Abstract

ORLOV, LEONID YURYEVICH. Language Minority Students: Bilingual Identity Development in the College Years. (Under the direction of Siu-Man "Raymond" Ting)

Following a preliminary screening, 7 undergraduate students participated in semi-structured interviews to aid in understanding of their experience as bilinguals at North Carolina State University. Only respondents indicating a language other than English (L2) as their first or "native" (L1) qualified for participation. The sample included persons of both sexes, from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, speaking 6 heritage languages with varying degrees of proficiency. Research question number 1 dealt with the latter aspect of bilingualism. There were 3 participants who reported higher proficiency in their first language (L1 Dominant), 2 – in English (L2 Dominant), and 2 indicated equal proficiency in both (Balanced). The second research question assessed the respondents' valorization of the 2 languages. All participants reported at least some valorization of both languages.

Research question number 3 sought to obtain rich qualitative data on students' experiences as members of a language minority (LM). All of the Dominant participants (5 out 7) seemed to endorse the latter approach to bilingualism. Because no research on bilingualism to date involved identity development in college-aged individuals, this study attempts to explain the phenomenon via a conceptual fusion of theories that describe experiences of other minorities. Biracial identity development was used to explain the way bilinguals negotiate 2 disparate identities: 1 representing a minority group and 1 – a majority cohort. Gay identity development was used to approximate bilinguals' experience of "invisibility" – having to make the choice of either announcing their LM membership or concealing it (a.k.a. "passing" for the majority).
The participants who were labeled as Balanced, seemed more likely to pass than to disclose. To manage the stigma associated with foreignness, the Balanced student (that identified as Caucasian) reported using his "American" appearance and lack of an accent to pass for the monolingual majority on a regular basis. The likely psychological impact of the latter coping mechanism on this Caucasian American language minority (CALM) student is delayed bilingual identity development. This phenomenon has not been previously studied in CALM individuals and warrants further inquiry. Of the L2 Dominant respondents, 1 came across as ambivalent, while the other appeared to favor disclosure slightly. The remainder of the sample (all L1 Dominant) seemed to overwhelmingly endorse disclosure and reject passing. Among L1 Dominant participants, 2 of 3 seemed to describe their LM experiences in predominantly emotional terms. Conversely, the 4 participants reporting high proficiency in English sounded rather pragmatic in recounting their experiences. This was noted as a theme of \textit{insignificance}, referring to advantages of being a part of LM. Several other patterns seemed to emerge from the data: \textit{differentiation} (describing advantages of bilingualism), \textit{skeptical} (referring to passing ability), \textit{conditional} (describing both passing and disclosure), \textit{communication} (both impeded and enhanced by bilingualism).

Research question number 4 endeavored to further synthesize all of the above data in a conceptual framework unique to bilingual development. Participants exposed to both languages from birth or from an early age, tended to have a more balanced bilingual proficiency than those who learned a second language as adults. Nevertheless, the former individuals seemed to have less of an insight into their relative minority status as bilinguals. The study concludes that combining other minority development theories is a
good initial framework for describing LM experiences of the 7 university students in the sample. Future research on this topic is encouraged in order to construct a comprehensive model of bilingual identity development for this cohort. Interventions, such as providing supportive counseling to help students cope with issues of proficiency (speaking with an accent, expressing thoughts and feelings) and development (achieving integrated bilingual identity) are suggested as part of the discussion.
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Counselors and other student affairs professionals are continuing to discover the diversity hidden under this familiar label. The distinction is most often made on the basis of such observable characteristics as color and ethnicity, overlooking the less obvious traits: gender, sexual orientation, bilingualism, disability, etc. The danger is no longer in being blind to the differences, but rather in being nearsighted to the fine details therein, i.e., acknowledging diversity within diversity. Although a great deal of clinical attention and research have been devoted to the minority experience on college campuses, this phenomenon has been described in very "black and white" terms. In fact, the word "minority" itself has become synonymous with "persons of color," often at the cost of excluding the other, less easily identifiable minorities.

One such group – bilinguals – merits special attention, if only because of its increasing presence at American institutions of higher learning. No definitive figure exists for the number of students that consider themselves bilingual, largely due to the current design of college applications that only inquire about race or ethnicity. However, in the population at large, in the year 2000 almost 47 million people aged 5 and above spoke "a language other than English at home" (Shin & Bruno, 2003, p. 1). Most were speakers of Spanish – 28.1 million, an unprecedented (for a minority of this size) 62% increase since the Census of 1990 (Shin & Bruno, 2003). North Carolina had the fastest
growing Hispanic population in the country during the 1990s, an increase of 394%. Other ethnic groups also showed rapid growth (United States Census Bureau, n.d.). Even if in the decade following the 2000 Census only a modest percentage of these individuals ended up in college, bilinguals would likely comprise a sizeable minority group therein. And as this new minority continues to grow, so would hopefully the Student Affairs professionals' ability to hear and understand their voices.

To date, a great deal of research has been devoted to bilingual children and some – to their parents (see, e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Lambert, 1975; Giles & Byrne, 1982; Landry, 1987; Hamers & Blanc, 1989; Landry & Allard, 1992). However, researchers in most of these studies seem to lose all interest in how their participants and their children develop by the time they reach high school. There seems to be a pervasive tendency to treat this developmental process as finite and strictly cognitive in nature, susceptible only somewhat to psychosocial influences. In other words, the existing research not only overlooks college-age bilinguals, but also (and most importantly) fails to heed a major experiential aspect of this cohort's bilingual development – personal identity as members of a minority group. And yet, non-English speakers immigrating to the US, along with their immigrant and American-born children, share in the common experience of being marginalized at American colleges and universities only because their "mother tongue" is not the majority language. Tolerance (though not always acceptance) on the part of the US monolingual majority is often contingent upon linguistic assimilation, i.e., identification with the majority English at the price of weakening, or even losing the connection with the minority heritage language.
Numerous minority development theories exist in the literature (see, e.g., Cass, 1979; Gibbs, 1987; Poston, 1990; Hall, 2001; Sue & Sue, 2003). The usual course of most such models is from discovery to empowerment of the marginalized identity, with concurrent decrease in resentment for the majority group. Minorities described by these models (e.g., African Americans) usually do not carry within themselves a combination of two or more conflicting identities related to the same type of characteristic, as is the case with another racial minority – biracials. For the latter group, existing development models introduce the concept of integrating the minority identity (e.g., Black) with the majority identity (e.g., White) as the highest level of development (see, e.g., Gibbs, 1987; Poston, 1990; Hall, 2001). Because of the apparent power differential between a person’s heritage language and that of the society at large, it seems reasonable to conjecture that biracial identity development theory can be used to understand the development of bilinguals as a language minority. This and other theoretical models contributing to the current research are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 of this paper.

The purpose of this research is to attain a deeper understanding of bilingual experiences of students enrolled in an American institution of higher learning. The general questions that helped guide this qualitative examination are stated below:

1. What is the linguistic proficiency for the bilingual students?
2. What value do the bilingual students place on each language?
3. What language minority experiences might the bilingual students have had?
4. How are the above three factors related to bilingual identity development?
In practical terms, the ability to better understand bilinguals in this sample is likely to allow counselors and other professionals to provide the support necessary for other such individuals' optimal functioning as members of American society.

Definition of Terms

Language comprehension is one of the main components of this research. It therefore seems proper to outline some of the terms I utilize throughout. These definitions are by no means exhaustive; they merely serve as translations for the key constructs that have become a part of this project's vocabulary.

Identity. It would be difficult to define such an iceberg of a term in one or two paragraphs. In the pages that follow, I embark on a journey to explore but a tip of this iceberg – bilingual identity development as a language minority. One of the dictionary definitions of identity-proper is "sameness of essential character" (Lexico Publishing Group, 2005, p.1). For the purposes of this research, I have conceived personal identity as a set of self-reported personal characteristics of utmost salience to the individual in question.

Bilingual. This study approaches bilingualism as an experience that goes beyond the mere ability to speak two languages. Specifically, I hold crucial the element of having a strong (and often – involuntary) connection to both languages in a person's repertoire. Thus, regardless of his or her mastery of a second language, an individual who grew up around a language other than the one spoken in the country at large would qualify for participation, while a foreign exchange student would not. In other words, a bilingual is a person whose linguistic duality is culturally relevant. Admittedly, this definition is somewhat circular, seeing how
the concept of *culture* encompasses a set of characteristics inherent to a
nationality of people, which includes language, customs, beliefs, etc. (Tylor,
1873, cited in Hamers & Blanc, 1989). Yet, in a similar vein, it would hardly
suffice to examine, e.g., sexual orientation solely by looking at such an umbrella
construct as gender.

**Minority.** At the proposal stage of this research, my goal was to devise as comprehensive
a definition of this term as possible. I started with the basic *quantitative*
definition – less than 50% of anything, such as the number of individuals
possessing a certain characteristic. When this simple numerical criterion is met,
the *qualitative* aspect of being a minority often follows – the group in question
can be said to have less than 50% of *power*. The latter term is extremely complex
in and of itself, but for the purposes of this study, it will be used in reference to a
group's relative societal advantage, a.k.a., *privilege*. The importance of
specifying the qualitative portion of the definition is in the seemingly paradoxical
dominance of certain less numerous groups (e.g., males in a number of contexts).

The term *language minority* (LM) has existed in professional literature since the last
quarter of the twentieth century (cf., Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Landry,
1987; Hamers & Blanc, 1989; Landry & Allard, 1992; Krashen, 1998; Kanno,
2003). However, it is often confused with its mirror image – *minority language*,
i.e., a language that is spoken by a minority group. Due to the specificity of the
above definition of minority groups, it would not suffice to describe minority
language as the one *utilized* by less than 50% of the country's citizens (i.e.,
quantity dimension) without the stipulation of being *valorized* by less than 50% of
the same (i.e., quality dimension). In turn, LM is a type of a minority group whose distinguishing trait is a minority language, regardless of any other salient characteristics the group may possess.

This latter provision is an important one, because it underscores the issue of invisibility, recently expanded upon in the case of sexual orientation by Tyler (2002). Because gay individuals are not always easily identified (by the larger society, the gay community or even themselves), they could either: 1) "come out" as members of the gay minority, or 2) "pass" for members of the heterosexual majority. In both scenarios they remain an invisible minority, hidden under the mask of looking and behaving like the majority, pending announcement of their true identity (Tyler, 2002). In the US, White bilinguals have similar options: to reveal their LM status, or to keep quiet and pass for the majority (viz., White monolinguals). Regardless of whether they choose to be inaudible, these bilinguals remain "CALM" – Caucasian American language minority of the invisible kind.

**Conceptual Framework**

What comes to mind when we hear the words "bilingual identity development"? This idea is so novel that PsycINFO, a comprehensive international bibliographic database of psychology, could locate no meaningful matches when all three words were entered in the search window (American Psychological Association, 2005). Furthermore, when entered into a leading internet search engine with quotes around it, only two unique hits resulted (Google Incorporated, 2005)! One is in the name of a course offered at a university in California (Pacific Oaks College and Children's School, 2005), while the
other is one of the references used in this research – a monograph that describes a longitudinal study of four bilingual teenagers (Kanno, 2003). In other words, whereas bilinguals, identity and development (as well as bilingual development, identity development, etc.) have been studied extensively, bilingual identity and minority development thereof – remain largely unexplored in the social sciences.

Aware of such a dearth in understanding of bilingual persons' minority experience, it seemed necessary to create a real-life metaphor to help illustrate this phenomenon. This conceptual framework is based on the existing anecdotal and clinical evidence, as well as (in part) on my own bilingual development experiences. Figure 1 contains an image of a compact disk – rewritable (CD-RW) with links to the audio tracks of my Bilingual Biography. The printed version of this work has the same audio content available on an actual CD-RW (see Appendix H). The difference, or lack thereof, between the message seen on the disk's label (i.e., appearance) and the message heard when the CD-RW is played back with an appropriate device (i.e., identity) is at the heart of the metaphor. It demonstrates the concept of invisibility defined earlier in this chapter. So, until the person speaks out, i.e. chooses to disclose his or her possible membership in a language minority, others are only able to guess about his or her actual linguistic identity via something noticeable externally (e.g., skin color, clothing, etc.), and even that – with no specific degree of certainty.

Interestingly, this disclosure need not occur via direct confession of the possible second language background – the content of the audio tracks. The mere process of playing back the CD-RW may be just as telling (though – again – not very conclusive), as it reveals an accent, exposes a "peculiar" way of producing sentences or other speech
elements, etc. In collecting and analyzing research data, I have attempted to integrate each participant's label with the richness of the sound contained in his or her audio tracks. As the study progresses I will continuously re-specify the logistics of the metaphor: how (if at all) some tracks are recorded on top of the other ones, what significance does the order of recording and playback have, etc. In other words, I shall return to the "CD-RW," both as a conceptual metaphor, and as a physical medium that is capable of narrating a bilingual's experience (viz., my own Bilingual Biography).

"Bilingual Biography"

01. Intro
02. L1: Age 0 to 1
03. L1: Age 1 to 3.5
04. L1: Age 3.5 to 6
05. L1 Schooling: USSR
06. L1: Grades 1-4
07. L1: Grades 4-10
08. L2 Schooling: USA
09. L1>L2: Grade 10
10. L1>L2: Grade 12
11. L1+L2 Mixing
12. L1=L2: College
13. L1=L2: Graduate
14. Dedication

Figure 1. Compact disk – Rewritable (CD-RW). Tracks 01-14 are clickable for audio playback of the author's Bilingual Biography. If reading the printed version, please see Appendix H for the enclosure containing an actual CD-RW with the same audio content.
The use of a CD-RW, a disk whose tracks can be recorded over and over again – up to 1,000 times – to illustrate the concept of bilingualism is not coincidental. Cognitively speaking, second language development can either add to, or take away from the first language development and vice versa (Landry & Allard, 1992). This view of bilingualism is explored in further detail in Chapter 2 of this paper. Unlike the CD-RW's predecessor, compact disk – recordable (CD-R), capable of recording the tracks only once and only in succession, CD-RW allows replacement of the earlier sound. It must also be noted that clues about linguistic identity are by no means the only messages that can be derived from the playback; other elements of what was earlier defined as personal identity come to life as we listen on. In fact, to produce the most accurate metaphor for personal identity, several other sensory components would have to be introduced. One possible way of doing this by means of fictional technology is via a rewritable digital video disk (DVD-RW) complete with three-dimensional virtual reality playback and capable of producing tactile, gustatory, and olfactory associations. Yet, due to the linguistic nature of the current study, a graphically labeled rewritable compact disk, whose tracks contain only the auditory clues about the person's identity characteristics, shall suffice.

