

5-2016

Adult Hispanic students' attitudes toward writing in English in a U.S. bilingual community

Analynn Bustamante
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bustamante, Analynn, "Adult Hispanic students' attitudes toward writing in English in a U.S. bilingual community" (2016). *Theses and Dissertations*. 12.
<https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/etd/12>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. For more information, please contact justin.white@utrgv.edu, william.flores01@utrgv.edu.

ADULT HISPANIC STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING
IN ENGLISH IN A U.S. BILINGUAL COMMUNITY

A Thesis

by

ANALYNN BUSTAMANTE

Submitted to the Graduate College of
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2016

Major Subject: English as a Second Language

ADULT HISPANIC STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING
IN ENGLISH IN A U.S. BILINGUAL COMMUNITY

A Thesis
by
ANALYNN BUSTAMANTE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Minhee Eom
Chair of Committee

Dr. John Foreman
Committee Member

Dr. Shannon McCrocklin
Committee Member

May 2016

Copyright 2016 Analynn Bustamante

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Bustamante, Analynn, Adult Hispanic Students' Attitudes Toward Writing in English in a U.S. Bilingual Community. Master of Arts (MA), May, 2016, 50 pp., 6 tables, references, 115 titles.

Attitude is widely regarded as a key component for writing achievement. This study explores the relationship between students' language dominance and their attitudes toward writing in English. Seventy-seven Hispanic adult students were recruited to participate in a survey. Four writing domains were tested: writing in general, writing in STEM courses, writing in humanities courses and writing in electronic communication. Participants' attitudes toward four different writing domains were compared. Significant difference was found between attitudes toward general writing attitudes and attitudes toward writing STEM courses, as well as between general writing and writing in humanities courses. Additionally, participants were divided by primary language spoken and their attitudes toward writing domains were compared. Significant difference was found between language dominance groups in attitudes toward using English in electronic communication.

DEDICATION

For my parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Minhee Eom, my committee members, Dr. John Foreman and Dr. Shannon McCrocklin, as well as the rest of the MA ESL faculty for their continued guidance.

I would also like to thank the administration and faculty at CCTA for their assistance in my research project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Section 1: Educational Context of Hispanic Bilingual Students	5
Section 2: Language Dominance	7
Section 3: Education in the Broader Cultural Context.....	8
Section 4: Second Language Writing	10
Section 5: Attitude	12
Section 6: Summary.....	16
CHAPTER III. METHODS.....	17
Section 1: Participants.....	17
Section 2: Instrument	18
Section 3: Procedure	21
Section 4: Data Analysis.....	22
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS.....	24
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	30
Section 1: General Discussion	30
Section 2: Classroom Recommendations.....	33
Section 3: Limitations and Implications for Further Study	34

Section 4: Conclusion	35
REFERENCES	37
APPENDIX A.....	46
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	50

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Demographic Information of Sample	25
Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations of Attitudes Toward Writing Domains of the Sample.....	25
Table 3: Results for Paired T-Tests Comparing Attitudes of the Sample Toward Writing Domains	26
Table 4: Demographic Information per Language Dominance Group.....	27
Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations of Attitudes Toward Writing Domains for Each Language Dominance Group.....	28
Table 6: Results for Independent T-Test Comparing Writing Attitudes between English and Spanish Dominant Groups.....	29

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Because writing is a major determining factor of academic success, it is crucial to explore the relationship between students' language backgrounds and their high school outcomes.

English Language Learners tend to have a relatively high dropout rate across the U.S., and the number of ELLs in American school systems has steadily increased over the last few decades without any signs of slowing down (Flynn & Hill, 2005; Kena, et al., 2015; Kim, 2011; Payán & Nettles, 2008). This thesis explores the writing attitudes of bilingual students in south Texas. The participants were recruited from a high school that caters to adults who have not completed their high school graduation requirements located in Hidalgo County, Texas.

The state of Texas has led the push for college readiness, enacting the country's first statewide college readiness standards (Yamamura, Martinez & Saenz, 2010). One challenge to college readiness that many Hispanic students face is speaking English as their second language (Alfredo & Gerardo, 2003; Becerra, 2010). South Texas, an area with a large population of Spanish-speaking Latino students, is home to "some of the lowest college-going rates in the state" (Yamamura, Martinez & Saenz, 2010, p. 127). Preparing Hispanic students to be successful in postsecondary education is of particular concern in Texas due to the growth of the Hispanic population (Martinez, Cortez & Saenz, 2013; Rodríguez, 2012; Ruecker, 2013; Yamamura, Martinez & Saenz, 2010).

College readiness can be defined as having the necessary skills and knowledge to be successful in college courses (Blume & Zumeta, 2014; Tierney & Sablan, 2014). Specifically, college ready students are those who

“can qualify for and succeed in credit bearing college courses leading to a baccalaureate or certificate, or other pathway oriented training programs without the need for remedial or developmental coursework” (Conley, 2007, p. 1).

In order to attain the skills and knowledge required for college readiness, students are required maintain a rigorous schedule in high school. Rigorous coursework tends to include four years of English language arts classes. Without four years of English, students may not even be considered for acceptance to a college or university (Greene & Forster, 2003). The required four years of English surpasses the required number of years for taking any other subject, including math (three years), social studies (two years), or foreign language (two years) (Greene & Forster, 2003). Generally, the primary responsibility for teaching students academic writing skills falls on English classes. These writing skills are essential to be successful in higher education (Byrd & MacDonald, 2005; Roderick, Nagaoka & Coca, 2009).

Transitioning from high school to college requires students to write academically, through high stakes standardized testing and admissions essays. In Texas, students must write essays in order to pass the English language arts STAAR (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness) exams in order to graduate high school (Texas Education Agency, n.d.). Additionally, writing samples are often required or suggested for many college entrance exams, such as the SAT (Scholastic Achievement Test) (SAT Essay, 2016) and the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) (TOEFL iBT Test Content, 2016). In addition to standardized

tests, students are often expected to write admissions essays as part of the college application process (Paley, 1996).

Once students arrive at college, they are expected to “write multiple papers in a short period time. These papers must be well reasoned, well organized, and well documented with evidence from credible sources” (Conley, 2007, p. 6). Universities expect students from all educational, cultural and linguistic backgrounds to be able to write academically acceptable essays with regard to language, form, topic and even higher-order composition skills like organization and coherence.

Though primarily considered in the realm of the humanities, writing is becoming increasingly important in math- and science-related disciplines (Eblen, 1983; Lefever-Davis & Pearman, 2015). Zhu (2004) found that “both the business and engineering faculty emphasized the importance of writing” (p. 34), particularly as “a communication tool in the real world” (p. 42). Often, students outside of the humanities think that writing will not be an essential aspect of their university coursework; however, in non-humanities courses, students are expected to successfully communicate via writing in order to do research or produce reports. Due to the importance of writing in math and science related fields (Zhu, 2004) and the push toward expanding STEM programs (Cohen, 2016; U.S. Department of Education, n.d.), more research is being done to examine students’ writing skills in the context of STEM courses (Hoskins, Lopatto & Stevens, 2011; Verkade & Lim, 2016; Taylor & Drury, 2005).

With the growth of English language learners throughout U.S. secondary and postsecondary education (U.S. Department of Education, 2012-2013; Texas Education Agency, 2015a), it is important to examine ELLs’ relationship with writing in English. ELLs often consider writing the most difficult language skill to master (Berman & Cheng, 2010; Zhang &

Mi 2010). It compounds the already challenging language barrier that they face in their academic attainment (Becerra, 2010; Grant & Wong, 2003; Ruecker, 2013; Strauss, 2012).

Several factors are involved in ELL writing achievement, such as cognition, language proficiency, writing proficiency, as well as affective variables (Clément & Kruidenier, 1985; Graham, Berninger & Fan, 2007; Graham & Perin, 2007; Hayes, 2000; Pajares, 2003; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Schoonen et al., 2003; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). One area of research concerning students' affective needs in writing achievement is attitudes toward writing. Research supports a causal relationship between attitude and motivation for both second language acquisition and writing skills development (Clément & Kruidenier, 1985; Dörnyei, 1998; Graham, Berninger & Fan, 2007; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Exploring ELLs' attitudes toward writing adds to the body of literature that helps English language education researchers and practitioners support students' affective needs.

