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ABSTRACT

This project is a case study that assesses the contextual factors for the implementation of immersion programs in the American context. The problem of this case study focuses on the readiness of American schools to implement Canadian-style immersion programs for language minority students. The research project uses the Contextual Interaction Model as a framework for assessing factors related to successful immersion programs. Five contextual factors have worked together to create a successful context for Canadian immersion programs: high parental attendance, high language status, superior teacher training and knowledge, students from middle class backgrounds, and goals and policies of the district aiming toward creating bilingual students. These five factors will be examined in the American context in order to determine if the American context is equivalent to the Canadian context. Ultimately, the contexts will be compared to determine if Canadian-style immersion programs could be transported to American schools, and if so, what modifications would be necessary.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

With the passage of the original Bilingual Education Act in 1968, various types of bilingual programs have been implemented in states where there is a large population of students whose primary language is not English. Because the laws regarding bilingual education were written very vaguely, they were interpreted differently by different states and districts. As a result, many different types of bilingual education programs have emerged.

The broad heading of "bilingual education" encompasses programs labeled transitional, maintenance, primary language instruction, and immersion programs. Some of these programs advocate teaching only in the primary language, others advocate teaching in the second language, while others advocate a little of both. While all of these programs involve language minority students (LMS), the programs do not all have the same instructional goals for these students. Some programs aim at producing fluent English speakers while others aim at maintaining and improving the student's primary language as well as having the students acquire the English language.

One of the problems in bilingual education is the fact that there is a lack of commitment among educators to support bilingual programs. Programs implemented for
language minority students are overseen by only a few administrators or teachers who have been trained to work with LMS. These educators have their own ideas of what the program goals should be, and therefore, create programs to meet their own professional needs. Because of this, these programs may not be endorsed by mainstream educators and administrators.

A second problem in bilingual education is the fact that different districts use different labels for bilingual programs. What one district calls immersion may actually be submersion. For example, in some schools that claim to have immersion programs, LMS are grouped indiscriminately with native English speakers for all or most of the school day; they are segregated for English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction; they have ESL teachers that are monolingual English speakers; there is little effort to provide native language instruction; and the school has limited parental involvement. Many schools would identify the above scenario as immersion, but in all actuality, this is a submersion (sink or swim) program (Cohen and Swain, 1976). What one district calls transitional bilingual education may be the same as a program labeled maintenance bilingual education in another district. Thus, because of the lack of consistent program definition, it becomes difficult to compare programs and ultimately to ascertain exactly what factors bring about success or failure in a program.
A large percentage of LMS are falling farther and farther behind in academic subjects as they progress through the grades, and many end up dropping out before completing high school (Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi, 1986). It is imperative to understand instructional factors associated with success, regardless of the program label, if second language learners are to succeed in the United States.

Background to the Study

This study will focus on assessing contextual factors associated with successful immersion programs. The instructional factors most associated with success of immersion programs are parental support, language status, teacher knowledge and training, economic status, and goals and policies of the district. These five contextual factors have been associated with successful immersion programs in Canada over the last thirty years.

Language immersion programs originated in Canada in the 1960's, with parents being the driving force behind the implementation of these programs. English-speaking parents in Quebec realized how beneficial bilingualism would be for their children in relation to the job market and relations among different ethnic groups. These parents also realized that the traditional method of teaching French as a foreign language was not successful. They recalled their own experiences as high school students who had studied French
as a subject, but upon graduation, could not carry on the simplest conversation in French. Therefore, this concerned group of parents worked in conjunction with Wallace Lambert at McGill University and with Wilder Penfield of the Montreal Neurological Institute (Genesee, 1984) to implement an experimental immersion program in the community of St. Lambert.

Genesee (1985) explains the rationale behind the experimental immersion program: People learn a second language (L2) much the same way that they learn their first language (L1). The second language is used as a means of communication, not as a topic of study. In other words, students in Canadian immersion programs would not "study" French, they would study history, literature, mathematics, etc. in the second language. This rationale follows Krashen's theory of comprehensible input (1984) that students and teachers negotiate meaning through real, interesting, and relevant input.

In the St. Lambert experiment, English-speaking students were completely immersed in French starting in kindergarten. Their teachers, honoring the silent period associated with second language acquisition (Krashen, 1984), allowed the students to respond in English at the beginning, but by first grade, all communication was conducted in French. The evaluation of the St. Lambert experiment concluded that the immersion students had attained a high
level of proficiency in the L2 at no cost to their academic or English language development (Genesee, 1985).

Canadian studies have since shown that immersion programs are successful in producing students who attain native-like levels of L2 in productive skills and native skills in receptive language. Additionally these students have a positive self image and positive attitudes towards representatives of the L2 language and culture. In some Canadian programs, English (the student's first language) is not introduced until grade two, three, or four, depending on the school district (Genesee, 1985). Because of this, in some cases, as in studies done by Bamford (1989), there is an initial lag in skills in the native language, but this is soon corrected after the introduction of language arts in the native language. Also, students in immersion programs seldom attain true native-like mastery of the grammatical elements of the L2, but they do attain high levels of functional oral proficiency (Genesee, 1985).

Another successful Canadian immersion study was conducted in British Columbia by Day and Shapson (1988). English-speaking students were instructed from kindergarten to second grade in French only. In third grade, teachers taught eighty percent of the day in French. In grades four through seven, the classes were conducted utilizing French fifty to seventy percent of the time. Again, the results of this study showed that at the beginning, before English
language arts were introduced, the students did experience a lag in their English literacy skills. However, these students caught up with their peers (who were not in immersion programs) within one to two years. This study also showed that the immersion students attained a much higher level of French than the students in a traditional setting in which French was taught as a subject. The immersion students also had native-like skills in receptive French. Overall, the native English speaking students who were immersed in French from kindergarten scored higher than average in English reading, math, and science.

At this point, it is helpful to review the factors associated with successful Canadian immersion programs. First, at the implementation stage, it was parents, not teachers or administrators, who were the force behind these immersion programs in Canada. These parents belonged to the middle and professional classes in their communities.

Second, the students' primary language (L1) was English, a language viewed by many as beneficial to know. Additionally, these children were immersed in French, a language that has prestige as well as institutional support in Canada. The students in these Canadian immersion programs faced no threat of losing their primary language (L1). The immersion programs were set up to be additive in nature, that is the students added a second language while maintaining their first.
Third, teachers and administrators of immersion programs were trained extensively in immersion methods. Teachers were trained to present themselves as monolingual speakers of the language to be acquired so that students would be encouraged to acquire this second language (L2) (Genesee, 1987). However, teachers in the Canadian immersion programs are bilingual and can understand everything the students say in their primary language (L1) (Cummins, 1989).

Fourth, the "who," the students in the Canadian immersion programs, were students who came mainly from the middle socioeconomic class (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984). The families involved in the immersion programs had political power and control over economic resources. Likewise, they had power over the decisions made at the schools which would influence their children.

Lastly, the goals of the Canadian immersion programs assured that the students would be truly bilingual because of this program. Students were set up to be successful in both languages, not to have their primary language replaced by French.

The Problem

With the success of the St. Lambert and the British Columbia programs, immersion programs soon became widely implemented across Canada. Because of this early success, American educators became quite interested in using the
Canadian program models for immersing American LMS. However, transplanting programs wholesale from Canada to the United States overlooks important contextual factors. It cannot be assumed that findings from a foreign context can be generalized to education in the United States. Without careful study of immersion models in the United States context, schools may be importing a new set of problems. The current study will examine the applicability of using Canadian immersion models in an American educational setting.

Statement of the Problem

This study will examine the following question: Are United States schools ready to implement Canadian style immersion programs for LMS? Before United States schools can answer this question, these Canadian immersion programs need to be thoroughly examined from an American point of view for applicability with minority populations. Many schools implement programs because they seem to have worked well for someone else; another school, another district, or perhaps even another state. In many cases, these so called “successful” programs have not been analyzed for implementation in different contexts. Factors such as parental attendance, language status, economic status, teacher training and knowledge, and the goals and policies of a district need to be examined in order to assess whether
United States schools are prepared to utilize programs based on the Canadian experience.

Research Questions

This study will examine the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference in parental attendance between two site schools and Canadian schools?

2. How does the status of Spanish in the two site schools compare to the status of English in the Canadian programs?

3. How does the training and knowledge of teachers in two United States site schools compare with Canadian teachers on the subject of bilingual education?

4. Is there a difference in economic class between study subjects and Canadian students?

5. Are the goals and policies of the two site schools the same or different from those of Canadian schools for second language learners?
Theoretical Framework

This study is based on the theoretical framework set forth by Cortes, Sue and Padilla (1986). The Contextual Interaction Model (CIM) is a dynamic model that looks at the relationship between social, institutional, and classroom factors and school achievement. Numerous non-school societal factors are related to the academic achievement of LMS: family, community, non-school institutions, mass media, heritage, culture, ethnicity, attitudes, perceptions, socio-economic status, and educational level. This CIM takes into consideration the complex and interdependent way that these factors act upon one another. There is no single simple cause for the great underachievement of LMS. Their success or failure comes about as a result of multiple factors coming into play.

The contextual factors specific to this case study are parental support, language status, teacher training and knowledge, economic status, and the goals and policies of a district. Parental support, language status, and economic status are all factors that influence the societal context. These societal factors in turn influence the school context. Within the school context the educational input factors are made up of teacher training and knowledge as well as the goals and policies of the district. All of these factors ultimately affect student abilities such as their oral
proficiency in L1 and L2; their academic skills; their attitudes toward L1 and L2; and their attitudes toward school and teachers.

The Contextual Interaction Model (CIM) can be used to assess the readiness of a school to implement a Canadian style immersion program. Since Canadian style immersion has proven successful in Canada, it will be the Canadian context that American schools must strive to duplicate in order for this same type of program to be successful in the United States. The context that needs to be created involves supportive parents who have some influence in the school, two languages (L1 and L2) that have equal status, (In Canada, both French and English are looked favorably upon and neither is viewed as a less prestigious language.) teachers who have been trained in immersion methods and who are also truly bilingual, students who are from the middle socio-economic class, and lastly, goals for immersion students that include becoming truly bilingual and viewing bilingualism as an additive process and not one of subtracting the primary language (L1).

