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This study explored the application of a holistic bilingual view to assess the writing of emerging bilingual children. The study is part of a 5-year longitudinal research and intervention project that explores the biliteracy development of Spanish–English emerging bilingual students who are receiving instruction in both languages. Participants included 36 bilingual teachers who were part of the project. Teachers evaluated student writing samples using a writing rubric developed for the project. They were trained to evaluate students’ Spanish and English language writing samples in a manner that allowed for cross-language comparison and analysis. A total of 216 writing samples produced by students from grades 1–5 were analyzed. Findings from this study suggest the need to train teachers to evaluate the writing of emerging bilingual children in ways that both challenge and expand on their current frames of reference. This paper posits that the utilization of a holistic bilingual lens to evaluate the writing of Spanish–English emerging bilingual children is a more robust and valid means of understanding language and biliteracy development in these children. Furthermore, a holistic bilingual lens can be useful in changing teacher perceptions about children’s biliteracy, thereby enhancing instruction.
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Introduction

The population of students who speak a language other than English in the USA is growing quickly. We will refer to them as emerging bilinguals, instead of the more common term English Language Learners. Despite the heterogeneity in this student population, almost 80% are Latino and Spanish is their home language (Kindler 2002). Further, 60% of those who speak Spanish come from Mexican immigrant families. Mexican families in the USA live in communities where the majority is poor and Latino, and as a consequence, Latino children are more likely to attend highly segregated schools (Kindler 2002; NCES 2006).

Literacy learning and instruction for emerging bilingual students across schools in the USA has been at the forefront of debates over the past three decades. In the
USA, most of the research on literacy for both native English speaking children and emerging bilingual students has been focused largely on reading with little attention to writing instruction or to writing assessment. Consider for example the reports of the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development 2000) and the National Reading Council (Snow et al. 1998). These panels examined research literature on reading exclusively, yet their findings have defined literacy instruction and research in this country in the last decade. This is even more pronounced when one considers writing instruction and assessment in two languages (August and Shanahan 2006; Serrano and Howard 2007). In their recent research synthesis on the development of literacy in language-minority students, August and Shanahan (2006, 169) state:

Research on the development of writing skills in English Language Learners is extremely sparse, and research on cross-linguistic influences in the acquisition of writing skills by English language learners is even sparser. Thus, much more research that focuses on the relationship between English language learners’ first and second language skills in the context of learning to write for academic purposes in English is necessary.

While literacy instruction and research in the USA has mostly focused on reading, we argue that effective literacy programs for emerging bilingual students must expand existing instruction and assessment practices to include greater attention to writing and to the development of oral language skills that are needed to become literate. In this study, literacy is understood as encompassing both comprehension (listening and reading) and production skills (speaking and writing) to make sense out of text, express meaning, and interact with others around texts. Emerging bilingual children benefit from literacy instruction that includes the teaching of oral and written language in both the home and the second language, in such a way that the two languages support each other and place students on a trajectory towards biliteracy.

Writing research from a developmental or constructivist perspective has documented writing processes and patterns of growth mostly in monolingual children (e.g., Ferreiro 1986; Ferreiro and Teberosky 1982; Tolchinsky Landsmann and Levin 1985; Vernon and Ferreiro 1999). In contrast, little attention has been paid to writing development in emerging bilingual students (but see Edelsky 1982, 1986; Serrano and Howard 2007; Valdés and Anloff Sanders 1999; Yaden and Tardibuono 2004).

We recognize that depicting developmental trends that shape literacy development in emerging bilingual students is a much needed area of investigation; however, such type of research is beyond the scope of this study. Instead, the overall goal of this article is to discuss how what we call a holistic bilingual view can be applied to the writing assessment of emerging bilingual children to better capture their writing abilities in the two languages as well as the transfer of those abilities across languages. The concept of transfer has been used in writing research to describe the relationships in writing processes and skills across languages (e.g., Edelsky 1982; Lanauze and Snow 1989). Traditionally, the phenomenon of transfer is considered to have a negative impact on second language literacy, yet there is a little research to confirm such a notion (August and Shanahan 2006). Our research and that of others (Dworin 2003; Valdés 1992) suggests that knowledge and literacy competencies in both languages support development for one another. Thus, we use the
term *cross-linguistic transfer* to highlight the bidirectional nature of the transfer process and the potential benefits for biliteracy development.

Further, we suggest that effective writing instruction and assessment practices for emerging bilingual children must shift from the prevailing monolingual view to a *holistic bilingual* perspective, a concept we will discuss more in depth in the following section. The findings from this study are part of the Literacy Squared® study, a 5-year longitudinal research and intervention project that explores the biliteracy development of Spanish–English emerging bilingual students who are receiving instruction in both languages. The Literacy Squared model places equal emphasis on the development of oral language, writing and reading in Spanish and English. In this model, teachers are trained and encouraged to use children’s written products as a vehicle for developing lessons, as a means of observing how children transfer knowledge, skills and life experiences across languages in a bidirectional way, and as assessment tools.

This study examined the following research questions:

1. What bilingual strategies do teachers note that students use when evaluating the writing of emerging bilingual students?
2. What discrepancies occur between the evaluation of children’s bilingual writing by teachers and by the researchers?
3. How does the teachers’ language background influence their perceptions of children’s bilingual writing (or bilingual strategies)?

**From parallel monolingualism to a holistic bilingual perspective on writing assessment**

We propose the concept of holistic bilingualism to examine and interpret the writing of Spanish–English speaking elementary aged children. This concept provides the theoretical support for the research questions posed above. A holistic view of bilingualism (Grosjean 1989; Valdés and Figueroa 1994) considers the bilingual learning process as a unified whole rather than as two separate and independent processes, refuting the idea that the bilingual resembles two monolinguals in one person. The interplay of two or more languages contributes to a uniquely endowed person whose experiences, abilities and knowledge can never be understood as independently constrained by each language separately.

