLD students in the learning of English (Bethell, 1979, cited in Noll, 1995; Ravitch, 1985, cited in Noll, 1995; Rossell & Ross, 1986). According to Crawford (1998), much of the debate on bilingual education is becoming more and more politicized because, on the one hand, English-only proponents are unwilling to pay high taxes to support schools for immigrants’ children, while on the other hand, the bilingual professional researchers have controlled much of the research evidence on the effectiveness of heritage language use in bilingual education. From the 1980s and the 1990s, critics of bilingual education have won increasing support, a phenomenon strengthened by the approval of Proposition 227 in California, which allows the elimination of most heritage-language instruction in a state with 40% of the nation’s CLD students.
Need for Understanding Parents’ Perceptions

The heated discussions surrounding use of heritage languages in bilingual education have left parents and practitioners confused. For example, in many states heritage language use as instructional support for educating CLD students has not been implemented, and efforts have not been shared among states in certifying bilingual teachers. Specifically in Iowa, for example, a subtractive model of submersion is widely used. This model places minority-language students in classrooms with native majority-language speakers. In such a classroom instruction is in the majority language targeted for the majority-language speakers, providing very little comprehensible input for the minority-language speakers. This model falls short of the federal standards to meet the increasing needs of CLD students. In recent years, the influx of CLD students in Iowa from war-torn areas is increasing in large numbers. According to the Department of Education in Des Moines (2001), there are about 11,500 CLD students in Iowa. However, most schools suffer from the lack of professional bilingual teachers to teach these students (Wymore, 1997). Under this condition, there has occurred increased parental involvement in the education of CLD students in Iowa. For instance, it is not uncommon for parents of CLD students to send their children to either heritage language schools or heritage language classes in addition to their regular schoolwork.

Parental involvement in their children’s learning is considered very important by many researchers. For example, Hernander (1992) and Soto (1997) emphasize that insights of the parents and their communities, together with CLD students’ cultural background factors, affect the schooling of language minority students. Cummins (1986)
earlier work concurs with Hernander and Soto. Community participation, school outreach and parental involvement can be an effective alternative to preserve the heritage language of CLD students. Indeed, the increased involvement from parents in the education of CLD students is not a superficial phenomenon and must not be ignored. Therefore, it is important for schools to know parents’ perceptions so as to build a network of cooperation with CLD students' communities and families (Macedo, 1991; McGroarty, 1992; Underwood, 1986, cited in Hernander, 1992).

The inquiry of this study is conducted under this parental involvement phenomenon and social context of conflicting debate over heritage language use in bilingual education. The author of this paper believes, among all the propaganda, confusion, and conflicting debates surrounding bilingual education, it is worthwhile exploring what the parents of CLD students think about the learning of the heritage language for their children and what are their insights about their children’s successful learning.

**Statement of Research Problem**

What are the parents' perceptions on maintaining the heritage language of CLD students?

**Significance of Study**

Bilingual education has long been a contentious issue. The complex factors surrounding the dispute have led to the current various misconceptions from both the parents and educators alike concerning what it means for CLD students to use the heritage language in bilingual instruction. Furthermore, the conflicting disputes have
made the issue more and more politicized. Many CLD parents feel confused about how to best educate their children whose heritage language is other than English. The inquiry into the perceptions of CLD student parents who have chosen to send their children to study in heritage language schools or classes will help to better understand what the parents truly think about heritage language importance, what bilingual education means to the families of CLD students and how the schools could be better aware of the needs of CLD students.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this inquiry is intended to examine parents' perceptions on maintaining the heritage language of CLD students who attend a heritage language school or receive heritage language instruction.

Limitations

The data are gathered in Iowa from only four heritage language schools. The sample is specific to the families who choose to send their children to receive the heritage language instruction, not generalizable to all ethnic groups. The generalizations are mainly for the low concentration of ethnic groups in areas such as Iowa where bilingual programs are not implemented, yet the parents have chosen to conserve the heritage language of their children.

Summary

The increasing number of CLD students have brought stronger pressures to the schools in the United States due to their limited English proficiency and high-drop out rates. Among many innovative models for promoting their academic achievement,
heritage language use in bilingual education is widely recognized by educators and researchers as the most efficient programs for their emphasis on valuing the native culture and language brought by the CLD students. Yet, the long-time dispute over bilingual education has led educators and parents into confusion about the true meaning of using heritage language in bilingual instruction. Since parents are the ones who care most about the learning of their children, and the successful learning of the CLD students is closely related to how classroom teachers interact with the parents and the communities they serve, the parental perceptions toward their children’s optimal learning outcomes should not be neglected. Therefore, it is essential to hear the voice of parents of CLD students concerning heritage language learning.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Heritage Language in Bilingual Education and CLD Students

The number of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students who speak languages other than English or whose English proficiency is limited has increased during the past decades. According to the Census of 1990, in the United States, there were 6.3 million CLD children, ages five to seventeen, speak a language other than English at home (cited in Crawford, 1997, p. 2), and the figure of school-age CLD children continues to rise. The U.S. Census Bureau data of 1991 shows that 31.8 million people indicated that they spoke a language other than English at home (cited in Soto, 1997, p. 8). The increasing numbers in heritage languages are in Spanish, Arabic, Asian-Indian languages, Russian, Chinese, American Indian languages, Laotian, Vietnamese, Portuguese and Japanese (Waggoner, 1993). Alarmingly, there is a high dropout rate for CLD students, and their school failures, family poverty and unequal job opportunities have aroused great concerns from educators and researchers who are committed to helping CLD learners achieve academic success. How to educate these CLD students effectively has been the central question for decades.

In addition, the rapidly increasing rate of CLD students has resulted in a severe shortage of teachers qualified in skills necessary to serve them. Many researchers have reported the shortage of qualified bilingual teachers to serve the needs of CLD students (Brisk, 1997; Crawford, 1997; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Soto, 1997). Furthermore, many researchers have warned that CLD students are not doing quality work at schools on a
large scale and the dropout rate is increasing among the students before the 12th grade (Baker, 1996; Collier, 1995; Crawford, 1997; Cummins, 1989, 1996). Presently, the major concerns held by both educators and parents of CLD students are as follows: (a) their school failures due to limited English proficiency; (b) their high drop-out rate; and (c) their unequal education and job opportunities (Baker, 1996; Casanova, 1992; Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1986, 1989; Porter, 1996; Soto, 1997; Trueba, 1990, 1997).

Programs using the heritage language of CLD students in instruction together with English are called bilingual programs. Bilingual programs found in schools today developed out of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. With the emergence of the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII (an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) enacted in 1968, public schools obtained funds from the federal government to create bilingual programs to serve limited English proficient speakers. These programs promoted the use of CLD students' heritage language to initiate instruction, with English taught as a second language which would then later be used in instruction as students developed proficiency in English. This allowed students to develop literacy and learn new concepts in content areas in their own heritage language at no cost to English acquisition (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Crawford, 1998; Ramirez, Sandra, & Dena, 1991; Willig, 1985).

Heritage language maintenance in bilingual programs has been considered as the most effective instructional model to help CLD students with limited English proficiency achieve academic success in public schools (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Gonzalez et al., 1997; McLaughlin, 1985; Ovando & Collier, 1998).
Strong research evidence demonstrates that well-designed bilingual programs help enhance the long-term school success of CLD students (Greene, 1998; Ramirez et al., 1991). The preservation of heritage languages of CLD students in bilingual programs has been documented as being beneficial in a variety of ways: develops pride in one’s identity (Cummins, 1981), develops cognitive flexibility and creativity (Hakuta, 1986), creates a learning environment with comprehensible content knowledge as input and promotes a healthy sense of biculturalism (Krashen, 1985). Across the United States bilingual education programs involve a variety of heritage languages, though the most common bilingual programs are in Spanish and English. In Arizona, bilingual programs are available in Navajo, Spanish, and Yaqui (a native language originally from northern Mexico). In Texas, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, heritage languages such as Spanish, Hmong, Korean, Mandarin, and Vietnamese are used in bilingual education. In Cambridge, Massachusetts, a Haitian Creole bilingual program provides instruction for students of refugee families from Haiti (Faltis & Hudelson, 1998).

However, heritage language use in bilingual education programs has experienced eras of development and underdevelopment since its birth (Baker, 1996; Ovando, 1999; Soto, 1997). According to Soto (1997), these eras can be divided into three periods: an era of the “flawed research methodology” in the 1950s, of the “positive findings” in the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and of the “newly evolving paradigms” in the 1980s and 1990s (pp. 3-4). Baker (1996) summarized the developmental eras of bilingual education in the U.S. into four overlapping periods with variations and shifts in each stage: “Permissive,” “Restrictive,” “Opportunist,” and “Dismissive” periods (p. 166).
Heritage language use as the medium of instruction in bilingual programs has been highly debated in the past two decades. In the 1980s, opposition toward use of languages other than English in education and other services for CLD students swept the country. The proponents from this campaign were called English-only supporters (Crawford, 1995, 1997; McGroarty, 1992). They argued that using heritage language in instruction prevented CLD students from making rapid achievement in learning English and distracted precious time from real learning for CLD students. Others from this camp called for an assimilation of all CLD students into the dominant culture of the United States, asserting that instruction in languages other than English focused on other cultures and threatened the unity of the United States. The heated debate centered around the choice of language in instruction, assimilation or integration versus pluralism, and the design of instructional models (how much heritage language should be used, length of time a heritage language should be used, and the implementation of instruction in English as a second language).

**Bilingual Education and Heritage Language**

**Bilinguals defined.** According to proponents of bilingual education, the term bilinguals refers to those individuals who know more than one language and use these languages for a variety of purposes (Brisk, 1998; Cummins, 1986; Mackey, 1968). For example, Grosjean (1989) defines a bilingual as a person who has developed competencies in two or more languages "to the extent required by his or her needs and those of the environment" (p. 6). The more recent definition given by Gonzalez et al. (1997) emphasizes the bilingual ability more as a process than as an ultimate state. Yet,
traditionally speaking, based on Bloomfield (1933), only full fluency in two languages was accepted as bilingualism. The definition of the term bilingual proposed by proponents of bilingual education has actually expanded the definition to include semi-bilinguals, individuals whose knowledge of a second language is limited. Generally speaking, CLD students are referred to as bilingual students (sometimes labeled language-minority students) because they already speak their heritage languages and are expected to learn English as their second (or other) language, thus creating a bilingual context with varied English proficiency levels.

**Bilingual education defined.** There are different definitions for bilingual education ranging from programs encompassing specific methods of teaching to programs using broader definitions of language use. According to Nieto (1992), bilingual education, broadly defined, refers to any "educational program that involves the use of two languages of instruction at some point in a student's school career" (p. 156). More recently, Faltis and Hudelson (1998) defined bilingual education as “teaching students in their native languages to develop socioacademic literacy and ways of talking about the various content areas of interest in school and society, while they are integrated into the same content areas in English as they progress through school” (p. 2). The use of a heritage language in educating CLD students in content knowledge learning has long been promoted by English-plus proponents who regard bilingual skills as resources instead of as problems. The theory assumes that teaching immigrants in their heritage language values their family and community culture and reinforces their sense of self-
worth, which will contribute to academic success of CLD students (Ogbu, 1992; Rothstein, 1998).

Technically speaking, "bilingual education" refers to all programs designed to give any support to non-English-speaking children, including programs whose main focus is immersion in English-speaking classrooms. In public debate, however, the term generally refers to only one such program, transitional bilingual education (TBE), in which heritage language instruction in academic subjects is given to non-English speakers (Rothstein, 1998). Crawford (1997) defined bilingual education more specifically as various models that use both English and heritage-language instruction to teach school subjects. ESL is also included in some of the features of bilingual models because some ESL programs encourage the heritage language teaching as the initial stage to develop CLD students' literacy. Bilingual education proponents hold strongly to the belief that bilingualism can serve as a bridge to enhance the mutual understanding among diverse ethnic groups and to increase the multicultural awareness of different culture values (Spindler & Spindler, 1983, cited in Trueba, 1997).

**Heritage language defined.** Heritage language may also be called first language, home language, primary language, native language, or mother tongue of the CLD students (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Cummins, 1981, 1986; Fishman, 1985; Garcia, 1993; Gonzalez et al., 1997). All these terms refer to the language that CLD students first learned in their home, whether that home was based in another country or in the United States. Heritage language can also refer to the historical language of a family, related to religious affiliations, country of origin affiliations, or ethnic group affiliations.
Heritage Language Use in Bilingual Program Models

Based on the goals of bilingual education, there are two major types of bilingual education models: additive or enrichment model, and subtractive or English-only model. This division is made by considering the amount of heritage language use in instruction ranging from the most to the least instructional support (Baker, 1996; Ovando & Collier, 1998). The major goal of additive models is for learners to achieve proficiency in two languages, the heritage language and English. In contrast, the main purpose of subtractive or English-only models is to encourage CLD students to strive for fluency in English, often referred to as a “monolingual goal” (Brisk, 1998, p. 13). However, bilingual education additive models have been considered the most effective instructional models for preparing CLD students to be academically successful. A substantial number of researchers and educators believe that maintaining the heritage language is an essential foundation for CLD students to achieve academically while acquiring a second language (Baker, 1996; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Brisk, 1998; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Gonzalez et al., 1997; Krashen, 1985; Macedo, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998). Bilingual education models differ in instructional support by the amount of heritage language use in their designs.

Additive bilingual models. Additive models recognize the heritage language that CLD students bring into school as a resource rather than a problem and aim at promoting its sustained use in content knowledge instruction. The chief goals for additive models are maintaining CLD students’ heritage language and fostering their sense of cultural identity so as to affirm their human rights. Additive models are as following:
1. Developmental Bilingual Education, historically known as *Maintenance Bilingual Education*, is a model intended to help CLD students achieve fluent *bilingualism* as well as *academic excellence*. This model is designed for CLD students to develop biliteracy and ideally continues through the 12th grade, but has rarely been implemented beyond elementary schools level in the United States.

2. Two-way Bilingual Education, also known as *Dual-language Instruction* or *Bilingual Immersion*, is a model combining Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE) for language-minority students and foreign-language immersion for English-proficient students. Both language majority and language minority students work together as peers tutoring each other. This model is designed for students to develop biliteracy while meeting high levels of academic standards (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Ovando & Collier, 1998).

3. Transitional bilingual education (TBE), known as early-exit bilingual education with its primary goal to “mainstream” students to all-English classroom, uses heritage-language instruction to help students keep up in other content subjects, but phases in English instruction as quickly as possible.

*Subtractive bilingual models*. Subtractive models, often described as English-only in nature, have a primary goal to transit CLD students into learning English as quickly as possible. In these models heritage language reflects a problem to be solved rather than a resource to be included in instruction. Therefore, the use of heritage language in instruction is either minimal (temporary and limited) or nonexistent. These models are as follows:
1. Immersion Education refers to various models applying communication-and content-based approaches to teaching second languages, with little or no use of students' heritage language, including: Special alternative instructional program (SAIP), foreign-language immersion, native-language immersion, etc.

2. Submersion, also known as sink or swim, teaches CLD students of limited English proficiency (LEP) in the mainstream English-language classroom. CLD students are placed in classrooms with students who are native speakers of English, and instruction is conducted in English with no special language assistance. Submersion models are seen by bilingual proponents as violating the civil rights guaranteed under the Supreme Court’s Lau v. Nichols (1974) decision.

3. English as a Second Language ESL is a supplemental program providing CLD students with instruction in English tailored to the needs of learners in an English-dominant society. Sometimes ESL instruction takes the form of “pullout” lessons, where CLD students are removed from submersion classrooms, typically for 30 to 40 minutes each day. Usually instruction is given by teachers who do not speak the heritage language of their students. Ideally, these models place CLD students for instruction with other CLD students of similar English proficiency and instruction provided focuses on comprehensible input designed to address the language proficiency level of the group. Realistically, CLD students are often placed for instruction in one group with a wide variance in English proficiency, and instruction is conducted in English with a generalized focus on comprehensible input.
In the recent decades, there is considerable support for bilingual education. For example, a recent survey of publications between 1984 and 1994 found that 82% of empirical studies and literature reviews were favorable to bilingual education, as compared with only 45% of editorials in major newspapers (McQuillan & Tse, cited in Collier, 1989). The rationale for benefits found in bilingual education can be endorsed through second language acquisition theories. Although the English-only proponents oppose the use of heritage language in instruction for educating CLD students, some researchers point out there is no basis for the concern that heritage language instruction might impede the acquisition of English (Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Collier, 1989). Major reviews of second language acquisition theories can support the positive effects of the learning through the use of heritage languages.

**Heritage Language Role In Second Language Acquisition Theories**

For example, Cummins (1981, 1991) noted that L1 and L2 literacy are interdependent and concepts learned in one language transfer to a second language. If a certain academic and literacy **threshold** is not reached in L1 by language-minority students for at least four to five years via L1 schooling, language-minority students may experience cognitive and academic difficulties in L2 (Cummins, 1981; Roberts, 1994). Therefore, developing L1 literacy is crucial in terms of attributes acquired and understood by the language learner. L1 literacy of the language minority students plays an important role in providing input or framework for thinking in acquiring L2. Cummins (1981) refers to this knowledge as a common underlying proficiency. Cummins' view is supported by many researchers such as Ellis (1985, 1994) and Roberts (1994) who emphasized that L1 literacy should be included in the development of L2 literacy. Ellis (1985) stated that only in surface structures do languages appear to be radically different, but at deeper level is the underlying knowledge base and life experience that students have developed in L1. This is why it is so important for students to fully develop their first languages.

