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Abstract

With an ever increasing population of English language learners (ELLs) in the United States, the complex question that must be addressed is which method is the best for teaching academic content to students learning English in our public schools? There are several basic inquiries that naturally develop in this quest: who are English language learners (ELLs)? How is it determined if they are effectively learning English, yet more specifically, academic English?

Another theoretical debate that arises, is if there is more than one way of learning a language? Which method has been proven by research to be the most effective for ELLs in learning academic content in English?

Another key component to this argument is who is best qualified or better equipped to give instruction to ELLs? This thesis will investigate some preliminary findings into this multi-faceted inquiry. But the emphasis of the investigation will primarily be focused on instructional methodology.

As stated above, this quest is strictly preliminary. However, what is anticipated is that the gathered evidence will conclusively demonstrate that there are active models
of instruction for ELLs in the United States, which are effectively demonstrating success in achieving academic progress in English for ELLs. The focus of this study will primarily be on students enrolled in elementary public schools. Although several instructional models will be investigated, only one will be conclusively presented as the most effective method of instruction for ELLs: Two-Way Immersion, also known as Dual-language Immersion.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Education of English Language Learners

The faces of public school students have been changing for years and with the change, a variety of languages can now be heard in the corridors of these schools. It is estimated that by the year 2020, one out of every two students in the United States will be a person of color (Banks, 1991 - As quoted in Dietrich, 1995). The U. S. Census Bureau projects that the proportion of children who are non-Hispanic white will fall steadily into the future, dropping below 50 percent after 2030 (Hernandez, D. J, Denton, N. A, and Macartney S. E, 2007). But is the classroom practice changing with the tide of demographical patterns? How does the federal mandate of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) influence the pedagogy of classroom tutelage?

Teaching these students who do not speak English as their first language (English Language Learners, or ELLs) has a long and complex history in the United States. Dating back to the foundational decades of the 1600s, there is a historical precedent for dual language instruction in
education (Brown, 1992; Crawford, 2007; Medina, 2003). As early as the initial 1800’s, several states had already allowed instruction in public schools to be taught in languages other than English (namely, German) upon parental request (Brown, 1992; Crawford, 2007). Such practices are still common today. In spite of proposition 227 in California, parents can still opt for an instructional method that reflects the needs of their community (Love, 2005). In today’s terms, this would be considered situated instruction, in which the local powers get to decide how the children of their own community ought to be taught. But as the country has grown, the local decision making process has been transferred to state or federal agencies.

As recent as the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, Dual-language instruction (DLI) was being established as pilot programs in four critical states (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). In the south, Florida was the first state to establish a DLI school (Coral Way Elementary School), which is still in operation today, and has recently won another “Blue-ribbon Award” from the federal department of education for outstanding academic excellence, for their bilingual program (NCELA, 1998). In the north, Illinois established the Lafayette Elementary School as a DLI school. Lafayette
is still operational today and is one of 183 other bilingual program schools in the Chicago city schools (Chicago public schools, 1995). On the East Coast, Washington D.C. established another long-standing exemplary bilingual school (Oyster Elementary) as their first DLI school in the District of Columbia, in which also was birthed the parent, grassroots community organization of The 21st Century School Fund, which is a nonprofit, private enterprise and public land use collaboration for rebuilding dilapidated schools (Blezard, 2002).

On the West Coast, California established their first DLI pilot programs in the early to mid 1980’s, in San Francisco (Buena Vista K-5 School, 1983); San Jose (River Glen K-8 school, 1986); Windsor (Calí Calmecac Charter K-8 school, 1987); Santa Monica-Malibu (Edison Language Academy, K-5; 1986); and another DLI school in Oakland, (which is no longer listed on the Two-way immersion (TWI) directory of the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) website (http://www.cal.org/jsp/TWI/SchoolSearch.jsp)), (Source, California Department of Education Language Policy and Leadership Office in Sacramento (no date)). (http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/ip/documents/twbi.ppt - slide number 3).
The historical experience of these and other states, may still hold the answer to the continual debate of whether teaching students in a comprehensible language is a valid pedagogical method or not. Current trends of immigration indicate that decision makers may yet have to consider if English only is a valid stance in approaching the education of English language learners. The results from educational legislation in just the last ten years are not very promising (Mora, 2007; Krashen & McMillan, 2007).

Background: The Problem of Bilingual Education in the United States

In recent history, the legal foundations for Bilingual Education can be traced back to the decade of the 1960s, in which it was formally enacted as a federal law in the United States (NABE, 1998; Crawford, 2007; SSCNET, UCLA, no date). Before the enactment of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (BEA), each state was allowed to adopt its own policies concerning education in a language other than English. It is fair to say that not all of the states adopted similar programs, but rather a "smorgasbord" approached was employed. Ohio was the first to do so in 1839. It was soon followed by Louisiana in 1847 and the Territory of New Mexico in 1850 (NABE, 1998).
It would also be a fair statement to say that initially, instruction in more than one language (i.e. English and some other language) was highly regarded as the choice of instruction for all children. Fitzgerald (1993) actually defines three historical eras of Bilingual education in the USA: the first era was from pre-colonial times to the late 1800s, which could be viewed as the "honeymoon stage," in which bilingual education was viewed acceptably. The second era was from around 1880 until about 1920, which could be viewed as the "age of turbulence" in the marriage of education and bilingualism. One side of the equation was looking for an excuse to justify a reasonable divorce. The third era would run from the 1920s to the present, in which an objective observer would say that the marriage was finally over (at least in three states: California, Arizona, and Massachusetts). The 1990's was the age of separation.

Some well funded and outspoken opponents to bilingual education claim that the "system" was flawed, and needed to be totally abandoned (Unz, 1997; Pedalino, 1997 & 1998). They claim that 30 years of failed policies had been long enough to prove that the theory of language acquisition applied to the methodology of bilingual instruction has
been quite sufficient. Their adamant complaint is that, "it didn’t work," and it was high time to get rid of bilingual instruction altogether. They flagrantly claim that there is no evidence to support the practice of instruction in two languages as a means of improving a child’s academic skills, nor their ability to acquire the English language (August & Hakuta, 1997). Pedalino (1998) actually states, "The accumulated research of the past thirty years reveals almost no justification for teaching children in their native language to help them learn either English or other subjects (Digital Edition, ¶ 11)." One team of researchers (McMilla & Tse, 1996) even go so far as to say that quoting from research reports and the like doesn’t really help the situation, since both sides of the argument for, or against bilingual education use their own set of research. Instead, they claim it’s really editorials that “cut thru the chase,” sort of speaking, to reach the mass population (and they use research to prove their point).