When speaking of readiness of a school to implement an immersion program, the school must have met the above criteria for duplicating the Canadian context. In some cases, schools may have met some of the criteria, but not all five aspects. Some of the above mentioned contextual factors can be changed by the school, such as the teacher.
training and knowledge. However, some contextual factors, such as language status and economic status, cannot be changed. A school needs to determine not only if it has met the criteria for a successful immersion program, but if society, or the immediate community which the school serves, is ready for such a program. A school will not be ready to implement a Canadian style immersion program until all five contextual factors are duplicated.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

The review of related literature will be organized into five sections. First, a description of the Canadian context in which immersion programs have been implemented will be provided. Second, an overview of some of the immersion programs implemented in the United States will be provided. Third, a discussion of the American context in which immersion programs would have to be implemented for LMS will be conducted. Fourth, a comparison and contrast between the Canadian and American contexts will be conducted to determine under what conditions immersion programs in the United States might be successful. Lastly, an examination of current research will be provided with an emphasis on what is being recommended for LMS in the United States context.

The Canadian Context

Immersion programs in Canada have proven to be effective. Because of their success, immersion programs currently exist in almost every province of Canada. Students who have been in Canadian immersion programs have acquired a high level of oral proficiency in their second language (L2), while at the same time, have developed their primary language (L1) at the same rate as students who were not in immersion programs (Cohen and Swain, 1976). To
understand the factors that have brought about such widespread success in these programs, it is necessary to examine the contextual factors in the Canadian setting.

The first important contextual factor is that of parental attendance. Students who were involved in immersion programs in Canada had parents who were very supportive and involved in their educational process. This was evidenced by the fact that it was parents, in part, who initiated the St. Lambert experiment which served as the impetus and model for other immersion programs in Canada and the United States (Genesee, 1984). Because these parents were from middle class educated backgrounds, they had knowledge of the schooling process as well as the means and capacity to improve upon elements of this schooling process so that their children would benefit.

Additionally, the language policy at the federal and provincial levels of government in Canada provided incentives for English-Canadian parents to enroll their children in French immersion programs (Lambert, 1974). Due to the fact that the St. Lambert school had parents who were willing and ready to have their children learn a second language (L2), the school was ready to implement an immersion program. Had the parents not been as supportive, or had they not wanted their children to learn a second language (L2), this school may not have been ready to implement an immersion program. For such a program to be
effective, parents must want their children to acquire another language.

The second contextual factor was that of language status. Language status refers to how a society views a particular language; its value, prestige, and daily use. If a society considers a language valuable to know, or as an asset, then that language has a higher status than one that society views as less useful. Also society can view one language as more prestigious than another which also influences the status of a language. If a society uses one language more than another, the language which is used more has a higher status.

In some areas of Canada, the French language has a high status and, therefore, is viewed as an asset. Although English is the dominant language of the country, French has prestige in some contexts and also has institutional support, especially in the Quebec area. In this context, English-speaking children learning French have no sense of inferiority as their social group is the dominant social group and their language is respected (McLaughlin, 1984). Thus, when English-speaking Canadians acquire French through immersion programs, they are praised and encouraged even if they sound less than native-like (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984).

Additionally, the student’s primary language (English) is fully maintained and these students do not fear losing their L1. This concept of maintaining the primary language
(L1) while acquiring a second is referred to as Additive Bilingualism (Cummins, 1989). Instead of continuing to think, as many educators do, that more L2 instruction will result in faster and more proficient L2 acquisition, educators must realize that bilingualism has an "additive" characteristic. Educators need to think in terms of "adding" a second language on top of what the student already knows, and not of "replacing" the language that the student comes with (Lambert, 1975). In this way, the child will be able to become truly proficient in both languages. In Canada, since both English and French are considered languages with high statuses, the concept of additive bilingualism becomes a reality. Children are not in danger of losing their L1 because it is constantly reinforced by society. Parents in Canada look highly upon the ability to converse in a second language (L2) and view the knowledge of L2 as a valuable asset.

A third contextual factor associated with successful immersion programs is the teacher training and knowledge. Immersion teachers in Canada are trained to use a specific pedagogy that has been proven successful for immersion students (Genesee, 1987). Immersion teachers use communication-based instruction, cooperative learning, and strive for positive interactions between teachers and students. Teachers have been trained and understand the
benefits of allowing the students to respond in their native language (L1) during the initial months of immersion.

Also, teachers are aware of the negative aspects of over-correcting and are trained to model the correct language for students rather than overtly correct student mistakes. Canadian immersion teachers understand the rationale and theoretical orientation behind the methods they implement in the immersion classroom as they have been inserviced on the current research on this topic. Usually the teachers are bilingual in French and English and are able to understand everything the students say in either language and can respond to them (Cohen and Swain, 1976). In some cases, teachers may not be native speakers of the L2, but they are perfectly fluent in it and possess the appropriate vocabulary in which to address children. These immersion teachers also value the child’s home language and culture and view bilingualism as a positive asset.

A fourth contextual factor is that of economic status of the families involved in the immersion programs. In Canada, the students who participated in the immersion programs were students who came mainly from the middle socio-economic class (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984; Swain and Lapkin, 1982). The parents of these students had political power and control over economic resources and were very active in the school in getting what they wanted for their children. Likewise, they also had power over decisions
made within the schools, and because of that power, school programs were designed (as in the Lambert experiment) to meet their needs.

Programs tend to be more successful if parents agree with them and support them. In this context in Canada, the parents were the ones who wanted their children to be in an immersion program. Because of their political power base, they were able to ensure that a program was implemented that met their needs. If this had been a group of parents from the lower economic class without experience in political activism, they may not have had the resources necessary to get such a program implemented.

A fifth contextual factor is that of the goals and policies of the Canadian districts involved in the immersion programs. According to Campbell (1972), immersion goals include acquiring native-like proficiency in speaking, understanding, reading, and writing in L2; making normal progress in achieving the standard objectives of the elementary school curriculum; maintaining normal progress in the maturation process of their L1; and developing positive attitudes toward representatives who speak L2 while maintaining a positive self-image as representatives of their community. According to Genesee (1984), immersion goals include developing L1 fully and L2 to a high degree; achieving academically in both L1 and L2; and developing
native cultural knowledge while adding L2 culture for enrichment.

Although the wording of the goals may differ depending on the author, the one overriding goal of immersion programs is that they focus not only on acquiring the L2, but also place much emphasis on fully developing and maintaining L1. In Canada, this goal of acquiring the L2 and maintaining the L1 is successfully met through immersion programs.

In summarizing the Canadian context, immersion programs have proven successful when certain criteria have been met. Immersion programs have been successful when parents of the students involved are in agreement with the goals of the program and want their children to learn a second language (L2). In Canada, immersion programs have been successful when both the L1 and L2 involved are languages that have a high status in the community in which the program was implemented. Immersion programs have been successful when the teachers have had the appropriate training and knowledge to effectively implement strategies that have been proven successful with second language learners. In Canada, the immersion programs have enrolled students of the middle socio-economic class whose parents have had some political power and the means to get their educational needs met. Lastly, the successful Canadian immersion programs have focused on simultaneously acquiring the L2 and on fully developing and maintaining the L1.
American Immersion Programs

The literature indicates that there is a great range of immersion programs in the United States (Genesee, 1987; Gersten and Woodward, 1985). Some of these programs immerse native English-speaking students while others immerse native Spanish-speaking students.

One of the first immersion programs in California took place in Culver City, in 1971. English-speaking students were immersed in Spanish language classes which proved to be very successful (Genesee, 1987). All instruction in kindergarten and first grade was done in Spanish. The student’s primary language (English) was introduced in second grade through language arts. Initially, the students lagged behind those who were not in the program in English language development. However, the immersion students did catch up to their peers within a year of having English (L1) language arts introduced in second grade, much like the students in the immersion programs in Canada. The American immersion students attained high levels of functional Spanish although they did not attain native-like fluency.

Another successful program was the Montgomery County Immersion Program, which began in 1974 at the Four Corners Elementary School in Rockville, Maryland. In this program, all instruction in kindergarten and first grade was given in French to native English speakers with the exception of P.E.
and Music. Again, the same results were found as in the Culver City Program: immersion students initially lagged behind in English language development, but caught up quickly when formal English language arts instruction was provided beginning in second grade (Genesee, 1987).

A final example deals with immersing a group of Hispanic students in Uvalde, Texas. Although this group of students spoke a minority language (Spanish) for the United States as a whole, in this small Texas town close to the Mexican border, the majority of the inhabitants spoke Spanish and Spanish was the major language for commerce and government. In school, all the teachers were bilingual, but instruction was conducted in English with new vocabulary being explained in Spanish (Li).

The Uvalde Program, then, is a program that immersed Hispanic students in English. The teachers taught the content areas in English using sheltered techniques. The home language, Spanish, was used to clarify instruction, and also used in some cases for translating. Additionally, parents and the community were highly involved in this program. The students became involved in this program when they were in kindergarten and continued until third grade. These students scored above or near the national norm on the language subtest and at, near, or above the national median level in math on the Metropolitan Achievement Test administered in English (Gersten and Woodward, 1985). This
immersion program dealing with Hispanic students learning English proved to be very successful in this particular context due to the fact that the teachers used specific teaching strategies that had been proven successful with LMS (Gersten and Woodward, 1985).

After looking at the American immersion programs, one can make two conclusions: that American immersion programs modeled after Canadian immersion programs can be successful with language majority children, and that American immersion programs can be successful with LMS in certain contexts. First, the Culver City and the Montgomery County immersion programs successfully immersed English-speaking language majority students in Spanish and French respectively. The two programs were modeled after the Canadian immersion programs. Second, the Uvalde Program successfully immersed Spanish-speaking students in English. This program took place in a small town very close to the Mexican border in which the majority of the inhabitants spoke Spanish. Therefore, these language minority students who were immersed in English were in no threat of losing their primary language (L1) due to the fact that the language of their surroundings provided an adequate context to maintain their L1 even if they did not maintain it at school.
American Context for Immersion Programs to be Implemented

In order to successfully transplant a Canadian immersion model to the United States, one must carefully assess the American context to see if and how it differs from the Canadian context. If the contextual factors that allow for a successful immersion program in Canada are not present, or cannot be made present, in the United States, it may be difficult if not impossible to transplant this model.