For the present study, the researcher explored the following questions:

Research Question 1: When comparing writing domains, do participants have more positive attitudes toward one writing domain than another?

Research Question 2: Do self-identified English-dominant speakers have a more positive attitude toward specified writing domains than Spanish-dominant speakers?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Section 1: Educational Context of Hispanic Bilingual Students

In education literature, the terms ELL, ESL, bilingual and Limited English Proficient (LEP) are used to refer to students who speak a language other than English at home and/or receive language support in school (Texas Administrative Code, 2012.; U.S. Department of Education, 2013). For the purposes of this study, information will be reported using the term that was used in the original source. Texas's ELL dropout rate of 14.9% in 2013, over twice the state average of 6.6% (Texas Education Agency, 2014). As of the 2014-2015 school year, there are almost 890,000 ELLs who speak Spanish as their first language, about 17% of the total student population in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 2015a).

Research on ELL dropouts shows that language issues are a major contributing factor to why these students are at such a high risk of dropping out of high school (Boone, 2011; Zarte & Pineda, 2014). Students who are more proficient in English tend to be more successful students, when controlling for various additional factors (Rumberger & Lim, 2008). Moreover, Watt and Roessingh (2001) found that ELLs with beginner English proficiency dropped out at a 40% higher rate than students with advanced proficiency, indicating that "language proficiency sets the tone for the challenges" (p. 219) for ESL students.

Aside from the risk of dropping out, language barriers serve as a general obstacle to ELLs' academic achievement. When asked, many students cite poor language proficiency as a discouraging factor throughout school (Boone, 2011; Bercerra, 2010). Bercerra (2010) notes that Hispanics perceive language as a major barrier to educational attainment. Additionally, language barriers are linked to difficulties in attaining "higher levels of literacy" (Grant & Wong, 2003, p. 387) for ESL students. Poor levels of literacy follow ESL students throughout their academic careers (Grant & Wong, 2003).

Language proficiency becomes particularly relevant when considering the impact that high-stakes standardized testing has had on education. Because testing is done in English, language has become an integral aspect of content knowledge (Menken, 2010). Therefore, ELL students are at a disadvantage with regard to language in the U.S. education system (Menken, 2010). ELLs tend to have lower high school test scores and greater need for college remediation (Flores & Drake, 2014; Menken 2010). According to Flores and Drake (2014), Hispanic ELLs tend to be negatively affected by English language deficiencies, possibly due to lack of access to high quality ESL services. Further research is needed in order to have a better understanding of the linguistic situation of Hispanic ELLs in the U.S.

Many ELLs are fully aware of their shortcomings as academic writers. One participant in a study of long term ELLs' perceptions of writing states that, "I know how to speak already. Writing, I just have [a] hard time to write like grammar and everything (Kim & Garcia, 2014, p. 308). Throughout Kim and Garcia (2014), there is a general consensus that these students feel that writing is a major factor holding them back from being truly academically successful. These students cite several aspects of writing that seem beyond their grasp, not only grammar, but

spelling and word choice as well. The students interviewed in this study also attribute their placement in less rigorous classes to their difficulties with writing. The authors note, “students discussed their concerns about their placement in these EOC (end of course) classes because they viewed EOC classes as less rigorous” (Kim & Garcia, 2014, p. 308). According to the article, EOC courses are remedial courses that focus solely on students’ completing high school graduation requirements and are not concerned with preparing students for university writing. It is argued that these courses contribute to students’ inability to catch up to those peers who have passed the state standardized tests.

Allison (2009) discusses the “accord, or lack thereof, between expectations in/across the two settings” (p. 76), college and high school and its impact on ELLs. She attributes much of the mismatch to high-stakes standardized testing saying, “if anything, literacy tasks are more closely determined by what will be assessed on high-stakes standardized tests” (p. 83). On the other hand, college writing is relatively student-centric on form and content. The discrepancies in the high school approach may amplify how challenging university-level writing may be for incoming students (Beil & Knight, 2007).

Section 2: Language Dominance

An estimated 84% of the population of Hidalgo county speaks Spanish or Spanish creole (U.S. Census, 2014). In the TEA designation, Region 1 (which consists of all school districts in south Texas), there are over 150,000 students designated as ELLs, or 36% of the overall population of students in this region (Texas Education Agency, 2015a). The general population of the border region of Texas tends to fall somewhere on the bilingual spectrum due to exposure to both English and Spanish throughout their daily lives (Mejias, Anderson-Mejias & Carlson, 2003).

Bilingual speakers tend to be dominant in one of their languages. Being able to determine a bilingual speaker's language dominance is necessary in order to do research in these complex linguistic situations. While there is no universally accepted definition or measurement of language dominance, language dominance is a useful tool for predicting a speaker's relative proficiency between the languages they speak. Researchers have proposed various methods and instruments by which to measure bilingual speakers' dominant language (Dunn & Fox Tree, 2009; Marian, Blumenfeld & Kaushankaya 2007; Treffers-Daller, 2011). Identifying a participants' dominant language allows researchers to explore the relationship between language and various behaviors by using language dominance as an independent variable (Bedore et. al. 2012; Li, Sepanski & Zhao 2006). Typically, the language that one encounters more frequently becomes his or her dominant language (Law & So, 2006).

Section 3: Education in the Broader Cultural Context

Due to the close sociolinguistic relationship, it is impossible to discuss language without discussing culture and race aspects of education. When considering race demographics, Hispanic students are especially at risk for dropping out of school, on the nation level as well as statewide. In 2012, Hispanic students dropped out at rate of 12% across the U.S. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). In the state of Texas, the Texas Education Agency reports Hispanic students drop out at a rate of 8.2% in 2013, whereas white students dropped out at a rate of 3.5% and the overall average dropout rate is 6.6% (Texas Education Agency, 2014).

Hispanic students may experience certain aspects of academic culture that is at odds with their home culture and may therefore struggle due to the difficulty of having to adapt from one to the other. Ogbu (1991) explains that when certain minority groups feel that the education system is not working for them, they no longer actively participate in the system. Minority

groups may become disillusioned by generational failure to become academically successful and cope by developing non-mainstream, non-education related strategies to survive. These strategies result in poor attitudes toward school related activities (Ogbu, 1991). In other words,

“Mexican American youths whose ethnically based behaviors and/or attitudes are incompatible with the requirements of school tasks may be less likely to respond to the demands of the immediate social environment” (Bernal, Saenz & Knight, 1994, p. 83).

Cultural differences between Hispanic students and the Anglo school system may include “nonverbal and verbal communication, cognitive styles, cultural values and behaviors” (Bernal, Saenz & Knight, 1991, p. 75). For example, Hispanic students tend to be more cooperative and collectivistic, where white students tend to be more competitive and individualistic (Neuliep, 2014); this individualism is reflected in the U.S. education system’s “emphasis on individual achievement” (Glass & Rud, 2012, p. 97). Individualistic behavior rewarded in public schools, such as giving an opinion or trying to be better than one’s peers, is often punished at home (Valdés, 1996). The U.S. education system tends to value a direct communication style in writing (Canagarajah, 2006), whereas Hispanic cultures tend to avoid directness and conflict (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000).

Ramanathan and Atkinson (1999) discuss individuality in relation to writing. According to these researchers, “numerous studies of language socialization have shown how children are socialized to such differing versions of selfhood” (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999, p. 51). Therefore, critical thinking, an act of individuality and a process highly valued in mainstream American education, may come less naturally to some students because the social skills for critical thinking are learned outside of schools from a formative age. Atkinson and Ramanathan

argue that the tasks expected of students in western academic writing - such as critical analysis, supporting one's own opinions with evidence, defending against counter arguments - "have direct implications for developing and asserting one's individuality" (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999, p. 61).

Writers from more interdependent cultures are often found to struggle with writing tasks that require them to assert their individuality (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). Many cultures do not emphasize academic or cognitive independence as acutely as mainstream American culture. Therefore, students who come from diverse backgrounds may be at a cultural disadvantage when participating in writing activities in the U.S. educational context.

Section 4: Second Language Writing

Throughout their academic careers, students are expected to engage in various writing assignments. Poor writing has a far reaching impact on students' academic and professional lives. Poor writers suffer from lower grades, particularly in courses where writing plays a significant role in assessment and are less likely to attend college (Graham & Perin, 2007). Writing is also highly valued in the professional world and can affect one's employment opportunities (Addison & McGee, 2010; Graham & Perin, 2007).