Furthermore, many research studies report that a wide variety of skills and learning strategies that are developed in L1 reading and writing transfer to L2 reading and writing (Bialystok, 1987; Edelsky, 1982; Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Hudelson, 1987; Snow, 1990; Thonis, 1981, cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998). As Cummins (1981) noted that language and thinking are interrelated; therefore, learners who feel confident in reading in their primary language (L1) are more likely to use the similar skills in second language reading (Edelsky, 1982, 1986; Hudelson, 1987). As it is known, language
competence in SLA is composed of four major skills: Listening, speaking, reading, and writing; however, Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) proposes that a fifth area of language competence should be added, "language used for thinking" (cited in Baker, 1996, p. 7). Cummins (1984) expresses this notion as cognitive competence in a language, referring to the individual's ability to use one or both languages for reasoning and careful thinking. Hence, knowledge gained by bilinguals in L1 serves as the foundation in terms of a frame for thinking in L2 learning, a closely connected L1 and L2 relationship (Cummins, 1984, cited in Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1986; Hakuta, 1986; Roberts, 1994). Therefore, L1 literacy of the CLD students plays a crucial role in serving as a framework for deliberation, especially in the process of constructing knowledge in L2. Indeed, learning a new language entails learning a new set of social and personal meanings, practices, and conventions. If students stop using their first languages when they enter school and begin using English, it may be more difficult for them to develop their general linguistic proficiency because learning a new language requires a complex cognitive process (Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Snow, 1990).

Krashen first introduced the Monitor Theory in 1977 as a comprehensive theory to explain second language acquisition among adult ESL learners. By the mid-1980s, he had extended the theory to include children (Krashen, 1985). The theory proposed by Krashen consists of the following five major interrelated hypotheses: (a) the learning-acquisition distinction; (b) the natural order hypothesis; (c) the monitor hypothesis; (d) the input hypothesis; and (e) the affective filter hypothesis (summarized by Faltis & Hudelson, 1998, p. 94). The first hypothesis, the learning-acquisition
distinction, sets the stage for the remaining four hypotheses because it has to do with the process of internalizing new second language knowledge, storing it, and using it for communication. For Krashen, acquisition occurs below the level of consciousness as a result of participating in authentic communicative settings in which the focus is on meaning. According to Krashen, efforts in school should focus on facilitating language acquisition.

Krashen's (1985, 1996) monitor hypothesis has to do with how acquisition and learning are used for and in the production of language. The input hypothesis is what Krashen introduces as his fundamental explanation for how children and adults acquire a second language. Krashen (1985) argues that individuals acquire language when they receive comprehensible input, messages that they understand. Additionally, Snow (1992) proposed that a more productive perspective on SLA research is that of sociocultural, which acknowledges the value of the social community and heritage culture.

In summarizing the research on the use of heritage languages in instruction, Soto (1997) provided a conclusive list of positive results gathered from the past three decades:

2. Bilingual children were more attentive to linguistic rules and structures (Ben-Zeev, 1977).
4. Bilingual children demonstrate stronger cognitive flexibilities in tasks such as

5. Bilingualism show positive effects on Piagetian conservation and field independence (Duncan & De Avila, 1979).


7. Learning concepts in the heritage language transfer to and enhance second language learning (Cummins, 1979).

However, L1 transfer and the amount of heritage language use in bilingual education have caused the conflicting dispute in the past decades and the dispute has divided the researchers into two camps: English-only and English-plus proponents.

**Bilingual Education Debate Concerning Heritage Language Use**

The inclusion of heritage language support for CLD students in instruction via bilingual programs has long been among the heated debates between two camps: English-only proponents and English-plus, or bilingual education proponents. Proponents of bilingual education have argued the attacks on bilingual education from the English-only supporters are *politicized*. Brisk (1998) stated that the debate on bilingual education is not about education but about language and models. She emphasized it is not even a general debate on bilingual education because those bilingual models have been developed and compared on the basis of language of instruction, not considering other important factors regarding instructional practices implemented for educational purposes related to academic achievement. Brisk
insisted that the purpose of education is not for learning a language only and that the sterile debate is of very little relevance to the 6 million CLD children and their parents whose home language is not English. In her point of view, it is political and economic forces that have always influenced the use of languages in public education in the United States.

Attitudes toward bilingual education have fluctuated greatly over the course of American history. The central point of debate point is between the concepts of assimilation versus pluralism (Mclaughlin, 1985). The differing view on what bilingual education means and why the heritage language of CLD students should be used in instruction has sharply divided the advocates of the English-only movement and those of English-plus. Bilingual education supporters blame the English-only promoters for their misconceptions of bilingual education and their ignorance in the development process of second language acquisition. English-only defenders insist on an assimilation view where schools use English in instruction as a tool to help CLD students make adjustments as rapidly as possible to the new language and culture (Collier, 1989; McGroarty, 1992; Ovando, 1999; Ovando & Collier, 1998).

English-Only Versus Strong Use of Heritage Language

Opponents of bilingual education insist that English should be the official language of the United States and they believe intense instruction in English is best for CLD students in acculturating into the dominant school culture. They adamantly oppose the use of heritage languages of the English-limited students in school instruction. Supporters of this political movement are a coalition of private lobbying groups with a
strong nativist strain (Baker, 1996; McGroarty, 1992). Two major lobbying groups have developed, both dedicated to what they see as the need to preserve English against the perceived threat arising from increased immigration. One group is the 100,000 members of English First supporters, of Springfield, VA. The other, U.S. English, with 240,000 members, was established in 1983 and traces its origins to U.S. senator S. I. Hayakawa's 1981 proposed amendment to make English the official language of the United States.

Other groups supporting the national English language amendment are the National Grange, the American Legion, the National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups, the Polish American Congress, and the German American National Congress (National Education Association, 1988, cited, in McGroarty, 1992). They reflect the views of the old immigrants of the 19th century who were concerned that their authority was threatened by the influx of later immigrants. This view was supported by Thompson's statement. George Thompson (1952) stated:

> There can be no doubt that the child reared in a bilingual environment is handicapped in his language growth. One can debate the issue as to whether speech facility in two languages is worth the consequent retardation in the common language of the realm. (cited in Hakuta, 1986, p. 14)

Thompson's view was widely used by the American textbooks in child psychology (Hakuta, 1986). This melting pot attitude has continued with the English-only movement, a typical attitude of integration. As Guy (1989) notes, "Language differences become politicized and divisive precisely when a dominant group tries to impose its language as an 'official' requirement" (cited in McGroarty, 1992, p. 12). Opposing English-only is the English-plus coalition, which promotes individual and group rights to use other languages. It was formed in 1988 through the efforts of the National
Immigration, Refugee, and Citizenship Forum, an advocacy and civil rights group, and the Joint National Committee on Languages, itself a coalition of professional groups representing language teachers, including the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). Interestingly, about thirty years ago, most professional ESL teachers would not allow students to use their heritage language(s) when they were supposed to be learning English. More recently, however, this position has changed. Numbers of ESL educators and organizations such as TESOL and NCTE now recognize that the learners' heritage language may be a resource for learning both content and English, a way for learners to negotiate their learning (NCTW, 1996; TESOL, 1996, cited in Faltis & Hudelson, 1998, p. 37). These groups are pro-bilingual-program defendants. For example, TESOL’s (1993) proposition indicates a strong support for bilingual education, seeing bilingual programs as “national resource for all students” (cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998, p. 20).

Proponents of bilingual education contend that bilingualism is good for all students. They feel that the presence of students of other languages and the existence of bilingual programs can only assist the goal of bilingualism for English speakers (Brisk, 1998). Therefore, they consider heritage languages of the CLD students as resources and they believe it is possible to achieve national unity through maintaining linguistic diversity (Baker, 1996). In addition, bilingual proponents insist that CLD students may learn more in school (including more English) if they believe that their home and community languages and cultures are acknowledged and valued (Faltis & Hudelson,
English-plus promotes the freedom to use any language and the value of learning and using languages in addition to English. The world of professional educators has witnessed a growing recognition of the validity of bilingual instruction.

Bilingual education has become rapidly institutionalized since the early 1970s when proponents found upon several investigations in multicultural communities that CLD students were educationally disadvantaged because of their inability to understand or speak English. They promoted bilingual education to help ensure that CLD students did not lag behind academically. The U.S. Supreme Court decision in Lau v. Nichols, issued in 1974 after a lawsuit case in Chinatown, California, provided the stimulus for the implementation of bilingual education throughout local regions. Major mainstream professional organizations such as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers have articulated official positions that support bilingual education. Many states have made explicit provisions for licensure in bilingual education.

In contrast, the English-only advocates believe that bilingual education is damaging CLD students' learning by delaying their English learning development. They consider the use of the native language of CLD students in bilingual instruction as an excuse for the English-plus supporters to segregate and isolate the ethnic communities. Their understanding toward the nature and goal of bilingual education is different from those of the bilingual instruction supporters. For example, Bethell (1979) argued that putting a group of immigrants in a class is segregation; that a bilingual program is actually preventing children from learning English because children will learn English
more rapidly if not being grouped separately. He accused bilingual programs of tongue-tying students in their home language (cited in Noll, 1995).

Moreover, bilingual critics contend that bilingual education provided "instruction in the native language most of the school day for several years" (Porter, 1994, cited in Brisk, 1998, p. 44); that bilingual education is threatening the unity of the United States by maintaining the CLD students in their native languages (Ravitch, 1985, cited in Noll, 1995); and that the heritage language instruction diverts precious time from learning English (Rossell & Ross, 1986). They believe ethnic cultural heritage is a private matter and should not be taught at public schools through bilingual education (Silber, 1996).

In fact, this heated dispute can be traced back to the early language schools that served as the potential stage for the later day debate.

Debate Through Historical Review Of Heritage Language Schools

From the 1700s to the late 1980s, bilingual education evolved in the United States through four ‘ideologically and pedagogically interconnected periods’: permissive, restrictive, opportunist and dismissive (Baker & Jones, 1998, cited in Ovando, 1999). Bilingual education was also strongly influenced by most of the social action programs, court cases, and the civil rights movement of the 1960s and the 1970s. Indeed, bilingual education benefited from the achievements made by the civil rights movement. However, the social events and the official English movement in the 1980s negatively impacted bilingual education and turned it into a more politicized arena (Baker, 1996; Crawford, 1998; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Soto, 1997).
Permissive Period (1700-1800s)

Diverse heritage language schools. The early native language schools of the colonizers and immigrants served as the potential sources for later day dispute over bilingual education. From 1700s to 1800s, linguistic diversity was protected by government policy; as a result, a variety of language schools were permitted to exist by the government (Baker, 1996; Baker & Prys Jones, 1997; Brisk, 1998; Ovando, 1999). For example, during the initial colonization of the United States, several native languages of the European colonizers were accepted as important for political purposes: German, French, Spanish, and Swedish. However, French and German were considered as the most important by the Continental Congress. At that time, the heritage language of the early settlers was well preserved in most rural schools and English was taught as a second language (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Keller & Van Hooft, 1982).

Three reasons fostered the use of bilingual instructional approaches during the permissive period: (a) humanitarian schools; (b) public schools showing tolerance in order to compete with the expanding private schools; and (c) the ethnolinguistic homogeneity of many communities (Crawford, 1997; Ovando, 1999). Ovando described this period as being characterized by linguistic tolerance toward non-English speakers.

The Restrictive Period (1900-1960s)

Foreign language teaching restricted. World War I broke out in 1914 with U.S entering the war in 1917, an event which changed the language policy of the United States. The permissive attitude toward foreign language teaching and heritage language teaching in schools gave way to a more restricted attitude due to the anti-Germany
sentiment in America. In fact, two marked phenomena could explain this attitudinal change: the anti-German feelings, and the concerns of the early European elites about the authoritative power over other later immigrants, mostly from Asian countries and Latin American countries.

The early immigrants from the European countries held strong European nationalism and they had more authoritative power over other later immigrant groups. Concerned about their authority, these early European settlers began to exert their influence on the government of the United States. They called for a policy of monolingualism and promoted the virtues of the melting pot ideology to counter their concern over foreign ideologies from newer immigrants that would threaten their authority and possibly have a negative impact on their home culture. Thus, in 1906 a law called the *Nationality Act* stipulated that to become a naturalized U.S. citizen, immigrants had to be able to speak English. This unified linguistic mode made teaching German as a foreign or heritage language forbidden in schools.

In 1919 the Americanization Department of the United States Bureau of Education adopted a resolution recommending that all states require all schools, private and public, to conduct instruction in English. Meanwhile, many large urban schools created Americanization classes to prepare immigrants for integration into mainstream society (Higham, 1992; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Soto, 1997). Any students speaking their heritage language in school would be punished. The major task for schools was to Americanize all immigrants and promote American citizenship (Crawford, 1995;
The public speech delivered by Roosevelt (1917), for example showed the unequivocal decision of this restrictive period:

any man who comes here...must adopt the institutions of the United States, and therefore he must adopt the language which is now the native tongue of our people, no matter what the several strains of blood in our veins may be. It would be not merely a misfortune but a crime to perpetuate differences of language in this country....We should provide for every immigrant by day schools for the young and night schools for the adult, the chance to learn English; and if after say five years he has not learned English, he should be sent back to the land from whence he came. (cited in Trueba & Barnett, 1985, p. 3)

However, the debate over the role of non-English heritage language instruction did not cease as a result of the political atmosphere of restriction. For example, the Supreme Court decision Meyer v. Nebraska (1923) declared Nebraska's prohibition against teaching foreign languages (and heritage languages) in elementary schools unconstitutional. It stated: "Forbidding the teaching in school of any other than the English language, until the pupil has passed the eighth grade, violates the guaranty of liberty in the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution, in the absence of sudden emergency rendering the knowledge of the foreign language clearly harmful (Kloss, 1977, cited in Ovando, 1999, p. 8).

Opportunist Period (late 1950s to 1980s)

Rebirth of heritage language learning. This period was characterized as the rebirth of bilingual education due to the influential social events of the 1960s, the dramatic policy changes in the 1970s, and research development on bilingual education in the 1980s. It was called the opportunist period because of the wide recognition of bilingual education and the opportunities for schools and students to be involved in
bilingual education programs (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Ovando, 1999; Ovando &
Collier, 1998).

World War II had an extremely important impact on policy decisions of the
American government in regards to the to the neglected issues of teaching foreign
languages at schools. This change in attitude toward foreign (and heritage) languages was
realized in the governmental changes in policy and position statements related to
linguistic diversity, beginning in the 1960s. This change was also the result of the Civil
Rights Movement during the 1960s and the 1970s. Actually, it was the 1964 Civil Rights
Act that led to the creation of the Office of Civil Rights. In addition, the Cuban refugees
arriving in Miami following the Cuban revolution of 1959 brought the rebirth of bilingual
education to American schools as large numbers of Spanish-speaking CLD students
flooded the Florida schools. Hence began the nation's first new bilingual program in this
century at Coral Way Elementary School in Miami in 1963 (Baker, 1996; Gonzalez et al.,

Background for the Civil Rights Movement and court decisions. In the early
1970s, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1971a, 1971b, 1972a, 1972b, 1973, 1974,
cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998) reported that, in addition to the lack of use of a heritage
language, isolation of CLD students, disregard for their cultural heritage, exclusion of
parents and communities from participation in school affairs, family poverty, poor
financing of schools, and quality of classroom interaction all contributed to the lack of
academic progress of CLD students and their high dropout rates (August & Hakuta, 1997;
Crawford, 1995). This report served as the most credible source of information
concerning the unequal treatment and the injustices suffered by the disenfranchised
groups in the American society. Thus, there occurred significant changes in the 1970s in
both policy and practice in U. S. educational institutions that helped CLD students
(Baker, 1996; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Soto, 1997). By 1971, the first International
Bilingual/Bicultural Education Conference was held in the United States and the National
Association for Bilingual Education was officially incorporated as a professional
organization in 1975. The schools, long held responsible for the assimilation of
ethnic/linguistic minorities into mainstream Anglo-American education, came under
severe attack for failing to meet this challenge within the traditional framework of all-

According to estimates by the Commission on Civil Rights in 1974, there were 5
million linguistically different children in the United States. Evidence existed that 45% of
Mexican American children dropped out of school before the 12th grade, and the attrition
rate for Native American students was 55%. It was more likely that many of these
linguistically different children would drop out of school if they continued to feel that
they were not able to keep up with the school curriculum. While the language difference
was not the sole contributor to the academic problems of these CLD students, it was
considered by many to be a major factor in their schooling delinquency (Crawford, 1995,
1997; Thomas & Thomas, 1982).

The important legal acts permitting heritage language teaching. The grim
situations for the CLD students reported above led to the most important events during
this period: The Bilingual Education Act, passed in 1968, and two U.S. Supreme Court
decisions: Lau v. Nichols in 1974, and Castaneda v. Pickard in 1981. All three of these events paved the way for language minorities to enjoy equal education opportunities.

The Bilingual Education Act granted financial support and provided sets of guidelines to support bilingual instruction programs. It was required by the Act that bilingual programs value and recognize CLD children's native language and cultural heritage during their process of learning English. The Act placed an obligation on school districts to take action to remove language barriers that had the effect of excluding linguistic minority children from full participation in public education (Collier, 1989; Porter, 1996).

The 1974 Supreme Court case, Lau v. Nichols, was the first extremely important legal case leading to the rebirth and development of bilingual education in the United States. The case was a class action suit representing 1800 Chinese students who accused their school districts of failing them academically due to the fact that they could not understand English used in instruction. This suit has had a profound effect on programs serving language minority students. According to Crawford (1997), Lau v. Nichols served as an enduring legal symbol for immigrants. This verdict also smoothened the way for the passage of the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) in 1974, because the verdict abolished the sink-or-swim practices promoted by the English-only supporters (Collier, 1989; Ovando, 1999). Later, Castaneda v. Pickard (1981) was generally regarded as the second most important court decision in its impact on educating limited-English minority learners, because it provided more specific guidelines for various
bilingual models for the public. The law required the school programs to be anchored in sound educational theory and to provide adequate resources for CLD students. However, bilingual education's rebirth also created more controversies because of the diversity of bilingual models practiced during the opportunist period. In 1977 the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education was created to help collect, research and disseminate information about bilingual education practices. The bilingual education research development from the period of the 1960s to the more flourishing stage of the 1980s contributed to the increased conflicts in the dispute surrounding bilingual education between the English-only defenders and the English-plus proponents (Baker, 1996; Collier, 1989; Lewis, 1977; Ovando & Collier, 1998, Soto, 1997).