The factor of parental attendance as it relates to the American context is necessary to consider. According to McLaughlin (1984), in the United States, parents are uninformed or misinformed about the purpose and goals of bilingual programs in their district. This lack of information, or misinformation, influences parental involvement in many schools.

According to Paulston (1975), the United States does not provide adequate incentives for parents to want their children in a bilingual program which could ultimately make them bilingual. American parents do not see the long term benefits of being bilingual. Many parents have in mind only that they want their children to learn English the quickest way possible with no regard for their primary language (LI).

In regards to the second contextual factor, language status, in the United States, the largest group of LMS speaks a language (Spanish) that is not highly regarded by
the English-speaking society. In fact, some cities and states have voted to designate English as the official language in their jurisdictions. Spanish has no institutional support and is not a valued language in society. Spanish is considered nonstandard and inappropriate for learning advanced concepts (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984).

Additionally, these students often lose their primary language (L1) along with their culture. When students end up losing their primary language (L1), they have experienced Subtractive Bilingualism (Cummins, 1989). When children experience Subtractive Bilingualism, their L1 skills are gradually replaced by L2. This happens when children lack educational support for the development of their L1. In other words, subtractive bilingualism can occur when children are placed in programs that place so much emphasis on acquiring the L2 that they do not spend time maintaining and developing the L1 of the children. In many cases, the children hear L2 on the playground, on the radio, on the television, and are basically surrounded by the L2, that the L2 eventually replaces the L1. The fact that Subtractive Bilingualism can and does occur in the United States illustrates the fact that Spanish is not a highly valued language.

The third contextual factor is that of teacher training and knowledge. In the United States, because of lack of
training, teachers have used various teaching methodologies when working with LMS. For example, some teachers use total physical response, others use the natural approach, still others use a functional approach. There has been no systematic evaluation of these methods to see which ones are successful and which ones are not (Hakuta and Gould, 1987). Additionally, teachers continue to have low expectations for LMS (Cohen and Swain, 1976). Teachers have not been trained as to what kinds of work they can expect from LMS who are in the process of acquiring their L2. Some teachers, who have had no training at all in second language acquisition methods, have been forced to work in bilingual programs because there are not any qualified teachers to fill such positions. Because of this lack of knowledge, it has been shown that teachers have lower expectations for the academic success of Spanish-speaking students than for English-speaking students (Carter, 1970).

The economic status of Spanish-speaking students in the United States is the fourth contextual factor that plays a major role in their educational experience. Most Spanish-speaking students come from lower class backgrounds based on occupation of their parents (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984). Their parents have little or no control over resources (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984). Because of this, these students are forced to take part in an educational system
that caters to the needs of the more powerful majority group (English speakers).

For example, since many programs for LMS are created by a few teachers with, perhaps, the help of an administrator, programs become transformed into something that no longer meets the needs of the LMS, but into something that meets the needs of the teachers and/or administrators who created the program. At times, the parents of these LMS are not well informed about educational research and do not know what exactly is best for their children. Many times, the parents of LMS will trust that the teachers have placed their children in an appropriate program without really knowing the goals or specifics of the program.

The last factor influencing the American context involves the goals and policies of a district. Regardless of the district involved, the goals and policies of American immersion programs tend to overlook development and maintenance of L1 in order to focus solely on the acquisition of L2. According to Genesee (1984) the goals for United States programs include developing L2 to a native-like proficiency while phasing out the L1; achieving academically only in L2; developing L2 culture in school, but maintaining L1 culture in the home. In a study by Hakuta and Gould (1987) every district surveyed listed as a goal the development of the students' English to the level of participation in all-English classrooms. Only fifteen
percent of these districts listed the goal of maintaining the students' first language (L1).

To get a clearer picture of what the context is for Spanish-speaking students in the United States, it is helpful to look at a broad view of American attitudes regarding bilingual education. A study was done in which English-speakers from Miami, Florida; Los Angeles and San Diego, California; New York City; and San Antonio, Texas were surveyed (Huddy and Sears, 1990). Of the 1,170 people surveyed, only one-third could accurately describe bilingual education. The third of the respondents who were aware of what bilingual education was, were not favorable towards bilingual education. It appeared that bilingual education attracted the most opposition from those who knew the most about it. Huddy and Sears (1990) concluded that support for bilingual education will decline sharply if it is portrayed as cultural and linguistic maintenance as opposed to directly teaching English with no primary language (L1) support.

In summarizing the American context that presently exists, one can begin to see some differences from the Canadian context. In the American context, parents of LMS are not likely to be involved in the education of their children and are, at times, uninformed or misinformed about the program in which their children participate. As for the status of the students' primary language (L1), Spanish is
not highly valued by society and some would say that it is not a language that should be used to learn advanced concepts. Society in general does not support programs that aim at maintaining the Spanish language and culture. In the American context, teachers have had little or no training in the methods proven successful to teach students who are acquiring a second language. Also, the LMS in the United States are generally coming from lower class backgrounds. These families usually have little control over resources and rarely implement changes within the school. Lastly, the goals of American programs tend to emphasize the acquisition of L2, while overlooking the maintenance and development of the L1, which eventually results in Subtractive Bilingualism (Cummins, 1989).

Comparison of the Two Contexts: Canadian and American

In comparing the Canadian context with that of the American context, one can see that there are marked differences in relation to the five contextual factors of parental attendance, language status, teacher training and knowledge, economic status, and goals and policies of the district. In Canada, parents are supportive of immersion programs; in the United States, parents are uninformed and not involved in the education of their children. In Canada, the languages involved in the immersion programs have high statuses while in the United States, Spanish is looked down
upon. In Canada, teachers are well trained to implement the immersion programs while in the United States, teachers are poorly trained or not trained at all. The economic status of the students involved in the Canadian programs is higher than that of the students involved in the American programs. In Canada, the main goal of the immersion programs is to acquire L2 while developing L1. In the United States, the overriding goal is to acquire the L2 with little time devoted to maintaining the L1.

The question still remains: Is it possible to use the Canadian immersion model in the United States with LMS? If so, would modifications need to be made with the Canadian model? In answering this question, it is helpful to look at some of the characteristics that Cohen and Swain (1976) have deemed necessary for positive results from immersion programs.

1. All instruction is initially done in L2; in second, third, or fourth grade, language arts are introduced through the primary language (L1).

2. All kindergarten students are monolingual in L1.

3. In first grade, native speakers of L2 may occasionally and temporarily be used as peer models of L2 so that pidginization does not occur.

4. The learners are heterogeneously grouped with no attention to social class, intelligence, or personality factors.
5. The teachers are bilingual, but only speak L2 in the classroom.
6. In kindergarten, students are permitted to use L1 until they feel comfortable speaking in L2.
7. In first grade and beyond, the teacher requests that only L2 be used.
8. The program follows the regular school curriculum.
9. The teacher expects that students will learn content and L2 through immersion.
10. Support from the community and administration is essential.

If one examines these characteristics carefully, it is apparent that in the United States an ideal situation, such as the one described by Cohen and Swain, does not exist. Students in American classrooms are not monolingual in L1. NEP (Non-English Proficient) and LEP (Limited-English Proficient) students are in classes that also have native English speakers. Many of the American teachers, as is true of Americans as a whole, are not bilingual. Many times, programs that schools have implemented for NEP and LEP speakers do not follow the regular school curriculum. These students are pulled out of the regular classroom to participate in a "special" language class, or ESL instruction, or something other than what the English-only speakers are doing. Also, a characteristic of bilingual
education in the United States is that the community and administration are not supportive of immersion or any bilingual program. Many times parents, because of lack of knowledge regarding research in bilingual education, insist that their children be placed in English-only classrooms. If the United States is to have successful immersion programs, it is essential that some of these characteristics are taken into consideration or changed.

Current Research in Immersion Education

After evaluating the two differing contexts between Canada and the United States in terms of the five key contextual factors, it is possible that an alternative form of immersion would work best in the United States context. This alternative form could prove to be beneficial not only for LMS, but also for language majority students.

Current research in immersion education leads educators to a type of immersion labeled "two-way immersion/enrichment programs." This model combines minority and majority language speakers and teaches them in two languages. In this type of program, LMS receive academics in their L1 and English language arts. Majority language students receive academics in their L2 and language arts in English. There are four critical features of a two-way immersion/bilingual enrichment program (Lindholm, 1990):
1. The program involves some form of dual language instruction.

2. One language is used at a time.

3. Both native English and non-native English speakers participate, preferably in equal numbers.

4. Students are integrated for most content instruction.

By using this model, the needs of language minority and majority students would be met simultaneously. This program design is based on the premise that a second language (L2) is best acquired by LMS when their L1 is firmly established. In conjunction with this, a second language (L2) for language majority students is best developed through immersion. This conflicting premise follows that the minority language, Spanish, is in jeopardy without early intensive exposure. English, the majority language, however, will develop without hinderance due to the dominance of English in our society.

The goals of two-way bilingual immersion include reaching high levels of language proficiency in both L1 and L2; academic achievement at or above level in both L1 and L2; and an enhanced psychosocial development and cross-cultural skills and attitudes (Lindholm, 1990).
Conclusion

The research since 1962 has demonstrated that there are generally positive gains among certain groups who have been in immersion programs provided that the acquisition of a second language (L2) in no way threatens or retards the development of the native language (L1) (Bamford, 1989). In contrasting the Canadian programs with the American programs, Lambert (1972) points out that whereas English is a valued "minority" language in French-speaking Canada, Spanish is not highly valued in the United States. Lambert (1972) goes on to say, "To place such children in an initially all-English instructional program would be to misapply the immersion process in a harmful, subtractive way."