For classroom purposes, writing can serve numerous functions. The vast majority of writing assignments are transactional. Writing, for example, can be used for informative, persuasive, expressive or exploratory purposes (Beil & Knight, 2007; Melzer, 2009). Students are expected to complete various writing tasks, such as term papers, essays, lab reports, book reports, reflections, and so on (Melzer, 2009). However, despite the importance of writing in academia and beyond, many students "do not develop the competence in writing needed" (Graham & Perin, 2007, p. 445) during their time in the K-12 education system. Poor writing

skills are magnified at the tertiary level. Student writers at express confusion regarding the requirements of their compositions. The expectations can be unclear and overwhelming for students (Lillis & Turner, 2001).

Writing is generally considered a highly complex task due to the integration of several cognitive and metacognitive processes and environmental factors (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hayes, 1989). Second language learners often consider writing the most difficult language skill to master (Berman & Cheng, 2010; Zhang & Mi, 2010; Strauss, 2012). Several areas of second language writing research have developed in order to better understand the aspects of achievement in this area (Clément & Kruidenier, 1985; Graham & Perin, 2007; Hayes, 2000; Pajares, 2003; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Schoonen et al., 2003).

Cognitive factors are often explored when discussing second language writing (Hayes, 2000; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Schoonen et al., 2003). For example, being able to access one's long-term memory, organize information and synthesize knowledge is a key factor of writing (Flower & Hayes, 1980). Writers also need to be capable of generating and developing ideas, then translating those ideas into written language (Flower & Hayes, 1980). On a metacognitive level, writing involves planning, goal-setting, familiarity with the writing process, and so on (Flower & Hayes, 1980).

Language proficiency is another aspect that is considered a factor of L2 writing success. Students must be able to process and produce information in a second language that reflects the writing paradigms of the target language (Hayes, 2000; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). However, studies yield mixed results when it comes to the effect L2 proficiency has on writing performance, as opposed to L1 "composing competence" (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996, p. 138). Some research suggests that L2 writing performance is distinctly influenced by L2 proficiency

(Cumming, 1989; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). On the other hand, contradicting research supports the alternate hypothesis that L2 writing achievement is better predicted by L1 writing competence, than L2 proficiency (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Schoonen et al., 2003).

In the affective realm of second language writing studies, there is research exploring affective variables such as self-efficacy, self-confidence, attitude, motivation, anxiety, among others (Hashemian & Heidari, 2012; Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999; Ismail et al., 2010; Pajares, 2003; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). Hayes (2000) posits that the relationship between cognition and affect --specifically motivation --is closely interconnected. One aspect of motivation often explored in second language studies is attitude. Attitude and motivation are generally thought to have a correlational relationship; some research supports a causal relationship in that that attitudes influence motivation. (Ansarimoghaddam & Tan, 2014; Clément & Kruidenier, 1985; Gardner, Lalonde & Pierson, 1983; Hashemian & Heidari, 2012; Ismail et al., 2010; Merisuo-Storm, 2007).

Section 5: Attitude

In general, second language writing literature strongly supports a correlation between writing attitude, motivation and achievement. Masgoret & Gardner's (2003) meta-analysis of attitude, motivation and second language acquisition studies concludes that "the evidence strongly supports that the correlations are consistently positive" (p. 200). Additionally, some research lends support to the theory that attitudes exercise a causal effect on motivation and achievement, both in second language acquisition studies and writing studies.

"Attitude" may be defined as:

"... a learned predisposition to respond in a consistent evaluative manner toward an object or a class of objects" (Ostrom, 1969).

“... learned from previous experience... they are not momentary, but relatively ‘enduring’” (Agheyisi & Fishman, 1970)

“... a response to an antecedent stimulus or attitude object” (Breckler, 1984).

“... a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Eagly & Chaiken, 2007).

For the purposes of this study, attitude is defined very generally in a way that is supported by many established definitions as a learned emotional response to a stimulus that may be self-assessed, though not directly observed.

It is widely accepted that attitude can be measured as the components of a tripartite model (Agheyisi & Fishman, 1970; Breckler, 1984; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Dwyer, 1993; Ostrom, 1969). The components of attitude are affect, behavior and cognition. Affect refers to an emotional reaction toward an attitude object. Behavior encompasses overt actions and intentions related to an attitude object. Cognition is a person’s value system, beliefs and/or perceptions regarding an attitude object. These components are generally considered an accurate representation of attitude in lieu of directly measuring a subject’s brain activity (Agheyisi & Fishman, 1970; Breckler, 1984; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Dwyer, 1993; Ostrom, 1969).

In language studies specifically, Krashen (1982) discusses how a language learner’s affective filter may affect his/her ability to acquire the target language. As per Krashen (1982), research about attitudinal variables fall into three categories: motivation, self-confidence and anxiety. High motivation, high self-confidence and low anxiety, not only predicts that students will more actively seek out comprehensible input, but it allows for the input to be more easily acquired by the learner. A high affective filter (i.e. low motivation, low self-confidence, high

anxiety) serves as an obstacle to language acquisition (Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999; Ismail et al., 2010; Krashen, 1982).

There are several studies that indicate a correlational relationship between attitude, motivation and achievement. For example, Hashemian and Heidari (2012) explored the relationship between second language attitude and writing success. Their study uses Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery Questionnaire to assess Iranian master's students' attitudes toward writing and a Writing Proficiency Test to assess second language writing achievement. They found that a positive attitude correlated with L2 writing success. According to these researchers, "participants who had positive attitude showed better operation in L2 writing than their peers with negative attitude" (p. 485).

Another study, comparing how Malaysian university students felt about writing in their L1 versus English, also shows a correlational relationship between positive attitudes toward English and a preference for writing in English. Participants who preferred writing in English to writing in their L1 more often used English when performing writing tasks (Ansarimoghaddam & Tan, 2014). When interviewed, students provided a range of explanations for their preference for English writing. Some had been writing in English from a young age; others found writing in English to be easier than in their L1; and others were consciously using writing as a way to improve their English (Ansarimoghaddam & Tan, 2014).

Additionally, a study of Finnish children appears to show a correlative relationship between attitude, literacy development and English proficiency. These students, who were participating in a bilingual Finnish-English program, had more positive attitudes toward language learning, had higher levels of literacy and became more proficient in English than the control group (Merisuo-Storm, 2007). The researcher does not draw a strong causal relationship

between these three aspects of the study; however, she does observe that positive attitudes are associated with higher levels of success in language learning (Merisuo-Storm, 2007).

Several second language acquisition models propose that attitude causes motivation, which then causes achievement. Models proposed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) and Clément and Kruidenier (1985) suggest that attitude is causally linked to motivation and, therefore, achievement. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) research targets second/foreign language learners. Clément and Kruidenier (1985) state that motivation (of which attitude is an aspect) “contributes significantly to linguistic outcomes” (p. 33), as supported by their study of 1,180 high school and middle school Québécois students learning English.

Gardner, Lalonde and Pierson (1983) explain that “the primary causal relationship was that attitudes and motivation influence achievement” (p. 3) rather than achievement having influence over attitudes and motivation. In a study that investigated eighteen variables of second language acquisition, Gardner, Lalonde and Pierson (1983) surveyed 140 university students studying French. They found that attitude variables, such as attitude toward learning situation and integrativeness, “are causally linked to motivation, which in turn causes second language achievement” (p. 11).

In addition, to second language acquisition models, Graham, Berninger and Fan (2007) propose a writing attitude model that suggests that attitudes cause motivation. The researchers asked elementary school-aged native English speaking students to write a short sample about a familiar topic. These samples were then rated by two trained raters. The researchers then surveyed students about their attitude toward writing. After comparing students’ writing samples and their answers to the attitude survey, Graham, Berninger and Fan (2007) conclude that, for

their study, “the model that provided the best fit to the data was the one that was consistent with the view that writing attitude influences writing performance” (p. 532).