The study draws from research on authentic writing assessment with bilingual students (Escamilla 2000; Garcia et al. 2002; Gort 2006; Valdés and Anloff Sanders 1999) and from research on biliteracy from a bilingual perspective (Dworin 2003; Durbin and Moll 2006; Martínez-Roldán and Sayer 2006; Reyes 2006; Reyes and Constanzo 2002; Valdés 1992). This bilingual perspective supports the notion that emerging bilingual children draw on all of their linguistic resources as they learn to read and write in two languages.

The concept of holistic bilingualism in this article is contrasted to the more common perspective of parallel monolingualism (Fitts 2006; Heller 2001), a dichotomous view of bilingualism in which bilingual/biliterate development are seen as separate cognitive and linguistic processes. The table below was first published by the authors in 2010. It is reproduced here to provide the necessary background.
to contrast notions of parallel monolingualism and holistic bilingualism applied to writing assessment that we explored in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallel monolingualism</th>
<th>Holistic bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of understanding that simultaneous development of two languages is mutually reinforcing. Writing abilities that are carried over to the other language are not recognized or are seen as random errors.</td>
<td>• The linguistic resources in emerging bilinguals are mutually reinforcing, and children are capable of bidirectional transfer. Unconventional writing that results from bidirectional transfer often reflects systematic approximations to conventional writing. These approximations are seen as patterns that are part of the interlanguage development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment is administered and analyzed in English and in the student’s first language separately. Looking at writing in each language separately only gives a limited understanding of a bilingual child’s learning. This assessment practice denies teachers opportunities to see how children work across languages.</td>
<td>• Assessment is administered in English and in the students’ first language and analyzed concurrently for cross-language comparison. The totality of what bilinguals know and can do is distributed across languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment instruments are a mere translation from English into the other language.</td>
<td>• Assessment takes into consideration features of language and organization or discourse style that are unique to each language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bilinguals are expected to perform all linguistic tasks equally well in both languages.</td>
<td>• Bilinguals may be able to perform one set of tasks well in one language and a different set of tasks well in the other language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bilingual strategies such as code-switching, lexical borrowing, and bidirectional transfer (phonetic, syntactic, semantic, and rhetorical structure) are viewed as markers of low language proficiency in both languages.</td>
<td>• Bilingual writing strategies are seen as part of the process to learn to write in two languages. They have been demonstrated to provide cognitive advantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second language writing development is measured against standards developed for monolingual speakers.</td>
<td>• Second language writing development is measured against English language development standards created for emerging bilinguals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above frameworks are used in this study to discuss the role that teachers’ perceptions about bilingual writing development play in the ways that teachers evaluate and interpret children’s writing. Previous research on the assessment of emerging bilingual children’s writing (Escamilla 2006; Escamilla and Coady 2001) found that teacher perceptions have been heavily influenced by parallel monolingual frameworks and monolingual assessment rubrics, both of which have exacerbated deficit notions about emerging bilinguals and their abilities in both of their languages. Based on our extensive work in bilingual classrooms and on findings from this study, we have come to believe that there is a need to prepare teachers to evaluate the writing of emerging bilingual children in ways that both challenge and expand on their current frames of reference.
Method

In 2009, after five years of implementation of the Literacy Squared project with over 2000 children and 120 teachers in 18 public schools in Colorado and Texas, we conducted a study about teachers’ evaluation of emerging bilingual students’ writing. The main purpose of this study was to examine the types of observable bilingual strategies used by students that teachers noted in the students’ writing in both languages as well as the bilingual writing behaviors that the teachers may have overlooked or misinterpreted.

Participants

Participants in the study included 36 bilingual teachers who were part of the Literacy Squared project and were teaching in three of the project’s schools. Two of these schools have a transitional bilingual program while the third has a language maintenance program. These teachers were randomly selected from the 102 evaluators who scored writing samples from the project in 2008. In general, all of our participating teachers have had some training in English as a Second Language instruction (ESL). In addition, they have been trained by researchers in the Literacy Squared project about the utilization of a holistic bilingual lens to evaluate students’ writing. All the teachers were bilingual individuals with various degrees of proficiency in English and Spanish; while some identified themselves as balanced bilinguals, others reported being more proficient in one language than in the other. Of the 36 teachers selected for this study, 18 were Spanish-dominant and 18 were English-dominant. A sample of the teacher questionnaire that we utilize annually in the project is included in Appendix 4.

Data collection

Each teacher was provided with 14 pairs of writing samples including at least one student from each grade level. They were asked to score the student writing samples using a writing rubric that the researchers developed for the purposes of the project. We then examined all of the evaluation rubrics completed by the participant teachers and purposefully identified the three sample pairs from each teacher that included the greatest number of descriptive observations about the students’ use of bilingual strategies. This selection resulted in a data pool that included the rubrics of 108 students ranging in grade from first to fifth. Because each student submitted one sample in Spanish and one sample in English, there were a total of 216 writing samples corresponding to the 108 students.

Procedure

We asked the teachers to evaluate writing samples of children learning to write in both Spanish and English who attend schools that are also part of the Literacy Squared project. The writing they examined was produced in January 2008 by children in first to fifth grades. Each child spent half an hour writing to a prompt. First, children wrote in response to a prompt in Spanish. Then, approximately two weeks later, they wrote to a comparable, but different, writing prompt in English. While the writing genre was the same across languages for each grade level, the topic
within the genre varied. For example, the first grade writing prompt in Spanish asked children to draw and write about their favorite animal and the English prompt asked them to draw and write about their favorite toy. Comparable writing prompts require students to accomplish the same writing task while avoiding the temptation to translate what was written to the first prompt.