In addition, political issues became a part of these educational discussions, making the debate on the effectiveness of bilingual education more complex and politicized. Hence, bilingual education maintenance in public schools has long been the central topic of debate among educators and administrators. Fishman (1976) stated there was paradoxical meaning surrounding the bilingual education debate: when it was employed in private schools for the children of elites throughout the world, bilingual education was accepted as educationally valid, but when immigrants were involved in this issue, the debates became more complex and politicized.

Research development in heritage language. A pioneering study conducted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the 1950s revealed that children educated in their second language, a language learned in addition to the mother language, experienced difficulties in school. The report concluded
that heritage language (also referred to as mother language, native language, primary
language, home language or first language) is the best initial medium of instruction
because it is the vehicle through "which a child absorbs the cultural environment"

Many studies found that literacy in the heritage language was positively related to
the academic achievement of CLD students in learning English as a second language
(Bialystok, 1987, 2001; Cummins, 1981, 1986; Cummins & Swain, 1986; Gardener &
Lambert, 1959, 1972; Paulston, 1974; Willig, 1985; Wong Fillmore, 1991; Wong
Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). Several studies also provided the evidence of cognitive
benefits as a result of knowing two languages (Bialystok, 1987; Cummins, 1986, 1989;
For example, Bialystok (1987) found that bilingual children showed more advanced
understanding of some aspects of the idea of words than did monolingual children.
Cummins found that balanced bilinguals (individuals with equal proficiency in two
languages) had more flexibility in thinking. The threshold theory suggested by Cummins
assumed that a certain level of proficiency in both languages must be attained for the
positive effects of bilingualism on metalinguistic awareness to occur. Again, Galambos
and Hakuta (1988) claimed that bilingualism enhanced metalinguistic abilities.

In addition, researchers found that it was important to maintain the cultural
heritage of CLD students in order to maintain or raise their self-esteem (Cummins, 1986;
Garcia, 1991; Ogbu, 1992; Taylor, 1991). In order to empower children in learning,
educators need to affirm each child's unique expressions of his/her cultural heritage and of his/her ongoing cultural environment (Treuba, 1990, 1997).

However, the practice of heritage language use in bilingual education has been challenged both by the English-only supporters and English-plus supporters. As early as 1952, the public was warned of the harmful effects caused by bilingual education to the children and urged to prohibit its use in public schools (Thompson, 1952). Fishman (1985, 1991) who is thought of as a bilingual education supporter, noted that bilingual education was not a cure-all method because it suffered four serious deficiencies including funds, trained personnel, evaluated experience, and sound perspectives. Paulston (1974) writing from a conflict paradigm, described her own position that unequal opportunity was the chief cause of CLD students' school failure.

Heated arguments over bilingual program models also occurred. The issues focused mainly on which were more effective: the transitional models or assimilation models. Hence, issues of equality and cultural heritage were at the center of this debate and led to more heated arguments during the dismissive period.

Dismissive Period (1980s to Present)

The controversy over heritage language use. The 1980s was a decade of rapid growth in immigration populations, which led to an increase in linguistic and cultural diversity. Politically speaking, the research findings were less encouraging as some studies showed that only one-third of CLD students were receiving appropriate education services (Casanova, 1992). This led to increased concern from educators at all levels, from the public, from the government, and especially from parents of CLD students, over
the frequent relocation of CLD students and on CLD students' progress in acquiring English (Ovando & Collier, 1998). For this reason, many U.S. voters reacted defensively against the racial, cultural, and language diversity brought by rising levels of immigration. Therefore, a nationwide campaign for the legal protection of English led to the passage of 19 state laws designating English as the sole language of government. In 1996, Republican President nominee Bob Dole stated that teaching of English to immigrants must be stopped (Crawford, 1998).

Yet, pedagogically speaking, the extensive research findings encouraged the development of bilingual programs that acknowledge the value of heritage language (Baker, 1990; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1981, 1986). These findings confirmed that developing fluent bilingualism and cultivating academic excellence were complementary, rather than contradictory, goals. This period marked the more mature bilingual education research in terms of the benefits in the areas of cognition, culture, identity and self-esteem for the CLD students. More research evidence in the 1980s and the 1990s suggested the strong positive relationship between heritage language literacy and literacy in English for CLD students and supported the maintenance of heritage languages of CLD students for the long-term academic achievements (Christian, 1996; Cummins, 1986, 1991; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Hakuta, 1986; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Malave, 1993; Ramirez, 1992; Ramirez et al., 1991; Snow, 1990; Willig, 1985). In addition, more and more research supported the conclusion that well-designed bilingual programs could produce high levels of school achievement.
among CLD students over the long term, at no cost to English acquisition (Collier, 1995; Crawford, 1998; Greene, 1998; Ramirez et al., 1991).

The impact of the move toward official English had damaging political effects on bilingual education, such as Secretary of Education William J. Bennett launching an attack on Title VII, accusing the bilingual programs of failure. As immigration increased, English-only organizations expanded across the United States. The continued attack from the English coalitions had an impact in redefining the debate terms surrounding bilingual education policy. The debate evolved from the early focus on the choice of bilingual programs during the 1970s, to a focus in the 1980s on the question of how to teach CLD children English as rapidly as possible, to the more politicized debate in the 1990s over bilingual versus English-only approaches. The English-only advocates continued to attack bilingual education more severely despite the research developments indicating positive effects of heritage language use in CLD students’ instruction (Brisk, 1998; Crawford, 1997; Ovando & Collier, 1998).

Current Research Development in Heritage Language Rationale

In order to defend bilingual education, many influential bilingual researchers, such as Bialystok (2001), Christian (1996), Collier (1989, 1995), Crawford (1997), Faltis and Hudelson (1998), Fishman (1985), Freeman and Freeman (1993), Macedo (1991), and Ovando and Collier (1998), have responded strongly to the English-only movement. These researchers along with bilingual education defenders highlight the following points as strong rationales for implementing bilingual education practice:
1. The economic and political advantages of supporting existing linguistic and cultural resources in a global economy.

2. The positive effects of bilingualism on cognitive and linguistic development.


4. The need for equity.


Other researchers look at bilingual education from a broader social perspective, for example, Macedo (1991), Taylor (1991), Thomas and Collier (1997), Trueba (1990), and Williams and Snipper (1990) stressed that bilingual education can serve as the bridge to a cohesive, culturally unified society because bilingual programs attend to students’ cultural and linguistic heritages which will maintain immigrants’ motivation for learning. Cultural understanding and its role in all aspects of education and language are at the core of promoting global peace and harmony. Therefore, bilingual programs are important in terms of preparing active, prepared citizens ready to meet the challenge of the 21st century (Hakuta & Garcia, 1989; Soto, 1997).

In addition, other proponents have made very strong arguments against English-only rhetoric and in support of the whole bilingual education campaign. For example, Macedo (1991), in the article, "English-only: The Tongue-Tying of America," claimed
that the conservative ideology that propels the anti-bilingual education forces ignores the
evidence supporting bilingual education and fails to recognize the need for preparing
students for the ever-changing, multilingual, and multicultural world of the twenty-first
century. According to Macedo, an English-only approach relegates the immigrant
population to the margins of society. Macedo clarified his position that linguistic
minority students' language should never be sacrificed by explaining that the learning of
English language skills alone will not enable these linguistic minority students to acquire
the critical tools "to awaken and liberate them from their mystified and distorted views of
themselves and their world" (cited in Noll, 1995, p. 256). Macedo opposed the English-
only position, which mistakenly regards the learning of English as education itself. He
further claims that decisions about how to educate non-English-speaking students cannot
be restricted to issues of language exclusively, but needs to embrace a full understanding
of the beliefs, ideas and values that arouse and sustain linguistic, racial, and sex
discrimination.

Williams and Snipper (1990) also stressed the importance of the mother-tongue,
where literacy in the mother-tongue and in English make students more academically
successful and creative. They state the real meaning of bilingual education is not to
divide the United States but to unite at a core level, where all individuals have access to
learning and are able to successfully communicate with one another.

The Present Debate on Heritage Language Use

The pros and cons regarding bilingual education and the use of heritage languages
in learning have become more emotional and politicized during the 1990s and into the
21st century. Factors involved in the dispute are complex. The following issues are at the core of this heated debate about bilingual education: choice of language for instruction, best models for educating CLD students, civil rights, ethnic identity, government funding, policy-making bias, and popular attitudes (Collier, 1989; Crawford, 1997; Ovando & Collier, 1998). In addition, issues such as how long and how much the heritage language should be used have caused disagreements among bilingual professionals (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998). For example, Rosalie Pedalino Porter (1996), once an insider of bilingual education, presented critical views about the nature and programs of bilingual education in her book entitled "Forked Tongue: The politics of bilingual education." She commented that the reports given by both Hakuta and Ramirez on the effectiveness of bilingual education were unreliable because of the poor validity of data proof. She highlighted a silent confrontation between two camps at an international conference in 1995 for a debate on bilingual education: Center for Equal Opportunity (CEO) and National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE). This event symbolized the inner conflicts of the groups concerned with the school achievements of CLD students and it once again added impetus to the English-only supporters' criticisms of bilingual education.

Rossell and Baker (1996) conducted a review of bilingual education research examining more than 300 bilingual education program evaluations and studies and found that only 72 met minimum methodological standards. Of these, 78% showed bilingual education was either no different-or actually worse-for LEP students. In response to these arguments, Crawford (1997) used bilingual education research data to renounce their
findings as incorrect and stated their review provided unfair accusations toward bilingual education.

In addition to arguments by educators and special interest groups, the current debate includes a more public discussion through writings of journalists and public figures interested in the issues of national unity, marginalization of minority groups, and the relationship of bilingual education to the education of CLD students. Ravitch (1985), an extreme critic of bilingual education, contended that the effort to continue the policy of bilingual education represents an over politicized attitude. For Ravitch, bilingual education should be abandoned because a bilingual program "exemplifies a campaign on behalf of social and political goals that are only tangentially related to education." (cited in Noll, 1995, p. 246). Ravitch believed that the aim of bilingual proponents was "to use the public schools to promote the maintenance of distinct ethnic communities, each with its own cultural heritage and language" (cited in Noll, 1995, p. 247). In such an argument, the use of native language instruction is destructive and threatens the unity of the school curriculum, or even the society.

Silber (1996), former president of Boston University and chairman of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, presented an argument in favor of English as the official language of the United States and opposed the multilingual ballots mandated by the 1975 Voting Rights Act. He insisted that English is a necessary component of the national identity of the United States. He called ethnicity a private matter and argued that multilingual ballots are a dangerous experiment. "Our common language provides the unity that, paradoxically, enables us to understand and cherish our cultural diversity"
He argued that America is a nation based on a set of ideals and allegiance to those ideals, rather than ethnicity or national origin.

In contrast to Silber's views, Ward (1995) claimed that what was most important to Americans was the promise of freedom and justice and opportunity. The danger that he saw was that Americans were becoming too intent on separating themselves from other Americans by language. He claimed that, "When we talk about language we are talking about identity, and making English our national language suggests that we are Americans only to the extent to which we know English. But what we should cherish most about America—the promise of freedom and justice and opportunity—is cherished most, I think, by our most recent immigrants. If we do require that in exercising certain rights, immigrants must entirely discard their own language, how exactly will America be the richer for it?" (cited in Goshgarian, 1999, p. 355). He believed that English-only policy sends the signal to the immigrants that "they are not welcome here until they have cease to be different from other citizens. This seems as if the burden of the cohesion of the nation rests not with those who have been here long enough to do something about it, but with those who have just arrived.

In the same vein, Dickstein (1997) expressed his worries that the failure to clearly say what it means to be American could result in similar divisiveness and hostilities. He suggested that English-plus serves as a solution or as a compromise that stands in interesting contrast to the views of other authors. He asserted, "...imagine a country torn by language, not race. In that country, it is not unusual for power and wealth to be distributed based on mother tongue, not merit. Frictions evolve into an endless series of
confrontations. Soon the vitality and vision of the country are entirely diverted by its obsession with the politics of language" (cited in Goshgarian, 1999, p. 368).

However, the views presented by Dickenstan and Ward were challenged by other writers. Fishman (1991) claims that assimilation and language acquisition do not take place through coercion and language learning is not the purpose or the primary goal of education; instead, human rights and content knowledge are the primary goal for helping CLD students. Additionally, Krashen (1999) argues that bilingual education has been condemned without a fair hearing. He challenged the belief that in the past immigrants achieved the American dream without bilingual instruction, pointing out that up to the 1950s it was possible to obtain economic success without much formal schooling.

English-only proponents contend that the use of heritage language in instruction will only serve to restrict language minority students more to their own community and language. Thus the question of whether English learning is the goal of education or academic content knowledge is the education goal for CLD students controls the debate. According to Hurn (1993), “the roots of the conflict often lies in the struggles for status and power between different groups” (p. 14).

Throughout the American history, language use in education was affected by social events and social changes. According to Apple (1990), educators need to be aware of the institutional ideology representing the privileged groups in the society and their connections to authority and power in the history which were preserved and distributed by the schools today. For Apple, educators must explore ways which respond less to the
economic and cultural requirements of hegemony and more to the needs of all of the
individuals, groups, and classes who make up this society.

Need for Understanding Parents' Perceptions on Maintaining Heritage Language

As the use of heritage language in bilingual programs has caused the heated
disputes among the different professional groups to become more and more
 politicized, parents of CLD students are left confused and uncertain about the
rationale of bilingual education (Collier, 1989). As Soto (1997) stated political issues
and power sharing get involved into bilingual education debate. Hence, an
understanding of the parents' perceptions and attitudes concerning their children's
education is important. Rothstein (1998) asserted that the best way to know the truth
about the bilingual education debate would be to "remove it from the political realm"
(p. 8). Soto (1997) proposed that educators need to push aside the political factors
involved in the debate of bilingual education and focus on the actual research results
of bilingual education and how these findings can help educators better address the
needs of CLD students.

In quality schools for CLD students, at the foundational level are the clear
goals, good leadership and productive relationships between the school and the
parents of the CLD students and their communities (Brisk, 1998; Chang, 1994;
parents' perceptions about successful learning for their children is essential in
developing an optimal learning environment for all CLD students. According to
Hernander (1992), parental involvement and family socialization patterns represent
two non-instructive features of context critical in the schooling of language minority students. In studies by Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972), it was found that parental attitudes toward the heritage language, positive or negative, were picked up by their children who, in turn, brought such an influenced attitude to their language learning at school.

However, parents' perceptions vary concerning the effectiveness of bilingual education. Part of the issue may be in the confusion parents have over the goal of bilingual education for their children. There are several reasons for parents' misunderstandings regarding the goal of bilingual education (Crawford, 1998). First, government agencies, educators' associations, and school districts have done little to explain the pedagogy to outsiders, including parents—many of whom are new to the United States. The broader public, never clear about the rationale for native-language instruction, is increasingly skeptical of its results. Secondly, the news media widely reported some of the unsound research evidence highlighting the ineffectiveness of bilingual education. Moreover, with the rise of English-only activity, assimilationist rhetoric has won a growing acceptance. For example, even the language-minority communities are impacted to choose structured English immersion programs as short cuts to learn English. Crawford points out "there is no question that parents of LEP students continue to feel strongly about the civil rights goals of bilingual education. Yet it is also clear that, in the 1990s, language minority communities are less vocal on its behalf than in the 1970s" (p. 9).
In addition, research shows different parental attitudes, both positive and negative, toward maintaining the heritage language of their children. For example, Soto (1997), shows through 30 home interviews with Puerto Rican families in eastern Pennsylvania, that parents of higher-achieving CLD children in grades K-2 preferred that their children have a native-language environment at home and at school to a greater extent than families of lower-achieving CLD students.

Further, in 1993, Malave's study on effective instruction for LEP students found that parents and administrators recognized the need for teachers to be aware of children's cultural differences and that parents regarded the use of their native language an effective part of bilingual instruction. However, Chavez and Amselle (1997) found that many Hispanic parents were not satisfied with the quality of bilingual education their children received. They complained about bilingual education teachers who could not speak English. These parents were tired of seeing their children go through the bilingual program and graduate without sufficient English skills to succeed in high school. These parents' perspectives helped researchers and educators better understand the problems existing in poorly implemented bilingual programs.

Parents' views on bilingual education, and media report, etc. have shown that the parents of CLD students have become more and more concerned about their child's education in the English-only schools. Meanwhile, they have more pressures in tutoring their children after school when their children are not helped in an alternative method program, that is, either bilingual programs or ESL. Parents also
have confused feelings regarding whether to choose English-only schools or bilingual programs for their children. Despite the confusion, many parents of CLD students recognize the value at a family and community level for their children to maintain knowledge of their heritage language. For example, some researchers found that parents of CLD students do not let the learning of English happen at the expense of losing the heritage language (Wong Fillmore, 1986). These parents are concerned that without the heritage language the family dynamics will be seriously disrupted. Parents' views about the value of heritage language instruction has become a valued research focus for educators interested in studying the efficacy of heritage language instruction.

A great amount of research evidence on parental perceptions of bilingual programs and the use of heritage language is largely concentrated in the regions where there is comparatively higher numbers of ethnic groups such as California, New York, etc. (Ovando & Collier, 1998). Little research has been done in smaller rural Midwest areas where CLD student numbers have grown in recent years. Schools in these Midwest states, such as Iowa, are mostly English-dominant in instructional programs and there is comparatively low concentrations of certain ethnic groups. But the impact of a growing diverse linguistic community, currently approximately 11,400 CLD students in Iowa’s public schools (Iowa Bureau of Refugee Services, 2000), has been reflected in the development of heritage language schools and classes. An inquiry of the parents' perceptions on maintaining the heritage language
of their children will help to better understand the reasons behind choosing to have their children receive heritage language instruction.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This chapter presents the research site and participants, data collection procedures, instruments, the theoretical foundations of conducting the qualitative inquiry, and the data analysis rationale used in exploring the parents' perceptions on maintaining the heritage language of their children.