Section 6: Summary

Current literature supports that ELL and bilingual Hispanic students in the U.S. struggle with writing in school due to linguistic reasons. Their struggle with writing is a problem because that writing is a crucial aspect of academic and professional success. Therefore, ELLs must learn how to be proficient writers in English. Additionally, research supports that positive attitudes toward writing may have a causal relationship with motivation, and, therefore, writing achievement. Exploring ELL’s writing attitudes will add to the literature that supports learners’ affective needs.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Section 1: Participants

The participants for this study were recruited from the College, Career and Technology Academy (CCTA), a secondary institution in south Texas. CCTA is considered an alternative high school. It serves students, ages 18 and up, who may have previously dropped out, do not have enough credits for graduation or did not pass the high school exit exam requirement (Pharr-Alamo-San Juan ISD, n.d.). The total enrollment of the school is 164 students. One-hundred percent of the students identify as ethnically Hispanic (Texas Education Agency, 2015b). Forty-four percent are considered ELLs by the state of Texas (Texas Education Agency, 2015b), which means they were identified as ELL upon initial enrollment and have yet to exit the Texas education ELL program (Texas Administrative Code, 2012). Additionally, 93% of the student population of the school is considered “at-risk” (Texas Education Agency, 2015b). The “at-risk” indicator includes students who are under 21 and deemed at-risk for not completing their high school diploma due to circumstances such as not passing an exit exam or failing multiple classes (Texas Education Agency, 2010); however, the school does serve students who are over 21. The students attend CCTA in order to recover credits toward their high school diploma or prepare for the exit exam. They attend classes in English, math, social studies and science. They are also

able to take classes that lead to associates' degrees in fields such as business, criminal justice, computers or welding (Pharr-Alamo-San Juan ISD, n.d.).

For this study, there were 77 students in total ($N = 77$) who participated during their class time. The ages ranged from eighteen to thirty-five. Thirty-four participants were female, 42 were male and 1 student did not specify gender. Seventy-five chose their ethnicity as Hispanic and two did not specify. When asked to choose a dominant language, 29 chose English and 48 choose Spanish. Notably, while 44% of the school population was identified as ELL, 62% of the population chose Spanish as their dominant language.

Section 2: Instrument

In order to collect data from the participants, the researcher designed a paper-based survey. The survey asked participants questions pertaining to their demographic information, language background and attitudes toward writing in various contexts. The demographic portion of the survey asked participants for their age, gender and ethnicity. General, language history surveys ask participants about information regarding demographic information (Li, Sepanski & Zhao 2006).

Additionally, participants were asked questions about their which languages they speak and which language they speak primarily. Adults are considered to be able to reliably self-report their dominant language (Bedore et al., 2012; Gollan et al., 2012; Marian, Blumenfeld & Kaushankaya 2007). For the present study, language dominance is defined as the language that a bilingual speaker considers her dominant language. Participants were directly asked to choose their primary language: English, Spanish or other.

For the attitude section of the survey, the questions were related to the tripartite model of attitude: affect, behavior and cognition. Cues were taken from Gardner's (2004)

Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) in the development of the survey items. Similar questions from Gardner's AMTB are, for example, "I hate English," "I really enjoy learning English," "I don't get anxious when I have to answer a question in my English class," "If I planned to stay in another country, I would try to learn their language" (Gardner, 2004, p. 1-12) The questions in the present study specifically ask participants how they feel about writing, how they behave in regard to writing and if they recognize particular qualities related to writing anxiety. Anxiety is a widely studied area of second language acquisition (Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999; Cheng, 2002). Cheng (2002) describes anxiety as "an emotional as well as a cognitive activity" (p. 647). Research by Cheng, Horwitz and Schallert (1999) support that writing anxiety and speaking anxiety are two separate constructs.

Participants were asked to rate attitudinal statements on a six point Likert scale, where 1 represented "strongly disagree", 2 represented "disagree," 3 represented "slightly disagree," 4 represented "slightly agree," 5 represented "agree," and 6 represented "strongly agree." Participants' attitudes toward four domains were tested: general writing, writing in humanities classes, writing in STEM classes and writing in electronic communication. The survey was limited in number of questions in order to avoid survey fatigue (Porter, Whitcomb, & Weitzer, 2004)

Many academic disciplines can be broadly generalized under the umbrella terms "humanities" and "STEM." Writing standards for these two groupings of disciplines emphasize different composition and cognitive skills. One study indicates that in humanities courses, students show "greater concern about structure and interpretation" (North, 2005, p. 530). They are also encouraged to "represent knowledge as perspectival rather than factual" (p. 530) and "present knowledge as constructed and contested, rather than as plain matter of fact" (p. 530).

Science writing generally emphasizes “assignments involving the reproduction of factual information” (p. 530).

The survey questions included in assessing general writing attitude were:

- I like school work that involves writing.
- I try to avoid writing for school work whenever possible.
- Writing for school stresses me out.
- I generally find writing to be a relaxing activity.
- I try to do my best on writing assignments.
- The writing I do in school in is not enjoyable.

The survey questions included in assessing humanities writing attitudes were:

- I hate writing about topics in English and social studies.
- Writing in English and social studies is not at all stressful.
- I like putting my ideas on paper in English and social studies.
- I try to practice my writing skills as much as possible in English and social studies.
- If we have a writing assignment in English or social studies, I try to write as little as possible.
- My mind goes blank when I try to do a writing assignment in English and social studies.

The survey questions included in assessing STEM writing attitudes were:

- Writing in math and science classes is enjoyable.
- I try to write in math and science as much as I can.
- I never stress out when we have to write in math and science.

- Trying to write about what I've learned in math and science causes me anxiety.
- I don't like to write in math and science.
- If we have writing assignments in math and science, I try not to do them.

In addition to academic writing, students are entrenched in a world where today's technology has allowed for an explosion of electronic written communication. Even though young people send countless text messages per day, most do not consider it "real writing." They are, however, of the opinion that strong writing skills are "important to success in life" (Lenhart, Arafeh & Smith, 2008).

The survey questions included in assessing electronic communication writing attitudes were:

- I prefer to use English when I send texts, instant messages and emails.
- I try to avoid sending texts, instant messages and emails in English.
- The thought of using English when I text, instant message or email makes me anxious.
- I want to use English when I text, instant message or email.
- Texts, instant messages and emails are a relaxing way to express myself in English.
- I dislike communicating through English texts, instant messages and emails.

(See Appendix A for the entire survey.)

Section 3: Procedure

Following a short introductory session during class time, participants were given fifteen minutes to complete the survey. The survey was given in English. The researcher gave the questionnaire to students to complete on paper. During the introductory session, the researcher

gave instructions on how to complete the form and informed consent was obtained through voluntary participation. Participants were informed that this was not a test and was completely anonymous; therefore, they should answer questions as truthfully and carefully as possible. The Likert scale was discussed and clarified. Participants were encouraged to thoroughly reflect on how they felt about each statement before answering. Once all participants had completed the survey, the forms were collected.

Section 4: Data Analysis

Variables: Participants were divided by their answer to the question of their dominant language: English ($n = 29$) or Spanish ($n = 48$). Such studies as Bedore et al. (2012) and Gollan et al., (2012) support that adult language learners can accurately self-report their dominant language. Secondly, participants were asked about attitudes toward four writing domains: general writing, humanities writing, STEM writing and electronic communication writing.

Analysis methods: The data were aggregated and t-tests were used to determine statistical significance between variables. In order to analyze the relations of language background and writing attitudes in the domains, participant's responses were grouped per their primary language. To answer the first research question, this study used a paired-sample t-test to compare the writing attitudes in the examined domains: general writing, writing in humanities, writing in STEM, and writing in electronic communication. Across groups, each writing domain was compared against each of the others for the paired-sample t-tests. General writing attitudes were compared to humanities writing, as well as to STEM writing, and to electronic communication writing; humanities writing was compared to STEM writing, and to electronic communication writing; finally, STEM writing was compared to writing in electronic communication. To answer the second research question about language group differences toward the various writing

domains, independent-sample t-tests were used to analyze if the two language groups (English-dominant and Spanish-dominant) showed statistically significant difference in each domain investigated in the previous research question.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics are addressed in this section.

Participants chose their attitudes toward the given items on a scale from 1 to 6, with 1 being strongly disagree and 6 being strongly agree. In order to aggregate the data, the scales for the negatively worded questions were changed so that they would reflect the positively worded items; e.g. if a participant chose a “1” on a negatively worded item, it became a “6” for the purposes of data aggregation. Statistical significance was considered $p < .05$.