 Teachers gathered in May 2008 to evaluate these writing samples using the Literacy Squared writing rubric. We asked them to note children’s strengths and weaknesses via numeric scores and then to analyze, qualitatively, bilingual strategies children were using to write. The actual writing rubric protocol is included in Appendix 1. All teachers were trained in how to use the writing rubric. Training consisted of a general overview of the rubric with emphasis on the importance of scoring a student’s Spanish language writing sample and English language writing sample in a manner that allowed for cross-language comparison and analysis. As part of this training, we use benchmark papers, which are representative of hundreds of students’ writing samples that we have analyzed through the course of the research project, to help teachers understand how to evaluate students’ writing using the Literacy Squared writing rubric. These benchmark papers give teachers a broad understanding of what typical Spanish and English writing looks like for emerging bilingual students in the middle of the school year in grades one through five.

The writing rubric

We suggest that holistic bilingual assessment can enable us to better approximate a student’s trajectory toward biliteracy. Creating this profile requires the use of an instrument that captures the biliteracy development of emerging bilingual children. For the purposes of the Literacy Squared research project, bilingual writing development is monitored and analyzed through the collection of writing samples in Spanish and English that the students produce one time per year. We collect students’ writing samples one time per year because our study is longitudinal and this enables us to look at writing growth over time. Additionally, since teachers are tasked with multiple assessments throughout the year, we want this writing assessment to be formative and to inform teachers’ instruction.

These samples are carefully evaluated using a writing rubric purposefully developed by the researchers to compare and contrast students’ writing trajectories in Spanish and English throughout the elementary grades. Writing rubrics in general are used for formative purposes, that is, to assess writing growth and to inform instruction. Also, rubrics are analytic instruments that break down the domain they are evaluating into component subparts or constructs. In the Literacy Squared project, the task of analyzing writing behaviors within each language is analytic, but we use this information to look at both languages from a holistic perspective. In order to document students’ bilingual writing trajectories holistically, the Spanish and English writing samples are evaluated side by side, and the scores from the two writing samples are reported on the same scoring sheet (see Appendix 1).

Components of the writing rubric

The writing rubric includes both a quantitative evaluation and a qualitative evaluation section. The quantitative section considers three aspects of writing: content,
punctuation, and spelling. An important feature of this writing rubric is that it does not assign equal weight to each of these three aspects. Instead, it distributes the scores in a way that it does not penalize students for approximations that are due to the simultaneous acquisition of two writing systems. A maximum score on the rubric is 14 (content = 7; punctuation = 3; and spelling = 4).

The qualitative section includes a three-column chart for the teachers to identify and to categorize the following types of linguistic approximations: (1) ‘Common to grade level errors’ or linguistic approximations within each language; (2) ‘bilingual strategies,’ which we also refer to as observable cross-linguistic transfer; and (3) ‘Common to ELD errors’ which are linguistic approximations typical of the English language development process. More specifically, the left and right columns of this chart in the writing rubric ask teachers to record concrete instances of linguistic approximations produced by the child. These approximations are divided into those typical of monolingual English and monolingual Spanish speaking students (common to grade level errors), and those that are unique to emergent bilingual children (common to ELD errors). The purpose of this separation is to help teachers identify the linguistic hypotheses and strategies children are utilizing as they develop bilingual writing competencies, so that they can better address them through instruction. The middle column asks teachers to note and to categorize students’ observable bilingual strategies that result from the transfer of knowledge and competencies from one language to the other. This task requires focused attention on cross-language analysis; that is, teachers record the observable bilingual strategies that children use as they write in either Spanish or English.

**Bilingual strategies**

The following bilingual strategies were included in the rubric:

- **Intra-sentential code-switching**: code-switching (switching from one language to the other) that occurs within the boundaries of a sentence (e.g., no puedo hablar in just one language/I can’t speak in just one language).

- **Inter-sentential code-switching**: code-switching that occurs between sentences (e.g., aprendí a hacer la división. It’s easy/I learned to do division. It’s easy).

- **Bidirectional syntax transfer**: syntactic structures unique to one language applied to writing in another language (e.g., the dog of my cousin).

- **Bidirectional phonetic transfer**: phonetic principles unique to one language being used to encode words in another language (e.g., jí/he; jegó/llegó).

- ‘Others.’ The list of bilingual strategies included in the middle column of the writing rubric was not meant to be exhaustive, therefore the rubric provided a space for teachers to make note of ‘other’ strategies they may observe. Only four teachers filled out this box in the rubric, and the following are the bilingual strategies they noted: use of ‘reverse punctuation’ (e.g., ¿Do you speak another language?), which we call ‘cross-linguistic transfer of punctuation’; ‘combo spelling’ (e.g., rlí/really), which we call ‘within word mixing of phonetic codes’; use of literal translation (e.g., tengo diversión instead of ‘me divierto’ as a literal translation from the English phrase ‘to have fun’), and the use of ‘loan’ words for names of movies or stores (e.g., ‘Macys’/Macy’s). We identified several other types of cross-linguistic transfer or bilingual strategies used by the students that had not been initially
considered in the rubric, which we also included under the ‘others’ category. A detailed description of these newly identified cross-linguistic transfers is provided in the following section.