Summary

Canadian immersion programs have proven to be successful in the Canadian context. This Canadian context includes supportive parents, languages of high statuses, well trained knowledgeable teachers, students of middle class backgrounds, and having the goal of creating truly bilingual students. The United States context, however, is quite different. In the United States, the parents are not as supportive and do not attend school functions as they do in Canada, the primary language (L1) of the students does
not have a high status, the teachers need much more training and knowledge, the students are of lower class backgrounds, and the primary goal of United States programs differs in the fact that American programs aim at producing students who acquire the L2 quickly with little regard to the L1.

Perhaps, after reviewing these two differing contexts, one should look not to transport the Canadian immersion model to the United States, but perhaps to changing the model to fit the context that presently exists. In the United States context, a two-way immersion program would be a better model to follow than the Canadian model. With two-way immersion, language minority and majority students could work side by side for the benefit of all in one classroom.
CHAPTER 3
Design/Methodology

This study is a case study of two elementary schools in rural southern California. A case study is an investigation that includes three components. First, a case study investigates a situation within its real context. Second, the boundaries between the situation and the context of that situation are not always clear. In other words, it is sometimes not possible to separate the situation from the context in which that situation is occurring. Third, in a case study, multiple sources of evidence are used to analyze the situation (Yin, 1981).

This case study will examine two schools by looking at five factors that are associated with a school's readiness to implement an immersion program. Five factors will be examined so that multiple evidence exists from which conclusions may be drawn. Data on all five factors will be collected and will then be compared to the information available on the Canadian immersion programs. If the data collected is comparable to the information already known about the Canadian programs, then one can conclude that that particular school is ready to implement a Canadian-style immersion program in a United State context. A qualitative analysis will be conducted in order to determine the readiness of two schools for the implementation of an immersion style program for Spanish-speaking students.
Subjects

To determine the readiness of these two schools to implement an immersion program, data will be collected from NEP and LEP students themselves, teachers, and administrators.

Students

Approximately six percent of the students in the district are migrant children. These students were born outside the United States and have been attending United States schools for less than three complete academic years. Furthermore, there is a growing population of migrant students currently being identified in the district.

The students that this district serves are of varying linguistic and socio-economic backgrounds. The district’s population includes students of African-American, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, and Caucasian backgrounds. However, forty-one percent of all students enrolled are Hispanic. This Hispanic group of students is the largest language minority group served by this district (Harris, 1992).

According to an R-30 Language Census Report dated March 1, 1989, this district had 417 NEP students, 525 LEP students, and 896 FEP (Fluent-English Proficient) speakers at the elementary level. These numbers do not include those
students who only speak English. These numbers refer to students who come from homes where a language other than English is used and have been classified as either NEP, LEP, or FEP. Breaking those numbers down, that means that on the average, each elementary school in the district had 153 of these students.

The students who will participate in this study will be students classified as either NEP or LEP by the IDEA Proficiency Test (Ballard and Tighe, 1979, 1982) that the district is currently using to classify students. Data will be collected from 200 students (93 students from school A and 107 students from school B). Sixty-six of the students will be classified as NEP while 134 students will be classified as LEP. School A is 48% Hispanic while school B is 78% Hispanic. In comparing the two schools, school B has more teachers who speak Spanish as well as a principal who speaks Spanish. Students at school B take part in cultural celebrations, such as Cinco de Mayo, whereas students at school A do not. NEP and LEP students at school B are serviced in their classroom while NEP and LEP students at school A are pulled from their regular classroom to work on English skills with an aide.
Teachers

The teachers who will be included in this study are regular teachers in grades first through fifth who teach in the two elementary schools. Data will be collected from 38 teachers (20 teachers from school A and 18 teachers from school B). Their teaching experience ranges from twenty-eight years to one year. Their educational backgrounds range from masters degrees and administrative credentials to emergency credentials. Some teachers are native Spanish speakers while others speak no Spanish at all. All teachers at both schools will be given a questionnaire to complete so all teachers will have an opportunity to be included in this study.

Administrators

The administrators who will be interviewed are the two principals and one assistant principal that are employed at the two elementary schools chosen for this study. One of the principals has worked in the district for fifteen years. She began as a teacher and has been principal at two elementary schools in the district. She is English-speaking and knows no Spanish. The assistant principal at this school is in her second year in this position. She also was a teacher in the district before becoming assistant principal in the middle of the 1991-1992 school year. She
is English-speaking but has studied Spanish abroad and is a fluent Spanish speaker. The second principal is new to this district, but has been working as a principal in another area where the population is similar to this one. This principal is bilingual speaking Spanish and English fluently.

Parents

The parents involved in this study are Hispanic parents. The majority of these parents come from working class homes and are either skilled or unskilled laborers, having little formal education. Many parents are single parents and work two jobs to make a living. In cases where both parents are in the home, it is common for the mother to be a housewife while the father works as a gardener or service worker. Also, it is common for the mothers of these families to babysit or clean houses for extra money.

These families follow the tradition of the extended family. Many times they will welcome cousins, aunts, or elderly parents into their home to live with them for a short time. This extended family serves as financial and emotional support in times of need (Griswold del Castillo, 1984). There is usually a family member nearby to watch the children, help cook the evening meal, or to lend a hand whenever something needs to be done. These families are very close and very supportive of one another.
Methodology

To gather data to answer the five research questions of this study, questionnaires will be completed by teachers and students and interviews will be conducted with the administrators. Teachers will be given a ten question questionnaire that they will respond to individually. The questionnaire will focus on questions related to language status and teacher training and knowledge. Teachers will use a four-part Likert scale for five questions. A sixth question will ask teachers to rank four languages. Question 7 will ask teachers how many inservices they have attended in the past year dealing with bilingual education while question 8 will ask for the number of university classes they have completed in the past year that dealt with bilingual education. The two final questions will ask how often teachers allow NEP/LEP students to do work in Spanish, and if they send notices home in Spanish (see Appendix B for a sample of the questionnaire).

The following is a detailed explanation of how data will be gathered for each of the five research questions.

Research Question #1: Is there a difference in parental attendance between two site schools and Canadian schools?

To answer this question, administrators will be asked if parents of NEP and LEP students attend school meetings, such as Site Council Meetings. They will also be asked how
many of these parents attend such meetings and how often they attend.

Research Question #2: How does the status of Spanish in the two site schools compare to the status of English in the Canadian programs?

To answer this question, all teachers at both elementary schools will have an opportunity to offer their evaluations on this topic by responding individually to five questions related to language status on their questionnaire. Teachers will be able to rank languages, indicating which language they view as being the most prestigious. Teachers will also strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with statements related to language status.

Also, NEP and LEP students in first through fifth grade will have an opportunity to offer their evaluations on the topic of language status by responding individually to five questions on their questionnaire. Students will answer "yes" or "no" to two questions related to language status. Students will also choose "English" or "Spanish" as responses to three questions.

The students in this study will be those students assessed as either NEP or LEP on the Idea Proficiency Test (Ballard & Tighe, 1979, 1982) and who are in first through fifth grade. The students who are tested with the Idea Proficiency Test are those students whose parents indicated
that a language other than English was spoken at home on the Home Language Survey. Upon registering a child for school, parents are asked to fill out the Home Language Survey. The Home Language Survey asks four questions: 1) Which language did your son/daughter learn when he or she first began to talk? 2) What language does your son or daughter most frequently use at home? 3) What language do you use most frequently to speak to your son or daughter? and 4) Name the language most often spoken by the adults at home. If a parent answers a language besides English on any of these four questions, that child will be tested with the IDEA Proficiency Test and given a label of either NEP, LEP, or FEP.

The IDEA Proficiency Test is a test that is used to determine the oral English fluency of students from non-English backgrounds in grades kindergarten to fifth. This test asks students to respond by pointing to a picture, to respond with one to two word phrases, and in the more advanced levels, to respond with complete sentences. Depending on how many sections the student can respond to correctly in conjunction with his or her grade level, the administrator of the test determines if the student is NEP, LEP, or FEP. There are six levels total, labeled A, B, C, D, E, and F. For example, a student could be labeled as NEP A, LEP B, or FEP E, depending on his or her grade level, and how many levels he or she was able to pass on the test.
On the Idea Proficiency Test, each level corresponds to one of the stages explained by Krashen (1981) in the Natural Approach. Level A corresponds to the pre-production stage. If a student tested in this category, he or she would respond non-verbally and have approximately 500 words in their receptive vocabulary. Level B and part of level C correspond to the early production stage. A student in the early production stage would be able to respond with one or two words and non-verbally. The student's vocabulary would encompass approximately 1,000 receptive words, 10% of which he would be able to express. Part of level C, D, and part of level E fall under Krashen's heading of speech emergence. A student in this stage, like an early production student, can express 10% of his or her vocabulary, but now has 7,000 receptive words. Part of level E and all of level F correspond to the intermediate fluency stage. Once a child reaches this stage, he or she should be able to engage in dialogue, continue to express 10% of their vocabulary, and will have approximately 12,000 words in his or her receptive vocabulary. The study included only those students labeled as NEP or LEP by the Idea Proficiency Test.

Research Question #3: How does the training and knowledge of teachers in two United States schools compare with Canadian teachers on the subject of bilingual education?
To answer this question, teachers will have an opportunity to answer five questions individually on a questionnaire related to teacher knowledge. On three questions, teachers will respond to statements by either choosing strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. On two questions, teachers will choose the number corresponding to how many inservices and university classes they have completed during the past year related to bilingual education.

Research Question #4: Is there a difference in the economic class between study subjects and Canadian students?

To answer this question, school records will be used to identify the occupations of the parents of the NEP and LEP students.

Research Question #5: Are the goals and policies of the two site schools the same or different from those of Canadian schools for second language learners?

To answer this question, administrators will be asked to describe the goals and policies in place at their respective schools. Questions will be asked in the form of interviews with principals and the assistant principal.

Data Needed

The data needed will be personal responses to a questionnaire illustrating attitudes, beliefs and knowledge
of teaching methods by the teachers at the two schools under investigation. Additionally, the data needed will also include personal responses to a questionnaire illustrating the attitudes and beliefs of the LMS at the two schools. In order to gather data from the administrators on their personal attitudes and beliefs, interviews will be conducted with the administrators of each school.