The demographic information of the sample is shown in Table 1. As previously stated, of the 77 total participants, 42(55%) are male, 34(44%) female and 1(1%) did not respond. Forty-three (56%) participants are ages 18-20, 23(30%) participants are ages 21-24, 7(9%) participants are ages 25-29, 3(4%) participants are ages 30 and older, and 1(1%) did not answer. Seventy-five (97%) participants chose Hispanic as their ethnicity, 1(1%) chose other but did not specify a certain ethnicity, and 1(1%) did not respond. Finally, 29(38%) chose English as their dominant language and 48(62%) chose Spanish. As shown in Table 2, participants' attitudes toward writing in general ($M = 3.89$, $SD = .800$) and writing in electronic communication ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.553$) were higher than their attitudes toward writing in English and history classes ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.800$), as well as science and math classes ($M = 3.6$, $SD = 0.830$).

Table 1
Demographic Information of Sample

	(N = 77)	
	N	%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	42	55%
Female	34	44%
Did not respond	1	1%
<u>Age</u>		
18-20	43	56%
21-24	23	30%
25-29	7	9%
30+	3	4%
Did not respond	1	1%
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
Hispanic	75	97%
Other	1	1%
Did not respond	1	1%

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Attitudes Toward Writing Domains of the Sample

Writing Domains	Total (n = 77)	
	M	SD
General Writing	3.89	.800
Humanities Writing	3.67	.800
STEM Writing	3.60	.830
Electronic Communication Writing	3.88	.553

To answer RQ1 – when comparing writing domains, do participants have more positive attitudes toward one writing domain over another? – paired sample t-tests were conducted to compare attitudes between each writing domain. As shown in Table 3, a statistically significant difference was found between general writing and writing in the humanities, $t(76) = 2.99$, p

=.004, and between general writing attitudes and writing in STEM courses, $t(76) = 2.79$, $p = .007$, with general writing attitudes being higher than both humanities writing and STEM writing. Additionally, there is a significant difference in the attitude scores of STEM writing and writing in electronic communication, $t(76) = -2.54$, $p = .013$, where electronic communication attitude scored higher. However, there was no significant difference found in the attitudes between general writing attitudes and attitudes toward writing in electronic communication, $t(76) = .788$, $p = .936$; humanities writing and STEM writing, $t(76) = 0.727$, $p = .469$; or humanities writing and electronic communication writing $t(76) = -1.79$, $p = .078$.

Table 3

Results for Paired T-Tests Comparing Attitudes of the Sample Toward Writing Domains

Writing Domains Compared	<i>t</i> -value	df	<i>p</i>
General Writing & Humanities Writing	2.99	76	.004**
General Writing & STEM Writing	2.79	76	.007**
General Writing & Electronic Comm.	.788	76	.936
Humanities Writing & STEM Writing	.727	76	.469
Humanities Writing & Electronic Comm.	-1.79	76	.078
STEM Writing & Electronic Communication	-2.54	76	.013*

* significant at $p < .05$. ** significant at $p < .01$.

The demographic information for each language dominance group is shown in table 4. For the English dominant group ($n = 29$), 18(62%) were male and 11(38%) were female. Fifteen (52%) were aged 18-20, 9(31%) were ages 21-24, 4(14%) were ages 25-29, and 1(3%) was ages 30 or older. Twenty-eight (97%) chose Hispanic as their ethnicity and 1(3%) chose other without

specifying a certain ethnicity. For the Spanish dominant group ($n = 48$), 24(50%) were male, 23(48%) were female and 1(2%) did not respond. Twenty-eight (58%) were aged 18-20, 14(29%) were ages 21-24, 3(6%) were ages 25-29, 2(4%) was ages 30 or older, and 1(2%) did not respond. Forty-seven (98%) chose Hispanic as their ethnicity and 1(2%) did not respond.

Table 4

<i>Demographic Information per Language Dominance Group</i>				
	English Dominant ($n = 29$)		Spanish Dominant ($n = 48$)	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	18	62%	24	50%
Female	11	38%	23	48%
Did not respond			1	2%
<u>Age</u>				
18-20	15	52%	28	58%
21-24	9	31%	14	29%
25-29	4	14%	3	6%
30+	1	3%	2	4%
Did not respond			1	2%
<u>Ethnicity</u>				
Hispanic	28	97%	47	98%
Other	1	3%		
Did not respond			1	2%

Table 5 shows that when divided into language background groups, the mean scores of English speaking students' ($n = 29$) attitudes throughout all domains were higher than that of Spanish speaking students ($n = 48$). The mean score of the English speaking students' attitudes ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.00$) toward general writing was slightly higher than those of the Spanish speaking students ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .660$). English speaking students ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 3.63$) had higher mean scores for humanities writing than the Spanish speaking group ($M = 3.23$, $SD = .700$). The English speaking group ($M = 3.66$, $SD = .907$) felt slightly more positively than the Spanish speaking group ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .788$) when it comes to writing in their science and math

courses as well. Finally, when discussing how they feel about electronic communication in English, English speakers also had a higher mean score ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.60$) than the Spanish speaking group ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.47$).

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Attitudes Toward Writing Domains for Each Language Dominance Group

Writing Domains	Language Dominance Groups			
	English-dominant <i>n</i> = 29		Spanish-dominant (<i>n</i> = 48)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
General Writing	3.94	1.00	3.86	.660
Humanities Writing	3.75	3.63	3.23	.700
STEM Writing	3.66	.907	3.57	.788
Electronic Communication Writing	4.14	.596	3.73	.470

For RQ2 – do self-identified English dominant speakers have a more positive attitude toward writing in various contexts than Spanish-dominant speakers? - the results of the independent t-test, shown in Table 6, demonstrate that primary language was found to have a significant effect with regard to attitudes toward electronic communication in English, $t(49) = 3.18$, $p = .003$. However, there was no statistical significance between the English language group and the Spanish language group with regard to their attitude toward general writing, $t(43) = -.364$, $p = .718$; humanities writing, $t(46) = -.598$, $p = .559$; or STEM writing, $t(53) = -.41$, $p = .682$.

Table 6

Results for Independent T-Test Comparing Writing Attitudes between English and Spanish Dominant Groups

Writing Domain	<i>t</i> -value	df	<i>p</i>
General Writing	-.364	43	.718
Humanities Writing	-.598	46	.559
STEM Writing	-.411	53	.682
Electronic Communications Writing	3.18	49	.003

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Section 1: General Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate writing attitudes of bilingual students, specifically the relationship between students' language background and their attitudes toward writing in English. The results of comparing each of the writing domains against each other suggest that students' attitudes toward writing in general are more positive than their attitudes toward the specific academic writing situations analyzed in this study. Even though the "general writing" portion of the survey asked students about writing in school, students were more likely to report negative feelings when prompted about academic writing in specific courses. The participants also felt more positively about written electronic communication than writing in their STEM courses. Additionally, the participants whose primary language was English had significantly more positive feelings toward written electronic communication than their Spanish-speaking counterparts.

The results regarding attitudes toward writing domains show that participants' attitudes toward writing in general are statistically higher than writing in specific subjects. For participants of the present study to have more positive feelings toward writing in general than in specific classes suggests that less positive attitudes may be linked to the association between writing and

those specified classes. This may be due to the recent push to increase writing activities throughout academic content areas (Adu-Gyamfi, Bossé, & Faulconer, 2010; Baker et al., 2008; Bangert-Drowns, Hurley & Wilkinson, 2004; Knipper & Duggan, 2006). Research suggests that attitudes toward writing and attitudes toward the class itself can be measured as separate constructs (Daly & Wilson, 1983).

One factor that may contribute to the present study's participants' less positive attitudes toward academic writing in specific classes is the standardized testing associated with those classes, as the state of Texas has implemented high-stakes standardized testing in math, science, history and English language arts (Texas Education Agency, n.d.). In general, standardized testing has had a largely negative impact on the schooling of minority communities (Heilig & Darling-Hammond, 2008), especially students whose second language is English (Palmer & Rangel, 2011; Ruecker, 2013). Particularly when considering academic writing and college-readiness, Hispanic ELL students are affected by test-specific writing activities. One study found that, due to high-stakes testing, ELL students' exposure to literacy was limited to activities reflected on the standardizes tests (Ruecker, 2013).