**Data analysis**

We analyzed the data using mixed-methods (Creswell and Plano Clark 2007) and the application of a holistic bilingual lens to the assessment of emerging bilingual children’s written work. Observations about what teachers noted in the students’ writing were quantified and compared along a variety of categories. We calculated percentages of student samples in which the teachers recognized a particular bilingual strategy (see Tables 1 and 2 in the ‘Findings’ section). Percentages of teachers who identified a certain bilingual strategy based on the teachers’ language backgrounds were also obtained (see Table 3). Further, qualitative differences in teacher evaluations of children’s writing were noted based on the language background of the scorer and the level of perceived expertise in the use of the rubric between the researchers and the teachers.

Research question one asked, ‘What bilingual strategies do teachers note that students use when evaluating the writing of emerging bilingual students?’ To answer this question, we engaged in what we refer to as ‘middle column’ analysis. The middle column of the three-column chart comprising the qualitative section of the writing rubric asks teachers to note and to categorize the bilingual strategies the students are using. Again, it requires focused attention on cross-language analysis. This column is framed by two other columns that ask teachers to record encoding approximations made because students are developing English as a second language and encoding approximations that are common to monolingual speakers at a particular grade level (see Appendix 1). The teachers’ middle column notations were initially sorted into the following categories, which were already included in the writing rubric: inter-sentential code-switching, intra-sentential code-switching, awareness behaviors, first language (L1-Spanish) phonetic influences on second language (L2-English) writing, L2 phonetic influences on L1 writing, L1 syntax applied to L2 writing, L2 syntax applied to L1 writing, and ‘other.’ These data were then summarized numerically and percentages of student writing samples where the teachers noted the use of these strategies were calculated.

Research question two asked, ‘What discrepancies occur between the evaluation of children’s bilingual writing by bilingual teachers and by the Literacy Squared research team?’ To answer this question, we re-evaluated the writing of the 108 students corresponding to the teachers’ scored samples. We specifically attended to evidence of cross-linguistic transfers or bilingual strategies. Our evaluations were then compared to those completed by the teachers on the same writing samples. The purpose of this analysis was to note not only where teachers focused when evaluating student writing, but to identify other writing behaviors that they overlooked. This analysis yielded two sets of evidence: writing behaviors indicated in the writing rubric that the teachers had overlooked, and new observable bilingual strategies used by the students that had not been originally included in the writing rubric. We grouped the newly identified bilingual strategies in three main categories, which we discuss below.
Discourse level bilingual strategies
This category comprises the use of cross-linguistic transfer of rhetorical structures and punctuation. Examples of cross-linguistic transfer of rhetorical structures observed include the use of questioning or exclamatory sentences in both samples to engage the reader. For instance, for the first grade prompt, a student concluded his narratives with a question: Spanish writing sample, ‘¿Tú tienes una mascota?’/Do you have a pet?; English writing sample, ‘What is your favourite toy?’

Punctuation was noted when conventions unique to one language were applied to writing in the other language (e.g., ¡That is why going to the aquarium was a lot of fun!).

Sentence level bilingual strategies
This category, like the bidirectional syntax transfer category included in the writing rubric, considers the application of syntactic structures from one language to the other. It also considers cross-linguistic semantic transfer, or the transfer of concepts across languages. In the samples analyzed for this study, the two main instances of sentence level bilingual strategies include the use of literal translation to convey ideas (cross-linguistic semantic transfer) and subject omission (bidirectional syntax transfer). Literal translations consisted of verbatim phrases that were converted from one language to the other resulting in uncommon phrasing (e.g., ‘agarré todas bien’/I got them all right; ‘I was with the mouth open’/Me quedé con la boca abierta). Instances of subject omission were observed when students omitted, more commonly in English, a required noun or pronoun (e.g., ‘Is my favourite toy to play with’).

Word level bilingual strategies
At the word level, we noted that students did not always restrict themselves to applying the sound/symbol correspondences of one language to the other, which in the rubric is called bidirectional phonetics transfer. Students often combined spelling conventions from each language to approximate a single word (e.g., ‘lecktura’, ‘jappy’). We referred to these as within word mixing of phonetic codes. At this level, they also incorporated loan words that although have language-specific equivalents, they are part of day-to-day language use (e.g., the use of characters’ names such as ‘Spider-man’ or the word ‘soccer’ while writing in Spanish). Loan words were sometimes nativized, so that words originating in one language were changed morphologically to incorporate the structure of the other language (e.g., ‘spláchate’/to splash yourself).

Research question three asked, ‘How do teachers’ language backgrounds influence their perceptions of children’s bilingual strategies?’ To answer this question, we returned to the data sources and sorted them by bilingual teachers who were Spanish-dominant and bilingual teachers who were English-dominant. Their responses were then analyzed to determine whether differences existed in the type of strategies they noted and whether or not they were more or less likely to attend to certain bilingual strategies in the Spanish writing sample or the English writing sample.
Findings

Findings from this study were derived from the evaluation of 216 student writing samples (half of which were in Spanish and the other half in English) by teachers and the researchers. A central premise within the Literacy Squared model is the use of a holistic bilingual lens when assessing the literacy development of emerging bilingual children. Employing a holistic bilingual lens requires that evaluators analyze side-by-side, rather than separately, children’s writing in the two languages and note the kind of bilingual strategies that students used. In addition, teachers are asked to report their scores of the Spanish and English writing samples in the same scoring sheet.

Research question one in our study examined the type of observable cross-linguistic transfer or bilingual strategies that teachers noted in the students’ writing in both languages, which they reported in the scoring rubric. We were also interested in examining bilingual writing behaviors that the teachers may have overlooked or misinterpreted. Therefore, research question two explored the discrepancies between the teachers’ evaluations and what the researchers reported. The quantitative results of these analyses are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 shows that from the seven types of bilingual strategies specified in the writing rubric, ‘L1–L2 syntactic’ and ‘L1–L2 phonetic transfers’ have the highest scoring discrepancy. A stark contrast is observed between the percentages of ‘L1–L2 syntactic transfers’ reported by the teachers and the researchers (6% and 41% respectively). Similarly, a considerable difference exists between the percentage of ‘L1–L2 phonetic transfers’ reported by the teachers (36%) and by the researchers (86%). ‘Inter-sentential code-switching’ is another strategy that was under-identified by the teachers as compared to the percentage of occurrence reported by the researchers; however, the difference is smaller than the discrepancy observed in the two strategies previously mentioned.