Although xenophobia continues to erupt from time to time, supporters of Bilingual Education continue to mount research study after study, testifying to the unequivocal success of Bilingual Education with long-term results. The key factor that most of the solidly empirical reports point
to, are the results from standardized testing. Three of these exemplary reports will be highlighted in this thesis. Current endeavors to assist English Language Learners (ELLs) as well as English Only (EOs) learners in public as well as private schools are showing up all across the USA.

In Seattle, WA, it might be a class taught in Spanish or Japanese, along with English (Bhatt, 2006). In Utah as well as in Chapel Hill, NC, it might start as early as preschool, with children learning academic content in Mandarin, Chinese (Erickson, 2007; Fiske, 2006).

Although private schools are capitalizing more on the recent public demand for foreign languages, such as French, German, Arabic and Italian in mid-western America (Walton, 2007), many state educational departments are awakening to the reality that quick immersion policies (e.g. "sink-or-swim") for English instruction are not working (Paulson, 2006; Boone, 2006). With the influx of Hispanic and Asian minorities spanning the nation, many state educational agencies are beginning to take notice of models of dual-language instruction (Zerh, 2005; Berger, 2007; Smith, 1998; Cabazon et al, 1993; Crowell, 2007). Politically active and informed parents are beginning to
take more local control of public schools thru charter school movements (Russell, 2007).

The federal law does allow for alternative methods of instruction, but does not specify which ones to employ (Crawford, 2007). It has left that up to the discretion of each state’s department of education. The only stipulation is that it must be based on research (Crawford, 2007; SSCNET, UCLA, no date).

What makes the task of establishing dual language programs as a state adopted method for educating ELLs, is the fact that the issue of bilingual education is so emotionally charged, and politically maneuvered.

Statement of the Problem: Methods of Instruction for English Language Learners (ELLs)

Since opposition to bilingual education has been existential from the very beginning of the history of education in this country, and in recent years it has even been dismantled by several state agencies; then what else is there to take its place? The question was posted earlier: which method is the best for teaching academic content to students learning English in our public schools?

In order to answer this question, we must first factually explore what an English language learner really
is. We must also critically look at what research has proposed in theory (and practice) as a typical manner for acquiring a second language, and ultimately which methods have been proven best to provide the means for retaining not only the functional use of English, but also the academic aspects of it.

According to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA), there are basically three structural models of second language instruction: Dual-language method; Transitional method; and Sheltered instruction method (NCELA, 2007 - see Appendix A).

The Dual-language method is highlighted in this thesis and the model predominantly represented in the literature review. The Transitional model has been gaining popularity in recent years, especially with ethnic and indigenous groups, as well as parents seeking to enrich their child’s educational experience, by placing them in private schools that teach foreign languages across their curriculum. The Sheltered Instruction model usually adopts a “sink-or-swim” praxis, which sadly is the predominant style in most public schools.
In order to better understand the three models mentioned by the NCELA, a metaphor is offered here by the author of this thesis, to describe the three main characteristics that all programs share in regards to their implementation: In an Immersion approach they let the student get their feet wet first, then slowly allow them to submerge themselves into the English culture. In a Developmental approach, they allow the swimmer to use "floatees," (i.e. first language as a resource) while they wade in the pool of the English culture. In a Transitional approach, they throw the swimmer into the water of the dominant culture, in hopes that they will swim.

Because of inconsistency of program choices and lack of perseverance in implementing one or another, Bilingual Education has suffered public disgrace as impatient citizens vote it out of their state. Just like good wine, a good educational program takes time. One other critical issue has been the extreme lack of proper professional preparatory courses for training teachers effectively. For example in California, it is a requirement to take course work that meets the requirements of a Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certificate, in order to teach English language learners in the public
schools of the state (Reference: California Education Code, Sec. 44203 & 44253.1-44253.10; and Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sec. 80015-80016, 80024.1-80024.2.1, 80024.7 & 80024.8). Many times, these courses are provided by the same districts that employ the teachers wanting to work with ELLs. Although there is supposed to be uniformity in the instruction of these courses, accountability is seldom kept by state authorities. Most of the certificates awarded by the school district that provides the courses are only good to use within that district. Therefore, it has always been difficult to maintain congruency of instructional matter and state resources to administer the classes. This in turn can lead to disparity in individual classes, in which ELLs were to receive the benefit from the course-work training. Poorly supervised teachers, who were poorly trained to begin with, resulted in a poorly delivered English language development (ELD), or an English as a second language (ESL) class for the ELL student. The results of such mismanaged training of educators who teach English to foreign students, or even American born, non-English speakers; have been quite evident in past record. ELLs were not meeting state standards. This is what has ushered in the English-only movement, which is reacting to
the unprofessional preparation and execution of English classes for ELLs.

But, does this mean that the theoretical practices of bilingual instruction ought to be abandoned? Do we throw the baby out with the bath water, simply because someone forgot to clean the tub before the bath? Are there alternative methods to instruct ELLs? The argument being presented in this thesis is that there are alternative methods that have proven effective results of ELLs acquiring English, and improving academically; as a result of bilingual instructional methods. The research presented validates the theoretical basis of bilingual education.

Purpose of the Study: The Need for Alternative Methodology

It is estimated that by the year 2020, Limited English proficient USA residents will equal thirty-nine percent of the population (Provasnik, 2007). The argument presented here is that they can best learn in a language they already are familiar with, while they acquire the second, dominant language of the societal majority: namely English. The evidence presented will conclusively demonstrate that a Two-way or Dual-language immersion strategy works best to
achieve the goal of bilingualism and biliteracy for our ELLs.