Parental attendance: An interview with the principal of each elementary school will be conducted to determine how many parents of NEP or LEP students are active in the site council. Information will be gathered as to how many parents attended such meetings within the last six months, and how many meetings were held within the last six months.

Language Status: Teachers will be given a questionnaire that asks how they view the Spanish and English languages; which language they value more and which is more prestigious. Teachers will also be asked if they allow NEP and LEP students to do work in Spanish and how often. Lastly, teachers will respond to questions related to sending notices home in English only. Students will also be given a questionnaire on the subject of language status. They will be asked if they like to speak English or Spanish better at school and which language they use on the playground. They will be asked if they use Spanish in their classroom and if they read and write in Spanish. Additionally, they will be asked which language they prefer.
to use when speaking to someone who understands both languages.

Teacher knowledge/Training: Teachers will be asked if they feel qualified to teach sheltered English to NEP and LEP students. They will be asked if they are familiar with teaching methods for NEP and LEP students and if they feel that they can meet the needs of the NEP and LEP students who are placed in their classes. On the subject of training, teachers will be asked how many inservices and how many university classes they have attended and completed in the past year that dealt with bilingual education programs or instruction. Teachers will also be asked how many years they have taught and how many of those years were spent teaching NEP or LEP students. Also, teachers will be asked which credentials and degrees they hold and if they have a Language Development Specialist Certificate (LDS) or a Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC).

Economic Status: The economic status of the NEP and LEP students at both schools will be obtained through school records. Economic status will be based on the parents' occupation. Economic status will be divided into four groups: 1) executives, professionals, and managers; 2) semi-professional, clerical and sales workers, and technicians; 3) skilled and semi-skilled employees; and 4) unskilled employees. Based on what the parent recorded on the school emergency card, the student will be placed into
one of the above categories. If the parent listed an occupation for both the mother and father, the one with the highest status will be used to classify the economic status of the child.

Goals and Policies of the District: The goals and policies for NEP and LEP students at these two elementary schools will obtained from school site administrators. This information will later be compared to the goals and policies of the Canadian immersion programs to see if they are in any way equivalent.

Data Collection

Parental Attendance: This data will be gathered through interviews with the site administrators. Questions will be asked relating to how many parents of the NEP and LEP students attend school functions such as Site Council meetings. Administrators will be asked specifically how many of these parents have attended during the last six months.

Language Status: This data will be collected through two questionnaires; one for students and one for teachers. The teacher questionnaires will be placed in the teachers' boxes and returned to the school secretary once they have been completed. The questionnaires will be picked up from the secretary the following week. The student
questionnaires will be given to the teachers or aides who work the most with the NEP and LEP students. These teachers and aides will be asked to have their students complete the questionnaires, in English or Spanish, at their convenience. The teachers and aides will be asked to read the questionnaires to the students in both languages and the students will be able to choose the language in which they wish to respond. Teachers will be asked to write the grade level and language classification of each student on the questionnaire.

Professional Training and Knowledge: This data will be collected through questionnaires administered to teachers at the two elementary schools. Questions will be asked pertaining to how many classes in the area of bilingual or ESL methods teachers have taken. Teachers will also be asked about inservices on this topic. Additionally, teachers will be asked how they view themselves in terms of being trained and prepared to teach NEP and LEP students.

Economic Status: This data will be collected from school emergency records. The emergency cards of the NEP and LEP students will be used to determine the occupation of their parents. The occupations will then be compared to a stratification table that categorizes occupations.

Goals and Policies: This data will be gathered through interviews with administrators. Administrators will be asked what types of bilingual programs they have at their
schools and what kinds of services the NEPS and LEPS receive.

Data Analysis

The teacher questionnaire will provide data on two of the five research questions: 1) How does the status of Spanish in the two site schools compare to the status of English in the Canadian programs? and 2) How does the training and knowledge of teachers in two United States schools compare with Canadian teachers on the subject of bilingual education? Questionnaire data will be analyzed in two separate categories. On the teacher questionnaire, questions one, two, six, nine, and ten focus on language status (see Appendix B). Each question will be analyzed separately. Each response will have a numerical value of one through four; one being strongly agree, two being agree, three being disagree, and four being strongly disagree. Initially, a frequency distribution for each question will be conducted in order to know how many teachers responded in which way to each question. Then, total sub-scale scores related to language status (questions one, two, six, nine, and ten) will be computed. These responses will provide an individual and sub-scale range and means of how teachers view the status of Spanish in relation to the status of English. Once individual question frequencies and sub-scale scores are calculated and given percentage equivalents,
scores below 50% will be considered low status, and scores of 50% or above will be considered high status.

The second set of questions focus on teacher training and knowledge. The frequency distribution for each question will be analyzed separately to assess how many teachers responded to each question. Then, total sub-scale scores related to training and knowledge (questions three, four, five, seven, and eight) will be computed. These responses will provide an individual and sub-scale range and means of how prepared the teachers are in the area of bilingual immersion programs. By comparing the training of these teacher groups to the training of the teachers who implemented the immersion programs in Canada, it will be possible to determine how ready each school is to implement an immersion program.

A frequency distribution of the student questionnaires will also be conducted. These questionnaires are set up so that the students can only mark one of two responses. Each question will be analyzed individually in relation to language status. Each response will have a numerical value of either one or two; one being "Spanish" or "yes", two being "English" or "no." Then, total sub-scale scores will be computed. These responses will provide information on how the students view the status of Spanish. Once these scores are translated into percentages, a score below 50% will be considered low status, while a score of 50% or above.
will be considered high status. These sub-scale scores will be computed by school site so that each school can be compared to the Canadian model.

In the area of parental attendance, attendance at Site Council Meetings will be examined to see how many NEP and LEP parents of students have been in attendance. The data collected from the interviews with the administrators will provide information that can be used to compare each school to the Canadian model.

To analyze economic status, occupations of the parents of NEP and LEP students will be categorized. Then percentages of parents who have professional, semi-professional, skilled, or unskilled jobs (based on a stratification provided by the California Assessment Test) will be calculated. Having these percentages will allow for a comparison to be done with the Canadian model.

After interviewing both principals and the assistant principal, an explanation of the types of programs the two schools provide for their NEPS and LEPS and the goals and policies of these programs will be given. An examination of the instructional services and goals and policies in each setting will be performed to determine if the two schools are equivalent or different from the Canadian programs.
CHAPTER 4
Analysis and Results

The analysis and results for each school will be reported in relation to the five research questions.

Analysis

Research Question #1
Is there a difference in parental attendance between the site schools and Canadian schools?

This question can be answered by examining the numbers of parents in attendance at Site Council Meetings. According to state guidelines, a school receiving School Improvement Plan (SIP) money, such as both site schools, must have a Site Council that proportionately represents the ethnic populations at the school. At school A, the average number of parents attending these meetings was ten, with two of the ten parents being Hispanic. At school B, the average number of parents attending these meetings was thirty, with twenty-five of the thirty parents being Hispanic. The ideal is to have the ethnic populations represented proportionately at Site Council Meetings in terms of total enrollment at the school.

For this study, if the percentage of Hispanic parents attending Site Council Meetings is equal to, or above the percentage of Hispanic students enrolled in the school, the parental attendance will be classified as high. If the
percentage attending such meetings is below the percentage enrolled in the school, the attendance will be classified as low.

At school A, the Hispanic parents numbered two of the ten total parents in attendance. Therefore, Hispanic parents made up 20% of the parents attending Site Council Meetings, but the school enrollment showed 48% Hispanic. Because the percentage in attendance was below the enrollment percentage, school A was determined to have low parental attendance.

At school B, the Hispanic parents numbered twenty-five of the thirty total parents in attendance. Therefore, Hispanic parents made up 83% of the parents attending Site Council Meetings, with the school enrollment being 78% Hispanic. Because the percentage in attendance exceeded the enrollment percentage, school B was determined to have high parental attendance.

In Canada, although exact numbers are not available, it is known that the original St. Lambert experimental program was initiated by a group of involved parents (Genesee, 1984). Since this group of parents was able to implement a new program, one can assume that parental attendance in Canada was high.

In summary, school A compared unfavorably to the Canadian model while school B compared favorably on the issue of parental attendance.
Research Question #2

How does the status of Spanish in the two site schools compare to the status of English in the Canadian programs?

In this study, language status was comprised of personal value placed upon a language, prestige associated with a language, and the use of that language on a daily basis. Personal value placed upon the Spanish language was measured by question #1 on the teacher questionnaire. The results showed that both site schools did value the Spanish language as 55% of the teachers at school A and 78% of the teachers at school B strongly agreed with the value statement (see Table 1).

In the Canadian setting, English was also highly valued by the teachers. English was the dominant language of the country and was a respected language (McLaughlin, 1984). The Canadian programs were set up to be additive in nature so that the students in immersion programs would be fluent in both the L1 and the L2. Students in French immersion programs were in no threat of losing their English skills.

In comparing the site schools to Canada, then, in terms of the value placed on the language, both site schools compared favorably with Canada. The site schools and Canadian schools did place a positive value on the student's primary language (L1).
Table 1

Distribution of teacher responses
to Spanish status at schools A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>*SA A/B</th>
<th>A A/B</th>
<th>D A/B</th>
<th>SD A/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>55%/78%</td>
<td>35%/17%</td>
<td>5%/6%</td>
<td>5%/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>0%/0%</td>
<td>0%/6%</td>
<td>78%/61%</td>
<td>22%/33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SA = strongly agree
A = agree
D = disagree
SD = strongly disagree

A second measure of language status was that of prestige. Teachers were asked if they felt Spanish was more prestigious than English (Question 2). At school A, 100% of the teachers either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. At school B, 94% of the teachers either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (see Table 1). There was an overwhelming response indicating that Spanish was not more prestigious than English.

In Canada, however, French (L2) was considered to be a prestigious language. French had institutional support and was viewed as an asset (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984).
On the point of language prestige, the site schools compared unfavorably to the Canadian schools. French was viewed as a prestigious language in Canada, but Spanish was not viewed as a prestigious language at the site schools.