Table 2 provides information about ‘other’ types of bilingual strategies used by the students that emerged during the data analysis (i.e., they had not been included as individual categories in the writing rubric). As we explained earlier, these strategies were grouped into three main categories and seven sub-categories. The three main categories allowed us to conduct a more comprehensive evaluation of student cross-linguistic writing behaviors at the word, sentence, and discourse level. The seven sub-categories helped us with the coding of more specific cross-linguistic strategies that teachers and researchers identified in the students’ writing. Only the strategies with more than 10% of occurrence and a large scoring discrepancy are
discussed. Approximations that we labeled ‘within word mixing of phonetic codes’ had the highest scoring discrepancy (2% by the teachers vs. 42% by the research team), followed by ‘subject omission’ and ‘rhetorical structures,’ for which a considerable discrepancy is also observed (0% vs. 12%), as well as ‘loan words’ (6% vs. 14%). In contrast to these differences in scoring, teachers and researchers identified almost the same number of transfer of ‘punctuation’ occurrences.

Research question three examined whether the teachers’ language backgrounds influenced their perceptions of students’ use of bilingual strategies. To respond to this question, we quantified the percentage of occurrences reported for each type of bilingual strategy by the English-dominant and Spanish-dominant bilingual teachers. We were interested in examining whether or not the teachers were more or less likely to attend to certain bilingual strategies observed in the Spanish writing sample or the English writing sample, based on their language backgrounds. Our findings indicate that the teachers’ language backgrounds did not seem to affect their perceptions about students’ use of bilingual strategies, except for the ‘bidirectional phonetics transfers’ category, where a large discrepancy occurred between the two groups of teachers. More specifically, a smaller number of English-dominant teachers reported instances of ‘L1–L2 phonetic transfer’ as compared to the Spanish-dominant teachers. For all the other bilingual strategies used by students, a similar frequency of occurrence was reported by both groups of teachers.

Table 2. Percentage of occurrence of ‘other’ bilingual strategies identified by teachers and researchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-linguistic transfer at word level</th>
<th>Cross-linguistic transfer at sentence level</th>
<th>Cross-linguistic transfer at discourse level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within word mixed phonetic L1–L2 (%)</td>
<td>Loan words L2–L1 (%)</td>
<td>Nativized loan words L2–L1 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan words L2–L1 (%)</td>
<td>Literal translation L2–L1 (%)</td>
<td>Subject omission L1–L2 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativized loan words L2–L1 (%)</td>
<td>Rhetorical structures (%)</td>
<td>Punct. L1–L2 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Teachers’ language background and type of bilingual strategies identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ language background</th>
<th>Inter-sentential CS (%)</th>
<th>Intra-sentential CS (%)</th>
<th>Borrowing (%)</th>
<th>Bidirectional phonetic transfer (%)</th>
<th>Bidirectional syntax transfer (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-dominant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-dominant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion
When we compared the teachers’ evaluations to our evaluations of students’ writing samples, three important patterns emerged. First, teachers tended to focus on only two types of strategies used by students, ‘L1–L2 phonetic transfers’ and ‘inter-sentential code-switching’ (reported in Table 1). This is not surprising, given that the students’ use of these types of strategies can be easily noted. The ‘L1–L2 phonetic transfers’ is manifested in the use of unconventional spelling as a result of applying Spanish phonetics when writing in English and ‘inter-sentential code-switching’ is observed when the two languages are mixed within sentence boundaries. Despite the fact that these two strategies were the most reported by the teachers, there is a notable discrepancy between the number of instances that we identified and the ones the teachers noted (ours being much higher). The second finding is that teachers’ observations frequently did not include ‘L1–L2 syntax transfers’ (see Table 1). While teachers did note phonetic transfers at the word level, their analysis largely ignored the use of bilingual strategies at the sentence level such as literal translations and subject omission among others. Although the frequency with which sentence- and discourse-level bilingual strategies occurred is lower than word-level strategies, they illustrate that cross-language transfer happens beyond the word-level phonetic transfer, and teachers must address them in their writing instruction. Support for these findings come from biliteracy research conducted in other educational settings (e.g., Edelsky 1982, 1986; Gort 2006; Serrano and Howard 2007). The third finding presents an even more striking realization than the discrepancies noted between the teachers’ evaluations and our own evaluations of students’ writing. When we re-evaluated the writing samples, we made the point of looking at the writing samples (English and Spanish) side by side in order to focus on cross-language transfers. This closer analysis revealed a much richer repertoire of bilingual strategies used by students than we had originally anticipated.

Further, our analysis of the influence of teachers’ language background on their evaluation of children’s writing lead us to hypothesize that the Spanish-dominant teachers seemed to have a better understanding of the nature of bidirectional phonetics transfer than the English-dominant teachers. It is possible that these findings may have been different had we included a group of monolingual teachers rather than two groups of bilingual teachers.