According to Torrez-Guzman, Kleyn, Morales-Rodríguez and Han (2005), most researchers agree upon the basic criteria for an authentic dual-language program (citing Lindholm-Leary, 2001). In general, researchers expect that the participants will reach a high level of academic achievement (Christian, 1996; Lindholm, 1990; Lindholm & Fairchild, 1990; Kerper Mora, Wink, & Wink, 2001; Torres-Guzmán, 2002). They also anticipate that students will acquire progressive bilingualism (language acquisition) and biliteracy (academic skills)—(Lindholm & Fairchild, 1990; Kerper Mora, Wink, & Wink, 2001; Torres-Guzmán, 2002). The hope is that all participating students will also become more culturally sensitive, that is, that they would develop an openness to accept the differences among the participants in a dual language program (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Kerper Mora, Wink, & Wink, 2001; Torres-Guzmán & Pérez, 1996; Valverde & Armendariz, 1999)—(from Torrez-Guzman, et al, 2005, p. 456). These are the core values held in common by most researchers of dual language instruction (DLI).
The requirements for bilingualism and biliteracy are that the instruction be conducted in both: the dominant language of English (L2), and the primary language of the ELL (L1), for at least a share 50/50 of the time. Another component of instruction is that the two languages be kept separate (in other words, not teaching in English with an immediate translation in the L1). Also, it is highly recommended that the classroom population be constructed equally of dominant speakers in the L1 language, as well as English speakers. The mixture of the students is not based primarily on ethnicity, but on the ability of their dominant language. If the primary concern for all interested parties is academic success for the students, and also the necessity of students to learn English so that they may become active and contributing members of the American society, then a whole-scale, systematic change must take place. Individual school success stories will be introduced in this thesis to validate the factual evidence, that when such changes are implemented systematically, the outcomes are extraordinary. Validation will be derived from three main quantitative studies; one of which is often quoted by other studies concerning the topic of dual language immersion.
The primary research reports are those conducted by Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (2002, Mar. and Winter of 2004, CREDE); Robledo Montecel, M. & Danini Cortez, J. (2002, Spring, IDRA), and Lindholm-Leary, K. (March, 2005, CAL/NCELA). The first document is an actual longitudinal study covering a vast territory in the USA, and consequently a large study sample of student outcomes. The second document is also quantitative, but it is based on qualitative research used to derive essential characteristics to be used as a norm of reference, to define excellent programs using the dual language immersion approach. The third study is a quantitative literature review, focusing on the essential characteristics that are evident in dual language immersion (DLI) programs. These studies primarily differ from those conducted a generation ago (1960’s – 1980’s), in that they are more focused on a specific methodology used in bilingual programs, instead of generalizations typically applied to the whole process of bilingual education. Typical studies that have been conducted in such fashion are the Green meta-analysis report (1998).

The exemplary study highlighted in the methodology segment of this thesis (Cummins, 2003) correlates with the
findings of Krashen (2003, p.25), in that he specifically recommends the use of “Handcrafted Books” (citing Dupuy and McQuillan, 1997), as a practice in increasing the literacy of ELLs. The recommendations cited in the final segment of this thesis, are patterned after the dual-language initiative that Cummins (2003) and his team implemented in a rural school of a Canadian province, which hosted a community of multilingual students, utilizing more than 40 languages.

The theoretical evidence of language acquisition, as proposed by Cummins (1979) and Krashen (2003) form the foundational premise of adopting the literary practice of creating student-made books, written in both their native tongue and in English, in parallel fashion on opposing pages.

Theoretical Basis of this Study: Theories of English Language Acquisition

The seminal work by Stephen Krashen (2003) on Second Language Acquisition and of Jim Cummins (1979) on cognitive/academic language proficiencies are known world over. Their applied methods have helped many public school teachers in California and in other states with heavy populations of ELLs, cope with the needs of their students.
through their required Strategically Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) training. Krashen’s theoretical quintet specifies:

The Acquisition Hypothesis, which states that the acquisition of language happens unconsciously; it’s mostly "caught" from our environment; through the interchange with modeled speech and oral communication. The Natural Order Hypothesis proposes the theory that we all acquire speech, or any language in the same predictable order. However, the order in which the acquirer receives these predictable patterns is not always the same for every one, although they don’t deviate much. Therefore, it cannot fit into a "pre-packaged" formula, although the order for the acquirer cannot be altered. To further compound the difficulty of instruction, the Natural order does not follow the General "teaching" order.

The Monitor Hypothesis states that we use our "monitoring," or editing abilities conscientiously. That is, we are aware of the analytical process of correcting that which is seemingly wrong. But this can only be performed subsequent to producing speech; either graphically or orally. However, this does not directly contribute to our fluency in the language. That is the
effect of acquisition, which takes a considerable amount of time (Krashen advises us to use the monitor only when we don’t have to speak).

The Comprehensible Input Hypothesis emphatically states, that we are able to acquire language in only one way: when we are able to understand it. This is made possible by the aid of our previously acquired linguistic competency, including our prior knowledge of the world, the situation at hand, and the contextualization of the message. Krashen (2003) advocates,

Language teaching is easy: All we have
to do is give students comprehensible
messages that they will pay attention to, and
they will pay attention if the message is
interesting. (p.4)

The fifth hypothesis to his quintet is the Affective Filter, which argues the theory of a device in the brain that is responsible for the acquisition of language. When this device is not allowed to receive the flow of comprehensible input, the information is lost in translation. Anything from anxiety, to nervousness, to low self-esteem can trigger the impenetrable walls to rise, blocking comprehension. In order to lower this affective filter,
Krashen (2003) recommends that we keep the experiences real and meaningful; that we utilize simplified instructions; that we lower our expectations of response, and that we keep all activities age-level appropriate.

Krashen (2003) does ascribe to Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), the area between what the student is capable of doing in the present and the point you want the student to achieve next (Vygotsky, 1978, as cited in Hill & Flynn, 2006); but he emphatically believes that it must be phased-in to facilitate the acquisition process.

The English language acquisition is something that happens naturally to the students, as they employ their monitoring skills to their original work in their native tongue, and transfer that comprehensible knowledge into their second language (L2). Ideally, this process is best initiated when a child is entering school for the first time (Kindergarten), since the full length of time it takes to master a language at the academic level is five to seven years (Cummins, 2003; Gibbons, 2002; Krashen, 2003). But many times this condition is out of the hands of the educational establishment, since the arrival of potential
students from other countries occur on a daily basis, and for all age stages and grade levels.