Researcher Perspective

I am a bilingual, Caucasian American, heterosexual male, who is 29 years old. The order in which these characteristics appear is not meaningful except for the fact that they follow the English alphabet. (To put the traits in alphabetical order in Russian, my native language, I would have to do some shuffling, not to mention creative translating). I chose not to include several other characteristics relevant to my personal identity –
above average in height, full-time counseling intern, with over 70% of vision loss, etc. – as they had little or no bearing on the analysis of the present study. In the headings that follow I explain (in English) how each descriptor relates to this research.

*Bilingual*

I spoke Russian almost exclusively until the age of 17, at which point I moved to the Unites States of America. The only exception until then was English class, during which I was fortunate enough to learn how to describe in broken English such topics as the structure of the Communist Party and of the British Parliament. Very little conversational skill was taught in Soviet schools, so upon arrival to the US, I basically had to start learning English all over again. Thirteen years later, it is difficult to imagine speaking – or even thinking – in just one language for an extended period of time. My experiences as a bilingual consist of learning my L1 from scratch and gradually mastering it, followed by a similar process for L2, though with two important provisions.

First of all, L2 acquisition did not occur in isolation – the basic sound clusters of Russian language (a.k.a., phonemes – discussed in Chapter 2 of this paper) were already in place when English went on its major offensive. Perhaps because of that, regardless of how easy it is for me to say, read or write something in English, the very same thing in Russian is at least somewhat easier or more meaningful. And secondly, despite L2's eventual occupation of my entire existence, I seem to have maintained a large deployment of Russian-speaking troops in the war theatre. Crucially, L1 is not merely a shadow of the old regime, but is every bit a key player in the new politics. In terms of both the relative proficiency and value, the two languages appear to have formed a single cohesive entity allowing for utilization of both interchangeably. For some examples of
such "code-mixing and code-switching" (Hamers & Blanc, 1989, p. 22), please refer to the track number 11 ("L1+L2 Mixing") on my Bilingual Biography (available via Figure 1 or Appendix H of the printed version).

"Bilingual" is the term I used in describing the study to potential participants, because it is generally well-recognized in American culture. An exception, which has a potential of becoming the rule in the near future, is the use of this label in large metropolitan cities with a high percentage of Spanish-speaking population. There, the word "bilingual" tends to mean, unequivocally, "the speaker of Spanish and English," and does not seem to include speakers of other minority languages. Because the university under investigation is not situated in a major metropolis, this trend appeared to be a non-issue for the current study. The only ambiguity resided in my intentionally vague study announcement, defining L1 as "some language other than English," which let to the exclusion of two highly proficient non-heritage bilinguals from the final sample.

Therefore, the adjective "bilingual" seemed to be a fairly neutral description of an individual who happens to speak two languages. Colloquially, it tends to imply that the relative proficiency is unknown until the term is modified by "fully" or "partly." Using a neutral term was important to conceal one of the true purposes of the study – determining the participants' bilingual status as balanced, subtractive or additive (Landry & Allard, 1992). Chapter 2 discusses the latter classifications in detail. I avoided using the term "language minority" until the debriefing process as not to prematurely introduce a sense of power differential between the two languages.

It appeared as though my self-identification as a bilingual tended to quickly put the participants at ease, and allowed for a comfortable, conversation-like interchange,
which is at the heart of in-depth qualitative interviewing (Douglas, 1985, cited in Holstein & Gubrium, 1997; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, cited in Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Please see Chapter 3 of this work for more on qualitative research design. Most of the participants reported that it was good to talk to someone who has had very similar experiences. This sense of an almost instant rapport was crucial because of the time limitations of the study. In just the second meeting, the interview content tended to include very personal information that would be difficult (if not impossible) to obtain in the absence of a good working alliance.

*Caucasian American*

Identifying as Caucasian American (rather than merely *White*) is deliberate on my part. A naturalized US citizen, i.e., having once been an *alien*, I do not take this status as an "inalienable" right, but rather as an earned privilege. As any privilege, this one comes at a price of disadvantaging somebody else: people that must wait for years to obtain temporary study or work visas, immigrants that enter and remain here illegally, et al., each enjoying only a minimal subset of the rights available to permanent residents of this country. Partly because of such a keen awareness of my *American* privilege, I am able to remain cognizant of my *White* privilege by combining them in the *Caucasian American* label. Acknowledging this dual majority affiliation is crucial to the design of the study in terms of understanding the temptation for myself and other CALM students to pass for the monolingual majority.

*Heterosexual Male*

As if the duet that is comprised by my Caucasian American privilege did not come through loudly enough, two other powerful voices sound through every chance they
get: being heterosexual and being male. Whereas the latter trait is something I have been aware of, and able to articulate long before I learned my first English word, I only "came out as straight" recently. Suddenly I came to realize that every time I wanted talk about my future life partner and our commitment ceremony, I am privileged enough to be able to use the words "wife" and "marriage" – labels that very few (if any) gay Americans can boast under the current US law. Having a clear set of societal advantages as a male (regardless of sexual orientation) goes without saying – from Wal-Mart to the academia, men receive systematic preferential treatment in terms of hiring, compensation, promotion, etc., not to mention the more subtle privileges that persons of my sex often enjoy at the expense of women.

Twenty-Nine Year Old

I am still dubious regarding the effect of my age on this research. The participants' median age was 20, though one was 33 years old. This means that with the exception for this outlier, I was 9 years their senior – hardly a bid for a peer status candidacy. However, because of my "youthful look" that allows me to pass for the majority of traditional-age college students, it is doubtful that this affected the initial establishment of the rapport and genuine disclosure during the interview. Nevertheless, the mere fact that I am a graduate student who assigns credit for participation, created a sense of power differential resembling a similar gap between an instructor and his students. Such a disparity in status in and of itself may have created a perception of a difference in age.
Summary

Being a heritage bilingual, along with my membership in the above cohorts, may have had an impact on design and data analysis of this study. Whereas some of my characteristics may have put the students at ease and allowed for rapport building to occur, other traits may have served to the opposite ends. Either way, the relationship that ensued had the potential of affecting the way I designed the instruments, conducted the interviews, etc. I have attempted to control for these research biases by obtaining a sample of students with diverse racial, ethnic, and heritage language backgrounds. In data collection and analysis, my own experiences served mostly as a rapport-building tool, rather than a guide for conceptual understanding. Additionally, with the exception for the semi-structured portions of the interview, all other interactions with respondents were strictly standardized.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Overview

When reviewing the literature for this study, I began to feel both excited and concerned about the seeming lack of writings on the topic of bilingual identity development. Excited, because discovering new grounds is at the heart of any research endeavor, and because making a significant contribution to the field seemed more feasible than ever in my academic career. Concerned, because the task of proving the merit of my ideas to the entire scientific community was a daunting one. With all this in mind, it seemed reasonable to embark on the journey qualitatively – by viewing my own and others’ bilingual experiences against the theoretical backdrop of existing minority identity development models. In this chapter, the theories of linguistic and minority identity development are outlined as they currently exist – independently from each other. In the remainder of this paper, I examine how these theories may fit together based on the LM experiences of 7 undergraduates at North Carolina State University.

Bilingual Development

Before proceeding to descriptions of bilingual development, it is important to differentiate between the two main approaches to modeling development in general. Lateral models describe an individual's single position in the entire spectrum of development, usually somewhere between two polar extremes. This normative approach is reminiscent of taking a snapshot of the individual and comparing him or her to some standard. Stage models, by contrast, deal with all positions the person has ever occupied in the spectrum of his or her development. In other words, the individual is compared to
him or herself at successive points in his or her life – an ipsative approach. Piaget's (1950, cited in Perry, 1970) theory of child development is a perfect example of a stage model. Finally, there are combination models, e.g., Perry's (1970) own model of intellectual development occurring along successive stages, some of which include structural organization of the lateral kind.

In the realm of bilingualism, there seems to be a pervasive trend for explaining linguistic development laterally, with sociological, psychological and other variables viewed merely as background factors. In all fairness, there was an attempt to define the stages of bilingual development for children whose parents each speak a different language and are equally invested in instilling both languages in their offspring's lexicon (Goodz, 1984, cited in Hamers & Blanc, 1989). Though idealistic and not easily generalizable to all bilingual children, and especially – to all adults, this is an important attempt to bring the social context to the foreground of bilingual development modeling (Hamers & Blanc, 1989). Even though creating a full-fledged stage model of bilingual identity development is beyond the scope of the present work, I will attempt to further the understanding of this process. I conceptualized it via a synthesis of stage models for all applicable minority groups, based on the structural elements of the accepted lateral model of bilingual development.

The first lateral explanation of bilingual development was put forth by Lambert (1975, cited in Landry & Allard, 1992) and has since been elaborated by a number of researchers, including Landry and Allard (1992; see also Hamers & Blanc, 1989). This view of bilingualism seeks to address varying degrees thereof in terms of dominance in proficiency of one language over the other. Persons that place more value on their
mother tongue, a.k.a., native, heritage, or simply – *first* language (L1), are considered "L1 Dominant" (Landry & Allard, 1992, p. 225). On the other extreme, those for whom some acquired, non-native, non-heritage, or simply – *second* language (L2) has a greater relative salience, are described as "L2 Dominant" (Landry & Allard, 1992, p. 225). Finally, those who fall in the middle of the spectrum of bilingualism are called "Balanced" (Landry & Allard, 1992, p. 225), or in colloquial terms – fully bilingual.

The model goes on to make a normative distinction between additive and subtractive bilingualism. When "the acquisition of L2 results in lower L1 development, bilingualism becomes a subtractive process" (Landry & Allard, 1992, p. 226). Similar to recording audio onto a CD-RW, some of the language acquisition tracks are "burnt" on top of the existing ones, making the latter nearly incomprehensible. Below is a simplified version of Landry & Allard's rendition of the model, with "+" and "−" signs included for emphasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>BALANCED</th>
<th>dominant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(L1)</td>
<td>L1 &gt; L2</td>
<td>L1 = L2</td>
<td>L2 &gt; L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−subtractive−</td>
<td>+ADDITIVE+</td>
<td>−subtractive−</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "BALANCED +ADDITIVE+" bilingualism is depicted in caps because Landry and Allard (1992) allude to this degree of linguistic competence as being the most adaptive, cognitively speaking. In terms of the compact disk metaphor, the new tracks are added in such a way that they preserve or even enhance the old ones. Albeit this view of bilingualism describes language, not minority development, the assignment of such labels as additive and subtractive, seems to have the undertones of dividing people into the more- and the less-privileged.
Indeed, Hamers and Blanc (1989) seemed to be quite explicit in recognizing the impact a person's bilingual development may have on his or her cultural identity. "...[L]anguage is a transmitter of culture; furthermore, it is the main tool for the internalization of culture by the individual" (p. 116). These authors did not put forth a model, but did seem to issue a call for others to expand the understanding of this phenomenon beyond psycholinguistics:

Because language is such an important component of culture it will be a salient feature of the individual's social cultural identity, while at the same time being a sociocultural marker of group membership in settings where cultures come into contact. Therefore the development of bilinguality has to be studied in relation to a more general approach to social perception and intergroup behavior (p. 117).

One logical choice for studying the above "intergroup behavior" is via the experiences of bilinguals in the society at large, in terms of their development as members of a LM group. Under the next heading I summarize several minority identity development theories that had an impact on this research.

As a side note, linguistic development at its basic level is a cognitive-behavioral process beginning in infancy, when the baby learns phonemes (pre-word sound clusters) of a language (or languages) that are utilized by those in the immediate surroundings. After about 1 year from birth, the original phonemes remain surprisingly resilient to any new languages an individual may learn to speak later in life (Sternberg, 1996). Thus, a person that acquired Japanese phonemes as an infant will always have some difficulty pronouncing English words with sounds "r" and "l" differentially. Of course, this
difficulty is exacerbated by such factors as age of exposure to the second language, the structural differences between the two languages, etc. (Barker, 1997). All of this speaks to language proficiency, the first of the experiential factors I asked the study participants to describe. The second aspect of bilingual experience of interest to the current investigation has to do with value — the language with which a person identifies because of perceived proficiency and other psychosocial factors, including (but not limited to) minority group membership.

_Minority Identity Development_

_Overview._

Summarizing all minority identity development theories in use today is certainly beyond the scope of this paper. Sue and Sue (2003) describe a "cookie-cutter" general model that has some applicability to all minority groups. In gist, this common derivative from stage models for specific minority populations, describes such milestones as pre-encounter, encounter, immersion, emersion and integration as parts of any minority group member's development. Though capable of infusing a different mindset into settings that lack a cross-cultural perspective, this model is not altogether useful for an in-depth exploration of bilinguals as a minority group. I therefore had to select several specific models, each of which seemed to approximate a certain aspect of what bilinguals (including myself) purport to experience.

_Gay Identity Development._

Let us revisit the metaphor of a graphically labeled, rewritable compact disk — CD-RW. At the heart of this depiction of bilingual experience is remaining invisible until the playback is heard. Looking for similar minority experiences within existing
theories of identity development, I found a number of uncanny similarities between experiences of bilinguals and gay individuals. For the purposes of this review, I use the term "gay" to describe male and female individuals that were referred to as "homosexuals" in the earlier literature. Thus, in 1979, Cass used this label in constructing a comprehensive model of identity development for gay persons (reproduced in Table 1 below and discussed later in this section). In the chapters that follow, I utilize the more inclusive umbrella construct – "gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered" (GLBT) when referring to the members of a sexual minority, regardless of sex or gender. I make this distinction in recognition of the GLBT community's struggle to distance themselves from the formerly diagnostic and often still derogatory label of "homosexual," which is described in more depth elsewhere (see, e.g., Tyler, 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Cass' Psychosocial Model of Homosexual Identity Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Cass (1979).

To manage the stigma of being recognized as a member of a minority, some gays and bilinguals engage in passing for the monolingual and heterosexual majority.
respectively. Although this strategy does serve to protect minority individuals from discomfort or outright persecution, it also comes at a great psychological cost of shame and denial of how these persons truly see themselves (Maylon, 1982; Tyler, 2002), a.k.a., identity. However, invisibility is not synonymous with passing. Sexual minority persons who choose not to "come out" and otherwise act in "gender-appropriate" ways, as well as CALM individuals who choose not to disclose their L1 or L2 identity, are no more invisible than their counterparts whose minority status is discovered by the larger society. Thus, individuals whose outward appearance seems incongruent with "their" sex or gender (e.g., "butch" lesbians, "flamboyant" gay males, trans-sex and trans-gendered persons) and persons of color (especially of Asian, Latino/Hispanic and Middle-Eastern ethnicities) are quickly – though sometimes mistakenly – identified by others as gay and bilingual. In summary, the dilemma of passing vs. disclosure is a common element in the identity of these and all other invisible minorities.