In short, a major finding of this study is that emerging bilingual students use multiple bilingual strategies when learning to write in Spanish and English simultaneously and that knowledge as well as certain competences transfer cross-linguistically. The new categories and subcategories that emerged from this study not only allowed us to fine-tune our categorization, but also to recognize the limited ways in which we had originally conceived students’ use of bilingual strategies. We came to realize that while we had emphasized bidirectional phonetics transfer and code-switching, we neglected the fact that cross-linguistic transfer occurs at the word, sentence, and discourse level. These findings reveal to us that the teachers’ perceptions of students’ bilingual writing were clearly influenced by our limited conceptions and the training they received as part of the Literacy Squared intervention. Although in this study the teachers’ language background did not seem to affect their ability to evaluate the writing of emerging bilingual students, except for the fact that Spanish-dominant teachers noticed more instances of bidirectional phonetics transfer, other studies indicate that teachers with knowledge
of Languages Other Than English (LOTE) feel more prepared and effective to work with these students (see Coady et al. 2010). We would like to add that while we believe that knowledge of another language could facilitate awareness of biliteracy behaviors used by students, there is still a need for ongoing professional development with regard to educational linguistics applied to writing instruction and evaluation for emerging bilingual students.

The findings also reflect the important role that professional development can have in changing teachers’ perceptions and knowledge about cross-linguistic transfer as an important aspect of biliteracy development. We agree with Fillmore and Snow (2000) who have documented the need for teachers to have additional training in applied linguistics so they can learn to utilize contrastive linguistics when analyzing the writing of emerging bilingual students. This knowledge will help them to distinguish writing behaviors that are common to monolingual speakers from those that can be expected in emerging bilinguals, and more importantly, how that can impact instructional decisions. In addition to addressing the students’ learning needs identified through contrastive analysis of their writing in the two languages, instruction can be enhanced through the explicit teaching of metalinguistic and metacognitive strategies to make cross-language connections. That is, to become aware of similarities and differences between the two languages and to treat writing competences demonstrated in one language as resources in the development of the other language. Finally, we came to realize that employing a holistic bilingual lens requires that evaluators analyze side-by-side, rather than separately, children’s writing in the two languages in order to have a more comprehensive understanding of the bilingual strategies that students use.

**Expanding current biliteracy assessment frameworks**

While authentic assessment is important to document student academic growth and to identify instructional needs, its use is not enough to evaluate students’ bilingual writing. A holistic bilingual lens is necessary for teachers to better understand how emerging bilingual children work across languages. Our notion of holistic bilingualism posits that the totality of what bilinguals know and can do is distributed across languages. We recognize that children are capable of acquiring and using bilingual strategies and that these strategies support their systematic approximations to conventional writing. Therefore, we suggest that a more valid way to evaluate students’ writing is to concurrently analyze written texts produced in the two languages. Conversely, in a parallel monolingualism view applied to writing assessment, student writing is evaluated in each language separately. We argue that such assessment practices deny teachers the opportunity to observe how writing abilities in the two languages support each other and are mutually reinforcing. Further, if teachers are not guided to understand how to recognize, analyze, and teach children to use bilingual strategies, instructional opportunities to maximize learning are lost.

**Changing teachers’ perceptions through the use of a holistic bilingual lens**

In order to illustrate how a student’s text may be evaluated from a parallel monolingualism and a holistic bilingualism perspective, we will discuss the writing samples of one student in the project. In what follows, we present the writing samples
created in Spanish and English by an 8 year-old in third grade who was attending one of the participating Literacy Squared schools, in response to the Spanish writing prompt, ‘Tell us in writing the best thing that has happened to you at school this year. Why do you think it was the best thing?’ and to the English writing prompt, ‘Write about the best thing that has ever happened to you. Why is it the best thing?’ A transcription of both texts is provided below (the original texts are included in Appendixes 2 and 3).

Spanish prompt: “Dinos por escrito lo mejor que te ha pasado en la escuela este año. ¿Por qué piensas que fue lo mejor?”

En el paseo
Un día yo la pace muy bien en la escuela porque fuimos a un paseo. En el paseo vimos animales resecos y muertos. Luego vimos basos echos de plastilina, vimos pueblitos echos de tierra, hojas y palos. También vimos la comida que ellos comian y también vimos arrmas que usaban para matar a los animals. Luego vimos cosas que usaban para acer la comida y para moler el mais. A mi me gusto mucho el paseo porque era lo mejor de todas las cosas que acemos en la casa. ¡Me gusto mucho el paseo!

(One day I had a good time at school because we went on a field trip. In the field trip we saw dry and dead animals. Then we saw glasses made out of clay, we saw small towns made out of dirt, leaves and sticks. We also saw the food that they use to eat and we also saw the weapons that they used to kill animals. Then we saw things that they used to prepare food and to ground corn. I like the field trip a lot because it was the best things that we do at home. I liked the field trip a lot!)

English prompt: “Write about the best thing that has ever happened to you. Why is it the best thing?”

My best day
My best day was that my cousin Diana went to my house to live thirty days. Enthen we play nintendo ds and a game of candy land. we eat rise with sop and beans. we se cartons and or favorite carton was pucca, the simpsons, pinky and the brain and dragon tales. Enthen we went shopin to the masys, target, rosee, kols, and best buy. That was my best thing because I have fun and my family were so but so happy they cudent stop lafing. And we slep at twelf of the nithe. It was my best day and fun day I never had in my live!

A scorer using a parallel monolingual lens to interpret this child’s writing might evaluate each writing sample separately without attending to cross-language writing behaviors and the use of bilingual writing strategies. The evaluator may perceive the Spanish writing sample as highly competent writing because the main idea is discernable and supported by details, varying sentence patterns are included, and a sense of completeness (clear introduction and conclusion) is observed as well as a good use of punctuation. The writing approximations that more likely would be identified as common among third graders who are monolingual Spanish speakers would be orthographic in nature. Examples of these approximations would include the following: a lack of accent marks in high utility words (e.g., día, também) and in verbs in past tense (e.g., pasé, gustó); substituting letters for others that have a similar sound such as s/c/z (e.g., pace/pasé, mais/maíz) and b/v (e.g., basos/vasos), and omitting the letter ‘h’ at the beginning of a word (e.g., echos/hechos, acemos/hacemos).