Site and Participants

Heritage language schools and language classes in four Midwestern communities were chosen as the research sites. The participants were parents who chose to send their children either to receive heritage language instruction either in heritage language schools or heritage language classes. The heritage languages included Arabic, Chinese and Hebrew, and Spanish. Data of the Arabic language school was collected from a city with a population of 193,200; data of the Chinese language school were collected from a city with a population of 59,700; data of the Spanish language class were collected from a town with a population of 2,935, and data of the Hebrew language classes were collected from two language school sites: a city with a population of 66,500 and a city with a population of 59,700. The focus of this study is on parents whose native language is the heritage language being studied by their children. The parents who chose Hebrew heritage language school for their children were not native speakers of Hebrew. However, this heritage language group was included in this study in order to provide additional
insights and information on perceptions of heritage language learning and the role of heritage language when it is not a recent native language of the family.

The participants were analyzed as a group of heritage language speakers, and were also analyzed by language categories within specific interview and survey results.

Data Collection Procedures

The research is mainly qualitative, with the structured survey questionnaires and interview questions developed and adjusted based on both the research literature in surveys and pilot study of one ethnic group—parents from a Chinese language school in a city of about 34,300 in the Midwest. Firstly, the survey questionnaires were mailed out with the letter of transmittal (see Appendix A for the complete letter), gratitude postcards and stamped return-addressed envelope to the participants. A record of respondents was kept according to the returning postcards. In addition, each survey was uniquely coded to identify the respondent to the survey. This identification coding system enabled the researcher to analyze the results of the surveys in order to choose specific individuals for follow-up interviews. If the returning rate was lower than 70%, a follow-up letter was sent to those non-respondents, indicating the major items in the questionnaires that needed to be answered and reemphasizing the importance of this study and the importance of the subject’s contribution. Due to the fact that many CLD parents may be limited in the English language proficiency (based on the pilot study), a field visit to each language school was conducted so that the researcher could have better communications with the respondents with the aid of the language school teachers.
After the survey questions were analyzed, interviews were conducted as research in depth. At this stage, four interviewees from each language school were chosen, representing different social class and educational background. The interviews were recorded and transcribed.

**Instruments**

**Survey and Interview**

This study involved the use of two instruments, a survey followed by an interview with open-ended questions. The survey, designed originally from a pilot study of Chinese-speaking families in the Midwest, contained 13 questions designed to elicit parents’ responses to general information about their reasoning behind involving their children in heritage language instruction (see Appendix B for the complete text of the survey). The interview, also designed from the same pilot study of Chinese-speaking families in the Midwest, contained 5 open-ended questions that elicit parents’ beliefs, values, and rationales for heritage language instruction (see Appendix C for the complete text of the interview).

**Pilot Study**

The pilot study was conducted in March 1999, to the parents of Chinese children in a mid-western city with a population of 34,300. The participants were mostly scholars at a university or employees at a local large implement production company. These participants had chose to place their children in Chinese language classes sponsored by a local nonprofit community service organization. The researcher had witnessed the Chinese parents' struggles in maintaining their children's heritage language while living
in an English-dominant environment in the Midwest. The researcher had also participated in the community activities of the Chinese ethnic group, observing how the parents communicated with their children in real life situations. Furthermore, the researcher read extensively the survey-method, literature reviews and technical handouts provided by the instructors of the related fields.

The pilot study involved both a survey containing questions related to parents’ perceptions of heritage language use, and an interview that asked specific in-depth questions about the parents’ values and beliefs regarding the use of heritage language in various contexts. The set of survey questionnaires were developed and modified after discussing with a professor and with participants of a graduate level data inquiry class. During the discussions, each survey question was examined individually, focusing on the language structure, content of inquiry and organizational layout. After further modifications of the instrument were completed, the survey was administered to the Chinese parents with children participating in the heritage language classes. The interview questions were developed as an in-depth extension of the survey, and were analyzed in the same process as the survey questions. Interviews were given to parents of five Chinese families, representing different family backgrounds and educational levels. Families that participated in the interviews were as follows: a family with both parents working full-time, a family with only parent working full-time, and three families where the parents were students at the local university.

Answers to the survey questions were analyzed for clarity of questions and for appropriateness of the answer choices in terms of discrete qualities and range of options.
Minor modifications were made to the survey questions to reflect the analysis of clarity and appropriateness. The responses to the open-ended interview questions and prompts used to elicit respondents' answers were transcribed and analyzed for clarity of questions and for consistency in terms of non-intrusive non-leading question prompts. The transcripts were analyzed using a clustering-theme method (Silverman, 1997). The interview questions and prompts were modified after the pilot interview to reflect the analysis of clarity and consistency. For specific data and analysis of the pilot study, see the section labeled Pilot Study at the end of this chapter.

**Epistemological Basis**

The study adopts a qualitative approach, which emphasizes the character of "naturally-occurring data" (Silverman, 1997, p. 23). A qualitative approach is concerned more with inducing hypotheses from field research. One of the main features of qualitative study, as Silverman (1997) notes, is that the field research should be "theoretically-driven" because theories serve to provide "a set of explanatory concepts" which offer ways of looking at the world (p. 29). Silverman (1997) proposes three types of theories as fundamental for qualitative social researches: functionalism, behaviorism, and symbolic interactionism. Moreover, Silverman summarizes that the theory of functionalism seeks to observe "functions of social institutions;" the theory of behaviorism tends to define all behaviors in terms of "stimulus" and "response" (p. 1). In contrast, symbolic interactionism focuses on how we attach symbolic meanings to interpersonal relations. This inquiry uses symbolic interactionism theory proposed by
Silverman to examine what exists already in reality and what constitutes the “field,” the particular experience held by a certain group of population (p. 3).

**Methodology Rationale**

Methodology, together with theory, hypothesis and method, comprises the basic concept in research. Methodology refers to a general approach to studying research topics. An appropriate selection of the approach is essential in social research because it helps the researchers to establish the conceptual framework concerning how to conduct the studies about the problems in reality. This study uses a qualitative methodology, seeking to examine the perceptions particularly held by the parents of certain ethnic groups.

Qualitative methodology helps with experiencing and understanding what already exists in reality. Based on Kirk and Miller (1986), “qualitative research is a particular tradition in social science that fundamentally depends on watching people in their own territory” (cited in Silverman, 1997, p. 29). Eisner (1993) emphasized both experience in real life situations and understanding the meaning of these experiences as crucial in conducting qualitative inquiry. Eisner believed in the important role experience plays in constructing and understanding meanings from real life contexts. Eisner (1991) asserted, "neither science nor art can exist outside of experience, and experience requires a subject matter. That subject matter is qualitative" (p. 27). Eisner further declared, “experience is the bedrock upon which meaning is constructed and that experience in significant degree depends on our ability to get in touch with the qualitative world we inhabit” (Eisner, 1993, p. 5).
In addition, the critical objective of qualitative inquiry is to find out what is meaningful to measure and how to choose the medium to represent what is significant in the real world. Usually, it is “authenticity” that is underscored in qualitative research and the “aim of doing a qualitative research is to gather an ‘authentic’ understanding of people’s experiences” (Silverman, 1997, p. 10). According to Eisner (1993), “we do research to understand” and “…the eye is a part of the mind” (p. 10). Moreover, what is meaningful to measure should be the aim for conducting a qualitative inquiry (Silverman, 1997). In order to achieve the aim of performing a qualitative study, the medium one chooses to represent the events in the real world is essential, and so is the way to explain the field experience. Therefore, survey and interview are used in this study to maintain data as authentic as possible, since the medium available for the researcher helps represent the knowledge of the experience in the world. As Eisner asserted (1991), how the world is understood and how a phenomena is perceived are closely related to how they are represented.

In conclusion, in conducting qualitative research, ways of understanding and representing the events happening in reality are essential for the researchers to define a researchable problem (Dooley, 1995; Eisner, 1991, 1993; Silverman, 1997). This inquiry intended to find out why parents prefer the experience of sending their children to language schools and what type of experience in the field was important to these parents. Since theory comes partially from data and partially from speculations (Dooley, 1995) after collecting data from each language school, a serious thinking process was involved.
before completing the data analysis. Hence, data collection and speculations were considered crucial in this inquiry.

Two key factors are fundamental for the researchers in representing the events in the real world: the form of representation and the conceptual framework employed. First of all, this study used the following research methods to examine the parents' perceptions in maintaining the heritage language of their children: cross-sectional survey of the parents from four different ethnic groups, interviews with audio-recording and transcriptions of interview dialogues. The data textual analysis was mainly inductive and a cross-sectional constant comparative method of analysis was employed in the text analyses for understanding participants' categories of meanings for their experiences in the field. The survey responses were displayed in charts and interview transcripts were coded and clustered into groups of themes. The inquiry proposed to describe and compare the parents' perceptions of CLD students, to examine the possible meanings and motives behind these perceptions, to explore the reasons behind choices to send their children to the language schools, and to draw implications from these beliefs.

Firstly, surveys were used to find out what is out there already in reality, to learn about people's attitudes, beliefs, values, opinions, desires, ideas, and other types of information. A critical objective for the survey researcher is to present all respondents with questions that they interpret and understand in exactly the same way. In the survey questions of this inquiry, categories of large issues concerning parents' perceptions were reflected in the questions asked, together with the specific issues within the categories.
Secondly, the rationale for conducting interview research was explicitly stated by Cicourel (1964). On interview research:

There has been considerable work done in calling to the researcher's attention the pitfalls and remedies in this method. But, in spite of improvement in interview techniques, little has been done to integrate social science theory with methodology. The subtleties which methodologist introduce to the novice interviewer can be read as properties to be found in the interaction between members of a society. Thus, the principles of "good and bad interviewing" can be read as basic features of social interaction which the social scientist is presumably seeking to study. (pp. 67-68)

Eisner (1993) summarized six features of qualitative study: (a) field-focused, (b) the self as an instrument, (c) interpretive character, (d) the use of expressive language, (e) attention to particulars, and (f) multiple forms of evidence. These are the most fundamental features of the qualitative inquiry (Dooley, 1995; Eisner, 1993; Kirk & Miller, 1986; Silverman, 1997). The features of qualitative study are shown in this inquiry.

First of all, the pilot study employed a field-focused observation and interviews of the parents from the Chinese ethnic group gained entry into the real-life interactions and observing of what is happening authentically between the parents and children. As a part of a field focus, the qualitative study is usually nonmanipulative, which means the research is intended to study situations and objects intact in an authentic situation. The observation in the pilot study was largely authentic with the interviewer as participant-observer.

Secondly, the researcher maintained a sensitive attitude in the process of data collecting. It is agreed that how the researchers make things meaningful and seen by the
readers largely depend on what instruments they bring into the field. As Eisner (1991) emphasized, self has the important role as an instrument, involved in the situation and constructing meaning out of the situation. Therefore, the researcher's sensibility and perceptivity brought into the context are crucial instruments in collecting data especially for the on-site observations because, as Eisner further stressed, "the features that count in a setting do not wear their labels on their sleeves: they do not announce themselves" (p. 33). Hence, researchers must see what is to be seen, given some frame of reference and some set of intentions. In conducting this study, the survey questions and interview questions were framed out of the researcher's cultural awareness and sensitivity to the cultural differences. In addition, the inquiry used interviews and real-life observations from a pilot study of the interactions between the parents and children to increase the researcher's sensibility and perceptions of the experience held by the groups of population being studied. Taken all together, the purpose of the study was to bring forth the meaning of parents' experience and significance of the context—language school sites.

Thirdly, researchers examining the field experience need to have the ability to explain why something is taking place. Moreover, they are supposed to be more interested in motives and the quality of experience undergone by those in the situation studied. More specifically, they must know how to interpret those motives and experience beyond the surface level. As Silverman (1997) proposed, doing interpretation requires that the researchers have the following sensitivities borne in mind so as to avoid the biases: "historical, cultural, political, and contextual biases" (p. 6). Since this inquiry was
cross-cultural in nature, the cultural and contextual sensitivities were particularly addressed.

In order to increase the degree of sensitivities, this study also recorded interviews and used interview transcripts to find out the meaning beneath manifest behavior, that is, parents' choice of sending their children to the language classes.

Finally, the expressive language is the strength and hallmark of qualitative research (Eisner, 1991; Silverman, 1997). Good qualitative writing helps the reader experience the heat of the events described through the presence of voice and the expressive language. The expressive language involves the revelation of the researcher's empathy. Based on Eisner's belief, emotion and cognition go hand in hand to transform the events clearly via vivid language descriptions. The clear writing style is achieved through the expressive language use.

In this type of inquiry, the issue of validity was centered on multiple sources of evidence. For example, cross-cultural survey was used to increase the validity. According to Eisner (1991), what makes a research plausible is the power of persuasion based on multiple forms of research evidence. The validity of this study was achieved through the use of cross-sectional survey data analysis, references to the findings of the pilot study, interview texts analysis, and references to the literature based on the importance of parental involvement in children's learning. This combination of analyses provided the necessary multiple data types and sources. The following two features for qualitative study proposed by Eisner (1991) are considered as strategies to increase validity by the researcher in this inquiry: Attentions to particulars and multiple forms of evidence.
Strategies to Increase Validity

Attention to Particulars

Qualitative study attends to the particulars which add flavor to the situations and which make the situational events distinctive. This involves also the researcher's sensitivity to the specific features of the case, and the researcher's ability to explain those distinctive features of the context explicitly through text analysis. This study focused on how the particular perceptions of the parents from certain minority groups led to their certain actions in life and how these patterns of perceptions were revealed in the text analysis and how these perceptions impact their children in education.

Multiple Forms of Evidence

A qualitative study becomes believable through its multiple ways of persuasion. According to Eisner (1991), “humans have the capacity to formulate different kinds of understanding and that these understandings are intimately related to the forms of representation they encounter or employ and the way in which those forms are treated” (p. 9). This study provided observations from pilot study, surveys, and interviews transcripts as different forms of understanding and representation so as to increase the persuasive power of the evidence. What counts as being persuasive and believable in this study depends on the multiple ways of evidence, coherence of the case and the appropriateness in interpretation based on constant-comparative analysis method.

Data Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994) describe qualitative analysis as three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification.
Data reduction refers to the analytic decisions by the researcher including selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data from the field notes into themes or categories. Data display is organizing the information from the research and presenting it in a well-organized way so that conclusion can be drawn and verified in the conclusion stage. In this inquiry, the researcher applied these three flows of activity in combination and endeavored to make the data interpretation as objective as possible by reducing the subjective view via different ways. For example, the interview data were firstly recorded in the field and transcribed. Then, for categorizing data information into themes, the researcher used the constant-comparative method proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) to analyze the interview texts so that summary of categories could be drawn from the authentic data. This medium of analysis helped achieve the aim of qualitative study: maintain the data as naturally as possible.

There are several steps involved in performing the constant-comparative method. First of all, the researcher read through the original texts of transcripts very attentively. Then, the researcher focused on reading for the key words carefully, going back and forth constantly to observe what were the repeated key words and noted their occurrences in the texts. For instance, when the key words such as “religion,” “culture,” “heritage,” emerged several times, the researcher would use specific letters such as A, B, C, D, etc. to label them. Key words were then grouped by similar theme based on the context in which it was used, such as “maintaining cultural and religious heritage.” Letters were then assigned to words categorized within specific themes. In this inquiry, letter “A” was assigned to stand for the category of “maintaining cultural and religious heritage,” which
meant that the frequencies of this coded letter "A" were recorded as having high occurrences. If the frequency of "A" appeared low, then this theme was not clustered.

The same method was used to code and record other themes. When the data were collapsed into themes, then the other categories were summarized. Therefore, the constant-comparative method for analysis was employed to supervise the process of conducting cross-cultural analysis of the parents' perceptions from interviews so as to achieve the aim of maintaining the authenticity of data.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

Survey Data Analysis

The survey data were collected from four language groups of five language school sites in Iowa: Arabic Language School at a city with a population of 193,200, Chinese Language School at a city with a population of 59,700, Hebrew Language Schools from a city with a population of 66,500 and a city with a population of 59,700, and a Spanish Dual Language School Class at a town with a population of 2,935. The sample population was composed of 65 CLD students' parents who chose to send their child/children to language schools (see Table 1); among them, 18 (27%) were from the Arabic language group, 16 (24%) of the sample were from the Chinese language group, 21 (32%) were from the Hebrew language group, and 10 (15%) were from the Spanish language group (see Appendix C for the complete survey questionnaire).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Sample Population from Four Language Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, and Spanish are the names of language schools/classes respectively.
For the interview data, four parents were chosen as interviewees from each of the field's trip interview or chosen from the survey respondents (see Appendix D for the interview questions). The survey questionnaire was composed of 13 questions. Several main issues were discussed in the survey questions: The reason for the parents of the CLD students to maintain the heritage language of their children, the parents' attitudes toward the bilingual schools, and their motivating methods for tutoring their child/children to learn the heritage language.

Question 1, The person who is filling out this form is the child/children's: Out of 65 as the total sample, 41.5% answered "Mother"; 49.2% answered "Father"; 9.2% answered "Other." Question 2, Your highest education level is: 58.5% answered "college-graduate or beyond"; 23% answered "college--bachelors"; 18% answered "high school." 0% answered "elementary (up to eighth grade)." Question 3, In your home, do you speak the heritage language your child/children is/are learning at language schools? The answers are as follows: 35.4% answered "Yes"; 36.9% answered "No"; 22% answered "Sometimes"; and 6.2% answered "Other." Question 4, Which of the following best suits your situation in U.S.: 10.9% answered "I stay as a foreign student planning not to return to the native country"; 3% answered "I stay as a foreign student planning to return to the native country"; 43% answered "I stay as an employee in U.S."; and 42% answered "Other (specify): the following were the answers found for this part: American citizen, born in U.S., have been living in U.S. for more years, immigrant, house wife." Question 5, At home, how much of your communication with your child is in the heritage
language? Seventeen percent answered "All of it"; 32% answered "Most of it"; 23% answered "Only for special occasions"; and 28% answered "Other (Specify)."