Another measure of language prestige was that of ranking four languages: English, Chinese, German, and Spanish (Question 6). At school A, 50% of the teachers ranked Spanish as the least prestigious language. At school B, 73% of the teachers ranked Spanish as the second most prestigious language. These percentages indicate that school A viewed the Spanish language as less prestigious than did school B. Therefore, on this measure of prestige, school A compared unfavorably with Canada, but school B compared favorably.

Another component of language status was that of daily use of a language. When teachers were asked if they allowed their students to do work in Spanish (Question 9), 65% of the teachers at school A responded that they always or sometimes allowed this (see Table 2). At school B, 88% of the teachers responded that they always or sometimes allowed work to be done in Spanish. Likewise, 85% of the teachers at school A said that they always or sometimes send notices home in Spanish (Question 10). At school B, 100% of the teachers responded that they always or sometimes send notices in Spanish.
As for daily use of English in Canada, students were allowed to use English during the initial weeks of an immersion program. However, once the teacher felt that the students were able to communicate in the L2, she expected all communication to take place in the L2. Then, students would not be taught in their L1 for two to three years, depending on the program. After the complete immersion in the L2, students would then study language arts in their L1, spending anywhere from 20% to 50% of their day studying in their L1 (Day and Shapson, 1988). As for sending notices home in English, teachers did conduct communication with

Table 2

Distribution of teacher responses to daily use of Spanish at schools A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>*A</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A/B</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>15%/35%</td>
<td>50%/53%</td>
<td>30%/0%</td>
<td>5%/12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>20%/94%</td>
<td>65%/6%</td>
<td>15%/0%</td>
<td>0%/0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A = always
SO = sometimes
SE = seldomly
N = never
parents completely in English as the parents did not know French.

Comparing the site schools to Canada on the issue of daily use of the L1, there would only be a difference during the two to three years that Canadian students were fully immersed in the L2. After this stage, students were able to communicate in either language as were the students at both site schools. Therefore, both site schools would compare favorably to Canada on the issue of daily use, the final measure of language status.

In summarizing the factor of language status as viewed by teachers based on personal value, prestige, and daily use, with the exception of language prestige at school A, both site schools compared favorably with Canada on the issues of language status.

Language status was also measured by student responses at both site schools. The results indicate that while the students at both site schools prefer to use English (Question 1) (see Table 3), the majority of students at school B use Spanish when speaking to a bilingual person (Question 2) and when on the playground (Question 5), unlike the students at school A. The results also show that the majority of students at school A do not use Spanish in their classroom (Question 3), or read and write in
Table 3  
Distribution of student responses  
to Spanish status at schools A and B  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>73%/27%</td>
<td>65%/35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>49%/51%</td>
<td>40%/60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>65%/35%</td>
<td>35%/65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish (Question 4). However, at school B, the reverse is true; the majority of students do use Spanish in the classroom and do read and write in Spanish. Since more Spanish is being used on the playground and in the classrooms at school B, the status of Spanish is higher at school B than at school A.

Again, in Canada, English was a valued language. It was the dominant language and the students were in no way
hindering their development of their L1 by being in an immersion program (Lambert, 1985). In Canada, both English (L1) and French (L2) were highly valued languages.

In comparing the language status as viewed by students at the site schools to the language status as viewed by students in Canada, school A compared negatively to the Canadian schools while school B compared positively.

In summarizing the factor of language status, there are similarities and differences between the site schools and the Canadian model. Depending upon whether one looks at the value placed upon a language, the prestige a language has, or on the daily use of a language, will determine how the site schools compared to Canada. Taking all the elements of language status as a whole, site school B compared more favorably to the Canadian model as school B only differed on one area in terms of language status. School A, however, differed on three of the five issues related to language status.

**Research Question #3**

How does the training and knowledge of teachers in two United States site schools compare with Canadian teachers on the subject of bilingual education?

On most questions relating to teacher training and knowledge (see Table 4), the results showed that the
majority of teachers at school B felt that they were qualified to teach NEP and LEP students (Question 3), were familiar with teaching methods for NEP and LEP students (Question 4), and could, therefore, meet the needs of these students (Question 5). With the exception of the question regarding being familiar with teaching methods for NEP and LEP students, the results showed that the opposite was true for teachers at school A. At school A, the majority of the teachers did not feel qualified to teach NEP and LEP students and did not feel that they could meet their needs. Additionally, at both site schools, the majority of teachers responded that they had not attended any inservices or completed any university classes dealing with bilingual education in the last year.

In Canada, the immersion teachers are highly trained to use a specific pedagogy that has been proven successful with immersion students (Genesee, 1987). These Canadian teachers are aware of the research dealing with second language acquisition and successfully use methods for teaching second language learners.

Comparing the training and knowledge of the teachers at the site schools to Canadian teachers gives a positive comparison for school B, as these teachers are familiar with methods and strategies and are meeting the needs of their students, but a negative comparison for school A, as
Table 4

Responses to teacher training
and knowledge at schools A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>*SA A/B</th>
<th>A A/B</th>
<th>D A/B</th>
<th>SD A/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A/B</td>
<td>5%/50%</td>
<td>21%/17%</td>
<td>37%/22%</td>
<td>37%/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>12%/44%</td>
<td>35%/50%</td>
<td>35%/6%</td>
<td>18%/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>10%/53%</td>
<td>25%/41%</td>
<td>45%/6%</td>
<td>20%/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>5%/22%</td>
<td>15%/17%</td>
<td>40%/39%</td>
<td>40%/22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>11%/11%</td>
<td>5%/6%</td>
<td>11%/0%</td>
<td>74%/83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SA = strongly agree
A = agree
D = disagree
SD = strongly disagree

these teachers do not feel qualified to teach NEP and LEP students.
Research Question #4

Is there a difference in economic class between study subjects and Canadian students?

In this study, economic status was based on parent occupation. A random sample of NEPS and LEPS were chosen from each of the two schools. The emergency cards were checked, which were filled out by the parents themselves, to see what the parents had listed for their occupations. The table provided by Individual Tests of Academic Skills (ITAS) Test Examiner Manual, Grade 3 was used to categorize the occupations. This table was created by the School Research and Service Corporation. The table classified jobs into four categories: 1) unskilled employees 2) skilled and semi-skilled employees 3) semi-professional, clerical and sales workers, and technicians and 4) executives, professionals, and managers.

At school A, a total of 180 occupations were classified according to the above categories. At this school, 90% of the occupations were classified as either unskilled, semi-skilled, or skilled (see Table 5). At school B, a total of 90 jobs were identified and categorized according to the above matrix. At this school, 97% of the occupations were considered to be unskilled, semi-skilled, or skilled.

In Canada, however, the parents of the students involved in second language learning were from middle class
Table 5

Parent occupations at schools A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Occupation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = unskilled
2 = skilled, semi-skilled
3 = semi-professional, clerical, sales, technicians
4 = executives, professionals, managers

backgrounds (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984 and Swain & Lapkin, 1982). These parents had political power and control over economic resources.

Both site schools compared unfavorably to Canadian schools on the factor of economic status of the parents of students who are acquiring a second language.

Research Question #5

Are the goals and policies of the two site schools the same or different from those of Canadian schools for second language learners?

This district has a set of goals that were district wide for second language learners. Each school was to follow these district goals, making modifications as
necessary for each particular school site depending on the numbers of second language learners and numbers of qualified bilingual teachers. The district’s goals are as follows: 1) Develop English language proficiency (L2) 2) Provide for academic achievement 3) Develop self esteem and 4) Provide for cross-cultural understanding.

Principals and assistant principals were interviewed about their specific goals and policies for the bilingual students at their respective schools.

At school A, both the principal and vice principal were interviewed at the same time. When asked what the goals of the bilingual program at school A were, the principal (who is a monolingual English speaker) said she was not quite sure how to answer, and looked to her bilingual vice principal for the answer. The vice principal explained that the goals were to teach the students English (L2) so that they could transition to all-English classes as soon as possible, to have the students maintain their first language (L1), and to promote their culture and in doing so, raise their self-esteem. When questioned further, she said that the main goal was for the children to be speaking and working in English (L2) as soon as possible. When asked how the bilingual program was set up at her school, she responded that the NEP and LEP students are pulled out of their regular English classroom anywhere from 30 minutes to one hour daily to work on English language development with
a bilingual aide. All instruction outside the regular classroom is given by bilingual aides.

At school B, when asked the same sorts of questions, the principal stated that the goals of the bilingual program at his school involved identifying and teaching NEP and LEP students in their first language (L1). The ideal is that by the time the students have been taught in their primary language (L1) for three to four years, they will be able to transfer skills over to English (L2). The overriding goal is to create bilingual and biliterate students. When questioned further on how exactly his bilingual program was set up, he explained that, at each grade level, there was at least one bilingual teacher who taught reading and math in the primary language (L1) to the NEP and LEP students at that level.

In Canada, the overriding goal of immersion programs is not only to acquire the L2, but to also fully develop and maintain the L1 (Campbell, 1972). The Canadian goal follows the theory of Additive Bilingualism, that the students will add a second language on top of the language they already know.

Comparing the goals of the site schools to the goals of the Canadian programs gives a negative comparison for school A, as this school focuses primarily on the acquisition of English with little regard to the L1. There was a positive comparison with school B, as this school, like the Canadian
schools, has second language acquisition and maintenance of the LI as goals.

Results

To see how the results from school A and school B compare to the Canadian model, it is helpful to summarize the findings of this study and the findings from the Canadian research (see table 6).

Research Question #1

Is there a difference in parental attendance between two site schools and Canadian schools?