When analyzing the English writing sample, the evaluator employing a parallel monolingual lens might also score this sample as highly competent writing. A sense
of completeness in the text can be observed by the use of an introduction and conclusion. In addition, the student used varying sentence patterns rather than a repetitive pattern in the construction of sentences as well as adequate punctuation. In relation to spelling, the evaluator may notice that most high frequency words were spelled conventionally and that the child is approximating standardization in her errors (e.g., faverite/favorite).

The evaluator might also notice some unusual syntactic structures (e.g., ‘And we slep at twelf of the nithe’), which do not reflect those of a monolingual English-speaking child. Consequently, the evaluator may consider that Spanish is interfering with this child’s English language and literacy development. In a parallel monolingual view, the writing development of a monolingual child is seen as the ‘norm,’ and when the writing of a bilingual child is compared to this ‘norm,’ her development may be judged as deficient. Evidence for this conclusion in the English writing sample would include the awkward syntax the child has used.

Using the writing rubric developed for the Literacy Squared project (see Appendix 1) would allow the evaluator to employ a holistic bilingual lens, and consequently, arrive to a different interpretation about this child’s bilingual writing abilities. From this perspective, we would evaluate both texts as highly competent writing for the same reasons stated previously (i.e., varying sentence patterns, a clear introduction and conclusion, a main idea supported by details, and adequate use of punctuation). In order to make a cross-language analysis, we would also identify the bilingual writing strategies that the child is using to express herself in the two languages, and describe them at the word, sentence and discourse levels.

At the word level, this child demonstrates concept of word (knowledge about word boundaries) across languages. We also notice that in both writing samples she uses standard spelling for most of the high frequency words and very little signs of bidirectional phonetic transfer are observed (e.g., cudent/couldn’t). In the English writing sample, the child is using approximations that reflect her emerging awareness of patterns unique to English and her ability to write in a way that looks like English (e.g., nithe/night, thirty/thirty). In other words, she is applying language-specific conventions. This illustrates that this child not only knows that sounds can be heard in her mind and then represented on writing, but more importantly, that she, like other children receiving paired literacy instruction, can differentiate two or more sound systems without becoming confused.

At the sentence level we also observe sentence separation across languages. In contrast to the word-level analysis, here we notice more reliance on syntactic structures common to the Spanish language being applied to English (e.g., ‘My family were so but so happy’, ‘we slep at twelf of the night’). However, instead of seeing the unusual syntax as evidence of language interference, we would see it as bidirectional syntax transfer that is affording this child a bilingual writing strategy to better express her ideas and emotions. Furthermore, this illustrates knowledge that language is rule governed and the fact that this knowledge transfers across languages. From this observation we can also conclude that emerging bilingual children are resourceful learners who draw from all their linguistic resources when writing in each language.

At the discourse level, several instances of cross-language transfer are observed. In both writing samples we notice that the child includes a title, organizes both narrative texts in a linear fashion, starting with a topic sentence followed by several supporting details, and ending with a conclusion. For the conclusion, she uses
exclamatory sentences as a rhetorical device that eloquently brings both narratives to an end. Additionally, she is aware about the similarities and differences in the use of punctuation marks appropriate to each language.

Conclusions and future research directions

In the study described in this paper, bilingual teachers were asked to evaluate the writing samples of children learning to read and write in both Spanish and English. They were asked to note children’s strengths and weaknesses via numeric scores and then to analyze qualitatively bilingual strategies children were using to write. Teacher analyses were then compared to researcher analyses. A major finding from this study clearly illustrates that evaluations of emerging bilingual children’s writing depend not just on what children produce, but more importantly on teachers’ interpretation of the written work. This finding is important because teachers’ interpretations lead to judgments about whether or not children’s literacy is developing as expected, and what concepts or skills should constitute the focus of instruction. If teachers have deficit notions about biliterate writing development, including the bilingual strategies used by emerging bilingual children, then their instruction may be less than effective.

The findings discussed above reaffirm for us the need for teachers to use a holistic bilingual lens when interpreting the writing of emerging bilingual children. We believe that a holistic bilingual lens can be a powerful framework to change teachers’ perceptions and knowledge about biliterate writing development in emerging bilingual children, thereby enhancing instruction. By looking at Spanish writing and English writing side by side and recognizing how languages reinforce each other, teachers can get a big picture view of the developing biliteracy of the children. Thus, we suggest that the development of a holistic bilingual lens for writing evaluation that considers contrastive linguistics should be a major focus of teacher education and staff development for teachers of emerging bilingual children.

From the study above we also learned that emerging bilinguals are resourceful learners who draw on all their linguistic resources when they learn to write in two languages and employ a variety of bilingual strategies at the word, sentence, and discourse level. This helps us realize the importance of evaluating and teaching bilingual writing as an integrated system rather than as discrete pieces. Further investigation is needed to determine how and to what extent cross-linguistic transfer at these levels influence the biliteracy trajectories of emerging bilingual children. In addition, investigating the relationship between cross-linguistic transfer and language proficiency among Spanish–English emerging bilinguals would inform us about the nature of biliteracy development. We are hopeful that additional research combined with more opportunities for professional development will result in an improved ability on the part of teachers and researchers to move beyond theories of parallel monolingualism toward more robust and valid theories of biliteracy.
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Notes
1. Since conducting this study, the writing rubric has been revised and substantial improvements have been made that more accurately evaluate the writing of emerging bilingual children from grades K-5th.
2. The trajectory toward biliteracy documents patterns of development and growth in Spanish and English literacy that are distinctive to emerging bilingual children, and in essence document each child’s unique biliteracy blueprint. Children’s academic achievement is expressed in terms of biliterate development rather than by grade levels, or other normative measures that look at two languages separately.
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## Appendix 1: The Literacy Squared® writing rubric