Table 1 above presents Cass' (1979) Psychosocial Model of Homosexual Identity Development. In this view, an individual journeys from confusion about sexual orientation to synthesis of gay identity into the larger sense of personal identity. Interestingly, when describing stigma management, Cass (1979) identifies passing as late as Identity Acceptance stage. In designing this research, I operated under the assumption that something similar is true for the bilinguals in my sample. In general, because of the common experience of invisibility, the process of gay development appears to be logically analogous to that of bilinguals. However, the stages of bilingual development are not likely to follow the same course due to the possibility (and as mentioned earlier in this chapter – desirability) of integrating two equally valid identities: L1 and L2. Thus,
for the *content* dimension of my CD-RW of a conceptual framework, I had to seek out yet another minority identity development theory.

*Biracial Identity Development.*

Having discovered the apparent similarities bilinguals have with gays and lesbians, my initial inkling was to consider development of bisexuals next. However, of the bisexual identity development models, (e.g., Weinberg, 1994 cited in Reynolds & Hanjorgiris, 2000), none addressed the issue of cultivating a balanced appreciation for both gay and straight identities. Instead, there seemed to be a trend for viewing bisexuality as a temporary point of indecision on the way to embracing either gayness or heterosexuality (Reynolds & Hanjorgiris, 2000). The only remaining well-researched minority group whose label contained the "bi-" prefix was biracials. Poston (1990) pointed out a shortcoming in existing racial identity development models, similar to the one leveled at the above bisexual theories: "when applied to biracial persons… these models do not allow for the integration of several group identities" (p. 152). What follows is a discussion of the theory Poston presented in response to this limitation.

Table 2 contains Poston's (1990) *Biracial Identity Development Model* in simplified form. The more or less racially naïve child of stage 1 starts to identify with the race he or she resembles the most. The uncanny parallel between relating to people that one most resembles *visually* (biracial) and *auditorily* (bilingual) at an early developmental stage, is among the key reasons for using this model in the current study. Poston introduced two more factors that contribute to the *Choice of Group Categorization* of stage 2 – "status… and social support" (p.154). These may pertain to the experience of bilinguals as well – many of them experience almost no valorization of their heritage
language by the larger society (low status), while opportunities may be sparse for associating with anyone else speaking their L1 (low social support) outside of the immediate family (Landry & Allard, 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Poston's Biracial Identity Development Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Personal Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Choice of Group Categorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Enmeshment/Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Poston (1990).

Bilinguals would seem unlikely to move on to **Appreciation** (stage 4) or **Integration** (stage 5) if they are unable to rectify the impact of the choices they make during **Choice of Group Categorization** (stage 2). The guilty **Enmeshment** of stage 3 may be especially salient for bilinguals who are L2 dominant, because by passing for the English-speaking majority they become entrenched in thinking that they need L1 progressively less. There is a plethora of anecdotes about individuals with no formal L1 schooling (in their home country or in the US) who insist on speaking English to their L1 Dominant parents whenever they can get away with it. The **Denial** of this stage comes from declaring one identity as shameful (and therefore – extraneous), and investing almost exclusively in the other that is "conveniently" (Poston, 1990, p.154) non-anxiety provoking.
Synthesis

The three theories of development described in this chapter all had a major impact on the study's design and analysis. The first two research questions, dealing with relative bilingual proficiency and value, are evaluated in terms of Landry & Allard's (1992) lateral spectrum of bilingualism. The concept of passing as a coping strategy, as described by Cass (1979), is the key frame of reference for answering the question about language minority experience. Finally, Poston's (1990) depiction of biracial experience will be used (in combination with the above factors) as a tentative framework for understanding bilingual identity development (question 4). It seemed logical to utilize qualitative methods (e.g., ethnography, analytic induction) to evaluate the application of such an eclectic mix of theories. Chapter 3 discusses my use of qualitative research in detail. Although creating a functional model for understanding bilingual identity development was not one of the goals of the current research, insights gained from personal experiences of individuals in my sample should gleam some light on applicability of the existing models. Pending further research, this light may prove to be the theoretical laser necessary for playback of many other bilingual CD-RWs.
Chapter 3

Design and Methodology

Participants

North Carolina State University (NCSU) students were recruited to participate in this study on the basis of bilingual self-identification. This sampling method – purposive selection – was the most appropriate for collecting rich descriptive data about a specific identity characteristic (Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003). Students in the final sample differed on the basis of language proficiency and several other essential characteristics: sex, race and ethnicity. This is consistent with Patton's (1990, cited in Miles & Huberman, 1984) assertion that using small, but maximally diverse samples shall land credibility to any emergent themes and patterns in the data. Attempting to further diversify the sample based on age, year in school, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status and other psychosocial characteristics was not feasible as part of this Master's thesis research. This potential sampling bias should be corrected at least in part by remaining cognizant of, and reporting on the differences that may be due to the influence of participants' identification with categories not highlighted by this study.

All participants were enrolled in the introductory Psychology course and received partial class credit for participation. Students responded to an intentionally vague study announcement and went through the initial screening, in which they were asked to clearly specify their L1 and L2. Regardless of proficiency, monolinguals claiming academic or any other non-heritage bilingualism did not qualify for the study. The final sample consisted of 3 males and 4 females of diverse ethnic and racial heritage, with Landry & Allard's (1992) entire spectrum of bilingualism (L1 Dominant, Balanced and L2
Dominant) represented. Table 3 summarizes participants' self-reported demographic and linguistic characteristics; detailed background information and behavioral observations are presented for each respondent in the paragraphs following the table. The names used here and throughout this research are fictitious and bear no resemblance to participants' real names.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Name&quot;</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Indonesian-Chinese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wambua</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>African*</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Caucasian American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Greek-American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Indian*</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data from Intake (Appendices A, B) and Interview (Appendix C).
* Wambua's and Elan's real languages not included due to confidentiality.

**Oma** is a 20 year-old female who self-identified as L1 (Indonesian) Dominant in terms of proficiency and value, but reported valuing English to some extent as well. Her classification at the University was "junior." Oma indicated Indonesian-Chinese under "Race" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), and added Asian during the Interview (Appendix C). She was born to ethnically Chinese parents in Indonesia where she lived until last summer. Oma is in the US for the final 2 years of her undergraduate education and possibly for a Master's degree. She seemed to have a great deal of interest in discussing her experiences both in the US and abroad throughout the interview.

**Nina** is a 20 year-old female who self-identified as L1 (Spanish) Dominant in terms of proficiency, but reported valuing English to some extent as well. Her
classification at the University was "unclassified student." Although her racial/ethnic self-identification was an unequivocal "Puerto-Rican" throughout the Interview (Appendix C), Nina was the only one to select "Prefer not to respond" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A). I attribute this preference to the participant's interpretation of the category "Race" as inadequate in terms of describing her experiences as a Latina – another label she used during the interview. Nina was born and raised in Puerto Rico and is in the continental US for the Spring semester only. She was probably the most animated of the participants, expressing eagerness to discuss her experiences as a bilingual even if she did not receive class credit for it.

Irene is a 33 year-old female who self-identified as L1 (Korean) Dominant in terms of proficiency, but reported being Balanced in terms of value. Her classification at the University was "sophomore." Irene indicated Asian American under "Race" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), and did not elaborate further during the Interview (Appendix C). She lived in South Korea for most of her life until marrying an American citizen and moving to the US about 3 years ago. Irene seemed to have given the most thought to her bilingual identity of all participants, which included a clearly articulated plan for its future development.

Wambua is an 18 year-old male who self-identified as Balanced in terms of proficiency, but reported assigning slightly more value for his mother-tongue (the actual name of this African language is withheld to protect confidentiality). His classification at the University was "freshman." Wambua indicated African under "Race" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), and added Nigerian and Black during the Interview (Appendix C). He was born and raised in Nigeria; his family immigrated to the US in time for him
to attend high school. Wambua's demeanor was somewhat aloof, but he did appear to be fully engaged in the interview process.

**Hector** is a 21 year-old male who self-identified as Balanced in terms of proficiency and value for his native Greek. His classification at the University was "senior." Hector indicated Caucasian American under "Race" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), and added Greek during the Interview (Appendix C). He was born to an American mother and a Greek father in Greece, where he lived until the age of 4. His family moved back and forth every 4-5 years until settling in the US when Hector began to attend high school. He seemed somewhat resistant to being labeled in any way, including as "bilingual," but was very cooperative during the interview.

**Ida** is a 19 year-old female who self-identified as L2 (English) Dominant in terms of proficiency, but reported being Balanced in terms of value for her native Greek. Her classification at the University was "freshman." Ida indicated Greek-American under "Race" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), and did not elaborate further during the Interview (Appendix C). She was born to ethnically Greek parents in the US where she lived continuously, attending both traditional American elementary school and regular after school classes in Greek language, religion and mythology. Ida's demeanor was somewhat reserved, but she seemed to be fully engaged in the interview process.

**Elan** is a 20 year-old male who self-identified as L2 (English) Dominant in terms of both proficiency and value, but reported valuing his native "Indian" language (actual language name is withheld to protect confidentiality) to some extent as well. His classification at the University was "junior." Elan indicated Indian under "Race" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), and did not elaborate further during the Interview.
(Appendix C). He was born in India and lived there until his family immigrated to the US when he was less than 2 years old. Elan appeared very motivated to explore his bilingual identity throughout the interview.

Data Collection

The respondents participated in two 1-hour sessions, first of which resembled a counseling center's initial intake, while the second – a follow-up interview. Although at no time did actual psychotherapy take place, the time-tested intake format allowed me to establish a working alliance by briefly and informally discussing information that qualifying participants provided on the written forms. Appropriately, Holstein and Gubrium (1997), see rapport building as a major precursor to successful qualitative interviewing. One week later, with some initial rapport already in place, I was able to quickly engage students in a meaningful discussion that seemed relaxed despite the presence of a video camera. This recording device served to eliminate note taking and to allow for subsequent analysis of both verbal and behavioral contents of the interview.

I used the beginning of the first session to explain informed consent for participation in research. The official form mandated by the University Human Subjects in Research Committee is reproduced here in Appendix D. Special emphasis was placed on confidentiality of storage and handling of videotaped data. Participants were told that the footage will be viewed only by the principal investigator and will remain securely locked in a file cabinet at all other times. I reassured them that videotaped raw data would be destroyed at the conclusion of the research, i.e., after the successful completion of all Master's thesis requirements. Respondents were also made aware of their right to discontinue participation at any time without incurring a penalty. Should they remain in
the study, participants had the option of receiving a copy of group results via electronic mail (as part of the final debriefing). None of the study materials asked the students to provide their real names; instead, code names were created by means of a secret formula that utilized such variables as country of origin, participant number, etc.

Some time in the first meeting was also devoted to discussing participants' life experiences pertaining to their responses on both forms of the self-administered portion of the Intake. First part of Form A (reproduced in Appendix A) served to collect basic demographic information (please see Table 3 in the preceding chapter). The categories were in alphabetical order (in English) and consisted of characteristics that in my view had a bearing on the study's analysis. In addition to age, race and sex, I inquired about each participant's sexual orientation. The choice to ask this question was influenced by my supposition of similarity between sexual and language minority experiences (explained in detail in Chapter 2 of this work).

The second part of Form A assessed the students' linguistic differences via open-ended and forced choice items in questions 1 and 2 respectively, while the possible responses to question 3 came from a mixed item design: forced choice and/or open-ended. The main purpose of question 1 was to screen out participants who could not positively identify with English as their second language – a choice that was pre-printed on the form. In this item, the students also listed the language they learned "first," i.e. the language that was in some way connected to their national heritage – their L1. Question 2 asked respondents to rate their relative linguistic proficiency in terms of personal experience (i.e., regardless of any type of social desirability) by choosing either "L1", "L2" or "both (L1+L2)." These choices were meant to determine each student's degree of
bilingualism as either: L1 Dominant, L2 Dominant or Balanced (Landry & Allard, 1992) respectively.

Question 3 requested that students identify with any number of the eight attitudes toward their L1 and L2, or free-respond if none were applicable. This exhaustive list of evaluative attitudes was derived from Poston's (1990) five stages of biracial identity development. Thus, stage 1 (Personal Identity) was meant to correspond with "No idea", stage 2 (Choice of Group Categorization) would be reflected by either "L1" or "L2", stage 3 (Enmeshment/Denial) would have been approximated by "L1 (but not L2)" or "L2 (but not L1)", and so forth. Mixing up the order of identity options, compared to that of the original model, had the intention of concealing the stage-like nature of the underlying theory, with the aim of reducing the study's demand characteristics. For the same reason, the actual name of the theory – Model of Biracial Identity Development (Poston, 1990) – was not revealed to the students until the final debriefing.

This rather crude method for assessing bilingual identity was useful because of ease and quickness of administration – less than 5 minutes for the entire Form A. However, just as playing a digital recording of a symphonic orchestra on a cell phone sized speaker is not likely to gratify a discerning music lover, assessing bilingual identity via the above procedure alone could not satisfy me as a qualitative researcher. Form B of the Intake (Appendix B) approaches this task with a bit more finesse by asking participants to identify with any number of the five "bilingual" case scenarios. I crafted these depictions by putting Poston's (1990) stage explanations into linguistic terms. In this assessment, students were asked to write down a narrative description of their own experiences in response to reading the one (or the ones) with which they identified. They
also had the option of explaining their reasons for being able to identify with none of the five vignettes. This type of assessment is referred to in the qualitative literature as a "solicited narrative" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p.103).

In addition to letting participants relate to a wide range of "real-life" examples, this method allowed me to illustrate the complexity of each stage in terms of both proficiency and value in a single statement. Below is the vignette representing stage 5 (Integration):

   Cameron is bilingual and is able to utilize both languages equally. Doing so is not only convenient, but also provides a sense of wholeness for Shannon. Both languages are integral parts of Shannon's linguistic and cultural identity (Appendix B, item 5).

One of the students in the sample – Hector, who marked "both (L1+L2)" for Proficiency and "L1 and L2" for Value on Form A, initially picked Shannon, based on the first sentence of the above scenario. However, he strongly disagreed with the implication that his bilingualism might provide a sense of wholeness, which is a key component of Integration according to Poston (1990). Therefore, it is crucial that Hector also had the opportunity to, and actually did identify with Tracy of stage 1 – Personal Identity.