Another theory called the Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) contends that there is a time limit placed on language acquisition process (Freeman & Freeman, 2004; Hakuta, K. 2003 - See Appendix B). According to Krashen, this period terminates at 5 years of age (Krashen, 1973). But Freeman and Freeman (2004) cite the following researchers in contrast to Krashen: Pinker claims it’s at 6 years of age (Pinker, 1994); Lenneberg (as cited by Lindfords, 1987) says it’s 12 years of age, whereas Johnson and Newport extend it all the way to 15 years of age (1989). Most researchers agree that children are able to acquire a second language more easily than adults. One may ask, “Why is this so?” Four considerations are offered to explain why: The Neurological Factors - Lateralization of the brain begins at age 2 in humans. By puberty (beginning as early as the age of ten and lasting as late as the age of 21), the lateralization is complete. The Cognitive Factors - the formal operational (academic) stage of the brain begins for most children around the age of eleven. This is mostly the ability to think about their own thinking process. The Affective Factors - As children
mature, they become more self-conscious of their accent, and may be less willing to attempt for fear of error. This is most critical in the adolescence stage, since they are heavily persuaded by peer pressures. The final factor is Fossilization, which may be a residue of the previous factor. Speech therapists affirm that the formation and solidification of the tongue muscles also play a very critical part in this “fossilization.” Once those muscles are trained, they are set (Source, Freeman and Freeman, 2004). A great example of this would be California Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger. Most adults tend to retain their accents, and therefore, “natural speaking” (or native imitation) may never occur for them.

According to Noam Chomsky (1959), who proposed the theory of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) in the brain, the ability to acquire language at all has more to do with brain functions than our linguistic capabilities (Gentry, 2006). Chomsky’s work has been supported in more recent years by researchers such as Lindfors (1987), who made the proposition of oral language development in stages. This position is further supported by Hymes (1970), Pinker (1994), Petitto (2003), and Hill & Flynn (2006).
Hymes contends that, "language always occurs in social context, and the meaning of many utterances depends on the context (Freeman and Freeman, 2004, p.8).” Pinker states, Children’s ability to learn vocabulary rapidly along with the ability to recognize and produce sentences that reflect understanding of syntax supports the idea that capacity for language development is either innate or the reflection of a special cognitive processing capacity for language. (As quoted by Freeman and Freeman, 2004, p.6)

Petitto’s contribution to the theory of stages of language development was to note that infants exposed to sign language go through the same stages as babies exposed to oral language (Freeman, 2004, p.6), which leads the authors to affirm, “children’s language development is a universal phenomenon (p.5).” The Freemans (2004) cite many more researchers and studies to support their claim, including the Goodman’s (1990) in their list of experts, alluding to their conviction that, Children try out different ways of expressing their ideas. They invent words and phrases. They modify their inventions in light of
their responses they receive. To succeed in school, they develop different language registers. (Freeman and Freeman, 2004, p.10)

Children do “learn” or adopt different language registers, or systems for communicating in school, simply because school is a separate culture from home. The language employed in school is different from the native tongue expressions from home life, and the vocabulary is vastly different than home. Work conducted by Hayes & Ahrens (1988, as cited by Krashen, 2003) on speech and language in printed material seems to support this theory (see Fig. 1, Appendix E).

At school, ELLs must master many academic registers (i.e. mathematic vocabulary; scientific vocabulary, etc). At best, all that can be expected from a teacher with the basic training in theories of pedagogy is to build an environment in which learning is welcomed, in which relationship are built with the students, and in which students are encouraged to build their own meaning from a print-rich environment, which may include an extensive assortment of leveled-reading books. These are the pragmatics often overlooked in most classrooms (Cole, 2004).
In order to make the input comprehensible, it needs to hold a high interest of meaning to the student (Smith & Wilhelm, 2006). Functional English (otherwise known as “survival English”) acquisition is possible within one to two years (Cummins, 2003 – citing Gonzalez 1986; Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle 1978), but it must require a reversal of roles, in which the teachers see themselves as active learners of culture and language, and the students as partners in learning.

Cummins (2003) suggests proceeding in three phases, depending on the progress of the students: Phase One - Focus on meaning; Phase Two - Focus on use (i.e. language functions); and Phase Three - Focus on language (i.e. vocabulary). He contends that this method can help students to process meaningful language concepts; deepen their awareness of how their own language works, and learn how to employ that in powerful ways to connect with people (Cummins, 2003, p.12). According to Steven Krashen’s position (2004), people acquire the ability to read and write in the same fashion that they learn a first or second language – by receiving meaningful input (p.4).

According to Freeman and Freeman (2004), English contains about 40 separate and distinctive phonemes (the
sounds that make a difference in meaning in a language - (p.54). The Freemans contend that these sounds, “don’t sound the same each time they are produced, but the variations are perceived as instances of the same sound by speakers of a language” (p.55).

If English Language Learners can be helped to hear how these basic sounds of the English language are formed, they should be able to “decode” most anything. The Freemans (2004) recommend that the best way to help the English Language Learner (ELL) is to give them activities that require problem-solving strategies for spelling (p.60). Of course, they also recommend extensive amounts of reading to improve spelling. They actually agree with Adams (1994) in the sense that they both affirm, that there is a “strategic” time in which to teach spelling to children, using both systems (“Phonics” and “Sociopsycholinguistic”).

The Freemans (2004) recommend “Inventive Spelling” in Pre-K through first grade, and then direct instruction (Metalinguistics) in grades 2-4, to be more effective, and parallel with the child’s “developmental stages” (Piaget, 1955). In allowing students to “dialogue” a lot more before they actually write about anything, especially when they
are learning new academic language; they will be enabled in their comprehension. The more they use vocabulary in meaningful contextualization, the more understanding they’ll have of the material presented to them through Direct Instruction.

This is supported by research conducted by Pally (2000) on Sustained Content Language Teaching, which is a throw-back to its earlier predecessor; the Natural Approach to teaching a second language. As the Freemans (2004) point out, “Students learn language as they read, write, and talk about content and become involved in investigations and studies of interest to them” (p. 85) - (this almost sounds like Montessori Theory). Children become more engaged in the learning process that way. This methodology resurfaced in the 1970’s and 80’s under the label of “Whole Language” instruction.

With a growing population of Spanish speaking students, it becomes more imperative that all children learn how to communicate with one another in more than one language, so as to develop cultural understanding, and identification with similarities between cultures (Souto-Manning, 2006). When a child is able to learn in two or more languages, it facilitates and accelerates their
overall academic achievement in the long run (Cummins, 2003). The benefit of learning Spanish as a second language will also serve to help English primary speakers with the acquisition of their Latin-based root words (Freeman, 2004), and the facility to acquire any of the Roman-based languages (French, Portuguese, Romany, and Latin). The comprehension of more than one language also serves to open up the world of authentic literature (Higgins, 2002). This simple activity will serve the student by enriching their literacy, as well as promote understanding of the content and transfer meaning from one language to another (Freeman, 2004; Gibbons, 2002; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

Limitations of this Thesis: Strengths and Weaknesses of Dual-Language Immersion

As Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) point out, in order for there to be success for all students in a Dual language immersion (DLI) model, it requires three strategic commitments. The first is that most of the staff, if not all of it at the school ought to be bilingual; meaning, able to speak in English and the other language(s) represented at the school by student demographics (Howard & Sugarman, 2001; Christian & Genesse, 2004). This presents a strategically enormous problem when the demographic
population in the USA equates to over eighty different languages (Thomas / Collier, 2004).