**Literacy Squared® Scoring Rubric: Grades 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5**

*(Please Circle Grade)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH SCORE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>ENGLISH SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Superior/Excellent Writing: Creativity that reflects children’s literature</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Competent Writing: Varying Sentence Patterns</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Competent Writing: Sense of completeness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transitioning Intermediate Writing: More than 2 ideas, main idea discernable, may be incomplete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beginning Writing: Two Ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emergent Writing: One Idea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prewriting: Not readable or incomplete thought. (Also, written in a language other than the prompt.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The student did not prepare a sample</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH SCORE</th>
<th>PUNCTUATION</th>
<th>ENGLISH SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accurate punctuation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some punctuation errors; Mostly correct</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Many punctuation errors-meaning not affected, or minimal punctuation used</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Punctuation errors affect meaning, or no punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH SCORE</th>
<th>SPANISH SCORE</th>
<th>SPELLING</th>
<th>ENGLISH SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accurate spelling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some spelling errors; Mostly correct</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many spelling errors; Meaning not affected</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Many spelling errors; Sometimes affects meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Spelling errors affect meaning</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common ELD Errors</th>
<th>Bilingual Strategies</th>
<th>Common Grade Level Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-sentential Codeswitching (I love my new ropa.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-sentential Codeswitching (Begins in 1 language and ends in the other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot; inserted to indicate knowledge that a word is borrowed from another language. (Vimos el “jellyfish.”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidirectional phonetics transfer (japi/happy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidirectional syntax transfer (The bike of my sister)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Literacy Squared®
### Grades 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 Writing Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>CRITICAL DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Complete story or summary that demonstrates consistency, creativity, and that reflects grade level literature.</td>
<td>Superior Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complete story using varied sentence structures and/or descriptive vocabulary</td>
<td>Highly Competent Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sense of completeness Has connecting or transitioning words Logical sequence</td>
<td>Competent Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More than 2 ideas The main idea can be inferred or stated explicitly Story or summary may be incomplete</td>
<td>Transitioning Intermediate Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two ideas (not necessarily separate sentences) Logical order</td>
<td>Beginning Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>One idea within a story or summary (not necessarily within the same sentence)</td>
<td>Emergent Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The sample does not have complete thoughts that can be easily understood. The sample may have letters, syllables, and/or various words, but it does not have a complete thought. Written in a language other than the prompt.</td>
<td>Prewriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The student did not prepare a sample.</td>
<td>No Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSUMPTIONS:**
- Critical descriptors are cumulative. To receive a 7, the student must exhibit all of the relevant indicators listed in the previous levels.
- Students should write to the prompt
- "Logical" order means any order that would be appropriate in EITHER Spanish or English. A monolingual reader may need to consult a bilingual colleague to determine whether or not the order is logical.
- Spelling should be analyzed by a bilingual person.

**Note:** Reproduced with permission.
Appendix 2. Spanish writing sample

En el paseo

En día yo la pase muy bien en la escuela porque fuimos a un paseo. En el paseo vimos animales resecos y muertos. Luego vimos bosques echos de plastilina, vimos pueblos echos de tierra, hojas y paños. También vimos la comida que ellos comían y también vimos armas que usaban para matar a los animales. Luego vimos cosas que usaban para acer la comida y para moler el maíz. Mi me gusta mucho el paseo porque era lo mejor de todas las cosas que aseme en la casa. Me gusta mucho el paseo!
Appendix 3. English writing sample

My best day was that my cousin Diana went to my house to live thirty days. Then we played Nintendo DS and a game of candy land, we ate rice with sausages and beans. We saw cartoons and our favorite cartoon was 'Pinky and the Brain' and 'Dragon Tales'. Then we went shopping to the mall, target, and best buy. That was my best day because I had fun and my family were so happy they couldn't stop laughing. And we slept at twelve of the night. It was my best day and fun day. I never had in my life!
Appendix 4. Teacher questionnaire

Literacy Squared®
2007-2008

TEACHER IN-TAKE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the following:

Part One: Demographics

1. First name__________________________________________________
2. Last name__________________________________________________
3. District___________________________________________________
4. School_________________________________________________
5. Grade:____________________________________
6. Gender ___________male                  _________________female
7. Age:  ________25-30   ________31-39   ______40-49  _______over 50
8. Ethnicity ___Latino;  ___White; ___African-American; ___Asian;  ___Other
9. Position title:________________________________

Type of Program:___________________________

Do you teach L1(Spanish)____;  L2 (English)____ Both_____

10. Number of years as a teacher______________
11. Education:
    a. What is your degree in?_____________________________
    b. Where did you receive your degree?_________________
    c. What is your certification/endorsement?____________
    d. Where did you receive your endorsement?____________
    e. Did you receive any of your education in bilingual settings?__ __
    f. If yes to ‘e’ (above) please describe____________________
    g. Advanced degree (Master’s etc/)._________________
    h. Where did you earn your advanced degree___________
Please fill out the chart by checking where you did your schooling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schooling</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Other Country (please specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please check in the table below with what you consider to be your native and second languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Second Language</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your proficiency in each of your languages on a scale of 1 -5 (1=low; 5=high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Training experience:
What types of professional development trainings have you had related to teacher ELLs?

What types of professional development trainings have you had related to teaching LITERACY to ELLs?