Even though writing is only required for the English exit tests, there is a trend toward writing being emphasized in all content areas (Adu-Gyamfi, Bossé, & Faulconer, 2010; Baker et al., 2008; Bangert-Drowns, Hurley & Wilkinson, 2004; Knipper & Duggan, 2006), in order for students to learn the material for the exit tests for all subject areas. For this specific student population, a major focus is preparation for the exit tests because it is a graduation requirement that many of them lack (Pharr-Alamo-San Juan ISD, n.d.). The emphasis on writing throughout their academic content areas may be related to their less positive attitudes toward writing in humanities and STEM.

Additionally, the emphasis on writing for the purpose of passing high-stakes standardized tests could account for the discrepancy between participants' attitudes about writing in general and written electronic communication and their attitudes when directed to consider their feelings toward writing for particular subjects (Lenhart, Arafeh & Smith, 2008). High school students tend to enjoy writing in low-stakes situations, for personal reasons or communication (Lenhart, Arafeh & Smith, 2008). Studies also show that students have a preference for self-selecting topics (Lenhart, Arafeh & Smith, 2008), something that is often discouraged in a test-centric environment. It has been argued that language learners in particular struggle with timed writing prompts considering that these tests not only elicit students' knowledge of unfamiliar information, but expect students use grammar and mechanics on a level similar to native English speakers (Song & August, 2002). While linguistic accuracy may come naturally to a native English speaking student, it may not come naturally to an ELL.

It was surprising to discover a statistically significant difference between attitudes of primarily English speaking participants and their primarily Spanish speaking counterparts when it comes to using English for electronic communication, considering there was no significant difference between these groups when asked about school-related writing. The statistics suggest that English dominant students felt more positively toward electronic communication in English than did Spanish dominant students. The difference in attitude between English dominant bilinguals and Spanish dominant bilinguals toward electronic communication supports the notion that a dichotomy exists between "communication" and "*real* writing" (Lenhart, Arafeh & Smith, 2008, p. *i*). Lenhart, Arafeh and Smith (2008) state that writing in texts, emails and instant messaging "carries the same weight to teens as phone calls and between-class hallway greetings"

(p. *i*). In their study, the participants indicated that while they felt that writing is important, they do not think of texting as “writing,” but simply as a form a communication.

There may be several reasons why Spanish dominant speakers have a less positive attitude toward electronic communication in English. Because the main purpose of texting is to maintain relationships, people may feel more comfortable expressing themselves in their dominant language (Lexander, 2011). Additionally, there is evidence that suggests that texting in one’s dominant language is more efficient than trying to use a second language (Carrier & Benitez, 2010). Less positive attitudes of Spanish dominant participants could reflect an affective response, or convenience (Lexander, 2011; Carrier & Benitez, 2010). Further research is needed in the area of bilingual language choice in electronic communication.

Section 2: Classroom Recommendations

Overall, the participants’ attitudes toward writing were somewhat ambivalent, neither strongly positive nor strongly negative. Because attitude plays a key role in writing motivation and achievement, developing positive attitudes toward writing may help students become more motivated. As for adolescent and adult learners, the results of this study support the inclusion of more low-stakes writing assignments in traditional educational settings, as opposed to test-driven writing activities.

Teachers often feel that high-stakes standardized testing prevents them from teaching writing in a way that is enjoyable (Barksdale-Ladd & Thomas, 2000; Beardsley & Berliner, 2002; White, Sturtevant & Dunlap, 2002). Teachers explain that while there are many activities they could incorporate would “get every child to love to write” (White, Sturtevant & Dunlap, 2002, p. 52) and “spark their interests” (p. 56), they are forced to “sacrifice instruction... in order to give more time for test preparation” (p. 56). A teacher notes that “the kids feel stress”

(Barksdale-Ladd & Thomas, 2000, p. 391) as a direct result of a statewide high-stakes standardized writing test. The focus on test preparation can be very stressful to students and have a negative impact on how students feel about writing (Barksdale-Ladd & Thomas, 2000; Ruecker, 2013).

In order to circumvent the negative writing attitudes students' may develop through instruction that is focused on high-stakes testing, students should be encouraged to engage in low-stakes writing activities. There is some evidence that shows positive outcomes when ESL students are engaged in and assessed by writing projects beyond timed essays (Jacobs, 2008; Song & August, 2002). Research has been done on how students general have a positive attitude toward informal writing and the informal writing activities improved students' ability to produce the target language (Sun, 2010). In another study, ESL students' writing motivation is greatly improved when the focus is shifted from language and form to content and meaning. The language learners in one study had a "stronger sense of purpose" (Lo & Hyland, 2007, p. 231) for writing when they were given "real topics where they had real information and feelings to communicate" (p. 231).

Section 3: Limitations and Implications for Further Research

As with any survey, there are several limitations to the results of this study. In order to further explore student population's attitudes toward writing, interviews or open-ended questionnaires could be administered in the future. The survey could also be administered in a traditional high school or university setting or with students of various language backgrounds. This survey does not ask students about writing in their L1, which could also be a consideration for further study. Another area in which this study could be expanded is asking students about specific writing activities, tasks or topics that they enjoy. Additionally, further research could

include comparing how students feel about writing activities compared with non-writing activities they do for school, such as math problems, art projects or science experiments. Moreover, future research could also ask students about their attitudes toward reading in order to compare writing attitudes and reading attitudes, thereby having a clearer picture of students' attitudes toward literacy in general.

There seems to be little research regarding the English academic writing development of students with similar needs as this student population - such as long-term ELLs, bilingual adult students in the U.S., non-traditional or GED students, at-risk students, students who live in a language minority area, etc. Exploring the writing attitudes of these particular populations could give researchers more insight to their struggles with academic writing.

There also is very little research on bilingual speakers' language use in electronic written communication and the effects of low-stakes writing activities on students' attitudes toward academic writing. In this area, further research could include surveying bilingual students on reasons for their language preference while texting.

Section 4: Conclusion

The present study adds to the literature regarding language and writing attitudes and adult English language education. Bilingual/ESL education practitioners are encouraged to reconsider how writing is approached in relation to high-stakes standardized testing, due to negative washback effects that manifest in students' attitudes toward writing. Having a positive attitude toward writing is an essential factor in writing achievement, which may affect one's academic and professional success. Students should also be encouraged to think of writing as a means of communication, as opposed to the abstract skill set conceptualized in the current high-stakes, test-driven environment. Such a shift in perspective could aid ELLs in developing positive

attitudes toward writing, thereby increasing their intrinsic motivation to write and improving their writing achievement.

REFERENCES

- Addison, J., & McGee, S. J. (2010). Writing in high school/writing in college: Research trends and future directions. *College Composition and Communication*, 147-179.
- Adu-Gyamfi, K., Bossé, M. J., & Faulconer, J. (2010). Assessing understanding through reading and writing in mathematics. *International Journal for Mathematics Teaching and Learning*, 11(5), 1-22.
- Agheyisi, R., & Fishman, J. A. (1970). Language attitude studies: A brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological linguistics*, 137-157.
- Alfredo, G., & Gerardo, E. (2003). Hispanic-serving institutions in the 21st century: Overview, challenges, and opportunities. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2(4), 377-391.
- Allison, H. (2009). High School Academic Literacy Instruction and the Transition to College Writing. *Generation 1.5 in College Composition* (76-90). New York: Routledge.
- Ansarimoghaddam, S., & Tan, B. H. (2014). Undergraduates' Experiences and Attitudes of Writing in L1 and English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 14(1).
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Hurley, M. M., & Wilkinson, B. (2004). The effects of school-based writing-to-learn interventions on academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research*, 74(1), 29-58.
- Baker, W. P. et al., (2008). Writing-to-learn in the inquiry-science classroom: Effective strategies from middle school science and writing teachers. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 81(3), 105-108.
- Barksdale-Ladd, M. A., & Thomas, K. F. (2000). What's at stake in high-stakes testing teachers and parents speak out. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(5), 384-397.
- Beardsley, A., & Berliner, D. C. (2002). High-stakes testing, uncertainty, and student learning. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10.
- Becerra, D. (2010). Differences in perceptions of barriers to college enrollment and the completion of a degree among Latinos in the United States. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 9(2), 187-201.