The analysis of parental attendance data indicated that there was a difference between parental attendance at school A and parental attendance in Canada. However, there was not a difference between parental attendance at school B and parental attendance in Canada. School B, like Canada, had high parental attendance while school A had low parental attendance. Because school B had a much larger percentage of Hispanic students attending the school, 78% compared to 48% at school A, school B had no choice but to get the Hispanic parents involved. In regard to parental attendance, one cannot expect a parent to attend school related functions if he or she does not understand the language in which the announcements are sent home or the language in which meetings are conducted. At school A, only
Table 6

Comparison of Canadian programs and two site schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parental attendance</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language status</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher training and</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>inferior</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic status</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals and policies</td>
<td>enrichment, bilingualism, academic achievement, recognize native culture</td>
<td>acquisition of L2 with no regard for maintenance of L1</td>
<td>enrichment bilingualism, academic achievement, recognize native culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% of the teachers said notices always go home in Spanish, compared to 94% of the teachers at school B who said notices always go home in Spanish. A school cannot expect parents
to attend functions if parents are not informed about them in a language they understand.

Also, the fact that school A was having a difficult time finding a Spanish-speaking person to be a representative on the Site Council was another indicator that school A had low parental attendance. School B, on the other hand, had been holding Site Council meetings in Spanish, indicating that the majority of parents in attendance were Spanish-speaking.

Another item that surfaced in the interview with the principal of school B was the celebration of Mexican holidays at the school, for example, Cinco de Mayo. School B had a very large turn out of parents as well as community members to their celebration. As research shows (Cummins, 1989), the key to a successful bilingual program is community involvement.

On the factor of parental attendance, then, only school B had the same parental attendance as Canada.

Research Question #2

How does the status of Spanish in the two site schools compare to the status of English in the Canadian programs?

The analysis showed that school B came close to meeting the criteria set by the Canadian model for language status, but school A did not. In Canada, English (L1) is a language with high status. At school A, Spanish (L1) had a very low
status while at school B it had a higher status. At school A, only 22% of the teachers ranked Spanish in the upper half of the prestigious languages. Since 22% is not even one-quarter of the teachers, Spanish was considered to have a low status at school A. At school B, 73% of the teachers ranked Spanish in the upper half of the prestigious languages. Since this was nearly three-fourths of the teachers, Spanish was considered to have a higher status at school B. The impression was given that the teachers at school B had positive feelings towards the language and the Hispanic students. However, at school A, teachers seemed to look down upon the Spanish language.

This same attitude was revealed through the student questionnaires. One can conclude that the students at school B were comfortable using Spanish at school and that they value this language. Even though they were learning English and most likely could communicate in English, they preferred to use Spanish. At school A, for 73% of the students to say that they preferred to use a language other than their primary language (L1) at school, Spanish was not regarded as an asset at this school. It appeared that the students were embarrassed, or ashamed, to speak Spanish at school.

In summary, school A did not view Spanish as highly as the Canadian schools viewed English. School B, although there was one exception, did view Spanish (L1) in a positive
light which was similar to how the Canadian schools viewed English (L1).

Research Question #3

How does the training and knowledge of teachers in two site schools compare with Canadian teachers on the subject of bilingual education?

The analysis showed that the training and knowledge of the Canadian teachers was superior to the training and knowledge of teachers at school A. However, the training and knowledge of the teachers at school B closely resembled that of the Canadian teachers. At school A, only 26% of the teachers felt that they were qualified to teach sheltered English while 67% of the teachers at school B felt that they were qualified to do this.

On the teacher questionnaire, the teachers were asked specifically how many inservices they had attended in the past year dealing with bilingual programs or teaching strategies for LMS. At school B, 22% of the teachers indicated that they had attended three or more of these inservices. At school A, only 5% of the teachers had attended this many inservices. For some reason, the teachers at school A were not getting inserviced on bilingual education methods and therefore, did not feel
qualified or able to meet the needs of their bilingual students.

When asked about the number of university classes they had completed on this same topic, at school A, 74% of the teachers responded that they had not completed any such classes. At school B, 83% of the teachers responded that they had not completed any of these classes either.

In conclusion, the Canadian teachers and the teachers at school B had similar training in the area of second language acquisition methods. The teachers at school A were lacking in this training.

Research Question #4

Is there a difference in economic class between the study subjects and Canadian students?

The analysis of the data showed that the students attending these two site schools came from a very different sector of the population than the Canadian students. The students of both school A and school B were overwhelmingly from families who were working in unskilled and skilled jobs. As the level of education needed for certain classifications of jobs increased, the number of parents in those classifications decreased.

The economic status of the students at the site schools and Canadian students was definitely different. Site school
students came from lower class backgrounds while Canadian students came from middle class backgrounds.

Research Question #5

Are the goals and policies of the two site schools the same or different from those of Canadian schools for second language learners?

It was very clear from the data analysis that the goals and policies of school A were different from the Canadian model while the goals and policies of school B were directly aligned with the Canadian model. It is important to note that the district goals did not include any mention of maintaining the primary language (L1). At school A, the principal was unsure of the goals, and was obviously not very familiar with bilingual education research. She relied on her bilingual assistant principal to answer questions pertaining to the bilingual program at the school. At school B, however, the principal explained what services the NEP and LEP students were receiving at each grade level. He went on to explain that the overriding goal of his program was to produce bilingual, biliterate students. He also stressed the importance of maintaining the students' primary language (L1). School A focused on teaching students English as soon as possible and made no provisions for supporting and maintaining Spanish. At school B, the
emphasis was on helping students read, write, speak, and understand both Spanish and English.

In conclusion, there was a difference between the goals and policies of school A and the Canadian schools. There was no difference at all, despite the district's goals, between the goals and policies of school B and those of the Canadian programs.
CHAPTER 5
Discussion

This study examined three contexts for second language learners; the Canadian context, the context of site school A, and the context of site school B. The Canadian context was different from the American contexts in some respects. However, the two American contexts were also very different from each other.

Because there are numerous labels for programs that focus on second language learners, it is beneficial to look at the factors creating an ideal context for these students rather than the label of the program. In the Canadian and American studies examined in the Review of Literature, successful programs had several factors in common: parents took part in school planning, and were involved in their children's education; the languages that were taught and maintained had high statuses in that society; the teachers who were directly involved in the implementation of successful programs had been well trained and had superior knowledge of how to implement methods appropriate for second language learners; students came from middle class backgrounds; and finally, the goals and policies focused on successful programs focused on having students become truly bilingual by acquiring a second language (L2) while simultaneously maintaining the primary language (L1).

The successful Canadian programs like those in St.
Lambert and Quebec had the above mentioned factors present which created a successful context for their second language learners. In the United States, the programs in Maryland and Texas also had these same factors present.

Shortcomings of the American Context

In creating a successful immersion program for second language learners then, one needs to aim at creating a context similar to the ones mentioned above. However, in many areas of the United States, the ideal context for second language learners does not exist and cannot be created due to situations beyond an educator's control. For example, perhaps there are not enough qualified bilingual teachers available to teach in such a program. Perhaps the teachers who are working in bilingual programs have not been adequately trained in the necessary methods. Another problem could arise if the parents of the second language learners are not highly involved in the decision making at the school or do not have the means to create changes within the school.

Lack of parental attendance

One shortcoming of school A was the lack of parental attendance at school meetings. One of the reasons parents were not attending very many school meetings at school A could have to do with the "oppositional attitude" explained
by Ogbru and Matute-Bianche (1986). This theory follows that Mexican Americans had been in the southwestern United States for about 150 years before the "Anglos" arrived, conquered, and annexed their territory. Mexican Americans have faced many forms of exploitation by the dominant group. Anglos regarded Mexican Americans as inferior. Mexican Americans had unequal access to housing, education, political power, and economic resources and rewards. Since Mexican Americans were paid lower wages for the jobs they held, the Mexican American youths most likely realized that getting an education would bring them few rewards. This attitude eventually developed into bitterness, frustration, resentment, and mistrust of Anglos and the entire educational system. The experiences of the Mexican Americans caused them to develop an "oppositional" attitude. It is likely that this attitude has influenced how frequently or infrequently these parents attend school meetings.

This oppositional attitude, however, can be overcome in the United States. School B was an excellent example of a school overcoming such an attitude. At this school's Site Council Meetings, 83% of the parents in attendance were Hispanic. This success was probably achieved through multiple factors, but it appeared that a big factor in parental attendance at school functions was related to what language the principal and the teachers spoke. If the
principal and some teachers spoke Spanish, Hispanic parents tended to be more involved in the school. This was most likely due to the fact that the parents felt that they could communicate with leaders of the school. At school A, the principal did not speak Spanish, and only 13% of the teachers spoke Spanish. At school B, the principal spoke Spanish and 33% of the teachers spoke Spanish.

**Lack of appropriately trained bilingual teachers**

Another obstacle to creating the ideal American context deals with the lack of qualified bilingual teachers. The district of schools A and B stated in 1990 that it employed only twelve teachers who held bilingual teaching certificates. Overall, this district, in 1990, had a shortage of twenty-five credentialed bilingual teachers for grades kindergarten through five (Berry, 1990). So, in reality, there is a shortage of trained bilingual teachers who could successfully implement programs for second language learners in the United States.

Due to the lack of qualified bilingual teachers, the overwhelming majority (seventy-four percent) of the teachers at school A who are working with second language learners responded that they did not feel at all qualified to work with such students. This figure indicated that in this context, the teachers have not been adequately trained and that much more training would need to be done before this
particular school could come close to meeting the ideal context for second language learners. However, the majority of teachers at school B reported that they did feel qualified to teach NEP and LEP students, that they were familiar with second language acquisition methods, and they felt that they were meeting the needs of these students. This difference seemed very perplexing as both of these schools are in the same district and all teachers should have been exposed to the same inservices and training programs which are mandatory. Perhaps the principal at school B had better supported the training provided by the district, or followed up on training so that the teachers felt comfortable and capable of meeting the needs of their NEP and LEP students. Also, since principals were able to plan some of their SIP (School Improvement Plan) days, perhaps the principal at school B had spent more time and money inservicing his teachers on this topic. Since school A had fewer NEP and LEP students, it is possible that the teachers there were focusing on issues other than bilingual education methods. Also, the policy and goals of schools A and B focused on different types of programs; school A focused on ESL while school B focused on bilingual strategies.