If the large number of languages spoken in larger metropolitan centers weren’t challenge enough, it is suggested that teachers of ELLs be trained with academic language in the L1 language (for example, Spanish). This means that they would have to be well versed in all of the technical terminology of every specific academic domain (language, math, science, and so on). For any instructor to be adequately proficient with academic language in both, the dominant language (i.e. English) and the native one (i.e. Spanish) is very uncommon.

The second strategic commitment as cited by Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002), is that all of the staff needs to have complete “buy-in” to the program (p.5). That is, everyone at the school needs to believe in the success of the dual language methods if it is to have the best impact upon the student body. It is emphasized that everyone from the support staff (custodians, office clerks, supervisors) to the teaching staff, and preferably the administrative staff be committed to this model of instruction (Lindholm-Leary, 2005).
The third strategic commitment that Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) prescribe is that the community as a whole be involved in the education process, from start to finish. The community is defined as the locality in which the school is situated (Smith, 2001; Osterling, 2001), including parents (Univ. of New Mexico, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2005), businesses (Carrera-Carrillo and Rickert Smith, 2006), and even the school district office personnel (Castro Feinberg, 1999; Freeman & Freeman, 2005). But of all of these diverse institutions, the one with the most effect upon positive outcomes is parental involvement (Salinas Sosa, 1997; Zarate, M. E, 2007). Parental involvement is not looked upon as a hindrance in the classroom, but rather as an asset to be capitalized upon (Cummins & Schecter, 2003). The parents are living resources of language and representatives of the community.

Cummins (2003) cites Ruiz (1988) in stating three possible views of language planning from a programming perspective: Viewing language as a problem to be solved; viewing language as a right people have; and viewing language as a resource people have. The significance of Ruiz' (1988) observation is in viewing the diversity of
languages as a resource of the multicultural community, rather than an ethnic group demanding entitlements.

The obvious possible negative outcome from this perspective is the disinterest on the part of the parents in the community/school association. But if properly trained, parents can become integral components of the educational process, and they don’t cost a cent to the district. Given the chance and the proper training, many parents would be more than eager to be an active participant (especially if they are college graduates) in their child’s educational process.

Some businesses are also eager to sponsor schools by giving grants, supplies for students, or computers for classrooms. This will not only benefit the school and the community at large, but it will also provide potential benefits for the businesses themselves (i.e. future employment; tax deductions). It is also a way to promote themselves as active partners in education.

Definition of Terms

The terms being used throughout this thesis have to do with the methodology being highlighted (Dual language immersion, or DLI) and the identification of students who receive services for English Language Development (ELD).
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This is not the same as providing a language class of English as a second language (ESL). The two terms can be easily confused by a parent or community member who may not be well informed. According to the Office of Civil Rights at the Federal Office of Education Department, ESL is, “a program of techniques, methodology, and special curriculum designed to teach ELL students English language skills, which may include listening, speaking, reading, writing, study skills, content vocabulary, and cultural orientation” (OCR, Glossary, last updated on May 16, 2007).

According to the California Office of Education, ELD is, “a specialized program of English language instruction appropriate for the English learner (EL) student's (formerly LEP students) identified level of language proficiency, implemented and designed to promote second language acquisition of listening, speaking, reading, and writing” (CDE, CBEDS Glossary, 2007). The basic difference between the two is that one is primarily designed to give oral instruction, in order to develop verbal skills (ELD), while the other is primarily designed to develop the academic components of the language (ESL); that is, grammar functions and verb tenses, and so on. Both of these methods can be adapted to any of the current strategies used in
giving instruction to ELLs (Dual language; transitional, or sheltered).

In this thesis, Dual language and Two-way immersion are synonymous terms. The first term is used in the main documents reviewed for this study. The second term is used more often on Web-posted resource pages. Both mean to, “use two languages for instruction in content areas with the goal of developing bilingualism and biliteracy” (CAL, no date). In the documentation reviewed, Dual language immersion (DLI) stands out as the most promising methodology for promoting English language acquisition that includes the cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), which is the language ability required for academic achievement.

According to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA), the synonymous terms English language learner (ELL) and Limited English Proficient (LEP) are used interchangeably in the literature and in legislation. In citing Loffler’s (OELA, 2006) summary of section twenty five from title IX (p. 115 STAT. 1961, of the Public law text) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), which was amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (2001),
the government's definition of an individual who is an
ELL/LEP can be: anyone age 3 through 21 who is enrolled or
preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary
school. These students may not have been born in the United
States, or their native tongue is a language other than
English, even though they may be natural citizens of the
USA (Native American Indians, or Alaskan natives).

English language learners are mostly defined by
environmental upbringing where a language other than
English has had a significant impact on their level of
English language proficiency. This can also be affected by
migratory patterns, which lends to the individual's
difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or
understanding the English language.

Because of this limitation, they may be denied the
opportunity to meet any given state's proficient level of
achievement on standardized state assessments, and lack the
academic ability to successfully achieve in classrooms
where the language of instruction is in English. This will
severely limit their opportunity to participate fully in a
society whose dominant language is English. Loeffler (OELA,
2006) further adds,
There is not, however, a single operational definition of the term. Each State uses different identification and assessment measures and makes its own decision regarding cut-off scores for both entering and exiting programs designed for English language learners.

It is probably due to the governmental lack of unification in policy that Bilingual Education (and consequently, Dual-language instruction) has suffered from lack of support in public opinion. For example, the California Department of Education (CDE) lists five classifications, or levels of English Language Acquisition (ELA): Beginning (B); Early Intermediate (EI); Intermediate (I); Early Advanced (EA); and Advanced (A) - (Source, California English Development Test (CELDT) Grades K-2 - Test Blueprint, CDE, 2006).

According to the Modern Language Association (MLA) website, there are 32 distinct language groups currently in the US (see Appendix G). Collectively they comprise forty-two percent of all school-age children in the US (Provasnik, 2007). How is it possible to adequately serve the needs of such a diverse (and large) population of
students? Clearly, this massive group of people with limited English skills cannot be ignored.