The second meeting consisted of the Interview (Appendix C). I utilized semi-structured ethnographic interviewing in this part of data collection. At the heart of any qualitative endeavor is the ability to respect "how the participant frames and structures the responses" (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.108) – hence the lack of rigid structure in the interview. In other words, even though my intention was to get responses to specific questions, I tended to let them come up in the conversation, rather than asking directly.
To achieve this means, I explored the participants' views on bilingual identity via "three main types of questions: descriptive, structural, and contrast" (Spradley, 1979, quoted in Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.112). Descriptive and structural questions were meant to help with assessing students' basic speech patterns and their fundamental cultural views, respectively. Meanwhile, contrast questions were intended to "provide… the meaning of various terms in the participant's language" (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.112). As evident from Appendix C, some of the items in the Interview consisted of possible prompts of all three types, while others utilized a specific type of questioning.

Responses to all 10 items on the interview contributed in some way to clarifying the hypothesis by means of analytic induction (introduced later in this chapter). The interview continued until all of the relevant experiences seemed to have transpired from our conversation. At that point participants were given the opportunity to add anything else, or to ask any questions about the interview. They then received a preliminary debriefing, which included information about receiving course credit and a reiteration of confidentiality provisions. I also took some time to explain the process of data analysis, including their being contacted for clarification of some of the interview responses. At the conclusion of the second meeting, I let the students know that they shall receive the final debriefing via electronic mail, complete with the summary of group results.

Data Analysis

The design of this study follows qualitative philosophy. In other words, I was "concerned with understanding the meanings which people attach to phenomena (actions, values, beliefs, etc.) within their social worlds" (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p.3). This paradigm allowed me to carefully explore a wide spectrum of bilingual experiences as
perceived by the seven students in the sample. My own bilingual background played a key role in theory selection and application, participant recruitment and questioning, etc. This is consistent with one of the basic tenets of qualitative research – ethnography, which calls on researchers to "focus on culture through the participant's perspective and through a firsthand encounter" (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.112). Chapter 1 details my bilingual background, as well as several other characteristics pertinent to this research. For my detailed Bilingual Biography, please refer to the audio tracks accessible via the links in Figure 1 or the compact disk in Appendix H of the printed version.

In addition to ethnographic interviewing (described earlier in this chapter), I utilized the method of analytic induction to build a tentative framework for describing bilingual identity development. Classic analytic induction consists of the seven steps presented in Table 4 below. For this research I defined the phenomenon as bilingual identity development, first introduced in Chapter 1. In the absence of preexisting identity development theory specific to bilinguals, I attempted to explain the phenomenon via combining other minority development theories (presented in detail in Chapter 2). Ethnographic interview data were then used to test this hypothesis as Taylor & Bogdan suggest in steps 3-7 below. In other words, rather than being confirmed or rejected, the hypothesis continued to emerge as data collection and analysis ensued.

Thus, a seeming incongruence between Hector's responses on Forms A and B of the Intake (viz., Value: L1=L2, scenarios 1 and 5) led me to question the initial supposition that each bilingual student would identify with a single Poston (1990) stage or at least – with several successive stages thereof. However, Hector's responses on the follow-up interview, such as: "I wouldn't say I have a first language," etc., indicated a
low relative valorization of his L1, as well as a low awareness of being bilingual in
general. In view of this, his tendency to pass for the monolingual majority ("I try to hide
it [being bilingual] even, I don't care…") as a stigma management strategy also makes
sense. To streamline the data analysis for the remainder of the sample, I entered
participants' verbatim responses into a conceptual matrix (described in detail in Chapter
4) and noted distinctive patterns (referred to interchangeably as themes) that emerged
from the interview data.

| Table 4. |
| Analytic Induction in Qualitative Research |
| 1. Develop a rough definition of the phenomenon to be explained |
| 2. Formulate a hypothesis to explain that phenomenon (this can be based
  on the data, other research, or the researcher's insight and intuition) |
| 3. Study one case to see the fit between the case and the hypothesis |
| 4. If the hypothesis does not explain the case, either reformulate the
  hypothesis or redefine the phenomenon |
| 5. Actively search for negative cases to disprove the hypothesis |
| 6. When negative cases are discovered, reformulate the hypothesis or
  reformulate the phenomenon |
| 7. Proceed until the hypothesis has adequately tested (according to some
  researchers, until a universal relationship has been established) by
  examining a broad range of cases |

Note. Adapted from Taylor & Bogdan, 1998

In order to reduce subjectivity in analyzing the data, I used participants' own
words when making analytical inferences. As mentioned above, respondent testimonies
were transcribed word-for-word from videotapes; square brackets were always used to
indicate any alterations made for readability (see, e.g., Appendices E-G). As themes and
patterns seemed to emerge from the data, I utilized coding methods closely resembling
quantitative techniques (described in detail in Chapter 4), e.g. counting, etc. Lastly, students in the sample had the opportunity to retract, or elaborate on any statement they made throughout the course of this research. Thus, during the Interview (Appendix C), they were asked to restate their original identification with the scenario or scenarios from Form B of the Intake (Appendix B) and to note any changes they might want to make. Participants were also given the opportunity to clarify or change their responses during the final debriefing, though none elected to do so.
Chapter 4

Results

Domains and Categories

As mentioned in the preceding chapters, data for this study were collected by means of an intake-like initial meeting and a semi-structured ethnographic follow-up interview. The data on the self-administered portions of the Intake (reproduced in Appendices A and B) answer general research questions 1 and 2, first introduced in Chapter 1. Appendix E summarizes linguistic data from Forms A and B of the Intake. The Proficiency column places respondents into three categories based on their relative language proficiency: L1 Dominant, L2 Dominant, and Balanced, (Landry & Allard, 1992). The Value column lists the languages with which participants identified for reasons going beyond (but not excluding) purely linguistic factors. These data are reported using the same labels as in the preceding column, with added flexibility to indicate the degree of relative valorization. For instance, Oma was labeled as "L1 Dominant and maybe L2", meaning that she places the greatest amount of value on her first language, but still values English to some extent.

Responses in the Value column were also meant to roughly approximate students' level of bilingual identity development based on the stages of Poston's (1990) model. The process by which this means was accomplished is described in detail in Chapter 3. However, the ensuing semi-structured ethnographic interview (reproduced in Appendix C) provided a more qualitatively rich assessment of students' identity. The standard opening question, as well as items 1 and 2, are the only clear examples of descriptive questions, as they ask the students to restate and clarify their narratives from Form B of
the Intake. One exception of a contrast kind is the last prompt of question 1, where the participants are asked to choose a single identity (if they had not already done so). In items 3 through 7, I continue mainly with contrast prompts aimed at learning the meaning participants attach to some of the terms utilized throughout this research (e.g., identity, minority, etc.). The main finding here was that most of the respondents' experiences as bilinguals justified the use of minority identity development theories introduced in Chapter 2.

The last two items of the interview were structural. The prompts in item 8 addressed participants' language minority experience – research question number 3 from Chapter 1. Item 9 delves into the invisible nature of bilingualism, specifically – the choice of passing for monolingual minority (a stigma management strategy discussed in detail in Chapter 2) or disclosing their bilingual minority status. The order of items in the interview had the intention of proceeding from the general units of cultural knowledge (e.g., personal identity, minority vs. majority), to the perceived implications of specific experiences (e.g., bilingualism as membership in a LM, passing vs. disclosure of LM status). Responses to items 1, 2, 8 and 9 in combination with the Intake data, deal with the final research question from Chapter 1.

Having recorded the descriptive data resulting from items 1 and 2 (see Appendix C), I began the process of reducing the structural data from items 8 and 9 into two conceptual domains: Language Minority Experience (Appendix F) and Aspects of Invisibility (Appendix G). Both were meant to reflect the conceptual framework of the CD-RW, introduced in Chapter 1. Track-by-track bilingual development represents LM identity development along successive stages (Domain One), while differentiating
between the disk's label and its audio content approximates the phenomenon of invisibility (Domain Two). In order to evaluate and adjust the logistical set-up of the metaphor, I asked the participants to share their experiences dichotomously, i.e., by describing the opposing aspects of their experiences. As a result, each domain consisted of two logical categories: Advantages and Disadvantages for the first one, Passing and Disclosure for the second.

Applicable interview data were then entered into an informant-by-variable matrix, which is a cross between a conceptually clustered matrix and a contrast table, described by Miles and Huberman (1984). Conceptually clustered matrix allows the researcher "to bring together items that 'belong together'" in terms of "the same overarching theme" (p.110). By means of a contrast table, one looks at a "variable that is present in high or low form, and contrasts several different attributes of the basic variable" (p.176). Instead of attributes, I set off to contrast the participants' experiences, conceptually clustered by the high and the low perceived impact thereof. The resulting display spanned both domains, with participant-specific data in rows and category-specific data in columns (Appendices E and F).

As a means of further data reduction, I proceeded by scanning down the columns for emerging themes by category. Names of the respondents were grouped by their self-reported proficiency: first L1 Dominant, then Balanced, and followed by L2 Dominant. Doing so simplified contrasting between students who would be classified as "similar" via the sociolinguistic theory of bilingual development – the lateral spectrum of bilingualism by Landry and Allard (1992). Coincidentally, the two students who indicated Greek as their L1 ended up next to each other. Because responses from all
three of the males were close together, sex differences shall be more easily discernable as well. In the next section of this chapter, I present the category-specific patterns as they unfolded for the entire sample.

Patterns by Category.

Having discussed "personal identity" and "minority vs. majority," I asked the students about their experiences as bilinguals in general, as well as specifically in terms of advantages and disadvantages. Data in both of these categories were coded as pertaining to different aspects of the LM experience. The usual way of coding qualitative data is via identifying respondents' statements as positive or negative, either from the outset of, or during data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Tyler, 2002). The coding convention for the domains in the present study arose directly from the data (in concert with the analytic induction paradigm, introduced in Chapter 3), as they were loaded into the matrix for conceptual contrasting.

Participant responses in both categories of Domain One seemed to belong to two distinct types that could be coded as "pragmatic" or "emotional." The first answer pattern described some tangible linguistic ability (or lack thereof), which became evident upon counting the number of occurrences of "can," "can't" and other such expressions related to "ability." I also scanned the data for instances of basic tasks of linguistic communication, e.g., understanding, speaking, reading, writing, translating, as well as for the words "communication" and "communicate" themselves. Miles and Huberman (1984) placed counting at the top of the list of "tactics for generating meaning" (p. 215) in qualitative research. These authors cite the following three reasons for this rather quantitative method. It allows the researcher "to see rapidly what… [is] in a large slice of
data; to verify a hunch or hypothesis; and to keep… analytically honest, protecting against bias" (p.215). All three seemed applicable at this stage of analysis, as I was continuously reevaluating the hypothesis explaining the phenomenon of bilingualism by combing through large chunks of data.

Responses of the second type – emotional – seemed to be related to an affective reaction of some sort. Sifting through the statements, I noted recurring instances of the roots "feel" and "emotion", as well as several common words that describe feelings and expressions thereof: love, like (i.e., "being attracted" vs. a commonly used filler word), happy, proud, and ashamed. For this means, I went through the matrix data and highlighted the above search items. I then extended the highlighting to sentence clauses or whole sentences when either both, or just one type of the responses were present in each coding segment. Eventually, instead of data-rich, but hard to decipher chunks of text, I ended up with a colorful display that already began to show patterning.

For Domain Two (Appendix G), I used similar procedures to distinguish between "confirmatory" and "dissenting" statements under the topics of Passing and Disclosure. In describing their experiences as members of the invisible minority, respondents tended to endorse some and disconfirm other aspects of the above categories. In order to see "the general drift of the data more easily and rapidly" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.215) in each domain, I counted the responses of both types for all participants and entered the resulting numbers into a distribution, as these authors suggest. This step in data reduction helped me to describe the preliminary patterns for the entire sample.

In doing so, I was able to recognize several specific data patterns (a.k.a., themes) among the highest concentrations of the matrix data. Other patterns came from noting a
response "that consistently happens in a specific way" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.215) – also evident from counting and graphing the raw interview data. Not all the responses fit the criteria described just above, but every student did contribute to at least one emergent theme. As can be seen in Appendix F, I utilized differential underlining and highlighting to indicate the coding. A solid straight line (highlighted in blue for "pragmatic" in Domain One and in green for "confirmatory" in Domain Two), and a broken straight line (highlighted in yellow for "emotional" in Domain One and in purple for "dissenting" in Domain Two) were used. Data patterns in the following paragraphs are presented conceptually by a priori domains and further – by categories derived from the interview questions (Appendix C). Statements from the solicited narratives and other relevant data from Appendices A and B were also used in comparing participant experiences.

*Language Minority Experience*

*Advantages.*

As mentioned above, overall patterns began to emerge from the data even as they were first pictured graphically. The diagram in Figure 2 is not a strict frequency distribution and is used merely to illustrate the difference in "magnitude" of two types of bilingual advantages as reported by participants in the sample. Please see Appendix F for a complete compilation of participants' verbatim responses. By glancing over the "distribution" below (Figure 2), it would appear that both L1 and L2 Dominant participants tended to err on the emotional side, while the Balanced respondents used mostly the pragmatic type of statements when describing LM advantages. In the spirit of analytic induction (first introduced in Chapter 3), this initial observation becomes a
tentative hypothesis and shall either be confirmed or reformulated by making comparisons between participants of different proficiency levels.

![LM Experience: Advantages](image)

**Figure 2.** Number of *emotional* and *pragmatic* coding segments for each participant describing advantages of his or her language minority experience. See Appendix F for verbatim statements.

The first contrast of this category comes from the responses of two participants with the lowest number of pragmatic statements: Oma (1) and Elan (1). The latter respondent had only this to say: "It's an advantage when translating or doing business in India." This response was coded as pragmatic – it matched the coding criterion for linguistic ability, described just above. Meanwhile, Oma reported liking English a lot, but admitted that on a deeper, more personal level, or as she put it, "just to myself – the Indonesian" is language she seemed to prefer. I took this view to be an emotional, because the incidence of the word "like" matched the scoring criterion for this type of
responses. She also seemed to be setting herself apart by expressing the desire to keep Indonesian personally relevant, in conjunction with an emerging appreciation for English.

What makes these two respondents interesting to contrast is that according to Poston (1990), they would be considered each other's mirror images in terms of both proficiency and value: L1 Dominant placing some value on L2 (Oma) and L2 Dominant placing some value on L1 (Elan). Remarkably, both students are 20 years old, both were born in the part of the world often referred to collectively as Asia, and both picked the scenario corresponding to Poston's (1990) Appreciation, when asked to identify with a single vignette earlier in the interview (please see Appending D for linguistic data).