Concerning the percentages of teachers at both schools who had not taken a university class dealing with bilingual education in the past year, it was surprising that the
percentages at both schools were extremely high (74% at school A and 83% at school B). School A is a new school of less than five years. School B is an older school, the first in this community. School A is staffed with newer teachers who have had less experience teaching - an average number of nine years. School B is staffed with a larger percentage of experienced teachers - an average number of fifteen years. It is possible that school A, being a newer school, would have had more teachers completing university classes as they might still be working on masters degrees or additional credentials. If this is the case, and these teachers are taking classes, they must be taking classes in something other than methods in bilingual education.

Economic Status

One of the major differences between the two site schools and the Canadian schools was the finding that the students in bilingual programs came from extremely different sectors of the society. In the two study schools the students came overwhelmingly from lower class backgrounds as opposed to the middle class backgrounds of the Canadian students. This was a major finding as economic background in turn influences school context and societal context. Students coming from middle class backgrounds definitely have different experiences than students coming from lower class backgrounds. These differing backgrounds cause
Because there was an extraordinary difference in economic class between the site school students and the Canadian students, more research needs to be done in this area to determine if lower economic status students can benefit from immersion programs similar to Canada.

Modifications Needed for American Schools

Because the American and Canadian contexts differ in important areas for second language learners, it would not be wise to transplant the Canadian model to the United States without first making some changes.

First, an effort must be made to involve the parents of second language learners in the education of their children. Notices must be sent home in a language that the parents understand. Meetings must be conducted or translated into a language the parents understand so that they can take an active part in such meetings. Bilingual teachers must be employed so that teachers and parents can communicate effectively about the progress of the students. Bilingual administrators must be employed so that parents can communicate their feelings to the administrators.

In Canada, this effort to involve the parents was not needed because the middle class parents were already
actively involved in their children's education. In the United States, the situation is different due to the fact that most second language learners come from lower class backgrounds. These parents will need to be encouraged strongly by school personnel if they are going to be actively involved in the education of their children.

A second modification that will need to occur in American schools deals with the attitude teachers, as members of society, transmit to their students regarding Spanish. At school A, teachers did not regard Spanish highly. If the teachers themselves feel that it is not worth the effort to learn Spanish, they consciously or unconsciously transmit this attitude to the students they come in contact with on a daily basis. Teachers need to view bilingualism as a positive asset, as something that will aid students as they go through life and meet people from other countries or as they apply for jobs requiring contacts with more than one language. Teachers themselves need to make an effort to learn the language of their students. This effort alone would make a big difference in how the students viewed the language.

In Canada, there was no problem of language status because the two languages involved had institutional support and were highly valued languages. Teachers were fluent in both English and French and one language was not considered to be superior to the other. In Canada, many jobs require
workers to be fluent in both languages and students can easily see that being bilingual is an asset.

A third modification that will be needed in the United States is that of training teachers. At school A, teachers admitted that they did not feel qualified to work with second language learners. Because this district lacked qualified bilingual teachers, regular education teachers having little or no training in second language acquisition methods were forced to work with these students. United States schools must adequately train bilingual teachers in methods that have been proven successful with second language learners. Teachers need to study the theories behind the methods so that they understand the process of acquiring a second language and can make professional decisions regarding the students in their classroom.

One last change that will need to occur in United States schools to create an ideal context for second language learners deals with the goals and policies of the program. Some American schools, like school A, focus solely on teaching students as quickly as possible the majority language with little regard to the students' primary language (L1). However, the overriding goal for these American students needs to be to acquire the second language (L2) while simultaneously maintaining and enriching the primary language (L1). American educators must not focus so much on the majority language (L2), that students ultimately
lose their primary language (L1). American educators must focus on creating truly bilingual students.

The Contexts of Schools A and B

The context of school A was not at all ideal for second language learners in comparison to the Canadian context. This school met none of the five criteria of this study. A possible reason for this lack could revolve around the philosophy of the principal. This principal explained that her goal for second language learners was to have them learn the majority language (L2) as quickly as possible. She was not of the opinion that maintaining the primary language (L1) was beneficial to the students as she did not see a correlation between maintaining the primary language (L1) and successfully building upon that knowledge to aid in learning a second language (L2). For this principal, Cummins' (1989) Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) Model went against what she personally believed. Because of the principal's beliefs, school A focused only on teaching English as quickly as possible to LMS.

The context of school B, on the other hand, came very close to meeting the criteria set by the Canadian model. At this school, parents of second language learners were attending meetings, the majority (95%) of teachers valued the Spanish language and were passing this attitude on to their students (62% of the students viewed Spanish in a
positive way). Teachers allowed students to do work in class in Spanish as well as sent notices home in Spanish. School B differed from the Canadian model in one respect; the parents of the second language learners at school B were from the lower class background while the Canadian parents were from the middle class background. In spite of this one difference, school B was successfully carrying out a program very similar to the Canadian immersion programs.

Comparison of Schools A and B

Considering that both school A and school B are in the same district in southern California and enroll students from the same population, why is the context of school B so much more aligned with the ideal context taken from the Canadian model?

The manner in which a school is managed and the success of its programs depend on the societal context which is created by language status, the community, socioeconomic status, and the attitudes about school. A school’s success also depends on the school context which is created by staff knowledge, staff attitudes about a student’s primary language (L1), appropriate materials, and the students’ perceptions of teachers. When all of these factors are taken into consideration, it is imperative to understand that they are all related and that they all influence each other. At school B, most of these factors were working
towards the success of the school, while at school A, they were not.

It is possible to understand why the differences exist between these two schools, but at the same time, it is necessary to keep in mind that there is not one single factor that causes success or failure. The school context is created by many factors: teachers, students, administrators and community. Logically, one can deduce that the administrators influence the teachers and that the teachers influence the students. If this is the case, then the tone set by the administrators will greatly influence the tone of the entire school. This chain of thought is helpful in understanding why the differences exist between school A and B.

At school A, it has already been mentioned that the administrator's primary goal was to teach language minority students English as quickly as possible. There was no attempt at all to maintain the primary language (L1) of the students. This attitude of the principal was transferred over to the teachers and ultimately to the students. At school B, however, the administrator had completely different goals for his students. He enumerated the primary goals of his program: 1) to teach students in their first language (L1) 2) to transfer skills learned in L1 to L2 within three to four years and 3) to create bilingual and biliterate students. This administrator had goals
resembling the goals of the Canadian immersion programs. Another important factor was that the administrator of school B was Hispanic and spoke fluent English and Spanish. Parents felt that they could communicate with him in a language with which they were comfortable. He made an effort to involve the parents as well as the community in school functions, as was proven by their largely successful Cinco de Mayo celebration. Because the principal of school B set the tone for the teachers, they were then able to set the tone for the students in creating a successful context for second language learners.

Conclusion

Referring back to the research questions, this case study showed that there are differences in parental attendance, language status, teacher training and knowledge, economic status, and goals and policies between Canada and the United States. This case study also showed that it is possible to use the Canadian model in the United States if some modifications are made. Focus needs to be placed on the context created for second language learners in the United States. Using the Canadian context as a model, United States educators can create a context in which second language learners can be successful. School B, although not working with parents of the same economic status as the
Canadian parents did create a successful context for their second language learners.

There is no one perfect model that can be used throughout the United States or even within a state. Educators need to become aware of the theories dealing with second language acquisition, receive training on the methods, and then create a context appropriate for their specific situation. The Canadian model can be used as just that, a model, but American educators will ultimately create their own model that will be used successfully with American LMS in an American context.
For my Masters Project, I am doing a study to assess a district's readiness to implement an immersion program. The variables I am focusing on are language status, and professional training and knowledge. Please take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire. You do not need to sign your name. All answers will remain confidential. Thank you in advance for your time and help in my study. Please return to your school secretary as soon as possible. I will pick them up next week. Thank you!

Cheryl Trout

School ________________________________

Grades Taught ________________________________

Years as a teacher ________________________________

Number of years you have worked with LEP/NEP students ________________________________

Credentials held ________________________________

Degrees held (Masters, etc.) ________________________________

Do you have a (LDS) Language Development Specialist Certificate? yes no

Do you have a (BCC) Bilingual Certificate of Competence? yes no

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!!!!!!
B. TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

To what degree do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
1= strongly agree  
2= agree  
3= disagree  
4= strongly disagree

1. You as a teacher value the Spanish language.  1  2  3  4

2. Spanish is more prestigious than English.  1  2  3  4

3. I feel that I am qualified to teach sheltered English to NEP/LEP students.  1  2  3  4

4. I am familiar with teaching methods for NEP/LEP students.  1  2  3  4

5. I feel that I can meet the needs of NEP/LEP students that are placed in my class.  1  2  3  4

6. Please rank the following languages in terms of prestige in our society: English, Chinese, German, Spanish

Most prestigious_____________________

__________________________________

__________________________________

Least prestigious_____________________

Please circle the response that pertains to your situation:

7. How many inservices have you attended in the past year that dealt with bilingual immersion programs?
   three or more  two  one  zero

8. How many university classes have you completed in the past year that dealt with bilingual programs or teaching strategies for language minority students?
   three or more  two  one  zero

9. Do you allow your NEP/LEP students to do work in Spanish?  Always  Sometimes  Seldomly  Never

10. Do you send notices home in Spanish?  Always  Sometimes  Seldomly  Never
C. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH)

Grade _____________

NEP       LEP

1. Do you like to speak English or Spanish better at school?
   - Spanish
   - English

2. If you are talking to someone who understands both Spanish and English, which language do you talk to them in?
   - Spanish
   - English

3. Do you use Spanish in your classroom?
   - yes
   - no

4. Do you read and write in Spanish?
   - yes
   - no

5. Which language do you use more on the playground?
   - Spanish
   - English
D. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (SPANISH)

Grado ________________ NEP LEP

1. Te gusta hablar inglés o español en la escuela?
   español     inglés

2. Si hablas con alguien que entiende inglés y español, cuál idioma usas?
   español     inglés

3. Hablas en español en tu clase?    si    no

4. Lees y escribes en español?   si    no

5. Cual idioma usas más durante recreo?
   español     inglés
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