Brantley (2007) elaborates on the work done in the field of English Language Acquisition (ELA), by citing the work of Krashen & Terrell (1983), and Hurley & Tinajero (2001), concerning the stages of language development. The first stage is the Preproduction stage (P), also recognized as the “silent stage” (this would equate with the Beginners stage as proposed in the California CELDT classifications priorly mentioned). A person acquiring a second language will spend the initial part ingesting oral communication, supported by visual stimulus. At this stage they should not be required to produce or respond in the second language (L2).

The second stage is the Early Production stage (EP), in which the ELL is beginning to understand what is being said, and venturing into single word responses (this would equate with the Early Intermediate stage of the CELDT levels). It is suggested that they be encouraged to respond by making phrasal requests. The third stage is the Speech Emergence stage (SE), in which the ELL becomes more confident in their L2 production (this equates to the CELDT Intermediate stage), and should be encouraged to
participate more actively in a social context, through games, play activities, and music. The fourth stage is the Intermediate stage (I) of fluency in the L2, in which the ELL becomes an active participant in the dominant language community (this equates to the CELDT, Early Advanced stage), by speaking, reading and writing in more comprehensive and extended language exchanges.

The final stage is the Advanced Fluency stage (AF), in which the ELL has more of a command (this equates to the CELDT, Advanced stage) on the grammatical, syntactical, semantic, and pragmatic features of the L2. Brantley (2007) suggests that this is the stage in which the ELL must be challenged to delve deeper into the "abstract" areas of the L2, for example, scientific vocabulary and idiomatic uses of the language.

In the following chapter, more documentation will be shared, that will shed more light on this most confusing of topics: instruction of English language learners, or ELLs.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review is divided into the following sections: historical background, theoretical background, academic achievement outcomes, systematic contributing components that support a successful dual language educational program, and essential characteristics of an authentic dual language educational program, synthesized from a review of research literature that analytically views multiple dual language programs. The primary reports selected for this literature review were chosen by those criteria.

Historical Background

During the colonial period of America, the language of education always reflected that of its community’s needs (Brown, 1992). But no sooner had our Founding Fathers decided to establish their independence, than arguments in favor of an English-only governmental rule was being taunted by such notables as Benjamin Franklin and John Adams (Brown, 1992). However, the fundamental principal of American jurisprudence has always been to allow the
inclusion of all citizenry vs. the legitimization of one singular group. In 1819 the secretary of state, John Quincy Adams wrote,

This is a land, not of privileges, but of equal rights... Privileges granted to one denomination of people, can very seldom be discriminated from the erosion of the rights of others. (as quoted by Crawford, 2007)

Fear has always been the ally of those who would seek to isolate America by intending to consolidate it as an English society. However, Americans today are not an English culture, but rather a multiplicity of cultures infused with English language traditions. This xenophobia has permeated most legislation in our country, concerning immigration laws. Three main language and cultural groups of immigrants are addressed in this section as an example of how our government’s policies have marginalized, not only immigrants seeking their rights to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” but also at times it’s own citizens. However, there has always been a minority voice that has fought for the rights of those who are less fortunate than themselves.
The Germanic Experience. It is ironic that one of the founding immigrant groups of the American institution of education (e.g. the Germans) would face isolation from the same. Although they could boast of being one of the earliest and largest immigrating groups to come to the USA (beginning in the 1600s and ending in the early 1900’s - source, Library of Congress, 2003) their political power, economic strength, and literary achievements could not hold back the discriminating tide against them.

Anti-immigration sentiment towards people of German decent caused politicization of bilingual instruction in public schools, leading to an English only consensus (Crawford, 2007) during the second European wave of immigration in the midst of the First World War (WWI). Many uninformed people make claims of the success of the "melting-pot" model of Americanization, by citing the unilingual emphasis on English. But the case could be made for fear of foreign language speakers as the unifying cause in America during that historical time period.

When the USA declared war on Germany in 1917, a wave of anti-Germanic sentiment spread like a cancer in American society. The adults that had been trained as children in German-style kindergartens, which promoted a philosophy of
tolerance and inclusion; where now forcing an unparallel cultural extermination.

The same government they had helped to establish was now obligating German descent people to change the names of their business establishments; change the names of any street, school, etc... that had a German vernacular; in short, anything German was under scrutiny (Library of Congress, 2003).

Perhaps the greatest loss to Germanic ancestry citizens was the forsaking of their mother tongue. When once it had held a prominent place in American society, German language was quickly being expunged from public life. German-language newspapers seized to exist. German-language books were burned. German-language classes (once commonplace in public-school curriculum) were canceled and, in many areas, completely outlawed. Centuries of German heritage in language and literature in the USA was pushed to the margins of national life in the name of patriotism. German culture on American soil never recovered from its fall. - Could this experience in American history have a sequel in the near future with the current political trend of the English only movement?
The Chinese Experience. Perhaps the only other large immigrant group to suffer discrimination by legislation so directly was the Chinese. Beginning in the mid 1800's, their indoctrination into American intolerance was plagued by violent racist attacks. "From Seattle to Los Angeles, from Wyoming to the small towns of California, immigrants from China were forced out of business, run out of town, beaten, tortured, lynched, and massacred, usually with little hope of help from the law" (Library of Congress, 2003). With such carnage on record, it can easily be said that Chinese immigrants suffered the worst treatment than any other group who willfully came to the USA.

Chinese immigrants were also barred from any governmental job, and from the privilege of educating their children in public schools (Library of Congress, 2003). Although most immigrants to the U.S. during the 1870's were not Chinese, this group of immigrants was often the scapegoat for the nation's economic problems. From 1882 to 1943, the United States Government severely restricted immigration from China (National Archives, no date). The welcome-mat was finally lifted in 1882 with the Chinese Exclusion Act. It was the first significant legislation
produced by our American government to deny the rights of a specific group of immigrants, labeling them as permanent aliens. The door would be further locked-up with the subsequent 1924 Immigration Act, excluding all classes of Chinese immigrants and extending the restrictive law to other Asian countries. These laws were not relaxed until the mid twentieth century (Library of Congress, 2003).