Question 6, How important is your child/children's heritage language learning to his/her overall academic performance in regular English school? Sixty percent answered "Very important or important"; 23% answered "Not really important"; and 12% answered "Not important at all." Question 7, In the heritage language learning class your child/children attend(s), what of the following does your child/children learn? Eight percent answered "Speaking"; 3% answered "Reading"; 6% answered "Writing"; 83% answered "All that apply: Speaking, Reading and Writing altogether." Question 8, How often do you actually teach your child/children heritage at home weekly? Thirty-nine percent answered "1-5 hours"; 8% answered "Beyond 5 hours"; 29% answered "Not regularly"; and 25% answered "Never." Question 9, For my child/children to be academically successful, the best school in U.S. would be: 35% answered "Bilingual school (instruction taught both in heritage language and in English)"; 31% answered "English school with extra instruction using heritage language"; 23% answered "English school only"; and 11% answered "Other (specify: one respondent answered Arabic school only)." Question 10, I use the heritage language to talk to my child/children at home mostly for: 5% answered "Stories"; 11% answered "Family background"; 22% answered "Moral values"; and 62% answered "Other (Specify: all that apply; stories, family background, and moral values and discipline)." Question 11, When my child/children speak(s) to me in English, I: 11% answered "In heritage language"; 39% answered "In English"; 17% answered "Remind them to use heritage language"; and 31% answered
"Answer in either English or heritage language." Question 12, What is the biggest obstacle for you to help your child/children maintain heritage language? Six percent answered "No community support"; 47% answered "Lack of language-use situations"; 24% answered "Insufficient time for tutoring"; and 18% answered "Other, the following were some of the answers to this part: this doesn't apply to me; I stayed at work most of the time; to have a special school teaching both English and Arabic language, etc."

Question 13, My child/children must learn to study heritage language in order to be academically successful in English school. Twenty percent answered "Strongly agree"; 25% answered "Agree"; 48% answered "Disagree"; and 8% answered "Other, the following were among the answers to this part: to keep stand with his religion and culture and tradition home; the importance of Arabic is beyond importance."

The whole survey results from the four language groups are displayed in the following table named as Table 2. Since there are four choices for each survey question; therefore, the four choices are represented as the following: Table 2a, Table 2b, Table 2c, and Table 2d.
### Table 2a

**Survey Results From Four Language Groups – A Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Arabic represents Arabic Language School, Chinese represents Chinese Language School, Hebrew represents Hebrew Language Schools, and Spanish represents Spanish Dual Language School/Class.
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### Table 2b

**Survey Results From Four Language Groups – B Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Arabic represents Arabic Language School, Chinese represents Chinese Language School, Hebrew represents Hebrew Language Schools, and Spanish represents Spanish Dual Language School/Class.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Arabic represents Arabic Language School, Chinese represents Chinese Language School, Hebrew represents Hebrew Language Schools, and Spanish represents Spanish Dual Language School/Class.
Table 2d

Survey Results From Four Language Groups – D Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Arabic represents Arabic Language School, Chinese represents Chinese Language School, Hebrew represents Hebrew Language Schools, and Spanish represents Spanish Dual Language School/Class.
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Individual Language Group Description

Arabic language group. For the Arabic language group, out of 18 as the total sample surveyed, 11% were mothers; 89% were fathers. In terms of the education level of the parents, 50% had the education of “college-graduate or beyond”; 33% were undergraduates; with 16.7% obtaining the education level of “elementary (up to eighth grade).” When asked about whether the parents speak Arabic with their children at home, 44% answered “Yes”; 33% answered “No”; with 22% saying “Sometimes.”

As for the social status of the parents surveyed in Question 4, 55.6% were staying in U.S. as employees; 27.8% were as citizens, immigrants; 11% were as foreign students planning to return to the native country; with 5.6% staying as foreign students planning not to return to the native country.

For the amount of oral Arabic language use at home addressed in Question 5, 33% used all of it; 28% used most of it; 22% gave other explanations; with 16.7% using it only for special occasions. For the importance of Arabic language learning to the overall academic performance of their children in regular English school addressed in Question 6, 50% answered as “Very important”; 33% answered as “Important”; 11% answered “Not really important”; with nobody answering “Not important at all.”

As for the question of the ideal school for their children as addressed in Question 9, 55.6% preferred “Bilingual school (instruction taught both in Arabic language and in English)”; 22.2% preferred “English school with extra instruction using Arabic language”; 11% preferred “English school only”; with 11% choosing other options.
The reasons why the parents use Arabic at home mostly to talk to their children addressed in Question 10 were as the following: 16.7% answered for "Family background"; 38.9% for "Moral values"; and 44.4% answered "Other (all that apply: stories, family background, moral values and discipline)." Question 11, "When my child/children speak(s) to me in English, I: 22.2% answered "In heritage language"; 22.2% answered "In English"; 27.8% answered "Remind them to use Arabic language"; and 27.8% answered "Answer in either English or Arabic."

The biggest obstacle for the parents to help their children maintain Arabic addressed in Question 12, 11% answered "No community support"; 22.2% answered "Lack of language-use situations"; 44.4% answered "Insufficient time for tutoring"; and 22.2% answered "Other (at work all day)." The attitude of the parents toward the effect of the Arabic language on the academic success of their children in English school is tapped in Question 13: "My child/children must learn to study heritage language in order to be academically successful in English school." For this question, 38.9% answered "Strongly agree"; 22.2% "Agree"; 22.2% "Disagree"; with 16.7% answering "Other: religion, culture and tradition."

Chinese language group. For the Chinese language group, of all those 16 who were surveyed, 62% were mothers; 37% were fathers. In terms of the education level of the parents, 93% had the education level of graduates, with 6% as undergraduates. When asked about whether the parents speak Chinese with their children at home, 68% said "Yes," with 25% saying they spoke Chinese at home sometimes. Question 5 asked how much of the parents' speech with their children at home is in Chinese. For this question,
81% used most of the Chinese to communicate with their children at home, with 12% using all of the Chinese to talk to their children. For the importance of Chinese language learning to the overall academic performance of their children in regular English school addressed in Question 6, 50% answered as “Important”; 18% answered as “Very important”; 25% answered as “Not really important”; with 6% answering “Not important at all.”

As for the question of the ideal school for their children as addressed in Question 9, 37% preferred an English school with extra instruction using Chinese; 31% preferred an English school only; 25% preferred a bilingual school (instruction taught both in Chinese and in English), with 6% choosing other options.

As for the social status of the parents surveyed in Question 4, 75% were staying in U.S. as the employee, with 12% staying as students planning not to return to their native country and 12% as students planning to return to their native country.

The reasons why the parents use Chinese at home mostly to talk to their children are addressed in Question 10. Six percent answered for “Stories”; 25% answered for “Family background”; 25% answered for “Moral values and disciple”; 43% answered for “All of the above.” Question 11, “When my child/children speak(s) to me in English other than Chinese, I” For this question, 18% answered “Remind them to use Chinese”; 75% answered “Answer in either English or Chinese.”

The biggest obstacle for the parents to help their children maintain Chinese addressed in Question 12, 50% answered “Lack of language-use situations”; 37% answered “Insufficient time for tutoring”; with 6% saying “No community support.” The
attitude of the parents toward the effect of the Chinese language on the academic success of their children in English school is addressed in Question 13: “My child/children must learn to study the Chinese language in order to be academically successful in English school.” The answers to this question were as the following: 12% “Strongly agree”; 43% “Agree”; with 43% choosing “Disagree.”

Hebrew language group. For the Hebrew language group, Question 1, The person who is filling out this form is the child/children's: Out of 21 as the total sample, 38.1% answered "Mother"; 38.1% answered "Father"; 23.8% answered "Other." Question 2, Your highest education level is: 66.7% answered "college—graduate or beyond"; 19% answered "college—bachelors"; 9.5% answered "high school"; 4.8% answered "elementary (up to eighth grade)." Question 3, In your home, do you speak Hebrew your child/children is/are learning at language schools? 0 answered "Yes"; 71.4% answered "No"; 14.3% answered "Sometimes"; and 14.3% answered "Other." Question 4, Which of the following best suits your situation in U.S: 4.8% answered "I stay as a foreign student planning not to return to the native country"; 0 answered "I stay as a foreign student planning to return to the native country"; 23.8% answered "I stay as an employee in U.S."; and 71% answered "Other (specify)." Question 5, At home, how much of your communication with your child is in the heritage language? For this question, 0 answered "All of it"; 4.8% answered "Most of it"; 52.4% answered "Only for special occasions"; 42.9% answered "Other (Specify)."

Question 6, How important is your child/children's Hebrew language learning to his/her overall academic performance in regular English school? The answers are: 23.8%
answered "Very important"; 14.3% answered "Important"; 23.8% answered "Not really important"; and 28.6% answered "Not important at all." Question 7, In the Hebrew learning class your child/children attend(s), what of the following does your child/children learn? For this question, 0 answered "Speaking"; 9.5% answered "Reading"; 4.8% answered "Writing"; 85.7% answered "All that apply: Speaking, Reading and Writing altogether." Question 8, How often do you actually teach your child/children Hebrew at home weekly? For this question, 33.3% answered "1-5 hours"; 4.8% answered "Beyond 5 hours"; 38.1% answered "Not regularly"; and 23.8% answered "Never." Question 9, For my child/children to be academically successful, the best school in U.S. would be: 19% answered "Bilingual school (instruction taught both in Hebrew and in English)"; 33.3% answered "English school with extra instruction using Hebrew"; 38.1% answered "English school only"; and 9.5% answered "Other (specify)." Question 10, I use Hebrew to talk to my child/children at home mostly for: 9.5% answered "Stories"; 0 answered "Family background"; 9.5% answered "Moral values and discipline"; and 81% answered "Other (all that apply: family background, moral values and discipline, stories)." Question 11, When my child/children speak(s) to me in English, I: 14.3% answered "In Hebrew"; 81% answered "In English"; 0% answered "Remind them to use Hebrew"; and 0% answered "Answer in either English or Hebrew." Question 12, What is the biggest obstacle for you to help your child/children maintain Hebrew? The answers are: 4.8% answered "No community support"; 66.7% answered "Lack of language-use situations"; 4.8% answered "Insufficient time for tutoring"; and 14.3% answered "Other." Question 13, My child/children must learn to study Hebrew in order to
be academically successful in English school, 4.8% answered "Strongly agree"; 19% answered "Agree"; 76.2% answered "Disagree"; and 0% answered "Other."

**Spanish language group.** For the Spanish language group, of all those 10 respondents who were surveyed, 70% were mothers; 20% were fathers; 10% chose "other: relatives or siblings." In terms of the education level of the parents, 40% had the education level of college—bachelors; 60% had the education level of high school; with 0% as "elementary (up to eighth grade)" or "college--graduate or beyond." When asked about whether the parents speak Spanish with their children at home, 40% answered "Yes"; 30% answered "No"; 30% answered "Sometimes." Question 4 addressed their legal status in U.S. For this question, 33% of the respondents answered their status were foreign students planning not to return to their native country; with 0% answering they were foreign students planning to return to the native country. As for the employee status, 11% answered "Yes"; with 55% answering "Other (specify: the American citizens; immigrants; native born)." Question 5 asked how much of the parents' communication with their children at home is in the heritage language, Spanish. Thirty percent used all of Spanish to talk to their children, with 20% using most of the Spanish and 10% speaking Spanish only for special occasions; 40% chose "Other (Specify)." For the importance of Spanish language learning to the overall academic performance of their children in regular English school addressed in Question 6, 40% answered "Very important"; 10% answered as "Important"; 40% answered as "Not really important"; with 10% answering "Not important at all."
As for the question of the ideal school for their children as addressed in Question 9, 50% preferred “Bilingual school (instruction taught both in Spanish and in English)”; 30% preferred “English school with extra instruction using Spanish”; 20% answered "Other (specify)"; with 0% choosing “English school only.”

The reason why the parents use Spanish at home mostly to talk to their children was addressed in Question 10: 89% answered “Other: stories, family background, moral values and discipline, kitchen talk”; with 11% choosing for “Moral values.” Question 11, "When my child/children speak(s) to me in English, I: 0 answered "In Spanish language"; 40% answered “In English”; 30% answered “Remind them to use Spanish”; and 30% answered “Answer in either English or Spanish.”

The biggest obstacle for the parents to help their children maintain Spanish addressed in Question 12, 50% answered “Lack of language-use situations”; 10% answered “Insufficient time for tutoring”; with nobody saying “No community support”; and 40% answered “Other (at work all day).” The attitude of the parents toward the effect of the Spanish language on the academic success of their children in English school is tapped in Question 13: "My child/children must learn to study Spanish language in order to be academically successful in English school." The answers were as the following: 30% “Strongly agree”; 10% “Agree”; 40% “Disagree”; with 20% choosing “Other.”

Comparison Across Language Groups

As it is known, inferential statistics consist of techniques that allow researchers to study samples and then make generalizations about the populations from which they were selected. According to Gravetter and Wallnau (1996), inferential statistics are a necessary
part of making assumptions throughout surveys and interviews. The following perceptions of the CLD students’ parents are outlined based on the survey sample results collected.

**Oral heritage language use at home.** Generally speaking, the perceptions of the CLD parents on maintaining their children’s heritage language, based on the data, were different across the language groups according to the question answered. The oral heritage language used for communications with their children at home as the main method to maintain their heritage language proficiency was different. This difference was shown through the answers to Question 3 which addressed whether the parents would use the heritage language orally at home with their child/children. The two language groups that used their heritage language most often at home to communicate with their child/children were the Chinese language group and the Arabic language group. From the data, the 11 people who stated they used mostly Chinese to talk to their child/children at home comprises 68% of the total sample of 16 respondents, with 25% of those saying they used it sometimes. The 8 people out of 18 from the Arabic language group who chose to speak Arabic to their child/children at home were 44% of the total respondents, with 22% of those saying they only used it sometimes. As for the Spanish language group, 40% of those expressed they would speak Spanish at home with their child/children while 30% answered they only used it sometimes. In contrast, 71% respondents from the Hebrew language group answered they would not speak Hebrew at home with their child/children.
**Amount of heritage language use.** The amount of heritage language use for communication at home was different among the four language groups. The Chinese language group ranked as the first in the amount of the heritage language use for communicating between the parents and the children at home in comparison to the other groups. For example, almost 90% of the Chinese respondents (15 out of the 16) claimed they would use mostly Chinese to communicate with their child/children at home. The Arabic language group ranked as the second, with 61% of the respondents saying they kept using Arabic to communicate with their child/children at home most of the time. The Spanish language group came as the third, with 50% of the respondents answering they maintained their child/children's speaking Spanish at home. For the Hebrew language group, 52% of those surveyed said they only used Hebrew for special religious occasions, not for oral communication.

**Attitudes toward the heritage language learning.** The attitudes were various among the parents surveyed toward the importance of maintaining the heritage language for the benefits of academic learning in the English school. In answering this question, again, both the Chinese group and the Arabic group showed positive attitudes. In the Chinese language group, the majority of the Chinese-speaking parents believed it as very important or important (11 out of 16 chose important or very important, comprising 68% of the total) to maintain the heritage language learning of their child/children for the benefits of the academic performances in regular English schools. For the Arabic language group, nearly 83% of the total respondents considered it important. In the Spanish language group, 50% of the respondents chose important or very important as
their answers, which was in contrast to another 50% of the respondents thinking the heritage language for academics as not really important. However, the attitudes expressed by the Hebrew language group of parents were different from those mentioned above. For them, 38% of the parents thought it as important with 52.4% assuming it not really important.

In addition, the attitudes toward heritage learning for academic success in English school for their child/children were different across the language group. Almost 54% of the parents from the Chinese language group agreed or strongly agreed that it was important, while 43% of those disagreed. Similar to the Chinese language group, 60% of those from the Arabic language group chose “Agree” or “Strongly agree,” with 22% selecting “Disagree.” For the Spanish language group, 40% chose “Agree” or “Strongly agree” while 40% chose “Disagree,” with 20% writing more explanations as answers to this question. Conversely, 76% of those from the Hebrew language group disagreed that their Hebrew was important for academic success, with only 19% agreeing. For this language group, Hebrew learning was mainly for maintaining their religion.

Opinions about the ideal school. The opinions of the respondents toward the ideal schools for their child/children were various across the language group. Twenty-five percent of those parents from the Chinese language group chose bilingual school as ideal for their child/children; 37% select English school with extra instruction using Chinese language. This data result of 62% showed the majority of the Chinese parents tended to hold a strong positive attitude in maintaining their child/children’s Chinese either through bilingual education or extra Chinese class. As for the Spanish language group, 50% of
those preferred bilingual schools, with 30% favoring English school with extra
instruction using Spanish. Altogether 80% of the parents surveyed preferred Spanish
language maintenance either through bilingual program or extra Spanish class teaching.
Among the parents from the Arabic language group, 55% chose bilingual school, with
22% favoring English school with extra instruction using Arabic. That is, 74% of the
parents surveyed preferred the Arabic language learning. It was evident from the data
showed above that the majority of these three language groups favored heritage language
maintenance.

In contrast, the Hebrew language group showed 38% favoring English school
only, 33% selecting English school with extra instruction using Hebrew, with only 19%
preferring bilingual school as the ideal school for their child/children.