However, their views on the advantages of bilingualism seem as disparate qualitatively as their languages of proficiency. This makes sense, considering what Landry and Allard (1992) refer to as "ethnolinguistic vitality… which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive… entity in intergroup relations" (p.172). The authors cite a number of psychosocial factors, including that of the individual's heritage language valorization in the larger society. More American people value Elan's L2 (English) than any other language, followed by Nina's L1 (Spanish) as a far second. Other L1 Dominant participants' languages – Oma's Indonesian and Irene's Korean – are valorized to even a lesser extend by the inhabitants of this country.

It could therefore be assumed that emotionality of experiences rises from difficulties with proficiency and vice versa. Indeed, L1 Dominant Nina, who reported valuing L2 "somewhat" on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A), had the highest "ratio" of emotional to pragmatic advantages – 9:5. Meanwhile, Balanced Hector's responses comprised the lowest emotional to pragmatic ratio – 2:6 (please see Appendix F for
examples of Hector's and Nina's statements). It must be noted that unlike everyone else, Nina seemed to be only describing the benefits of speaking Spanish rather than both of the languages. This is consistent with the Enmeshment of Poston's (1990) stage 3 – the "bilingual" description with which she identified when asked to choose just one. Interestingly, Nina, Elan and Oma, all labeled as Dominant in terms of Proficiency and Value (with some interest in the other language) happened to be the only respondents who did not identify with the vignette approximating Poston's highest stage – Integration.

However, the above hypothesis regarding co-occurrence of emotionality and a lack in L2 proficiency does not stand the test of the two remaining dominant students in the sample. Irene (L1 Dominant) had a ratio of 7 to 5 in favor of the pragmatic experiences, while Ida (L2 Dominant) described only 1 pragmatic experience (vs. 3 emotional ones). In fact, Ida insisted that her only pragmatic advantage – being able to do what others cannot – is only relevant because it "makes you feel a little better about yourself." Ida then goes on to talk about "being proud of" (rather than flaunting her L1 abilities), as part of another statement coded as emotional.

These responses by Ida seem to be reflective of the identity development stage that Poston (1990) calls Appreciation, approximated by vignette number 4 on Form B of the Intake (Appendix B). Whereas the student did identify with the passage describing this stage of development, she also picked Personal Identity and Integration. This is the second participant to identify with the scenarios representing the beginning and the end of Poston's (1990) developmental continuum (Hector was first). Perhaps, when translated into bilingual terms, these stages seemed complementary to these students. Future studies aimed at designing a full-fledged bilingual identity model (vs. an approximation
attempted here), would benefit from more sophisticated methods, such as factor analysis, etc. In Chapter 5 of this paper, I introduce an alternative explanation for the presence of bilingual identity unawareness and awareness alike in Ida's and Hector's responses.

When asked to select a single "bilingual" vignette during the follow-up interview, Ida was able to narrow it down to the one that corresponds to Poston's (1990) Integration. Another piece of data supporting this level of bilingual identity is her placement of equivalent value on both languages on Form A of the Intake (Appendix A). This is different from Hector, who picked "Personal Identity" despite selecting the Balanced option in terms of proficiency and value. The contrast between these two unaccented bilinguals (whose heritage language is Greek) is also reflected in the types of responses they gave to the prompts in item number 8 of the Interview (Appendix C). As mentioned just above, every one of Ida's pragmatic comments was substantiated by an emotional statement. Meanwhile, Hector seemed to find many more pragmatic than emotional advantages to being bilingual (6 vs. 2). Two examples of the pragmatic advantages he offered were: speaking any language he chooses and helping other Greek speakers with translation.

The other student who seemed to be concerned only with the "practical" benefits of bilingualism is Wambua. He cited getting into school, getting a job, and the ability "to speak to someone in a language others can't understand" as advantageous. Wambua is one of the only two participants (along with Irene) who identified unequivocally with the scenario representing Poston's (1990) highest stage – Integration. Based on their Intake responses, I classified both students as Balanced (Wambua – Proficiency, Irene – Value) and L1 Dominant (Wambua – Value, Irene – Proficiency). However, Irene's
report on her LM experiences contained a significantly higher number of emotional elements than did Wambua's – her 5 to his 0. The same appeared to be the case with their responses of the pragmatic kind – her 7 to his 3. Thus, perhaps due to some combination of differences in age, heritage language, national origin, race and sex, Wambua and Irene may have been describing bilingual experiences that are qualitatively similar, but different in "magnitude."

Notwithstanding the dearth of emotional statements in the sample, everyone had at least 1 pragmatic advantage to report. This generally "practical" tone of the reported benefits of bilingualism was at the heart of the first pattern in the data – communication. Nina, Hector and Wambua used this exact word or its derivative, while Elan cited translation as an advantage, which can be reasonably subsumed under communication. Online multi-source dictionary search service (Lexico Publishing Group, 2005) gives the following definition of the latter concept: "The exchange of thoughts, messages, or information, as by speech, signals, writing, or behavior" (p.1). Ida's and Irene's narratives contained numerous examples of exchanging all three of the above by means of everything except writing. The only participant who did not contribute to this theme is Oma, who also happens to be the only one with an overwhelmingly emotional view of Language Minority advantages.

Responding to the prompts on item 8 of the Interview (Appendix C), Ida shared: "Knowing for myself that I'm [linguistically] different, mentally and emotionally is more of an advantage." This statement, made by the only American-born student in the sample, can be summarized by the second conceptual theme – differentiation. In addition to Ida, two other students (Hector and Irene) used a word with the root "differ" at least
once in their statements regarding advantages of bilingualism. Oma's emotional comment, cited just above, also pertains to differentiation as a statement of intent to always keep Indonesian "just to herself" regardless of how much she may grow to like English.

Wambua too seemed to value the experience of setting himself and other speakers of his heritage language apart. Meanwhile, Nina's entire response to this prompt could be cited here, as it pertained to speaking her native Spanish exclusively. Here is an illustrative excerpt:

> I really like my language, and I really love reading in Spanish and I'm really good at writing in Spanish… Some writings in Spanish I don't just read, but I feel really identified with that kind of writing, I feel like it's a part of me! There are beautiful memories you have and you just can't translate them, they're beautiful just as they are, and most of them – with my mom, my dad, my family, so they have to be in Spanish!

The only participant who did not seem to contribute to the theme of differentiation is Elan. Coincidentally, his view of advantages to being a part of a language minority, was coded entirely pragmatic – unlike the remainder of the sample.

*Disadvantages.*

The second category in Domain One – Disadvantages – is represented graphically in Figure 3 below. The responses here were coded as pragmatic and emotional using the same criteria as described earlier in this chapter. Upon casual inspection, the following "distribution" of responses (Figure 3) appears to fall in a pattern similar to the one observed in the Advantages category, i.e. with L1 and L2 Dominant respondents
accounting for the majority of the emotional points. However, what jumps out right away is the overall dearth of emotional statements – 10 vs. 19 of the pragmatic kind. In general, students in the sample identified far fewer disadvantages (29) than they did advantages (44). It also appears as though the Balanced respondents had little awareness of any disadvantages to being bilingual.

Figure 3. Number of emotional and pragmatic coding segments for each participant describing disadvantages of his or her language minority experience. See Appendix F for verbatim statements.

In fact, Wambua could not think of any disadvantages whatsoever: "...it doesn't matter that I speak two languages – I don't use it to weigh myself in society." This sentiment was echoed by the other Balanced respondent, Hector: "I don't think it's that important..." He did, eventually, come up with a hypothetical pragmatic disadvantage of having difficulty in obtaining "some kind of a government job." The L2 Dominant participants seemed equally as skeptical. Ida weighed in with the emotional: "some
people may prejudge you, but other than that there aren't any real disadvantages." The conceptual theme that seemed to emerge from the above statements was that of **significance**. With the exception for Elan, native (or native-like) speakers of L2 (English) seemed to have a hard time understanding what could be troubling about having another language at their disposal. Having mastered the society's most valorized language, they no longer placed the same significance in their L1, which consequently seemed to become more akin to a *second* language one learns in school or at work.

Elan (L2 Dominant) also started off doubtful: "I really don't find it as a disadvantage." However, he did admit to feeling "more and more disconnected" from his heritage culture, almost to the point of "being two different people," in addition to listing 3 communicative difficulties that were coded a pragmatic. Similarly, L2 Dominant Oma, Nina and Irene reported being affected by their lack of L2 proficiency in predominantly pragmatic ways: problems with speaking, reading, writing and understanding English. Irene also admitted to crying helplessly during a tough exam and feeling "like I am just stupid" when others did not understand her – both of which were coded as emotional.

However, it was Nina, who seemed to personify a wide spectrum of possible experiences in this category. I lost count of how many times she had to stop to search for "the right word in English" and, never having found it, used what she described as a "bad synonym," or stopped talking completely, forced to eventually switch the topic. "It is frustrating not to say whatever you want to say, because you feel: 'I can't, so I don't feel like I should talk.'" She went on to liken the above experience to suddenly becoming "mute… after 20 years of my life speaking." The theme of **communication**, first introduced under Advantages, seemed to be present in this data category as well.
To summarize the results in Domain One – Language Minority Experience – I compiled all of the data into a single "diagram" below. Immediately apparent is the general ambivalence of L2 Dominant and Balanced respondents throughout the discussion of LM experiences. It is possible that in their view, because of high proficiency in the society's main language, being bilingual does not qualify them for minority status. This finding was reflected in a theme that emerged from the data on Disadvantages – insignificance. Somewhat surprisingly, responses by L1 Dominant Oma's seemed to follow this pattern as well. Perhaps her experiences with discrimination as ethnically Chinese in Indonesia, and as a non-native speaker in China could account for this seemingly incongruent desensitization to being a minority in the US.

Figure 4. Number of emotional and pragmatic coding segments for each participant describing both advantages and disadvantages of his or her language minority experience. See Appendix F for verbatim statements.
Aspects of Invisibility

Passing.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, participant responses tended to either endorse or disconfirm some aspect of invisibility, labeled as "confirmatory" or "dissenting." Both types of responses to item number 9 of the Interview were recorded verbatim in Appendix G and later distinguished from each other via differential highlighting and underlining. Unlike the previous domain, participants tended to use a plethora of conditional statements to explain their positions, which were underlined, but not highlighted. These statements illustrate the theme I called situational, referring to the way all of the participants seemed to describe their attitude toward both Passing and Disclosure aspects of invisibility. Figure 5 depicts the number of responses in each conceptual type by means of a "bar graph." Again, displaying qualitative data in this a way is for illustration purposes only and does not constitute a true frequency distribution.

Judging from this display, the main differences in the likelihood of passing were based on language proficiency. Indeed, with the exception for Oma, who admitted to sometimes hiding her bilingualism "by not saying anything to avoid being intimidated," L1 Dominant respondents did not endorse passing. In fact, these participants seemed quite indignant that this topic is even being discussed. "Wow, I don't want to even think about it – it would be terrible!" was Nina's immediate reaction. Irene gave two reasons against passing: "First of all, I don't think I could hide my accent… Second – I don't want to hide!" Even Oma, having just admitted to occasional passing, immediately clarified that doing so never resulted in loosing a sense of pride in her bilingual background. She
said: "Hiding your identity from people is such a stupid idea, because eventually people will know who you are, and you should be proud of it!"

![Aspects of Invisibility: Passing](image)

**Figure 5.** Number of confirmatory and dissenting coding segments for each participant describing the passing aspects of his or her invisibility. See Appendix G for verbatim statements.

Ida's attitude towards passing seemed equivocal, with 2 confirmatory and 2 dissenting responses, e.g., "I would not mention it [that I am bilingual]" (confirmatory), "I don't know if I could do it [hide my bilingualism]" (dissenting), etc. Similar to the L1 dominant participants, she seemed to share some of their uncertainty regarding actually being able to go through with it in some situations. Moreover, Ida described "being proud of it" as an advantage of bilingualism in Domain One. The other L2 Dominant participant – Elan – presented just as mixed of a reaction to the phenomenon in question (4 pro and 4 con). On the one hand, he too echoed Ida's logistical uncertainty about passing and a sense of pride in his bilingual heritage: "I don't see how I could really hide
it… this is who I am, I don't feel ashamed!" On the other hand, Elan admitted to "letting go of my language because I fit in otherwise" in addition to his unwillingness to take the extra step to "define myself to other people."

Such homogeneity in responses among the L1 and L2 Dominant students in the sample highlighted a clear contrast with the Balanced participants. Not only did the Balanced Wambua and Hector endorse passing in concept, they readily reported on the actual techniques doing so on a daily basis! Thus, Wambua offered: "To hide it I just don't talk about it. But if they see my name or hear my accent, I'd tell them that my mom and dad are from there [Nigeria], but not me." Hector's description of his methods was a bit more vague: "I just blend in, I interact with people without them noticing… I try to hide it even, I don't care…" This "strategy" does not come as a surprise, considering his unaccented English and Anglo-Saxon appearance. With the latter characteristics on display, passing via simply remaining CALM (with Caucasian American in capital letters and "lowercase" language minority) seems to make the most sense to Hector.

Excepting for Hector and Wambua, there seemed to be a pervasive pattern in everybody else's responses. One way or another, participants tended to describe passing as something that is either morally or logistically faulty, regardless of whether they chose to partake in it. Thus, Ida lamented that passing feels like "lying or keeping a secret" and for Nina (as quoted above) it was "terrible" to even think about. Oma and Irene pointed out that a person who engages in passing will eventually be found out, while Elan explained that to pass and be taken "at face value" left who he really is out of people's awareness. This notion of skepticism was the only clear theme that emerged from the
data in the present category. Also noteworthy is the fact that exactly half of all statements were coded as confirmatory and half – as dissenting in regards to passing.

**Disclosure.**

Disclosing a bilingual status, or in GLBT terms – "coming out" as bilinguals is what effectively puts an end to passing. However, the invisible status of LM individuals does not go away – every day, in every new situation bilinguals face a choice: to pass and go on with their lives, or to disclose and face the consequences (positive, negative or both). Therefore, I am considering disclosure not simply as a negation of passing, but as a confirmation of the students' membership in a LM, whose advantages and disadvantages were analyzed earlier in this chapter. Still, the expectation was to observe responses of a similar "magnitude," but in the opposite "direction" to that of passing. Figure 6 presents an illustration of the participants' attitude towards Disclosure, while Appendix G contains all of the verbatim responses pertaining thereto.