**Bigotry Top Down.** The American fear of foreigners found its highest expression in the Theodore Roosevelt administration during the 1920's. Roosevelt himself was a former student of one of the originators of the doctrine of racial suicide popularized by Nathaniel Southgate Shaler (Dyer, 1980, p.144, as cited by Brown, 1998). Intolerance of foreign speakers in the name of Americanism found its way into restrictive educational policies during this time (Mosley, 1969, as cited in Brown, 1998).

At the same time, public mistrust of Germans continued into the Second World War (WWII), but it was less overt. Perhaps because German-Americans fought so bravely in the WWII, and three of our leading generals (Eisenhower, Nimitz and Spaatz) lead us to V.D. Day (Library of Congress, 2003). Although our nation was grateful to these patriotic
American generals, our nation has never apologized for treating their German predecessors so badly.

However, the American theory of individualism and the associated rights as a citizen did engender some legal confrontation between American citizens and unfair practices disguised as law. These marginalized citizens fought against the injustice of racism associated to a person’s right to speak in another tongue that wasn’t English. It is only when individual citizens decide that they will no longer allow themselves to be pushed to the fringes of society, that any significant change ever takes place. Such was the example set by a ground-breaking court case in Nebraska, which took place in 1920.

Grass-roots Justice. A German-America citizen named Robert Meyers appealed twice to the Supreme Court of the land (eventually winning); in a suit brought against him for teaching a Sunday-school lesson in German to children. The significance of this case was that it was the first ruled in favor of the linguist rights of minorities. Using the fourteenth amendment of the constitution as their justification for requiring “substantive due process,” the
final majority opinion was written by Judge James McReynolds. It stated,

    This cannot be coerced with methods which conflict with the Constitution - a desirable end cannot be promoted by prohibited means.
    (as cited by Crawford, 2007)

In 1940 and again in 1950, restrictive immigration laws were enacted requiring proficiency in English to enter the country (Hakuta, 1969, as cited in Brown, 1998). These laws were perhaps aimed at yet another large migrating group (e.g. Mexicans) who like the Germans; enjoyed a very long history of association with Americans, on North American soil.

The Mexican Experience. Like the Chinese, Mexican immigrants permeated many American labor forces, most notably railroad construction and farming (Library of Congress, 2003). In 1942, the U.S. and Mexico collaborated to create the “bracero” program, to persuade Mexican citizens to venture into the USA as contract workers. “The program was very popular with U.S. farmers, and was extended well past the end of World War II, not ending
until 1964. More than 5 million Mexicans came to the U.S. as braceros, and hundreds of thousands stayed.” (Library of Congress, 2003). This group holds the distinction of being the fastest growing minority group in the USA, and will be the leading cause of modifications to, or repealing of current immigration laws (NCES, 2007-039, p. 6).

Confusion Among the Ranks. Just as an example of how confusing (and contradictive) American Immigration policies have been, as one government program was enticing Mexican immigrants into the USA, another was trying to get them out. After WWII, the American government began a new campaign of deportation. The expulsions continued well into the 1950’s, expelling more than four million Mexican immigrants (including many Mexican-American citizens), back to Mexico (Library of Congress, 2003).

Popularity of Languages. It wasn’t until after the WWII, when soldiers returning from the battle-grounds abroad, that the American public was awakened with an awareness of the need for formal education of foreign languages. It was those loyal German-American soldiers that
made the difference between life and death for many an
American GI.

Once these former soldiers returned to civilian life, they took on the responsibility of promoting the rights so evident in the first amendment of our constitution; the right to speak, and to express one-self by publish anything, in any language. This emboldened minority rights groups to fight for greater constitutional rights of equality and due process under the law, specifically in educational matters (Brown, 1998).

The greatest victory for minority language advocates, came in 1954 with the Brown vs. Board of Education case, outlawing racial segregation in public schools (Crawford, 2007). Consequently, students of color were allowed integration to public schools in other neighborhoods that enjoyed better facilities, better educational materials and resources, which are essential in giving instruction to language minority students, so that they may acquire English and be assimilated into the American culture.

The government also established the National Defense Education Act (NDEA, 1958) authorizing grants to schools in
math, science, and foreign language instruction. This was followed up by the Civil Rights Act (CRA) in 1964 (Crawford, 2007), and the Immigration Act in 1965 (Brown, 1998). Subsequent to these were the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) in 1968 and the Lau vs. Nichols case in 1974 (Brown, 1998), in which the rights of minorities to have equal access to education were upheld. However, these legal and legislative victories were short lived.

The Might of Controlling Forces. In the 1980’s categorical spending funding from Title VII of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA, 1968) and the Title II from the Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA, 1974) were drastically cut under the Ronald Reagan administration (Crawford, 2007; AASC, UCLA, no date). This was followed up in the 1990’s with a renewed anti-immigration wave, directed mostly at Hispanics, by political action pacts (PACs) promoting an English only legislation modification. Between 1998 and 2002, state ballot measures in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts were overwhelmingly passed by voters (the one in Colorado did not pass) to effectively dismantle Bilingual Education in those state (Crawford, 2007).
In spite of all this political maneuvering, the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) has been ratified five times. In wasn’t until the enacting of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation under President George W. Bush in 2001 that any reference to “bilingual,” or “bilingualism” was eliminated from all educational legislative language (Crawford, 2007; AASC, UCLA, no date). Regardless of this legislative offensive, the federal government has made allowance for parents who so desire to have their own child instructed in alternative methods, to petition their state’s department of education (DOE) for a waver of educational programs for their child.

In California, the only stipulation is that there be at least 20 other parents who desire the same thing for their own child, and who happen to be at the same grade level as the other students petitioning for alternative instructional programs. A good question to ask on behalf of these minority language parents is, if giving instruction to their own child in another program that is not English-only will help their child attain academic success.
Theoretical Background

Two definite conclusions can be derived from the surmountable evidence on bilingual education: all those who participated in an effective program, either scored at the same level of their English mainstream peers, or in some cases outperformed them (Thomas, W. & Collier, V, 2002; Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. et al, 2005; Gómez, L, Freeman, D, & Freeman, Y, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, K. J, 2005). All ELLs who were misplaced in remedial English instruction courses, or bumped-along in English Immersion courses fared far less adequate (Thomas, W. & Collier, V, 2002; de Jong, E. J, 2004; Garcia, G. N, 2000). According to Thomas / Collier (2002), a large number of ELLs will drop out of High School before they finish the eleventh grade (p. 2). Drop-out rates for Latino ELLs can run as high as 25% or more (Kohler & Lazarin, NCLR, 2007, p.5). By contrast, a very high percentage of students who stay in their effective bilingual education model until they graduate from High School, have a far better chance to graduate from college.
Evidence Supporting the Research Background. It is important to note that Hill & Flynn (2006) make reference to the Thomas / Collier (2002) study and its longitudinal effect in academic language acquisition within five to seven years. Haynes, J. (2002) also cites Thomas / Collier (2002), and gives more specifics, concerning the age of the students and their potential acquisition rate. Student’s ages 8 to 11 years old with two to three years of native language education took five to seven years to become proficient thru standardized testing. Students with little or no formal schooling, who arrived in the USA before the age of 8, took 7 to 10 years to achieve the same status in English language literacy as the former group. Students who were below grade level in their native language also took 7 to 10 years to reach the 50th percentile, and many of these students never achieve grade-level norms.