The respondents’ choices among bilingual school, English school with extra
instruction using heritage language and regular English-only school were closely linked
to their positive perceptions on maintaining the heritage language of their child/children.
As the data reflected, those parents who held the views that heritage language learning
was connected to the academic performance of their child/children in regular English
school tended to choose as the ideal school bilingual schools or English schools with
extra instruction using the heritage language. For example, among the 11 respondents
from the Chinese language group who chose learning heritage language as important or
very important to the academic performance in the regular English school, 64% (7 out of
11) respondents chose bilingual school or English school with extra instruction using
heritage language as the ideal schools for their child/children. From the Spanish language
group, among those who chose as important, 80% (4 out of 5) selected bilingual school as the ideal school with 20% choosing English school with extra instruction using heritage language. For the Arabic language group, there were 15 respondents who chose as important (15 out of 18). Among them, 60% (9 out of 15) chose bilingual school, 26% (4 out of 15) chose English school with extra instruction using heritage language. From the Hebrew language group, 8 people from this group (8 out of 21) chose as important. Among them, 25% (2 out of 8) chose bilingual school, 62% (5 out of 8) opted English with extra instruction using heritage language.

**Purpose for heritage language use at home.** Interestingly, the purposes for using heritage language at home to communicate with their child/children were quite similar between the Spanish language group and the Hebrew language group, and between the Chinese language group and Arabic language group. For example, 88% from the Spanish language group and 81% from the Hebrew language group stated they used heritage language at home for stories, family background, moral values and discipline, or all these were applied. In comparison, from the Chinese language group, 25% of the respondents chose family background; 25% chose moral values and discipline, with 43% selecting all that apply: stories, family background, moral values and discipline. As for the Arabic language group, 16% of the respondents chose for family background mainly, 38.9% selected for moral values and discipline, with 44% of those chose all that apply: stories, family background, moral values and discipline, or for keeping culture and religion.

**Obstacles of maintaining heritage language.** Concerning about the obstacles of maintaining the heritage language of their child/children, most of the respondents, that is,
50% from the Chinese language group, 50% from the Spanish language group, 66.7% from the Hebrew language group agreed that lack of language environment was the main obstacle. In addition, insufficient tutoring time was another chief reason. For example, 37% of the parents from the Chinese language group and 44% of the parents from the Arabic language group answered that they did not have enough time to tutor their child/children at home on heritage language learning.

**Interview Analysis**

Four parents of the CLD students were chosen from each language group as the interviewees. However, the process of choosing the interviewees was unexpectedly difficult. First of all, the researcher tried hard to use a coding method to choose the interviewees according to their educational backgrounds and different responses to the questions addressed in the survey questionnaire, but failed to obtain the data twice because of the complexity of privacy issues involved with various language groups. In addition, many respondents were unwilling to reveal their real names in the answering cards which made the coding difficult to trace. In spite of the difficulties, the researcher, however, connected to the head of each language school and made every effort through field trips to each of the four language schools to establish a group of four interviewees as a follow up to the survey.

At the Chinese language school, the parents were interviewed in the company of the language school principal, Mr. B, in one of the mid-western cities. The researcher also visited the Arabic language school in the capital of Iowa at the time when the parents were waiting for their children outside the language classrooms. Four parents were
interviewed with the help of the school principal, Mr. M. At the site, the Arabic language parents (mothers, especially) were more cautious regarding signing the interview form until the school principal explained everything to them clearly in their own language.

The researcher visited two Hebrew language schools from the two mid-western cities. For the Spanish language class, the researcher visited a school west of the Iowa State University. The interviewees were introduced to the researcher by Mrs. M, a teacher from the school, after the parent-teacher conference at the dual language class. Even with the introduction of the teacher, some parents were still very reluctant to be interviewed due to some unspoken reasons and the fact that some of them could not speak English well themselves.

The interview questionnaires were designed to elicit the main reasons for sending their children to the language school, what observed benefits they saw of their children learning the heritage languages, what were the motivating strategies that the parents used to help maintain the heritage language of their children, and if parents could obtain community support to help with their intention to keep their heritage languages (see Appendix C for interview questions).

Based on the data from the transcriptions, the parents of the CLD students who were chosen as the interviewees from the four language schools explained the reasons why they wanted to send their children to language school. Reasons were mentioned such as for maintaining the cultural and religious heritage, strengthening family ties and promoting bilingual skills for better future job opportunities. In addition, they expressed their willingness in the involvement of the heritage language learning of their children,
their motivating strategies used at home for tutoring, and their concerns over the various
issues surrounding their children's heritage language learning.

Cross Language Group Discussion

Heritage language has played a vital role across the four language groups, linking
the CLD population to their past, connecting them to the present community, and helping
them to be able to strive for a better future for their children. These roles of the heritage
language were expressed in the interviews and best summarized based on the transcripts
through using the constant comparative method:

1. Maintaining cultural and religious heritage by sending CLD students to
language class regularly.

2. Strengthening family ties and family moral values.

3. Keeping connections to their own cultural and language communities.

4. Promoting bilingual skills for better job opportunities (see Table 3 for these
Categories).

Table 3 is the thematic category occurrences summarized from interview text
analysis. The categorized items are formed based on the frequency of the key words in
the interview. Table 4 is the number of category occurrences across the four language
groups. The number of occurrences are counted according to the key words' occurrences.
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Table 3

**Thematic Category Occurrences From Interview Text Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter and original category name</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in the data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Maintaining cultural and religious heritage</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Strengthening family ties and family moral values</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Keeping connections to their own cultural and language communities</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Promoting bilingual skills for better job opportunities</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Cognitive benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Open to other cultures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Parents' hope</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

**Number Of Category Occurrences Across the Language Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Letters A, B, C, and D represent the thematic categories in Table 3.*
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Defining the Labeling Categories

The process of defining the labeling categories as outlined above was based on the constant comparative method. For instance, the first category as “maintaining cultural and religious heritage by sending CLD students to language class” was the result of the repeated occurrences of word codes such as “culture,” “religion,” “heritage,” “reading stories,” or “native root.” The interviewees from the Arabic or Hebrew language groups used the words such as “our Koran,” “our Bible,” “prayers,” “worship” more frequently while the interviewees from the Spanish and the Chinese language groups used the words “culture” and “root” more. Since no specific traditional religions were defined or used by the interviewees from the Chinese language group, it was shown through the interview that they tended to regard their ancient culture and ideology such as Taoism as their faith. Therefore, their use of the word codes such as “our root” or “our ancient classic heritage” were all collapsed into the first category as “maintaining cultural and religious heritage by sending CLD students to language class.” The same method was used for the rest of the categories.

The second labeling category, “Strengthening family ties and family moral values,” was summarized based on the frequent occurrences of word codes such as “talking to the grandparents,” “visiting the relatives in the home country,” “teaching children about family principles” or “disciplining children.” These word codes were summed up under the title of “strengthening family ties and family moral values.” The third labeling category as “keeping connections to their own cultural and language
"communities" was collapsed according to the word codes such as "talking to the others in the community," "speaking in the local stores," "understanding the communications."

Finally, the fourth category, "Promoting bilingual skills for better job opportunities," was summed up by the repeated word codes such as "better jobs," "speaking two languages," "learning the heritage for the better future," and "more skills."

In brief, these four labeling categories came into being as a result of collapsing the repeated word codes.

**Maintaining cultural and religious heritage.** The heritage cultural maintenance and religious beliefs were the topics for most of the parents interviewed. During the interview, the words *culture* and *religion* were frequently mentioned by the CLD parents. For them, their culture and religion are closely connected, together serving as the bridge to link them and their children to their past, to their origins, and to their roots in the native country. Also, most of the parents showed strong concern about the possibility that their kids' being exposed to the American culture and English-speaking environment, might lose their own native culture heritage and respective religious beliefs. Therefore, most of the parents tried to communicate with their children as much as they could by speaking in heritage language at home with only the Hebrew language group as the exception.

For certain language groups, religion is their culture and their culture is best represented in their religion, such as Islam. For the Arabic language group, Islam is the essence of their cultural heritage. The parents put religion as the top reason for maintaining their children's heritage language. Religion was always the theme for each respondent. The parents interviewed from the Arabic language school were more
concerned with their children being able to read Koran Bible and pray. For example, Mr. S said, "I will be very very concerned if my children never learn Arabic because they will not be able to pray right." He explained why it is so important for the religion by noting, "First, we require every Muslim to read Arabic with very good accent because Koran is read in Arabic language. You see Muslims, when the Muslims pray, they pray in Arabic language..." Mr. S has three children who have graduated from the Arabic language school. For Mr. S, he believes that having the children become bilingual when they are still young is very important and he considers it as "handicapped" if a child does not know two languages.

Another interviewee, Mr. D said he would be mad if his kids should forget about his family root and family values. He emphasized: "...because in the Koran, the kids must obey their parents. We don't have in our culture, you know, these issues, for example, if someone gets 18 years old, 19 or 21, and he get kicked out, and we don't have this, you know. "There is no English at my home; we all speak Arabic at home," added Mr. D. We keep our children ever, ever, even though there is no difference in age, you know." Mr. D had three children and all of them were in the language school. Mr. D wanted his children to obey the parents and be well-disciplined, not like some of the American kids who have too much freedom to sin, according to Mr. D. Moreover, Mr. D expressed that in order to maintain his children good Arabic language skills, he and his wife would send their children occasionally back to their home country to learn Arabic for a while.
For the Chinese parents, the main concern expressed was that if kids did not learn the Chinese when they were young, they might lose it when they grew up. For the elder parents, the ancient Chinese thoughts and ideologies were believed as the essence of their heritage culture. In order to maintain the cultural heritage, most of the Chinese parents mentioned bedtime story telling as the chief way of communicating with their children. In addition, they emphasized the importance of understanding ancient stories, cultural roots, being able to read classic poetry during the interviews. One parent, Mr. C said, "I read some interesting stories to my child and discuss with them... This way it is easier for us to keep them the language." Mr. F added, "we Chinese are called the descendants of Emperors Yan and Huang, it is important to maintain our cultural heritage....Therefore, for whatever reasons, we cannot forget our language...even if they were born in the United States, or even they grow up and find jobs in U.S, but they are so closely connected to the ancestors in so many ways..." Mr.F continued, "...in comparison with other kids, we are Chinese and they [kids] should learn Chinese."

For the Spanish language group, three interviewees mentioned keeping their culture as important for sending their children to the Spanish-language class. For example, when asking what are the main reasons for choosing to send the child/children to the Spanish class, Mr. R said, "...for keeping the language...for keeping family ties...I pretty much want to keep family ties...in the Spanish population we have close families."

Mr. R also stressed that he would be mad if his kids forgot the Spanish language. When asking why he would feel mad, he stated, "because they won't want to keep their culture;
they will forget their culture." Two other parents interviewed emphasized that they actually talked to their children in Spanish at home.

For the Hebrew language group, Judaism is the center of their life and Hebrew language serves as the key for holding all the Jewish people together. Judaism, as the parents claimed, is a family-orientated religion; therefore, the Jewish parents tried very best to educate their children according to Torah. For the Jewish people, they strongly believe that everything begins in the family. One parent said, "...The most important sanctuary in Judaism is the home, not at the church time. The most important sanctuary is your home..." Those who are able to read Torah with beautiful accent and able to pray in Hebrew are highly respected by the Jewish community. For example, Mr. S said, "the Jewish people always pray in Hebrew no matter where they are worshiping God around the world... Hebrew is the universal language of prayer in all the synagogues around the world. " One parent pointed out at the prayer book, saying that it is written in two languages, a real bilingual prayer book. For example, he explained, “if you go to Germany, the prayer book is written in both Hebrew and German.” In addition, this parent emphasized that Hebrew is the language that could best unite the Jewish people and remind them of the past. He explained "One of the things that hold us together as a people internationally world is the language."

The parents of the Hebrew language group being interviewed highly valued their children’s Hebrew learning. They believe that the importance of knowing Hebrew can better unite the Jewish people and also essentially important for their faith growth. As Mrs. T put, "...the most important is...the worship is done in Hebrew, and it's hard to
follow along in the worship service if you don't understand the language..." Mrs. T also reiterated that she would be very concerned if her children should not follow the Ten Commandments in the Bible.

**Strengthening family ties and family moral values.** Two language groups have the highest occurrences for this category: Chinese language group and the Arabic language group. One parent from the Chinese language group said, “I believe when kids learn Chinese, it benefits their thinking and they also learn ethics, moral principles of the family via the heritage language...” (Mr.C). Another parent emphasized, “I will be greatly disappointed if they cannot talk in Chinese to their grandparents in China!” (Mrs. F). In addition, Mr. S said, “most Chinese parents have noticed that if their kids have learned Chinese, they keep a better communication with their parents and a closer tie to the family, too.”

One father from the Arabic language group said that they wanted to keep connected with Islam and that having kids learn Arabic was more related to the culture and visiting their relatives when they go back home. “I like my kids to learn Arabic good and be fluent so when they go back home they are not handicapped for communication,” said Mr. S. Other parents also mentioned that they wanted their children to be able to connect to their ancestors via speaking Arabic.

**Keeping connections to their own cultural and language communities.** The Spanish language group interviewees expressed the importance of mutual communication among the local Spanish communities. For the Spanish language group, there was a comparatively larger Hispanic population in the area visited by the researcher. Hence, the
local community had more support organizations such as churches, public libraries where the Spanish-speaking people could communicate more in their heritage language when attending various events held by these support organizations. For example, people usually speak Spanish at stores run by the Spanish-speakers, attend church services in Spanish and go to the public library to check out books, journals and magazines written in Spanish. In addition, both the school and the church offer bilingual Spanish/English classes, which make this group more privileged than other language groups. In fact, the situational use of the heritage language is more frequent than that of other language groups. One father, Mr. R. said, "We use 90% Spanish to communicate with our children..." He also emphasized that if his children spoke English at home to answer him, he would be unhappy with them. He said, "...I get argue with them...they have to answer in Spanish." He said he would be mad if his children should forget their home culture. Another mother said, "...because it will be hard to keep family ties if only my child learn English language, then it is harder for the child to go home to the grandma..."

The parents of the Spanish language group also attend to the social life of their child/children in their local community, such as making friends, maintaining their customs and their friendship among the people. One mother said, "...my child has friends that do not speak English, so he can talk to his friends at school in Spanish...and he can teach other Anglo kids the language and they can teach him their language..."

Promoting bilingual skills for better job opportunities. Generally speaking, the parents from each of the language group believe that bilingual speakers will remain more competitive in job choices. For example, most Chinese parents were more concerned
about future job choices of their children. In the interview, almost four Chinese parents mentioned the importance of keeping their child/children bilingual so that they may have more job choices in future. "I think it is good to learn Chinese because in future my kids can have more choices in job hunting." (said Mrs. S, one of the woman interviewees). Another Chinese parent Mr. S said, “...we want our kids to learn Chinese well and we push them to learn more.”

Most of the interviewees expressed their desire of keeping their children bilingual at an early age so that when they grow up they can have better job opportunities. "...I think the kids' attitudes learning in another language when they are five or six years old, so that they are very open-minded about it, so they will learn it really easily..." said Ms. A. "...and with my child, I want him learn both languages. It is hard; it is hard only learning one language. It is better to know two more languages," said Ms. F.

The four interviewees from the Spanish language group claimed the fact that they gave regular Spanish tutoring lessons to their children at home. When asking about why he wanted to teach his children Spanish at home, Mr. J said, "because it is better for them, you know, in future, they can speak two languages and they will have a lot of better opportunities. So it is better for them to learn both languages."

Individual Language Group Discussion

Among the 30 occurrences for maintaining cultural and religious heritage, both Arabic and Hebrew language groups emphasized more on the topics of maintaining their own religions. For strengthening family ties and family moral values, among the 14 occurrences mentioning this topic, Chinese and Arabic language groups ranked as the
highest two groups. Concerning keeping connections to their own cultural and language communities, among the 16 occurrences, Spanish language group took a further lead than any other language groups, with 9 occurrences. In terms of promoting bilingual skills for better job opportunities, among the 26 occurrences, Spanish language group ranked as the first, with 12; next was the Chinese language group, with 8. Noticeably, the parents from these two language groups focused more on their children’s bilingual skills for job hunting in future.

**Arabic language group.** The parents as interviewees from the Arabic language group expressed the importance of maintaining the Muslim religion and children's mutual communication between the younger generation and the elder generation in the family through speaking Arabic as much as they could at home. They put religion as the top reason for maintaining their children's heritage language. Religion was the theme for each respondent. For example, Mr. S said, "I will be very very concerned if my children never learn Arabic because they will not be able to pray right." He explained why it is so important for the religion by noting, "First, we require every Muslims to read Arabic with very good accent because Koran is read in Arabic language. You see Muslims, when the Muslims pray, they pray in Arabic language..."

The four interviewees from the Arabic group emphasized the following points as important reasons for maintaining their children Arabic:

1. Reading Koran, the Holy book with good accent and praying.
2. Maintaining close connection to the ancestors and the family members.
3. Speak Arabic at home with the children as the main motivating strategy.
Chinese language group. The Chinese language parents were concerned more about maintaining cultural heritage, promoting bilingual skills for good job opportunities, and strengthening family ties and family moral values. For example, one Chinese parent said that China is a country of rich culture and history and that he would be very sad if his children should forget the homeland root. Additionally, another parent said, "I think it is good to learn Chinese because in future my kids can have more choices in job hunting." For the Chinese-speaking parents, issues addressed in the interviews of these four parents were as the following:

1. More choices for job opportunities.
2. Maintaining cultural heritage via talking at home.
4. Promoting family ties and building better parent-child communication.

Hebrew language group. The parents of Hebrew-learning children emphasized more on the importance of uniting the Jewish people through the heritage language, Hebrew. For this group, being able to read the Hebrew bible with the beautiful pronunciation and intonation is highly regarded for their children's faith growth. "...the most important is...the worship is done in Hebrew, and it's hard to follow alone in the worship service if you don't understand the language..." said Mrs. T. Mrs. T also emphasized that she would be very concerned if her children should not follow the ten commandments in the Bible.