As expected, about the same number of statements seemed to be in favor of disclosure as were reported against passing (15 and 13). However, judging from the above diagram, very few respondents felt strongly enough to actually disconfirm the concept of LM identity disclosure. Wambua, Hector and Elan were the only ones who made statements of the dissenting type – 4, compared to the 10 endorsements they made for passing (3 statements of this type were made by other participants). For the first time in the course of this research, there was a clear difference in responses between males and females in the sample. Besides sex differences (which are discussed along with other possible confounding variables in the final chapter of this paper) there did not seem to be any clear patterns in the data on Disclosure.
Figure 6. Number of confirmatory and dissenting coding segments for each participant describing the disclosure aspects of his or her invisibility. See Appendix G for verbatim statements.

Somewhat surprisingly, Wambua and Hector, having unequivocally endorsed passing, both seemed to favor disclosure as well! Wambua said:

I tell people upfront. Unless sometimes I don't feel like it, like when people don't detect an accent and don't ask me where I'm from. And I would still tell them then, if I knew we'd see each other again, not just for a few minutes (From Appendix G).

In this excerpt from Domain Two of the Conceptually Clustered Matrix (Appendix G), I maintained the underlining that sets the confirmatory responses apart from the dissenting. For Wambua, there is still a tinge of preference for passing, but the student does appear to
be quite resolute to let people know about his bilingualism, at least when it comes to acquaintances of some significance.

Hector too seemed to endorse Disclosure with 4 of his statements in addition to only 2 that disconfirmed it. His confirmatory responses were similar to Wambua's in terms of assessing meaningfulness of the encounter before making the decision to disclose. However, one of the statements that I coded as dissenting had a different character to it: "It's not something I'm necessarily proud of" – almost as if Hector was apologizing for the fact that he has a dual linguistic heritage. In fact, he does go on to use a rather consolatory phrase "I'm sorry" when talking about his determination to disclose despite almost any adverse reaction from other people.

Elan's ambivalence toward passing seemed to have remained the same, as he reported 1 confirmatory reaction ("I feel better trying to separate myself") and 1 dissenting response ("I don't feel like I'm beating myself up, whether I am doing it or not") under Disclosure. Ida, the other L2 Dominant respondent, only made 1 statement in confirmation of disclosure: "When I meet someone who I'm going to be friends with, I think it more comes out." Similar to Elan, she seems to carry her equivocal attitude towards passing over into the Disclosure category, via limiting her support of disclosure to conversations with potential friends.

Of the three L1 Dominant participants, Nina made the most comments that seemed to endorse disclosure (4), followed by Irene (2) and Ida (1). Irene's comments summarized all 7 affirmative responses quite well:
That's who I am [and others deserve to know]. And also it's very important to let them know, so that it's not embarrassing when I couldn't understand what they say, and so they don't think I'm just stupid.

The importance of letting others know seemed to cover two broad areas for these three respondents. As can be seen in the above excerpt, Irene's approach justified disclosure by seeing it as an opportunity to assert her ethnolinguistic pride, but also to make sure others did not misinterpret her lack of proficiency as a sign of lower intelligence. For Oma, Irene's first motivation seemed to be key, while for Nina it was likely a variation of the second one.

The summary of Domain Two – Aspects of Invisibility – seemed a daunting task at first. Similar to what was observed in Domain One, the number of responses in the second category here (Disclosure) seemed to have dropped by almost 25%. One potentially meaningful aspect of this trend was in the Balanced respondents' tendency to endorse both passing and disclosure. In the realm of invisibility, as Landry and Allard (1992) suggested, their bilingualism may after all be of the Additive rather than of Subtractive kind. To make sense of the overall data structure in this domain, I followed my initial inclination to treat statements that endorsed passing, but did not confirm disclosure, as relating to a similar attitude – "passing." And vice versa, responses that did confirm disclosure, but did not endorse passing were subsumed under "disclosure." The relative "frequency" for the above two attitudes towards invisibility are presented graphically in Figure 7 below.
Figure 7. Number of coding segments for each participant describing attitude toward passing (i.e. segments that confirm passing and reject disclosure) vs. disclosure (i.e. segments that confirm disclosure and reject passing). See Appendix G for verbatim statements.
Chapter 5

Discussion

Overview

Chapter 4 presented ethnographic interview data along with the conceptual analysis thereof. As part of the analysis, most of the conclusions were already conjectured upon, but will now be synthesized as part of the broader concepts named in the title of the study. The discussion will proceed along four general research questions (first introduced in Chapter 1), followed by some general insights gleamed from the data. Because the present research is qualitative in nature, the discussion will not contain prescriptive generalizations to other bilinguals, nor will it propose wide reaching theory implications. However, what is true for the seven bilingual participants in this study may have "a conceptual analogue, which lends more plausibility to the finding[s] and to the concept, which is now empirically grounded in a new context" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.229). I will therefore conclude by proposing explanations for the patterns that arose from the current data as they do (or do not) relate to the existing understanding of similar phenomena. The very last heading in this chapter will address clinical and research implications of this research.

Conclusions

Research question one.

The first research question was, "What is the linguistic proficiency for the bilingual students?" Learning about this rather basic self-identification early on in the data collection and analysis proved invaluable. In fact, this was the only piece of linguistic information that respondents could speak about with some certainty. There was
no reason to suspect any intentional misreporting of this characteristic because of the way this study was advertised. In general, when considering bilingual experiences in college, one tends to think of mostly technical (i.e., devoid of normative or emotional content) topics, such as proficiency, comprehension, etc. A similar distinction between pragmatic and emotional aspects of bilingualism later emerged from the data in Domain One – Language Minority Experience (discussed later in this chapter).

Additionally, the existing writings in sociolinguistics seemed to have adopted the proficiency-based understanding of bilingual development. Hammers and Blanc (1989), Landry and Allard (1992), and several others allude to the "L1 Dominant – Balanced – L2 Dominant" spectrum of bilingualism, first introduced by Lambert (1975, cited in Landry & Allard, 1992). Having assigned the above cognitive labels to the participants in my study, I was able to display the experiential data in an intrinsically meaningful way, rather than just alphabetically, or via any other conventional method.

Students' linguistic proficiency (along with other personal characteristics) is explicated in Chapter 3 of this research. It is worth reiterating, however, that for the purposes of this study, only two linguistic affiliations were considered for each respondent. Because North Carolina State University is an American institution of higher learning, where English is the most prevalent mode of instruction (or any other communication), the L2 was *preset* as English. The other language of interest was each participant's native or heritage language. For simplicity it was labeled as L1, though for some individuals in the sample it was not "the first language" per se.

Thus, both participants labeled as Balanced (Hector and Wambua), described "growing up with both" languages for reasons unique to their specific upbringing. To
qualify for participation, every respondent, regardless of proficiency, had to indicate how he or she used the language labeled as L1 to navigate his or her heritage culture. Both Hector and Wambua were able to positively do so, though at certain times during the interview their statements seemed to indicate rather dubious valuation of their heritage languages. This notion of relative linguistic valorization is discussed further under the next heading.

*Research question two.*

The second plane of inquiry in the present research was directed at how much value bilingual students in the sample assigned to each of their languages. As mentioned just above, cognitive factors (e.g., proficiency, order of acquisition, etc.) did not always translate directly into how much a student valorized each of his or her languages. Having subsumed Hector and Wambua under the same proficiency label (Balanced), it is now proper to differentiate between them on the basis of value. On Form A of the Intake (reproduced here in Appendix A), Hector checked off "L1=L2" under Value, as a conscious indication of equivalency. Wambua, however, checked "Other" and explained: "I put a little bit more value on L1, but not much more." Thus, without making a full commitment to valuing his heritage language at the expense of L2, he nonetheless saw it proper to pay at least minimal lip service to the language of his ancestors.

In general, asking participants to indicate value separately from proficiency, allowed me to get a glimpse into even more than just their relative language valorization. As explained in detail in Chapter 3, each value choice loosely corresponded to a stage in Poston's (1990) Model of Biracial Identity Development. Some of the data in the two major conceptual domains that seemed contrary to respondents' proficiency, made much
more sense when the dimension of value was added to the analysis. Domains One (Language Minority Experience) and Two (Aspects of Invisibility) are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Research question three.

Data analysis in the above domains contributed to the third research question: "What language minority experiences might the bilingual students have had?" The most consistent theme in all of the data emerged in both categories of Domain One – communication. Nevertheless, participants seemed to bring forth different meanings when describing this notion. Hector and Wambua (both labeled as Balanced in Proficiency) seemed to go out of their way to present language as merely a communicative device and nothing beyond that, while Nina (identified as L1 Dominant) stressed that it is the way to communicate who she is, in addition to what she is saying. It makes sense that when the ability to use this major communicative tool quickly and efficiently (i.e., native-level proficiency) is taken away or restricted, the distress level would mount. This type of disfranchisement seems to have been the case with L1 Dominant study participants while in the US – hence the prevalence of emotional statements in their responses.

In terms of the conceptual framework of the CD-RW, both the Balanced and the Dominant bilingual disks contain the relevant tracks capable of playback. However, only the disk whose tracks are recorded in the society's dominant language is heard loud and clear, but most importantly – right away. The message from the other CD (that is not as "versed" in L2) has to go through an imperfect translation mechanism and thus ends up sounding muffled, incomplete, with some delay or may not play at all! This inaction on
the part of a bilingual – choosing to remain silent due to feelings of linguistic inadequacy – has potentially damaging consequences. The person gradually begins to overvalue one language at the detriment of developing his or her other language. This cognitive shortfall, referred to as subtractive bilingualism (Landry & Allard, 1992), was a common occurrence among both L1 and L2 Dominant speakers in the sample.

However, the above voluntary muting was only reported in that exact language by one of the participants – Nina. Experiences of the other two L1 Dominant students' that pertained to subtractive bilingualism seemed to come across differently. Oma had apparently come to terms with "speak[ing] broken English," while Irene reported feeling "just stupid" when misunderstood, but still "interested in English" and happy because she speaks two languages. The L2 Dominant participants were still different in their reports. Elan described his subtractive bilingualism in both affective and practical terms: "It's like I'm living in two different worlds… I feel more and more disconnected", and "…some of them [Indians] cannot understand me because of my [American] pronunciation." Ida, the only American-born respondent, felt "different mentally and emotionally" as well as "proud of it [being bilingual]."

Listening to such a chorus of stories (all describing the same basic phenomenon), it almost seems as if they could be lined up in a natural experiential progression, similar to that of the tracks in a recording of a musical, an opera, etc. Nina's part, "I can't be who I am!" would play first, fraught with quiet resentment of the majority English imposing "muteness" on her beloved Spanish. Elan's aria of guilty overinvolvement in the dominant linguistic culture – "Letting go of my language because I fit in otherwise" – would follow. Further down the list is Oma, ready to embrace the other language (but not
quite there) with "English means a lot to me," followed closely by proud and invested Ida with "They're both important." Finally, Irene's track "That's who I am" would tell a story of her continuous struggle to combine all of her linguistic parts into a meaningful whole. The order of tracks on this L1/L2 Dominant compilation does not seem to happen in order of proficiency, but rather – of personal identity.

Interestingly, several research studies in psycholinguistics described some of the above reactions almost exactly:

There is evidence that some heritage language speakers go through a stage of rejection or avoidance of their heritage culture (Tse, 1998) and may avoid using the heritage language. Those in this stage…will not improve their heritage language competence, regardless of whether input is available or not. Finally, some imperfect heritage language speakers report that their efforts to use the language are met with correction and even ridicule by more competent HL speakers, a reaction that discourages the use of the HL (Gupta & Yeok, 1995, Krashen, 1998; cited in Krashen, 2004, p. 148)

Unfortunately, development stages described in the above quote pertain to ethnic rather than linguistic identity. Another qualitative study by Kanno (2003) comes even closer to describing the phenomenon in the topic of the present work – bilingual identity development as a language minority – by considering "linguistic and cultural identities" (p.14). She approaches these as separate entities in the lives of Japanese returnees, though for some reason always discusses them next to each other in the sentence. Under
the next heading, I superimpose the bilingual line-up of the current study with that of Poston's (1990) stages of biracial identity development.

Research question four.

The final research question was aimed at synthesizing the data on proficiency, value and LM experiences into a single bilingual identity development framework by means of existing development theories. The way some of the participants in this study seemed to line up based just on the above excerpts from the Domain One data (reproduced in Appendix F), followed the stages of Poston's (1990) model almost perfectly. Thus, Nina could be seen at stage 2 (Choice of Group Categorization), Elan – at 3 (Enmeshment/Denial), Oma and Ida – at 4 (Appreciation), and Irene – at 5 (Integration). Interestingly, the present assessment matches students' self-identification with the case scenarios approximating Poston's model (listed on Form B of the Intake), though not always with their final choices (please see Appendix E for all of the verbatim selections). When asked to choose a single vignette (marked with an asterisk in Appendix E) during the follow-up interview, students may have picked the one they already somewhat resembled, or wished to resemble in the future.

If the latter supposition were correct, Hector's final choice of Poston's (1990) stage 1 (Personal Identity), would be a perfect illustration for the phenomenon of passing. Indeed, why would a Balanced (i.e., additive!) bilingual, purporting to be versed in the customs of both of his cultures, strive to get to a place where his awareness of linguistic identity is limited? Perhaps, therein lies the path to "monolingual privilege," introduced in the following paragraph. As far as Wambua is concerned, it is difficult to make a judgment regarding his level of development without examining his responses in the
Passing category of Domain Two (reproduced in Appendix G and discussed just below). For the record, Wambua did self-identify with the scenario representing Poston's Integration, though from his statements in Domain One (Appendix F) and solicited narrative (Appendix E) he would probably qualify for a stage no higher than Enmeshment/Denial.

Even though the domains were treated as two separate analytical entities, the second one could theoretically be subsumed under the first. The data seemed to suggest that such Aspects of Invisibility (Domain Two) as passing and disclosure are inherently a major part of the Language Minority Experience (Domain One). For example, the predominantly pragmatic and virtually non-existing LM experiences presented by Hector and Wambua respectively (both Balanced bilinguals) may be suggestive of their experiencing non-minority bilingualism of sorts. Because both claim to be minority language speakers, this seems possible only via their passing themselves off as monolinguals every time they are able to gain access to – what I refer to here as – monolingual privilege.