- Bedore, L. M., Pena, E. D., Summers, C. L., Boerger, K. M., Resendiz, M. D., Greene, K., ... & Gillam, R. B. (2012). The measure matters: Language dominance profiles across measures in Spanish-English bilingual children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(03), 616-629.
- Beil, C., & Knight, M. A. (2007). Understanding the Gap between High School and College Writing. *Assessment Update*, 19(6), 6-8.
- Berman, R., & Cheng, L. (2010). English academic language skills: Perceived difficulties by undergraduate and graduate students, and their academic achievement. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 4(1), 25-40.
- Bernal, M. E., Saenz, D. S., & Knight, G. P. (1995). Ethnic identity and adaptation of Mexican American youths in school settings. Padilla, Amado M., ed. *Hispanic psychology: Critical issues in theory and research*, 71-88.
- Blume, G. H., & Zumeta, W. M. (2013). The State of State College Readiness Policies. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 0002764213515235.
- Boone, J. H. (2013). ¡Ya Me Fui! When English Learners Consider Leaving School. *Education and Urban Society*, 45(4), 415-439.
- Breckler, S. J. (1984). Empirical validation of affect, behavior, and cognition as distinct components of attitude. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 47(6), 1191-1205.
- Byrd, K. L., & MacDonald, G. (2005). Defining college readiness from the inside out: first-generation college student perspectives. *Community College Review*, 33(1), 22+
- Canagarajah, A. (2006). Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.
- Carrier, L. M., & Benitez, S. Y. (2010). The effect of bilingualism on communication efficiency in text messages (SMS). *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 29(2), 167-183.
- Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign language annals*, 35(6), 647-656.
- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language learning*, 49(3), 417-446. Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language learning*, 49(3), 417-446.). Undergraduates' Experiences and Attitudes of Writing in L1 and English. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 14(1).

- Clément, R., & Kruidenier, B. G. (1985). Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clement's model. *Journal of language and Social Psychology*, 4(1), 21-37.
- Cohen, P. (2016, February 21). A Rising Call to Promote STEM Education and Cut Liberal Arts Funding. *New York Times*.
- Conley, D. T. (2007). Redefining College Readiness. *Educational Policy Improvement Center (NJ)*.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39,81-141.
- Daly, J. A., & Wilson, D. A. (1983). Writing apprehension, self-esteem, and personality. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 327-341.
- Dornyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation..
- Dunn, A. L., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2009). A quick, gradient bilingual dominance scale. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12(03), 273-289.
- Dwyer, E. E. (1993). Attitude Scale Construction: A Review of the Literature.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Eblen, C. (1983). Writing across-the-curriculum: A survey of a university faculty's views and classroom practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 343-348.
- Flores, S. M., & Drake, T. A. (2014). Does English Language Learner (ELL) Identification Predict College Remediation Designation?: A Comparison by Race and Ethnicity, and ELL Waiver Status. *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(1), 1-36.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College composition and communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Flynn, K., & Hill, J. (2005). English language learners: A growing population. *Policy Brief: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning*, 1-12.
- Gardner, R. C. (2004). Attitude/motivation test battery: International AMTB research project. *Retrieved*, 5(2010), 237-260.
- Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., & Pierson, R. (1983). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: An investigation using LISREL causal modeling. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 2(1), 1-15.

- Glass, G. V., & Rud, A. G. (2012). The Struggle Between Individualism and Communitarianism: The Pressure of Population, Prejudice, and the Purse. *Review of Research in Education*, 36(1), 95-112.
- Gollan, T. H., Weissberger, G. H., Runnqvist, E., Montoya, R. I., & Cera, C. M. (2012). Self-ratings of spoken language dominance: A Multilingual Naming Test (MINT) and preliminary norms for young and aging Spanish–English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(03), 594-615.
- Graham, S., Berninger, V., & Fan, W. (2007). The structural relationship between writing attitude and writing achievement in first and third grade students. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 32(3), 516-536.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of educational psychology*, 99(3), 445.
- Grant, R. A., & Wong, S. D. (2003). Barriers to literacy for language-minority learners: An argument for change in the literacy education profession. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(5), 386-394.
- Greene, J. P., & Forster, G. (2003). Public High School Graduation and College Readiness Rates in the United States. Education Working Paper No. 3. *Center for Civic Innovation*.
- Hashemian, M., & Heidari, A. (2012). The Relationship between L2 Learners' Motivation/Attitude and Success in L2 Writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 476-489.
- Hayes, J. R. (1989). Writing research: The analysis of a very complex task. *Complex information processing: The impact of Herbert A. Simon*, 209-234.
- Hayes, J. R. (2000). A New Framework for Understanding Cognition and Affect in Writing. *Perspectives on Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice*, 6.
- Heilig, J. V., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Accountability Texas-style: The progress and learning of urban minority students in a high-stakes testing context. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 30(2), 75-110.
- Hoskins, S. G., Lopatto, D., & Stevens, L. M. (2011). The C.R.E.A.T.E. approach to primary literature shifts undergraduates' self-assessed ability to read and analyze journal articles, attitudes about science, and epistemological beliefs. *CBE--Life Sciences Education*, 10, 368-378.
- Ismail, N., Elias, S., Albakri, I. S. M. A., Perumal, P. D., & Muthusamy, I. (2010). Exploring ESL Students' Apprehension Level and Attitude towards Academic Writing. *International Journal of Learning*, 17(6).

- Jacobs, C. L. (2008). Long-term English learners writing their stories. *English Journal*, 87-91.
- Kena, G., Musu-Gillette, L., Robinson, J., Wang, X., Rathbun, A., Zhang, J., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Barmer, A., and Dunlop Velez, E. (2015). The Condition of Education 2015 (NCES 2015-144). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC.
- Kim, J. (2011). Relationships among and between ELL Status, Demographic Characteristics, Enrollment History, and School Persistence. CRESST Report 810. *National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)*.
- Kim, W. G., & Garcia, S. B. (2014). Long-term English language learners' perceptions of their language and academic learning experiences. *Remedial and Special Education*, 0741932514525047.
- Knipper, K. J., & Duggan, T. J. (2006). Writing to learn across the curriculum: Tools for comprehension in content area classes. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(5), 462-470.
- Law, N. C., & So, L. K. (2006). The relationship of phonological development and language dominance in bilingual Cantonese-Putonghua children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 10(4), 405-427
- Lefever-Davis, S., & Pearman, C. J. (2015). Reading, Writing and Relevancy: Integrating 3R's into STEM. *The Open Communication Journal*, 9(1).
- Lenhart, A., Arafeh, S., & Smith, A. (2008). Writing, technology and teens. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*.
- Lexander, K. V. (2011). Names U ma puce: multilingual texting in Senegal. *Working paper 2011*.
- Li, P., Sepanski, S., & Zhao, X. (2006). Language history questionnaire: A web-based interface for bilingual research. *Behavior research methods*, 38(2), 202-210.
- Lillis, T., & Turner, J. (2001). Student writing in higher education: contemporary confusion, traditional concerns. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(1), 57-68.
- Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing students' engagement and motivation in writing: The case of primary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 219-237.
- Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H. K., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals and multilinguals. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50(4), 940-967.
- Martinez, M. A., Cortez, L. J., & Saenz, V. B. (2013). Latino parents' perceptions of the role of schools in college readiness. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 12(2), 108-120.

- Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: a meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language learning*, 53(1), 123-163.
- Mejias, H. A., Anderson-Mejias, P. L., & Carlson, R. (2003). Attitude update: Spanish on the South Texas border. *Hispania*, 138-150.
- Menken, K. (2010). NCLB and English Language Learners: Challenges and Consequences, Theory Into Practice. *Theory into Practice*, 49(2), 121-128.
- Merisuo-Storm, T. (2007). Pupils' attitudes towards foreign-language learning and the development of literacy skills in bilingual education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(2), 226-235.
- Melzer, D. (2009). Writing assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), W240.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2014, Jan). *Status Dropout Rates*. Retrieved from National Center for Educaiton Statistics: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_coj.asp
- Neuliep, J. W. (2014). *Intercultural Communication: A Contextual Approach: A Contextual Approach*. Sage Publications.
- North, S. (2005). Different values, different skills? A comparison of essay writing by students from arts and science backgrounds. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(5), 517-533.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1991). Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M. Gibson, & J. (. Ogbu, *Minority status and schooling: a comparative study of immigrant and involuntary minorities* (pp. 3-33). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Ostrom, T. M. (1969). The relationship between the affective, behavioral, and cognitive components of attitude. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 5(1), 12-30.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139-158.
- Paley, K. S. (1996). The college application essay: A rhetorical paradox. *Assessing Writing*, 3(1), 85-105.
- Palmer, D., & Rangel, V. S. (2010). High stakes accountability and policy implementation: Teacher decision making in bilingual classrooms in Texas. *Educational Policy*.
- Payán, R. M., & Nettles, M. T. (2008). Current state of English-language learners in the US K-12 student population. In *2008 English Language Learner Symposium, Princeton, NJ*. Retrieved October (Vol. 29, p. 2008).