In addition, the parents believe that learning Hebrew, a comparatively difficult language to learn in the world is surely beneficial to the cognitive complexity growth of
their children. Dr. P said in the interview, "...I think the big benefits of studying any languages as a second language is at an early age, but I think that they get double benefits in studying Hebrew because it is a very different language than English, so they have to deal with the whole different characters set and they have to read from right to left, then left to right so it just really tests their intellectual skills and it helps them to develop mentally." The conclusion drawn from the Jewish group concerning the reasons for keeping their children's Hebrew are summarized as the following:

1. Worshiping and praying in Hebrew; keeping Jewish people together via the heritage language
2. Promoting bilingual skills as the integral part of cognitive growth.
4. Maintaining Hebrew as part of the cultural heritage

Spanish language group. For the Spanish language group, there is comparatively larger Hispanic population than other language groups researched. Hence, the local community has more support organizations such as churches, public libraries where the Spanish-speaking people could communicate more in their heritage language when attending various events held by these support organizations. For example, people usually speak Spanish at stores run by the Spanish-speakers, attend church services in Spanish and go to the public library to check out books, journals and magazines written in Spanish. In addition, both the school and the church offer bilingual Spanish/English classes, which make this group more privileged than other language groups. In fact, the situational use of the heritage language is more frequent than that of other language
groups. For example, one father, Mr. R. said, "We use 90% Spanish to communicate with our children..." He also emphasized that if his children spoke English at home to answer him, he would get argue with them. He said, "...I get argue with them...they have to answer in Spanish."

Most of the interviewees expressed their desire of keeping their children bilingual at an early age so that when they grow up they can have better job opportunities. "...I think the kids' attitudes learning in another language when they are five or six years old, so that they are very open-minded about it, so they will learn it really easily..." said Ms. A. Another parent, Mr. J said, "because it is better for them, you know, in future, they can speak two languages and they will have a lot of better opportunities. So it is better for them to learn both languages."

Four main points were addressed by most of the interviewees from the Spanish-speaking group concerning the reasons of maintaining their children's heritage language:

1. Keeping the home culture.
2. Meeting the community communication needs and making friends.
3. Promoting bilingual skills for more job opportunities.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

An extensive amount of research has shown that the successful learning of any child, and especially CLD students, is strongly connected to parental involvement and family support. This research study was designed specifically to tap into the parents' attitudes and opinions toward their own heritage language and culture and the role of that heritage language in their children's learning. The study results have shown two aspects: the very positive attitude of the parents of the CLD students in maintaining the heritage language of their children and the value these parents see in the inclusion of heritage language learning into instructional plans for CLD students.

Heritage Language Importance through Current Research

For many of the CLD students, their heritage language is their first or primary language. This becomes an important issue in terms of second language acquisition, where current research has found that literacy and thinking are interrelated, and skills and learning strategies developed in the heritage language create an underlying proficiency which then transfers to second language learning (Cummins, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996; Hakuta, 1986; Krashen, 1996; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Padilla, 1981; Roberts, 1994; Snow, 1990; Wong Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). In addition, many researchers have emphasized the importance of including heritage language in content knowledge instruction. In this way, CLD students who are limited in English proficiency are not isolated from the rest of the content knowledge learning while learning English. If students stop growth in their heritage language learning when they enter English schools,
it may be more difficult for them to develop their general linguistic proficiency and their abilities in general knowledge learning. In the content areas this becomes crucial as the first (heritage) language helps a student develop concepts, negotiate meaning, read and write (Cummins, 1981, 1991, 1996; Fishman, 1976; Gonzalez et al., 1997).

Moreover, current approaches to bilingual education as well as ESL programs emphasize the necessity of using first language, or heritage language, in instruction. Bilingual education promotes the use of the heritage language of the CLD students in instruction in order to ensure the long-term academic achievement of the CLD students in L2 (Freeman & Freeman, 1993; Macedo, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1998). In bilingual instruction, heritage language literacy is the essential base for CLD students' learning of content knowledge in their second language. As Collier and Thomas (1989), Crawford (1995), and Macedo (1991) warned, linguistic minority students' language should never be sacrificed. Their research has shown that heritage language plays a crucial role in connecting parents with CLD students, and CLD students and parents to the instructional program in a school. Researchers such as Genesee (1994) and Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins (1988) proposed that when parents and their children use the language they know the best to communicate at home, this interaction benefits the children’s cognitive development.

Similarly, Freeman and Freeman (1993) suggest that bilingual education may adopt different models for the students, but whatever models are employed, it must include sufficient heritage language instruction so that the students of minority-language groups can comprehend the learning. In fact, some researchers have reported that
bilingual children demonstrated superior performance on verbal and nonverbal standardized intelligence tests and a more heterogeneous pattern of intelligence than monolingual children (Baker, 1996; Bialystok, 1991; Hakuta, 1986; Peal & Lambert, 1962). With the aid of their first language, students can use their heritage language learning as a base or framework for their thinking in order to accomplish more complex tasks at schools.

**Parents' Attitudes Toward the Heritage Language**

The research results of this study have shown that most of the parents demonstrated self-pride in their own cultural heritage. They also demonstrated a strong interest in maintaining their heritage language with their children for various benefits, including maintaining their cultural and religious heritage by sending their children to language classes or through speaking at home, strengthening family ties between the younger generation and the elder generation, keeping connections to their own cultural and language communities, and promoting bilingual skills for their children’s better job opportunities. All four language groups, Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, and Spanish, found their heritage language important in connecting with their culture, their religious beliefs, their families, and their community. However, promoting bilingual skills as a means to better job opportunities was found important by parents whose language was used beyond the context of religion. While all four groups saw their heritage language as an important part of their religious life, parents in the Arabic, Chinese, and Spanish language groups also saw their language as a bridge to better opportunities for their children in the job market. As the world moves to a stronger global market economy, these parents found
value in pursuing their heritage language as an additional strength or advantage for their children to stay competitive in the future. However, the parents in the Hebrew language group did not see a connection between developing their child’s heritage language for religious and cultural purposes and the use of that language for job opportunities for their children in the future. They focused more on their children’s religious growth through this heritage language.

Most of the parents regard their heritage language as the main carrier of their own culture, religion, and family values. For example, parents from the Arabic language group believed the development of their child’s heritage language knowledge was critical in maintaining their Muslim faith through the reading of the Koran in their own heritage language. The same was true for parents of the Hebrew language group. For these two language groups, religion is culture and culture is best represented through religion.

In addition, most of the parents in the Arabic, Chinese, and Spanish language groups were more attentive to using their heritage language for discipline or for developing family moral values in their children. The parents from these three language groups have spent comparatively more time in oral communication using heritage language at home. Also, they were more in favor of school instruction with extra heritage language teaching included.

Moreover, most of the parents from these language groups (specifically the parents from the Arabic, Chinese and Spanish language groups) do not want their children to lose their own cultural and social identity; hence, they want to keep a close relationship with their children through communication in the heritage language. In terms
of other aspects such as thinking, some parents believe that their children's cognitive development benefits from being able to speak two languages (such as the parents from the Hebrew language group and those from the Chinese language group).

**Parents' Active Involvement**

The research results of this study have revealed the active involvement of parents in their children's learning of their heritage language. These CLD parents were willing to spend more time maintaining their children’s heritage language proficiency through language school or talking at home. In addition, most of the parents used motivating strategies at home to maintain their children’s heritage language proficiency. For example, Chinese parents would buy books of folklore, legend, classic poetry and written textbooks from China to tutor their children. However, the parents of the Hebrew language group depended more on the regular Hebrew classes offered at the synagogue and did not use oral Hebrew language at home. Hebrew language at home was most often discussed in terms of practice for religious ceremonies and through listening to tapes assigned as homework by the synagogue Hebrew classes. Except for the Hebrew language group, the parents from the Arabic, Chinese, and Spanish language groups all tried to speak their heritage language at home as much as possible with their children. When the children answered back in English, they corrected by using the heritage language to reply. These parents found their heritage language to be more of an integral part of their day to day lives, where the language could be used in various contexts for various purposes. In a sense, these heritage languages (Arabic, Chinese, and Spanish) were integrated into the families’ lives in a way that reflected their families history and
future, where the language was seen as a living part of their existence that extended beyond the boundaries of religious or cultural contexts to a broader context of thinking, living and working in a multi-lingual, global environment.

**Suggestions for Future School Innovations**

The findings of this research show that CLD parents’ opinions about the ideal school for their children are in favor of a school that either implements the bilingual instructional models or includes heritage language as extra instruction in school programs. In addition, the study shows, when the ideals of these parents were not met, most of the parents chose their own alternatives by sending their children to language schools and by maintaining heritage language communications at home. The study shows that parents of these CLD students are determined to help their children maintain their homeland cultural roots and heritage traditions by choosing to send their children regularly to language classes in spite of the fact that the schools at their districts are not providing them with sufficient heritage learning resources.

Moreover, the parents’ active involvement in their children’s learning was demonstrated by their varied strategies in motivating their children to learn their heritage language. Data shows the majority of the parents (with Hebrew language group as exception) chose to use their heritage language at home as much as possible to communicate with their children. For example, even when their children spoke to them in English, they would choose to answer back in their heritage language.

Many studies have shown that parental involvement in children’s education generally benefits children’s learning and school success (Collier, 1989, 1995; Soto,
Therefore, the parents’ attitudes of the CLD students toward their successful learning should not be ignored by any schools. School leaders at all levels need to be aware that quality schools for optimal learning by CLD students should create opportunities for classroom teachers to keep active partnership with the parents and the communities they serve. Additionally, a closer and productive relationship between the schools and the communities, between the teachers and the parents, is fundamental to CLD students’ academic success. Equally important is quality curricula that addresses the parents’ needs in helping their children learn through providing relevant resources to the parents. Such quality curricula would include heritage language instruction that respects CLD students, their heritage language and their culture (Brisk, 1998; Cummins, 1986; Garcia, 1991, 1993; Troike, 1978). Therefore, schools need to develop an awareness of the heritage language role in CLD students’ learning and their parents’ attitudes and expectations of their school learning. Essentially, attention to the opinions of the parents of CLD students needs to be put on the school agenda. The following are suggestions for heritage language considerations by educators and schools.

**Sensitivity to the Diversity of CLD Students**

The most important of all, schools at all levels need to be sensitive to the diverse needs of the CLD students and respect what heritage cultures and languages they bring into the school environment. Bilingual learners access knowledge not only through English but also through their heritage languages. Their cultural experience determines their views and assumptions. Quality education for language minority students combines
concerns for language development and cultural awareness in a constant quest for good education. The key factor is the acceptance by schools, families, and students of bilingualism as a resource (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Collier, 1989; Crawford, 1997). This sensitivity to different cultures and languages of the CLD students is so crucial to the successful learning of all those children different from the children of the dominant culture. Indeed, a great many researchers have found that a positive school culture will lead to the development of self-esteem in learning for students. If CLD students sense their cultural heritages and languages are respected in school, they will feel more secure in learning and their self-confidence will be greatly increased. Long years of school practice have shown that an assimilation approach has resulted in more drop-out rates than an inclusive approach, which means combining the heritage language and culture of all students into school instruction (Bialystok, 2001; Brisk, 1998; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1986; Garcia, 1993; Gonzalez et al., 1997).

Attention to the Parents’ Perceptions of the CLD Students

Home and community play important roles in students’ sociocultural adjustment, bilingualism, and school performance. Parents’ characteristics and views govern childrearing practices as well as perceptions and relations with schools. Since parents play a crucial role in the linguistic development of their children, parents’ opinions about the successful learning and the ideal school are important for school leaders at all levels to know (Brisk, 1998). In order to manage effective schools for all children, it is crucial for school leaders at all levels to attend more to what the parents think about their own cultures and languages and why they want to get involved in their children’s heritage.
language learning. Many parents in this study stated that they definitely wanted to maintain their homeland culture and heritage so that their children could better communicate with their elders in the family and honor their family traditions. These parents also believed that their active involvement in their children's learning would better help them maintain the heritage traditions. Therefore, if schools show favoritism in imposing the dominant cultures to the CLD students, then schools will lose their relationship with the parents. If this happens, this type of school culture will be detrimental to the academic growth as well as the psychological growth of the CLD students. Extensive research has shown that CLD students cannot learn well under pressures of losing their own culture and their ethnic identity (Trueba, 1990, 1997; Trueba & Barnett, 1985; Waggoner, 1993; Williams & Snipper, 1990). For this reason, the issue of parental involvement in their children's learning should be addressed.

Inclusion of Heritage Language Learning in Instruction

A significant amount of research has shown that assimilation for CLD students into either the dominant culture or the majority curriculum is detrimental to real learning for these CLD students because they tend to be poorly motivated to learn if the input provided is not comprehensible or their own cultural heritage is not represented (Brisk, 1998; Cummins, 1986; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Taylor, 1991). According to Brisk (1998), quality education should view students' heritage and culture as vehicles for education, and quality curricula for CLD students should include heritage language instruction for literacy and content area learning. Schools at large are suggested to design more content-knowledge learning curriculum which includes the heritage language. For
example, schools can provide developmental bilingual programs emphasizing the
development of CLD students’ skills in their heritage language through language arts and
content-area instruction until they become fully English-proficient. For this model, if
schools have budget problems, they can organize the international students from that
native country to help the children in learning literacy in the heritage language. This will
reduce the burden of responsibility on the parents to provide all heritage language
support.

Varied Resource and Supportive Instruction Models

There are many ways for monolingual ESL teachers to demonstrate their
commitment to valuing students’ languages and cultural experiences. For example,
teachers could make literature and other learning resources available in more than one
language, invite bilingual adults into the classroom to share their culture and language,
ask children/or adults to create classroom and school signs in multiple languages, utilize
adult and peer volunteer tutors proficient in the learner’s heritage language, and explain
to parents the importance of continuing heritage language development at home (Collier,
1995; Faltis & Huddson, 1998; Freeman &Freeman, 1993).

Resources such as the native or heritage language speakers in the local
community/neighborhood and the international graduate students in the community can
be tapped by the local schools hosting CLD students to accommodate the staff shortage
of bilingual teachers or heritage language teachers. In addition, local libraries can also
provide more reading materials in the heritage language so that these minority language
groups can easily check out materials instead of having to purchase their own reading
through their contacts with their home country. Bilingual speakers from the international
groups in the community can be placed on a resource list for the school to refer to when
they need help. In addition, school administrators can widen their network to outreach the
communities where there is a high concentration of the CLD population and connect to
the local churches or social agencies for more bilingual speakers whose names could also
be kept on file and available to contact for tutoring CLD students. Classroom teachers
can engage students in different projects that incorporate students’ cultures and traditions
as classroom materials so that students feel their culture and traditions are respected.

In summary, CLD students’ school success is closely related to the parental
involvement and how classroom teachers interact with the students and their families;
therefore, the voice of the CLD students’ parents should not be silenced. The parental
involvement in their children’s learning, their sense of efficacy in helping their children
to succeed, their attitudes and their ideals toward successful learning of their children
should be taken into serious consideration by school administrators and teachers at all
levels. If the goal of education is to touch the future, to awaken the students’ motivation
for learning, classroom teachers need to redefine their roles and make a concerted effort
to develop a closer relationship with the parents and the communities they serve by
listening to their voices, sharing their concerns, and understanding their students’
cultures. In this way, they can build an improved relationship with the parents for the
benefit of the CLD students’ learning. Since heritage language learning is essential for
the whole growth of the CLD students, and for the inclusion of their families, it is
important that public schools not be sidetracked by the politicized issues of bilingual
education. Rather, schools should attend more to meeting the needs of the CLD students by providing them with an instructional model that effectively uses the heritage language to enhance the learning of the CLD students.

Furthermore, the distorted views caused by the long-time heated arguments need to give way to what really matters to the real learning of all CLD students, what actually helps their academic achievements, and what obstacles schools need to overcome in order to bring about a real change to the current monolingual education system. In order to achieve these goals, parents’ attitudes and their opinions toward successful learning of their CLD children should be respected and included as part of the voice that shapes the school’s agenda for learning; cultural and linguistic differences need to be appreciated and included in the curriculum; and, schools need to provide a system that enables parents to participate, providing them with a sense of efficacy in helping their children to succeed.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study examined the views of parents of CLD students who chose to send their children to heritage language schools. Future research should be extended to include the views of parents of CLD students who do not have their children participate in heritage language schools. Research should also include those parents whose native language is English and who chose to send their children to minority language schools or to involve their children in a dual-language model of education. Another area of research could include the CLD students’ views of learning/maintaining their heritage language and views of their schooling experiences in an English-dominant learning environment.
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APPENDIX A

Informed Consent Statement

The purpose of this interview is to find out the perceptions of the parents on maintaining the heritage language of CLD (Linguistically and Culturally Different) students. The interview questions consist of 7 questions, addressing the issues of reasons for sending CLD students to receive heritage language instruction, community support for their language learning, efforts, and the methods used in keeping their children conserving the heritage language.

First of all, a clear explanation of the interview purpose and questions will be given to the subjects chosen as the interviewees. Secondly, the interviewer will assure the subjects that their participation is voluntary; that the content of their answers will be used only for the purpose of dissertation data analysis, not subject to use by any second interviewers; that the taped voices will be destroyed after data analysis. Thirdly, the informed consent form will be presented to the interviewee to sign. Finally, the typed interview questions will be asked one by one, with their voices recorded.

Each subject will be given the gift worth $5. However, the subjects will be informed of the address and phone number of the office of the Human Subjects Coordinator, of advisor, of Coordinator of Doctor of Education at the University of Northern Iowa in case they have further concerns and questions regarding their rights. The addresses and phone numbers are as follows:

Dr. David Walker, Coordinator of the Office of the Human Subjects Graduate College, Seerly Hall, UNI, Cedar Falls, 50614 Phone: 319 273-2748

Dr. Deborah L Tidwell, Advisor, Chair of Dissertation Curriculum & Instruction SEC 139, UNI, Cedar Falls, 50614 Phone: 319 273-2983

Ruth Lingxin Yan Doctoral student of Education 2422 College St. Cedar Falls, IA, 50613 Phone: 319 2664071

I am fully aware of the nature and extent of my participation in this project as stated above and the possible risks arising from it. I hereby agree to participate in this project. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent statement.