This may be a new term, but it certainly is not a novel concept. Similar to the advantages that Caucasians, heterosexuals, males, and other privileged cohorts enjoy in the United States, monolingual heritage speakers of American English share the privilege of not being singled out just because of the way they sound. Accented bilinguals, on the other hand, are frequently marginalized as sounding "different," "not from around here," etc. While persons who speak English with a "slight" accent may be perceived as sexy or be otherwise romanticized, "heavily" accented speakers are often seen as less intelligent, less worthy (cf., Giles, 1970; Hamers & Blanc, 1989; Landry & Allard, 1992; Derwing,
Rossiter & Munro, 2002), or even dangerous. During last century's Cold War against Soviet Union, this seemed to be the case with Russian-accented speakers. Currently, there is a plethora of anecdotal evidence that America's War on Terror is resulting in similar treatment for Arabic-accented bilinguals. Perhaps due to reappearance of this decade-old stigma, none of the L1 Arabic speakers at NCSU volunteered for this study, and therefore – none could be asked to speak about it from personal experience.

Similar to gay persons, no visible characteristic can reliably identify someone as a bilingual, making both minority groups invisible, i.e., their members must in some way make their status known to others. For a review of the literature on gay identity development, please see Chapter 2 of this paper. In order to gain access to monolingual privilege, unaccented bilinguals in the study – Hector, Ida and Elan must remain invisible and effectively conceal their bilingualism. Regardless of race, there seem to be two possible methods for achieving this objective. One way is to pass for monolinguals *auditorily* – by only speaking the society's most valorized language (i.e., English in the US), while the other is to say nothing at all – by letting their *visible* characteristics (e.g., race, ethnicity, etc.) define them. Unlike the above three participants, bilinguals of color and those who speak English with an accent have only the second method of passing at their disposal. It would therefore appear that the access to, and amount of monolingual privilege enjoyed by participants in this study, also depended on their visible minority characteristics. However, because the precise aim of this research was to take a closer look at student minority experiences as heritage bilinguals, the data that pertain to any other minority memberships was not analyzed fully.
It does, however, seem proper to briefly discuss the differences among the participants of color, pertaining to their invisible status as bilinguals. Although only one respondent identified as Caucasian American (Hector), everyone else in the sample was not automatically treated as a person of color. The latter identification was assumed only when the participant him- or herself made an allusion to membership in a racial or ethnic group of color. Neither Ida, nor Nina picked a racial or ethnic category commonly associated with such a distinction. Unlike Hector, her Greek-speaking counterpart who identified as Caucasian, Ida checked "Multiracial" on Intake Form A (Appendix A) and specified "Greek-American." Nina, on the other hand, indicated "Prefer not to respond" on the same form, though throughout the ensuing interview she referred to herself as a Latina. Therefore, only Irene (Asian American), Elan (Other: Indian), Oma (Other: Indonesian-Chinese) and Wambua (African) were assumed to be non-White by self-identification.

Interestingly, rather than physical appearance, all four of the above respondents cited some indicator of speaking another language as the reason they would be identified as being from somewhere else. This is contrary to previous research indicating that it would be "difficult for the balanced bilingual [of color] to be identified as the member of either ethnolinguistic group" (Kalin, 1982, cited in Hammers & Blanc, 1989, p.133). Elan and Oma seemed to disagree, as they spoke, in general terms, about other people eventually learning about their bilingual background via non-visual markers, while Irene and Wambua alluded specifically to their accents (when speaking English) as a linguistic marker for being found out. Irene shared that she could not hide her accent even if she tried: "even after 2.5 years – I'd be recognized as someone from Korea or Asia."
Wambua seemed to have somewhat of a different outlook on his ability to pass for monolingual majority: "To hide it I just don't talk about it. But if they see my name or hear my accent, I'd tell them that my mom and dad are from there [Nigeria], but not me."

Unlike other bilinguals of color, but similar to his Balanced counterpart Hector, Wambua appeared almost as enthusiastic about disclosing as he seemed to be about passing: "I tell people upfront. Unless sometimes I don't feel like it, like when people don't detect an accent and don't ask me where I'm from. And I would still tell them then, if I knew we'd see each other again, not just for a few minutes." And yet, there seems to be a qualitative difference between Hector's and Wambua's attitudes towards speaking a heritage language. Whereas Hector admits that speaking Greek "is not something I'm necessarily proud of," Wambua's relationship with his African language came across as based on respect and admiration, rather than on indifference. In view of these response data, Wambua's level of bilingual identity development is probably closer to Poston's (1990) Appreciation than to the stage by which I had previously labeled him – Enmeshment/Denial.

Implications for counseling and further research.

College and university students request counseling services for a variety of reasons, presenting with concerns that span from academic to career to personal. The last area is the most expansive of the three, as it may include issues ranging from coping with anxiety and depression, to concerns with relationships and identity. LM students in this study could benefit from a variety of interventions based on their differing levels of bilingual identity development, all other distinctions held equal. Thus, Nina's enthusiasm about disclosing seemed to be related to her anxiety about speaking English instead of
Spanish, with which she identified very strongly. This is consistent with Poston's (1990) Enmeshment/Denial stage, where he describes an individual feeling ashamed and scared of the other identity, that may not be as fitting (p.154). In Nina's own words:

I can tell you what I feel inside, about my cultural shock, about not being able to say it in English what I can say in Spanish! It's a good therapy for me to say it and go over it... [A]nd I don't feel the pressure to speak fast or slow, I can feel identified with you because this [English] is not your permanent language!

Whether or not our encounter was indeed therapeutic, it stands reason to conjecture that while at an intermediate stage of bilingual identity development, this student could benefit from a supportive conversation with another bilingual or a sympathetic ally.

To work effectively with Nina and other accented heritage bilinguals in the sample, counselors and other student affairs professionals may need to develop something as basic as their willingness to listen to these individuals (Derwing, Rossiter & Munro, 2002). Thus, only Irene seemed to make it clear that after 2.5 years in the US, she has accepted her accent as something that distinguishes her as authentically Asian vs. makes her an inferior member of society. In other words, regardless of others' reactions, Irene seemed to be willing to embrace bilingualism as an integral part of who she is, suggestive of Poston's highest stage – Integration. Participants at other stages of development, seemed to be affected to a greater extent by their accents or lack thereof, and would therefore be more sensitive to any subtle clues of discontent or approval respectively. My conjecture is that either of these attitudes on the part of the practitioner
will likely encourage passing for monolingual majority, as seemed to be the case with Hector.

In terms of the CD-RW metaphor, his Caucasian American label and the few preprogrammed monolingual-like tracks are the sights and sounds Hector presents to the outside world. Some musical groups, e.g., Green Day (Wright III, 1994) and The Offspring (Holland, 1994), developed a habit of including one or two hidden tracks at the very end of their albums as a reward for careful and devoted CD listeners. Hector's CALM habits are no different: the Greek LM tracks are only played back in the company of Greeks or other bilinguals. Selectively muting (to borrow Nina's expression) a salient part of one's identity creates a sense of disconnectedness to which Elan had alluded. And the antidote is probably (as Ida put it) "not to flaunt it in somebody's face," but – like Irene – to accept it as a part of one's identity, accent notwithstanding. As student affairs professionals we could make a difference by helping American LM college students say: "I do use it to weigh myself in society and I am proud of it!" (Thanks to Wambua and Oma for contributing to the first and the second clauses of the above passage, respectively.)

In addition to being cognizant of the different needs of language minority students at different levels of bilingual identity development, it is important to follow some basic tenets of working with this student cohort. For example, depending on English proficiency and other factors discussed in this paper, the affective statements made by students in the session may not be representative of the full magnitude of their emotions (Swagler & Ellis, 2003). On a more pragmatic level, heritage bilingual students may not have the grasp of certain constructs that do not exist as such in their L1 (e.g., depression,
identity, etc.), while American clinicians may hold those as self-evident. Perhaps the most effective technique for addressing the above two impediments to the therapeutic alliance is to invite LM students to express their thoughts and feelings in their heritage language as much as possible, with subsequent discussion in English (Santiago-Rivera, 1995). Using this paradoxical method gives the students an almost instant sensation of clarity (both cognitively and emotionally), in addition to sending a message of the counselor's valorization of their L1.

This study presents a practical approach of uncovering the hidden tracks on the seven bilingual CD-RW's in the sample, as well as introducing student affairs professionals to several techniques for heeding the message therein. Moreover, this research begins an important new chapter in understanding the diversity hidden within the phrase – American college student. Counseling as a field cannot afford to ignore the calmly growing bilingual diversity within already diverse American colleges and universities. Further research on bilingual identity development is warranted to equip clinicians in higher education with a comprehensive framework for meeting the emotional and intellectual needs of this emerging population.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Intake Form A

I. Demographics.
As a student you represent many diverse groups. Some of your innate characteristics may place you in the majority, and some – in the minority. In this section, please tell us about some of these essential traits, so we may better understand your overall college experience. Choices are listed in alphabetical order and are in no way hierarchical. If none or more than one of the options are appropriate, feel free to mark all that apply and/or use "Other________ "

1) **Age:** ____ (if not 18 as of today, please notify the researcher)

2) **Race:**
   - African American__
   - Asian American__
   - Caucasian American__
   - Hispanic American__
   - Multiracial (specify)__________________________
   - Other____________________________________
   - Prefer not to respond__

3) **Sex:**
   - Female__
   - Male__
   - Transgender__

4) **Sexual Orientation:**
   - Bisexual__
   - Gay__
   - Heterosexual__
   - Lesbian__
   - Other______________________________
   - Prefer not to respond__

II. Linguistics.
As a bilingual student you represent two groups: language majority (English or "L2") and language minority (your "heritage" language or "L1"). Your allegiance to these groups may not be equivalent in terms of how well you speak the languages (Proficiency) and/or the role they play in your life (Value). Earlier, we asked about your Proficiency – please indicate it again. Today, to better understand your bilingual experience, we would like to learn about the Value you place in your L1 and/or L2. Feel free to mark all that apply; if none do – please use the space provided under "(Other)________" to explain your position.

1) **Languages:**
   - My heritage language (L1) is ____________________, (L2): **English**

2) **Proficiency:**
   - I speak better and/or prefer to speak: L1 __  L2 __  both (L1+L2)__

3) **Value:**
   - I identify mostly with: L1 __  L1 (but not L2)__  L1 (and maybe L2)__
   - L2 __  L2 (but not L1)__  L2 (and maybe L1)__  L1 and L2 __  No idea__
   - (Other)______________________________________________________________
Appendix B

Intake Form B

Please carefully read these descriptions of six college students:

1) Tracy is bilingual, but does not give it much thought. It's not an issue at home, school, or work. Things just seem to fall into place regardless of Tracy's or others' linguistic background. Sometimes weeks or even months pass before Tracy is reminded of being bilingual by a random encounter.

2) Shannon is bilingual, but feels "forced" to use one language vs. the other. This "primary" language happens to be the one people use in most contexts, in which Shannon participates. Sometimes Shannon feels alienated from the company of people who speak the "other" language.

3) Alex is bilingual and often feels guilty for choosing one language over the other. It is almost as if using this "primary" language does not fully represent who Alex really is. Sometimes Alex does not feel fully accepted by people that use either of the two languages.

4) Dana is bilingual, but has to choose a "primary" language in most contexts. Yet, Dana takes advantage of every opportunity to use the other language or learn about the culture of people who speak it. There is an increasing sense of appreciation of the role this "secondary" language plays in Dana's life.

5) Cameron is bilingual and is able to utilize both languages equally. Doing so is not only convenient, but also provides a sense of wholeness for Cameron. Both languages are integral parts of Shannon's linguistic and cultural identity.

On a separate sheet, indicate with which one(s) do you most identify (e.g., "4"); "2 and 3") and why. If you think that nothing adequately reflects your experience, please mark "none" and explain your position.

Please take your time and let us know if you need more paper for your response or if you have any questions.
Appendix C

Interview

Standard opening question:
"Last week you shared some of your experiences as a bilingual student at NC State. If there is anything we did not have a chance to cover, please tell me about that."

Semi-standard prompts:
1) Last week you identified with [Name(s), description(s)]. Please explain your position again. If you had to choose just one person, who would it be?

2) If you no longer identify with the same person(s), please explain how your position is different today.

3) What does personal identity mean to you? What does it consist of?

4) What does linguistic identity mean to you? How (if at all) does it fit in with your personal identity?

5) What comes to mind when you hear the words "majority" and "minority"?

6) In what (if any) majority and/or minority categories do you consider yourself to be?

7) In what (if any) majority and/or minority categories does your linguistic identity place you?

8) Being a language majority and/or minority may have given you an advantage, disadvantage or some combination of both. If so, please give some examples.

9) If for some reason you did not want others to know about your linguistic identity, how would you go about it? What might be some of those reasons? How would you feel if you had to reveal your linguistic identity?
Appendix D

Informed Consent Form for Research

**Title of Study:** Bilingual Experience at North Carolina State University

**Principal Investigator:** Leonid Y. Orlov, B.S.  **Faculty Sponsor:** Siu-Man "Raymond" Ting, Ph.D., LPC, NCC

We are asking you to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate factors affecting bilingual students while at NCSU.

**INFORMATION**
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a 1-page questionnaire (3-5 min.) and discuss it with the researcher (30-50 min.) on the first day of the study. On the second day (1 week later) you will be asked to participate in a structured videotaped interview (30-50 min.). The total time required of you will not exceed 2 hours.

**RISKS**
Sharing your experiences as a bilingual is unlikely to produce any psychological distress. However, should this occur, you are advised to notify the experimenter, who will determine the necessity of urgent psychological help. You will then have the option of continuing or withdrawing from the study without penalty.

**BENEFITS**
The results will help to improve new student orientation, counseling and other student services, and may also contribute to improved self-concept on your part.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**
The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. When not being analyzed, data will be stored securely in a locked cabinet at the investigator's office. No reference will be made in oral or written reports, which could link you to the study.

**COMPENSATION** (if applicable)
For participating in this study you will receive a maximum of 2.0 hrs. of PSYC 200 research credit. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will receive 0.5 hr. credit for up to 30 min. of participation and 1.0 hr. credit for anything beyond that. For other ways to earn the same amount of credit, please contact your PSYC 200 Instructor.

**CONTACT**
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Leonid Y. Orlov, B.S., at Campus Box 7801, Counselor Ed., or 919-619-0838. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Matthew Zingraff, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-1834) or Mr. Matthew Ronning, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-2148)

**PARTICIPATION**
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed at your request.
CONSENT
“I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time.”