- Pharr-Alamo-San Juan ISD. (n.d.) Mission Statement. Retrieved from <http://www.psjaisd.us/Page/1085>.
- Porter, S. R., Whitcomb, M. E., & Weitzer, W. H. (2004). Multiple surveys of students and survey fatigue. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2004(121), 63-73.
- Portocarrero, J. S., Burright, R. G., & Donovan, P. J. (2007). Vocabulary and verbal fluency of bilingual and monolingual college students. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 22(3), 415-422.
- Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of second language writing*, 8(1), 45-75.
- Roderick, M., Nagaoka, J., & Coca, V. (2009). College readiness for all: The challenge for urban high schools. *The Future of Children*, 19(1), 185-210.
- Rodríguez, M. A. (2012). "But They Just Can't Do It" Reconciling Teacher Expectations of Latino Students. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 15(1), 25-31.
- Ruecker, T. (2013). High-Stakes Testing and Latina/o Students Creating a Hierarchy of College Readiness. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 12(4), 303-320.
- Rumberger, R. W., & Lim, S. A. (2008). *Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research* (Vol. 15, pp. 1-130). California Dropout Research Project Report.
- Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language learning*, 46(1), 137-168.
- SAT Essay. (2016). Retrieved April 17, 2016, from <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/inside-the-test/essay>
- Schoonen, R., Gelderen, A. V., Glopper, K. D., Hulstijn, J., Simis, A., Snellings, P., & Stevenson, M. (2003). First language and second language writing: The role of linguistic knowledge, speed of processing, and metacognitive knowledge. *Language learning*, 53(1), 165-202.
- Song, B., & August, B. (2002). Using portfolios to assess the writing of ESL students: a powerful alternative?. *Journal of second language writing*, 11(1), 49-72.
- Strauss, P. (2012). 'The English is not the same': challenges in thesis writing for second language speakers of English. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 17(3), 283-293.
- Sun, Y. C. (2010). Extensive writing in foreign-language classrooms: A blogging approach. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 47(3), 327-339.

- Taylor, C. E., & Drury, H. (2005). The effect of student prior experience, attitudes, and approaches on performance in an undergraduate science writing program. In *Effective Learning and Teaching of Writing* (pp. 561-573). Springer Netherlands.
- Texas Education Agency. (2010). At-Risk Indicator Code. Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/1314/index.html?e0919>
- Texas Education Agency. (2014). Secondary school completion and dropouts in Texas public schools, 2012-13 (Document No. GE14 601 07). Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Education Agency. (2015)a. 2014-15 ELL Student Reports by Language and Grade. Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/adhocrpt/adleplg.html>.
- Texas Education Agency. (2015)b. Texas Performance Reporting System. Retrieved from <http://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tprs/index.html>.
- Texas Education Agency (n.d.). STAAR Resources. Retrieved April 01, 2016, from <http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/staar/>
- Texas Administrative Code. (2012) Chapter 89. Adaptations for Special Populations Subchapter BB. Commissioner's Rules Concerning State Plan for Educating English Language Learners.
- Tierney, W. G., & Sablan, J. R. (2014). Examining college readiness. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(8), 943-946.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1), 47-81.
- TOEFL iBT Test Content. (2016). Retrieved April 17, 2016, from <http://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/about/content/>
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2011). Operationalizing and measuring language dominance. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(2), 147-163.
- Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(4), 505-518.
- U.S Census. (2014). Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English for the Population 5 Years and Over: Hidalgo County, Texas. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from <http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>

- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "Local Education Agency Universe Survey," 2012–13. See *Digest of Education Statistics 2014*, table 204.20. Retrieved April 20, 2016 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Science, Technology, Engineering and Math: Education for Global Leadership. Retrieved March 04, 2016, from <http://www.ed.gov/stem>
- Valdes, G. (1996). *Con Respeto: Bridging the Distances Between Culturally Diverse Families and Schools : An Ethnographic Portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Verkade, H., & Lim, S. H. (2016). Undergraduate Science Students' Attitudes Toward and Approaches to Scientific Reading and Writing. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 45(4), 83.
- Watt, D., & Roessingh, H. (2001). The dynamics of ESL drop-out: Plus ça change.... *Canadian modern language review*, 58(2), 203-222.
- White, C. S., Sturtevant, E. G., & Dunlap, K. L. (2002). Preservice and beginning teachers' perceptions of the influence of high stakes tests on their literacy-related instructional beliefs and decisions. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 42(2), 39-62.
- Yamamura, E. K., Martinez, M. A., & Saenz, V. B. (2010). Moving beyond high school expectations: Examining stakeholders' responsibility for increasing Latina/o students' college readiness. *The High School Journal*, 93(3), 126-148.
- Zhang, Y., & Mi, Y. (2010). Another look at the language difficulties of international students. *Journal of Studies in international Education*, 14(4), 371-388.
- Zarate, M. E., & Pineda, C. G. (2014). Effects of Elementary School Home Language, Immigrant Generation, Language Classification, and School's English Learner Concentration on Latinos' High School Completion. *Teachers College Record*, 116(2).
- Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of second language Writing*, 13(1), 29-48.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

I. Demographics.

1. How old are you? _____
2. What is your gender? M F
3. What is your ethnicity?
 - Hispanic
 - White (non-Hispanic)
 - Black (non-Hispanic)
 - Asian
 - Other _____
4. Which language(s) can you speak?
 - English Spanish Other
5. What is your primary language of communication?
 - English Spanish Other

II. Language Dominance.

6. At what age did you first learn English?
 - 0-5 6-9 10-15 16 and older
7. At what age did you feel comfortable speaking English?
 - 0-5 years 6-9 years 10-15 years 16 and older Not yet
8. Which language do you use at home?
 - Only Spanish Usually Spanish Both Usually English Only English
9. Which language do you use to do math in your head (such as $20 \times 5 = X$ or $107 + 56 = X$)?
 - Only Spanish Usually Spanish Both Usually English Only English

III. Writing Attitude. Fill in the bubble by the number that you feel best expresses how you feel.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree

***The questions specifically refer to writing in the English language!!!

Writing in School

10. I like school work that involves writing.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. I try to avoid writing for school work whenever possible.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. Writing for school stresses me out.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. I generally find writing to be a relaxing activity.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. I try to do my best on writing assignments.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. The writing I do in school is not enjoyable.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

Writing in English and Social Studies

16. I hate writing about topics in English and social studies.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

17. Writing in English and social studies is not at all stressful.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. I like putting my ideas on paper in English and social studies.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. I try to practice my writing skills as much as possible in English and social studies.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

20. If we have a writing assignment in English or social studies, I try to write as little as possible.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

21. My mind goes blank when I try to do a writing assignment in English and social studies.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

Writing in Math and Science

22. Writing in math and science classes is enjoyable.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

23. I try to write in math and science as much as I can.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

24. I never stress out when we have to write in math and science.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

25. Trying to write about what I've learned in math and science causes me anxiety.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

26. I don't like to write in math and science.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

27. If we have writing assignments in math and science, I try not to do them.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

Writing in Electronic Communication

28. I prefer to use English when I send texts, instant messages and emails.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

29. I try to avoid sending texts, instant messages and emails in English.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

30. The thought of using English when I text, instant message or email makes me anxious.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

31. I want to use English when I text, instant message or email.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

32. Texts, instant messages and emails are a relaxing way to express myself in English.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

33. I dislike communicating through English texts, instant messages and emails.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Analyynn Bustamante received a Bachelor of Arts in English from the University of Texas at Austin in 2008. In 2016, she received her Master of Arts degree in ESL from the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. She has taught English in South Korea, China and South Texas. Her mailing address is 610 N. Broadway, McAllen, Texas 78501. Her email address is analyynn.bustamante01@utrgv.edu.