(Signature of subject or responsible agent) Date

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX B

Letter of Transmittal for the Survey

Dear Parents:

I am in the process of writing a doctoral dissertation concerning the perceptions of parents on maintaining the heritage language (mother language) of their child/children. As you know, parental involvement in maintaining the heritage language of the child has greatly increased in the past decade.

As parents, we all share a common concern for our child/children’s education in the English-dominant schools. It is on this basis of our commitment to educating our child/children that I am requesting your cooperation in filling out the enclosed questionnaire.

The questionnaire contains 13 questions which are concerned with your perceptions of the heritage language importance. The questionnaire has been carefully discussed and studied by professionals and parents in the local community. It will take you no more than 15 minutes to fill it out. I sincerely hope you can answer these survey questions as accurately as possible. You may choose to sign the questionnaire, but please print your name only on the Thanks-note-card and mail back to me separately from the survey questionnaire. However, you are assured that your response will remain anonymous and confidential. Your participation is, of course, voluntary.

Please answer all of the questions and return the completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed envelope before March, 18th, 2000. I highly value your cooperation in helping me accomplish this research.

Thanks for your cooperation

Doctoral Student of Education
Curriculum and Instruction
University of Northern Iowa
e-mail: Yanl0230@uni.edu
Phone: 319 266 4071
Advisor: Dr. Deb. Tidwell
Phone: 319 273 2983
APPENDIX C

Survey Questionnaires

1. The person who is filling out this form is the child/children's
   (a) Mother  (c) Grandparents
   (b) Father  (d) Other (specify):

2. Your highest education level is:
   (a) Elementary (up to eighth grade)  (c) College—Bachelors
   (b) High School  (d) College—Graduate(Masters/Doctorate)

3. In your home, do you speak the heritage language your child/children is/are studying at language schools?
   (a) Yes  (c) Only sometimes
   (b) No  (d) Other (specify):

4. Which of the following best suits your situation in U.S.?
   (a) I stay as a foreign student planning not to return to the native country.
   (b) I stay as a foreign student planning to return to the native country.
   (c) I stay as an employee.
   (d) Other (specify):

5. At home, how much of your communication with your child is in the heritage language?
   (a) All of it.  (c) Only for special occasions.
   (b) Most of it.  (d) Other (specify):

6. How important is your child/children's heritage learning to his/her overall
academic performance in regular English school?
(a) Very important  (c) Not really important
(b) Important  (d) Not important at all
Explain if (d) is the answer:

7. In the heritage learning class your child/children attend(s), what of the following does your child/children learn?
(a) Speaking  (c) Writing
(b) Reading.  (d) Other (Circle all that apply).

8. How often do you actually teach your child/children Spanish at home weekly?
(a) 1-5 hours.  (c) Not regularly.
(b) Beyond 5 hours.  (d) Never.

9. For my child/children to be academically successful, the best school in U. S. would be:
(a) Bilingual school (instruction taught both in Heritage and in English).
(b) English school with extra instruction using Heritage.
(c) English school only.
(d) Other (specify):

10. I use Heritage to talk to my child/children at home mostly for
(a) Stories.  (c) Moral values and discipline
(b) Family background.  (d) Other (all that apply):

11. When my child/children speak(s) to me in English, I
(a) Answer in heritage language.  (c) Remind them to use heritage language
12. What is the biggest obstacle for you to help your child/children maintain the heritage language?
(a) No community support.  (c) Insufficient time for tutoring.
(b) Lack of language-use situations.  (d) Other (specify):

13. My child/children must learn to study the heritage language in order to be academically successful in English school.
(a) Strongly agree  (c) Disagree
(b) Agree  (d) Other (specify):
APPENDIX D

Interview Questions:

1. What are your main reasons for choosing to send your child/children to the native language school? (Prompts: What do you think is the most important: culture heritage, family values, self-identity, or what?)

2. Do you try to motivate your child/children to learn the native language at home? How?

3. What is the observed benefits you see in your kinds' speaking the native language?

4. Would you be concerned if your child/children never learned to speak the native language? Why?

5. Can you describe what you have done at home to help your child/children in the native language learning?

6. Specifically, in what situations do you use the native language with your child/children? (Prompts: What about at home, or in the community?).

7. Do you have community support for your child/children language learning? If so, what access do you have? If not, what else would you like to see?
APPENDIX E
PILOT STUDY

PERENTIAL PERCEPTIONS
ON MAINTAINING HERITAGE LANGUAGES
OF CLD STUDENTS
(A PILOT STUDY OF THE CHINESE LANGUAGE GROUP)
ABSTRACT

The rationale for maintaining the native or heritage language literacy of CLD students for the benefits of long-term academic success has been controversial. In the states where the native language use as instructional support in bilingual programs are not provided, it is important to know what parents think about the native language maintenance in the English predominant school environments and what are the main reasons for parental involvement in their children's education and learning the native language at language class.
INTRODUCTION

Linguistic and cultural diversity has been the dynamics of American society as well as the issues of controversy. As it is known, Bilingual Education Act of 1968, which allowed the heritage language use in instruction was inspired by the demographic reality of language diversity. Since then, the use of heritage language as the instructional support for culturally and linguistically different (CLD) students in bilingual education has been acknowledged. However, in the past twenty years, the heritage language use as the instructional support in bilingual programs has aroused the heated debate, leaving parents of CLD students uncertain about the rationale of bilingual education. Moreover, the rapid growth of CLD in the public schools in recent decades, together with their literacy issues, school experience, and academic failures has attracted increasing concerns from educators at all levels (Alexander and Baker, 1994; Baker, 1996; Christian, 1996; Gonzalez, Brusca-Vega, & Yawkey, 1997). Issues concerning how to teach CLD students effectively have caused the heated arguments among both administrators and educational practitioners (Casanova, 1992; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Hakuta, 1990).

According to the report by Census Bureau of the United States, the number of immigrants has reached 8.7 million (U.S. Census Bureau, 1992, cited in Ovando & Collier, 1998, p. 31). The rapidly increasing rate of CLD students has resulted in the severe shortage of teachers qualified in skills necessary to serve them. Furthermore, many researchers have warned that CLD students are not doing quality work at schools on a large scale and the dropout rate is increasing among the students before the 12th grade.
In the recent decades, various innovative models have been promoted to help CLD students achieve academic success; however, heritage language use in most of the bilingual programs for CLD students has been proposed as most effective for the long-term academic achievement of CLD students (Ada, 1986; Christian, 1996; Cummins, 1984, 1986, 1989, 1991; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Galazer & Cummins, 1985; Krashen & Biber, 1988). A considerable amount of research evidence indicates that the reported school failure of CLD students is related to the education policy that has not promoted the heritage language and culture of CLD students. Many researchers emphasize that if heritage language access is barred to CLD students through bilingual education, the consequences could be tragic. Presently, although much of the research on bilingualism and bicognitivism is still in progress, the weight of the evidence continues to support the heritage language use in bilingual education which has positive influence on the cognitive development of CLD students (Collier & Thomas, 1989; Gonzalez et al., 1997). So far, bilingual education has been in the forefront for educating CLD students for its' advocates' profound knowledge for the advancement of multi-cultural education; for its' positive position in encouraging the use of the heritage language of the language-minority students in instruction; for its' research evidence of a linguistic enrichment with possible cognitive advantages, and for its' emphasis on accepting the value of the minority native culture which is important in raising the self-esteem of linguistic minority students (Cummins, 1984, 1986, 1989, 1991; Gonzalez et al., 1997; Macedo, 1991;

Usually, those CLD students who have learned both the heritage language and the target language, English, are called bilinguals. Essentially, bilingual education approach assumes that CLD children will learn well if they can understand the language and find their cultural value conveyed through instruction. The true goal of bilingual education is to continue to develop students' first language or heritage language skills while they simultaneously begin learning the second language, English. (Baker, 1996; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1986, 1989; Glazer & Cummins, 1985; Gonzalez et al., 1997; Lessow-Hurley, 1991; McGroarty, 1992; McLaughlin, 1984; Williams & Snipper, 1990; Wong Fillmore, 1982). In fact, heritage language use in instruction makes bilingual education different from any other innovated models for improving CLD students' academic achievement. Heritage language provides the comprehensive input for the CLD students. As Krashen (1988) argued that we acquire language when we receive comprehensible input, messages that we understand. Therefore, to learn a second language, students need to have an understanding of what they hear or read.

Bilingual education may take on different forms, but it must include sufficient first language instruction, for the first language instruction provides the comprehensible input students need to develop academic concepts (Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1991). Additionally, concepts learned in one language transfer to a second language since language and thinking are regarded as interrelated via the reports of many researchers.
For example, Cummins (1989) stated that we can learn in one language and discuss what we've learned in another because the concepts themselves form the basis for our underlying proficiency, and Cummins calls this knowledge a *common underlying proficiency*. According to him, students also build up an *underlying language proficiency*. This is why it is so important for students to fully develop their first languages. If students stop using their first languages when they enter school and begin using English, it may be more difficult for them to develop their general linguistic proficiency. Moreover, Cummins says first language can help develop concepts, negotiate meaning, and help read and write.

A variety of studies have reported that bilingual education can serve as the bridge to a cohesive, culturally unified society because it emphasizes the importance of heritage language in instructional strategies and taps CLD students' cultural and linguistic richness, which are regarded as crucial for maintaining immigrants' motivation for learning (Csikszentmihalyi, 1993; Glazer & Cummins, 1985; Trueba, 1990, 1997). As Slonim (1991) states, "a society's culture encompasses its citizens' efforts to develop meaning about individual and collective values, beliefs and actions" (p. 75, cited in Swick, Van Scoy, & Boutte, 1994). Therefore, it is important to develop the societal awareness of the rationale of heritage language use in bilingual education which serves to help CLD students maintain their cultural values and self-identities in their process of making adjustments to adapt to the majority culture.

The most influential research on heritage language importance was conducted in the 1950s by a group of research experts organized by UNESCO (United Nations
Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). The reports supported the 'mother language' as the best initial medium of instruction for children educated in their second language schools (cited in Brisk, 1998). The recent researchers have provided more evidence of the positive relationship between literacy in the heritage language and literacy in English for linguistic-minority students. The heritage language literacy of CLD students is reported as crucial in the long-term academic achievement.

However, the issue of accommodating non-English-speaking CLD students by means of bilingual education programs has long been controversial since its official recognition in the 1960s in the United States. The period from the late 1980s to the 1990s, in particularly, has witnessed the most contentious debate between the current English-only movement proponents and the English Plus advocates, most of whom are educators determined to promote individual and CLD students' rights to use their heritage language in learning (Alexander & Baker, 1994; Cummins, 1986; Hakuta, 1990; McGroarty, 1992; Noll, 1995; Williams & Snipper, 1990).

Issues surrounding the bilingual education debate are complex, ranging from social, political, ethnic factors to educational factors such as the choices of bilingual methodologies, assessment tools and bilingual models. (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 1998; Gonzalez et al., 1997). Much of the debate on bilingual education is becoming more and more politicized because, on the one hand, English-only proponents are unwilling to pay high tax to support schools for CLD children’s education via bilingual programs; on the other hand, bilingual professional researchers have controlled much of the research evidence on the effectiveness of heritage language use in bilingual education and some of
them are reluctant to take a clear stand on the necessity of heritage language support in bilingual instructional models, leaving most of the parents of CLD students uncertain about the rationale of using heritage language in bilingual education (Alexander & Baker, 1994; Gonzalez et al., 1997). In fact, from the 1980s and the 1990s, critics of bilingual education have won increasing support. Meanwhile, the research development on the rationale of heritage language use in bilingual education is flourishing, making the issue of bilingual education more heated between two camps: English only proponents and English-plus supporters.

In many states of the United States, heritage language use as instructional support for educating CLD students has not been implemented, and efforts have not been shared among states in certifying bilingual teachers. In Iowa, for example, submersion is widely used which is short of the federal standards to meet the increasing needs of CLD students. Factors hindering the implementation of bilingual programs in Iowa are complex. The main reason is that, for certain ethnic groups, such as Chinese, there is a comparatively low concentration of the student population in school districts. Under this condition, there has occurred the increased parental involvement in the education of CLD students in Iowa. For instance, it is not uncommon to see parents send their children to either heritage language schools or heritage language classes in addition to their regular school work.

As Chang (1994) emphasizes cultural background factors related to the family environment affect the schooling of language minority students. The increased involvement from the parents in the education of CLD students is not a superficial
phenomenon. Schools need to take alternatives to outreach the parents and attend to their own needs by overcoming language barriers. Cummins (1986) points out community participation, where parental involvement can be an effective alternative to preserve the heritage language of CLD students. Therefore, it is crucial for schools at all levels to understand what parents of CLD students think about the successful learning for their children and develop knowledge of how to bring parental involvement into the process of education in more effective ways.

The inquiry of this study is conducted under this social context of conflicting debate over the heritage language use in bilingual education. The author of this paper believes, among all the propaganda confusions and conflicting debates surrounding bilingual education, it is worthwhile exploring what the parents of CLD students think about the learning of the heritage language for their children because they, the parents, know their children the best; therefore, their voices for their children’s learning should not be ignored by educators and administrators of schools at all levels.

**Methods of Research**

The site is in a Midwestern town of 66,500 in population, a group of Chinese parents. The researcher's role is both 'immersed' in the situation and as an observer because the researcher has close connection with the subjects studied and volunteered to teach the subjects' children the mother language. The researcher uses interactive strategies such as participant observation and interviews and survey questions. Besides, the researcher also uses the case study. The specific strategies are as follows:
1. Survey questionnaire of eight well-shaped questions is mailed out to ten Chinese families, with all of them returned. The research result is kept anonymous to the subjects. The questions focus on obtaining the authentic, truthful beliefs of the parents in maintaining the mother language of their children.

2. Interview is conducted to four typical families: (a) both parents work full-time; (b) one parent works full-time with the other staying at home; (c) both parents are full-time students; and (d) one parent is a full-time student; with the other working part-time. All the interviews are conducted with tape-recording and the mutual consent.

**Design Limitations**

The researcher's close relationship with some of the subjects might affect the truthfulness and authenticity in the interview answers. Besides, the educational levels of subjects are higher education degrees; therefore, it might be hard to be generalizable to other ethnic groups who have comparatively lower educational levels.

**Data Analysis**

The survey result suggests that almost 70% of the parents surveyed agree that the native language literacy is very important for their kids to be academically successful in English schools. There are 80% of the parents want their children be educated in English schools where their children could have extra instruction conducted in their native language. The big majority of the parents speak mostly Chinese at home to their children, and they tend to correct their children by using the mother language if they find kids using English to answer them. Seventy percent of the parents agree that the biggest obstacle for them to maintain their children's native language is due to the lack of
language-use situations because 50% of the parents agree that their children seldom use the mother language to communicate with other bilingual children. However, none of them think they don't value the mother language as primarily important. Besides, few parents also think they don't have sufficient time to tutoring their children's mother language at home. There are fifty percent of parents having a regular schedule of teaching their children the native language through the story-telling or reading for about one to five hours weekly and only one percent is teaching their children at five-to-ten-hour weekly schedule.

The interview transcripts show a pattern of the parents' high value of the mother language culture, history and the language benefits for positive identity of their kids. The text analysis of the talks shows that the majority of the parents have a clear understanding of the multicultural education and the diverse situations that require a person's bilingual proficiency for both education and career development. In addition, many of the parents believe if they maintain their children fully bilingual, their children will stay more competitive than those who are only monolingual for various job markets. They emphasized in the interview that they tried various strategies to motivate their children to maintain the native language learning. For example, many mentioned using story-telling method, subscribing Chinese newspaper, buying children books written in Chinese from China, borrowing TV programs or video-tapes for their children to watch and practice, and ordering books regularly from their native-country friends or relatives. Most important of all, the parents do not want their children to forget their cultural identity and they keep reminding them that they are from China, the Chinese who have a big country,
rich culture and long history to be proud of. One intellectual parent also mentioned that she wanted to keep her children balanced in cultural identity: obtaining the best from both the American culture and the Chinese culture. Another father also stressed that he really wanted his children to keep connection to their grandparents in China and could talk or write to them in Chinese.

During the interviews, the researcher also found that the parents kept correcting their children when they answered back in English the questions their parents addressed in oral Chinese.

**Implications**

There are several significant implications of the study. First, in the contexts where bilingual programs are not implemented, schools could build community support to help CLD students through getting parental involvement, through paraprofessional training from the native language speaker community, and through involving the UNI scholars who know both the mother language of the CLD students and English. In this way, CLD students' needs will be met even in the contexts of lack of bilingual programs.
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How much of your speech with your child is in the native language at home?
   (a) All of it. (c) Only for special occasions.
   (b) Most of it. (d) Never.
   Other (specify):

2. My child needs to study the native language to be academically successful in English school.
   (a) Strongly agree. (c) I am not sure.
   (b) Agree (d) Disagree.
   Explain if (d) is the answer:

3. Does your child use the native language to speak with other bilingual children?
   (a) Always. (c) Seldom.
   (b) At special occasions. (d) Never.

4. How often do you actually teach your child the native language at home?
   (a) 1-5 hours weekly. (c) Occasionally.
   (b) 5-10 hours weekly. (d) Never.
   Other (specify):

5. The best school in U. S. for my child/children to be academically successful would be
   (a) Bilingual school (instruction taught both in the native language and in English).
   (b) English school with extra instruction using my native language.
   (c) English school only.
(d) I am not sure.

Other (specify):

6. I use my native language to talk to my child/children at home mostly for

(a) Stories. (c) Moral values.
(b) Family background. (d) Discipline.

Other (specify):

7. When my child/children speak(s) to me in English other than the native language, I

(a) Answer in the native language. (c) Remind them to use the native language.
(b) Answer in English. (d) I don't care.

Other (specify):

8. What is the biggest obstacle for you to maintain your child's native language?

(a) No community support. (c) Insufficient time for tutoring.
(b) Lack of language-use situations. (d) I don't value it as primarily important.

Other (specify):
Table 5

Survey Results From The Chinese Language Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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