Subject's signature_______________________________________ Date _________________

Investigator's signature__________________________________ Date _________________
## Appendix E

**Self-reported Bilingual Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Development Level(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Oma          | L1 DOMINANT (and maybe L2) | L1 DOMINANT | 2 - CATEGORIZATION: "Sometimes I feel alienated when I talk with a group of people that speak English very well. May main problem will probably be catching up with their jokes. Another example is, when my American friends talk about (American) football and other 'American games.'"
|              |             |       | 4 - APPRECIATION*: "My roommates and most of my friends are from Indonesia, so I mostly use Indonesian language every day. Therefore, I can't really utilize my secondary language (English) maximally. I do appreciate the role of this secondary language however. I also try to adapt to American customs, not because I feel like have to, but because I feel that it slowly became an integral part of myself."
| Nina         | L1 DOMINANT (and maybe L2) | L1 DOMINANT | 2 - CATEGORIZATION: "Being in NC as an exchange student has forced me to use the language I'm not used to using. I definitely feel alienated in school, because I think that those who speak the language very well, might have a difficulty understanding me and it's difficult for me to speak and express myself the way I would like to."
|              |             |       | 3 - ENMESHMENT*: "Lately I've thought about how uncomfortable it is to have to choose one language over the other. I think that when you see yourself, express yourself, identify yourself with your main language, you can't {hardly} in a difficult way show how you really are."
| Irene        | L1 DOMINANT | L1 and L2 BALANCED | 5 - INTEGRATION: "I utilize both languages equally. I am from Korea around 2 years ago, but I married to American and live in America. So English became very important in my life. I also teach Korean at Korean school to the children. Most of my students are half Korean and half American. I tell them why we need to speak two languages. Not because they are half Korean, but speaking two languages provides them more opportunities and understanding of other cultures. I believe that bilingual people have more benefit in their life."
<p>| Wambua       | L1 = L2 BALANCED | Other: &quot;I put a little bit more value on L1 [DOMINANT], but not much more&quot; | 5 - INTEGRATION: &quot;I speak two languages and use both of them equally and I'm also very proficient with them. Sometimes I even interchange the two without noticing it. I learnt both languages at the same time and I don’t want to forget either of them, so I speak them any chance I get.&quot; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>L1 &amp; L2 Proficiency</th>
<th>L1 &amp; L2 Development Level</th>
<th>1 - PERSONAL IDENTITY*</th>
<th>4 - APPRECIATION*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>L1 = L2 BALANCED</td>
<td>L1 and L2 BALANCED</td>
<td>&quot;I don't put much thought into the fact that I am bilingual. I don't think it provides a sense of wholeness for me. A lot of times I identify with Greek more, because of the comparison between lifestyle and the fact that I grew up in Greece for 12 years vs. 9 years here.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I identify with both languages probably equally. I use both languages every day since I have a lot of Greek friends and I talk to my father every day. Switching between languages seems to be natural.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>L2 DOMINANT</td>
<td>L1 and L2 BALANCED</td>
<td>&quot;I don't go everywhere thinking, 'Yes, I am bilingual &amp; I am different.' Being bilingual comes naturally to me, I don't think about it every day, though I do not forget either. Especially since I am at school and not with my family, I am more adapted to English and I do not think twice about it. I don't see bilingualism as an issue; it is more of who I am and where I am and it just comes to me without really thinking about it.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Although I choose English as my primary language, I am still interested in Greek and don't say &quot;Oh, I know everything,&quot; but want to learn more about Greece. I have to have English as my primary language because I live in America and would not get things accomplished if I spoke Greek to everyone.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elan</td>
<td>L2 DOMINANT (and maybe L1)</td>
<td>L2 DOMINANT (and maybe L1)</td>
<td>&quot;In order to function well within one culture, I feel as if I had to give up a part of my own heritage in order to 'fit in'. Every grammar-related structure and nuance must be drilled into one's head. Thus my grasp of my native language is reduced. I feel as if my hold on the first language I learned has slackened. Much of the jargon and simple talk I understand, but I still feel left out. Since I cannot convey my feelings coherently with the native tongue, I resort to English. Those who speak English since they were children feel the same as they learn a second language in school.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Since my parents speak my language fluently, I feel more at home as I relate myself to objects, history, or knowledge of India. I am forced to speak English (and coherently), thus Indian is more of a vacation from the norm. Mostly, I learn by associating with my parents' friends who are Indians who speak different dialects. I also learn how to cook Indian food and use Indian products. The greatest part is when I come across a thing that reminds me of my home in India. It really allows me to connect my heritage (including my language) to my current situation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Participant names are fictitious. Data are from Forms A and B of the Intake (Appendices A and B). All text in quotes is from verbatim responses, including capitalization and corrections. Proficiency and Value labels are from Landry & Allard (1992), Development Level labels are from Poston (1990).
* Some participants identified with more than one vignette representing bilingual identity development. When asked to choose a single identity during Interview (Appendix C), they picked the one asterisked.
† The actual name of the Indian language Elan speaks is not provided due to confidentiality.
## Appendix F

### Conceptually Clustered Contrast Matrix:
Domain One – Language minority experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Dominant</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oma</strong></td>
<td>I would choose English language as the first one, because it means a lot to me. But even though I like English, just in myself – the Indonesian language.</td>
<td>The most troubling part is how to write, rather than to speak. Because I saw a lot of people speak broken English, so it’s the same problem with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0:2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nina</strong></td>
<td>I think language is very important, it's the way of communication, the way of expressing myself... The language is just... it's what you are: it's how you speak, and what you know, and how you know, and what you have lived... And for me it's much more important – I really like my language, and I really love reading in Spanish and I'm really good at writing in Spanish... Some writings in Spanish I don't just read, but I feel really identified with that kind of writing, I feel like it's a part of me! There are beautiful memories you have and you just can't translate them, they're beautiful just as they are, and most of them – with my mom, my dad, my family, so they have to be in Spanish!</td>
<td>Right now, after 20 years of my life speaking, for some reason I get... mute? Is that the word? Yeah, mute – I would probably explode, because nothing I say can express what I'm trying to say! It's putting psychological pressure on me because I can't be who I am in the classroom environment... And I love asking questions and I love learning actively in the class and it's very difficult here. And sometimes I can't... you know... [searches for a word, but cannot find the right one] It is frustrating not to say whatever you want to say because you feel, &quot;I can't, so I don't feel like I should talk...&quot; There's a difference between just speaking the language because everyone speaks it and being able to really understand on higher levels like in the literature. And in English I can't recognize so easily from one book to another – how it's different, how an author writes and another author writes, their style – a book is just a book in English! And there are some expressions that you just can't translate into English and remember it the same way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5:9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irene</strong></td>
<td>At [NC] State, most people try to understand me, speak slowly, try to help me, so now it's an advantage in a way. If I were just American, and just speak the [English] language, I am then just a normal person in America. Because I speak Korean, I can do something different from normal [monolingual] Americans, I can do more. I think I am happy because I speak 2 languages, but I wish I could speak English much better than Korean. It's easier and more natural to speak Korean, it feels better [than English], though my It's a disadvantage because I have to ask the professor for help directly unlike others who speak English well. After taking a test in Business – 60 questions and each like a paragraph you have to read – I cried! Concepts in English just don't come out the same [as in my native language]. Because of that I have a disability – have to study almost double for every single class, except for Mathematics, because it doesn't rely on reading as much. On the test, I'd prefer questions in Korean!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean is not perfect. But English is more fun, because you have to plan how and what to say, prepare for it. Sometimes I speak English to my Korean friends, sometimes I think English first, even though I speak in Korean – I think this is because I'm interested in English. English is important because I need to get a job in the future and as a [bilingual] 33 year-old woman I have more opportunities here than in Korea.</td>
<td>When somebody does not understand [me], I feel like I'm just stupid – a lot! Especially if it's an easy or a general concept, but for me – every single word is new!</td>
<td>7:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wambua</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think language is just a way of communication. As far as being a bilingual, I would say that it's an advantage in most cases, like to get into a fancy school or to get a job... Also, it's very useful sometimes to speak to someone in a language others can't understand.</td>
<td>I have no idea – it doesn't show... I mean, it's not a big deal... it's like it doesn't matter that I speak two languages, I don't use it to weigh myself in the society. It does not necessarily represent the culture, especially since I learned both languages at the same time. But I can't think of any disadvantages for myself in the society as a bilingual.</td>
<td>I wouldn't say I have a first language – I grew up with both, so what my first language is can switch quickly. And I switch languages a lot when I talk, even in an interview or with a professor, as long as the other person understands both. Being a bilingual has never been discriminating to me. I just use it to help out – like if a friend was struggling to express himself in English. I can speak both languages, so if I have a problem with one, I'd probably just speak one language instead of the other and not really try to get them even. It's not like I use the language to prove myself – just to communicate. I interact with a lot of Greek people. I try to keep talking because if you don't use the language you forget it. If I find someone who speaks Greek, I show different interest than if someone was from somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Dominant</td>
<td>Knowing for myself that I'm different, mentally and emotionally is more of an advantage. Because you know you can do things that other people can't, makes you feel a little bit better about yourself. But it's not to flaunt it in somebody's face and say, &quot;ha-ha, I can speak a different language and you can't!&quot; – it's just about being proud of it.</td>
<td>Some people might prejudge you, but other than that there aren't any real disadvantages that I can remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>It's an advantage when translating or doing business in India.</td>
<td>I really don't find it as a disadvantage unless I am trying to fully function as I used to – I think I may have lost touch with how to be strictly Indian. It's like now I'm living in two different worlds [linguistically]: family and school/work, it's almost a sense of being two different people. I used to understand people who speak English with an Indian accent, but now I can't. I feel more and more disconnected. And some of them cannot understand me because of my [American] pronunciation and how fast I speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Participant names are fictitious. Data are from verbatim responses during Interview (Appendix C). Messages inside square brackets are added for clarity.

Coding. Each completed sentence containing response(s) of one type, received a score of "1" (except for verbatim repetitions). Otherwise, each completed clause containing response(s) of one type received a score of "1" (except for verbatim repetitions).

Types of Responses:
- "pragmatic" responses pertain to what participants did as part of their LM experiences
- "emotional" responses pertain to how participants felt as part of their LM experiences
## Appendix G

Conceptually Clustered Contrast Matrix:
Domain Two – Aspects of Invisibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Dominant</th>
<th>Passing</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oma</strong></td>
<td>I sometimes hide it by not saying anything to avoid being intimidated. But I never in my life felt like I am not proud of who I am, my background. To hide your [bilingual] identity from people is such a stupid idea because eventually people will know who you are. And – you should be proud of it! <strong>1:2</strong></td>
<td>Even if I feel somehow intimidated, I will go ahead and say it – people are different! <strong>1:0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nina</strong></td>
<td>Wow, I don’t want to even think about it, it would be terrible [to hide that I am bilingual]! If I were completely bilingual, even if they [the languages] were at the same level, I think I’d still prefer my Spanish language just because I’m raised with it. <strong>0:2</strong></td>
<td>All these things I’ve been through these few weeks I’ve been here, you've been my… [searches for the right word, but cannot find one] I can tell you what I feel inside, about my cultural shock, about not being able to say it in English what I can say in Spanish! It's a good therapy for me to say it and go over it. I am more comfortable talking to you as a person from another country who grew up speaking another language, because you're like me – sometimes stop and think about the words, and I don't feel the pressure to speak fast or slow. I can feel identified with you because this [English] is not your permanent language! <strong>4:0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irene</strong></td>
<td>First of all, I don't want to hide my accent, even after 2.5 years – I'd be recognized as from Korea or Asia. Second, I don't want to hide! Why? There is no reason to hide! Even if I know that people don't like Asians, I don't want to hide! <strong>0:3</strong></td>
<td>That's who I am [so I must disclose]. And also it's very important to let them know, so that it's not embarrassing when I couldn't understand what they say, and so they don't think I'm just stupid. <strong>2:0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wambua</strong></td>
<td>To hide it I just don't talk about it. But if they see my name or hear my accent, I'd tell them that my mom and dad are from [Nigeria], but not me.</td>
<td>I tell people upfront. Unless sometimes I don't feel like it, like when people don't detect an accent and don't ask me where I'm from. And I would still tell them then, if I knew we'd see each other again, not just for a few minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hector</strong></td>
<td>I've never been considered a minority – I just blend in. I interact with people without them noticing that I am bilingual. Like yesterday another Greek person told me &quot;I didn't know you were Greek – I thought you were American!&quot; I wouldn't come up and just say &quot;I'm Greek&quot; – it's not something I point out or brag about. I try to hide it even, I don't care, especially knowing that people will start asking you stupid questions. It depends also on my mood – if I don't feel like it, I just don't say anything.</td>
<td>I would tell a person that I'm Greek if they asked me directly or if they needed my help with translation or something. It is not something I'm necessarily proud of – I just tell it more as a fact. I can't control other people's feelings, so if they don't like it – [I'm] sorry, what can I say [except for the truth]? If I was to get killed afterwards, I don't know, maybe I wouldn't try to hide it, but otherwise… even if it was a girl I was trying to date, or a hiring manager – I wouldn't try to hide it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>L2 Dominant</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ida</strong></td>
<td>I would not mention it, but [only] with just strangers: a one-time event, like orientation – it doesn't matter. If it was a long-term thing, I don't know if I could do it. And if I did [try to hide it], I'd have that feeling that I'm lying, keeping a secret, like you want to tell someone even though you can't. But if I got used to it eventually, if I kept it in so long – I'd probably completely forget and start telling myself that [I am not bilingual].</td>
<td>When I meet someone who I'm going to be friends with, I think it more comes out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elan</strong></td>
<td>I find myself letting go of my language [i.e., Indian] because I fit in otherwise – I speak the language that everyone else speaks, so I don't really have to speak Indian unless I have to. I'm so used to English it just comes naturally. I don't see how I could really hide it. If I speak another language, I don't really care how people react to it. The only way I would hide it is to just not announce it – it's more of an omission than anything else. Whether or not people know about it [that I am bilingual]</td>
<td>I feel better trying to separate myself [linguistically]. But I don't feel like I'm beating myself up, whether I am doing it or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- this is who I am. I don't feel ashamed! If you take me at face value, that's not all I am — [being bilingual] defines me. I don't have to explain it to someone else, to define myself to other people.

4:4

Note. Participant names are fictitious. Data are from verbatim responses during Interview (Appendix C). Messages inside square brackets are added for clarity.
† The actual name of the Indian language Elan speaks is not provided due to confidentiality.

Coding. Each completed sentence containing response(s) of one type, received a score of "1" (except for verbatim repetitions). Otherwise, each completed clause containing response(s) of one type received a score of "1" (except for verbatim repetitions).

Types of Responses:
- "confirmatory" responses pertain to the aspects of invisibility participants endorsed
- "dissenting" responses pertain to the aspects of invisibility participants did not endorse
- "logistical" clauses pertain to conditions for differential endorsement of invisibility
Appendix H

Bilingual Biography

(Printed version only. Electronic version: see Figure 1 for links to audio content.)

[Compact Disk]