It is also crucial to keep in mind that these same students are required by law to be 100% at grade level by the year 2014, according to the current No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, and it is not expected to change much after a new administration takes office in 2009.
Alternative Methods of Instruction for English Language Learners

The guiding question for this thesis paper is which method is the best suited for teaching academic content to students who are at the same time learning English in our public schools. The primary emphasis is in observing programs that promote bilingual instruction, and more specifically the dual-language immersion approach. Current methods of dual language instruction are highlighted in this literature review. To that purpose, three quantitative studies are specifically cited in this report, along with multiple qualitative examples of programs, research, and/or results from investigations into bilingual education.

Justifying the Selection of the Main Documents. The first document is a study conducted by Thomas / Collier (2002 & 2004, CREDE), which focuses on the long term academic achievement of ELLs (p.12). This longitudinal quantitative study covered a period of five years (1996-2001). Thomas / Collier (2002) looked at the programs provided for English language learners (ELLs) in five different districts (K-12) across the in USA. This study was selected because it is the most comprehensive quantitative study that looks at outcomes from standardized
testing in ELLs. The outcomes are covered in the discussion section of this thesis.

The second study (Robledo Montecel, M. & Danini Cortez, J, 2002, IDRA) discusses the findings from a governmental commission to investigate the ten most effective bilingual programs in the USA. This study took on a qualitative approach, in that characteristics of effective methods being used in successful schools (and by success, the results from state standardized tests is the criteria) were categorized from a quantitative analysis of research conducted over a period of twenty five years.

The Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002, IDRA) study was selected because it employed a holistic approach in identifying all the noticeable, contributing factors that encourage the successful outcomes in the schools observed; which primarily serve a population of low social economic status (SES) students. The essential characteristics of effective models observed by Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) are covered in the discussion section of this thesis.

The third study (Lindholm-Leary, 2005) is an authentic literature review which analyzed and synthesized essential characteristics that were found in common, in multiple
studies reviewed. The Lindholm-Leary (2005, CAL/NCELA) study is used in this thesis as a systematic outline to define seven essential components of an effective dual language educational program. The Lindholm-Leary study (2005) is more congruent with the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez study (2002), in that it focuses more on the contributing factors of success for a Dual-language program of instruction, vs. the Thomas / Collier study (2004), which strictly recorded the academic progress over time.

Focus on the Most Promising Method: Two-Way Immersion

Using Lindholm-Leary’s (2005) seven-pronged determining characteristics of an effective program, including assessment and accountability, curricular planning, instructional practices, staff quality and professional development, program structure, family and community, and support systems; a systematic view of a dual-language immersion model is presented.

Assessment and Accountability. The first determining characteristic is assessment and accountability. Dual language programs require the use of multiple measures of assessment in both languages (L1 & English) in order to determine the effective progression towards the goal of

The common practice is to allow assessment outcomes dictate the direction of instruction (Brantley, 2007; Popham, 2005). Popham (2005) would argue that we assess the mastery of the intended skills we want students to learn (p.198). Brantley (2007) would argue that ELLs ought to be assessed in their dominant language (L1) first, and then in English (L2), in order to provide a more accurate depiction of a student’s true skill level of mastery. This first determining characteristic of an effective DLI program naturally leads into the second one: curriculum development.

**Curricular Development.** The content being taught must be clearly aligned to the state’s standards and assessment requirements. It also must be meaningful to the student (Lindholm-Leary’s, 2005, p.12; Francis, D. J, & Rivera, M. et al, 2006; Lockwood, A. T. & Secada, W. G, 1999; Samway, K, 2006) so that they don’t loose interest in learning (and consequently become unmotivated in their studies). The curriculum must be academically rigorous and challenging
(Francis, D. J., & Rivera, M. et al, 2006; Genesee, 1994; Resnick, L. et al, 2004), so that it continues to promote academic achievement for the student. It helps if the content is thematically integrated across the curricular domains (Howard, E. R, Sugarman, J. & Christian, D, 2007).

**Instructional Practices.** Instruction must be enriching vs. being remedial (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Robledo Montecel, M. & Danini Cortez, J, 2002) otherwise, academic progress will continue to deteriorate, and the ELL student will continue to fall further behind their contemporaries. Language instruction must be integrated within the curriculum (Gibbons, P, 2002; Van Sluys, K. and Reiner, R, 2006; Dorr, R. E, 2006) and together with literature should be developed across the curricular spectrum (Vialpando, J. et al, 2005; Dietrich, D. & Ralph, K, 1995; Higgins, J, 2002). If the literary associations also happen to lend themselves to multicultural perspectives, this will only enhance comprehension for ELLs and cultural sensitivity for all students. Lindholm-Leary (2005) also points out that instruction that integrates technology has proven to increase the level of success in a program for ELLs (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.13 - also Meskill, C. et al, 1999). As in the sequential flow between the first and the
second characteristics identified by Lindholm-Leary (2005), likewise between curriculum development and instructional practices.

For the success of a dual language program, the third characteristic (instruction) of an effective DLI program becomes that much more complicated, due to the additional goal of multicultural appreciation attainment, along with the dual-goals of bilingualism and biliteracy (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 14). The desire to facilitate a multicultural experience of validating each ethnic group which participates in the program is essential to the instructional practice component of an effective DLI program (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Dietrich, D. & Ralph, K, 1995; Francis, D. J, & Rivera, M. et al, 2006; McCollum, P, 1999; Villarreal, A, 1999). One specific method cited that makes this possible is the practice of Reciprocal Teaching (Palinscar, A.S., & Brown, A.L, 1984), which creates a reversal of roles between the learner and the teacher (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 15 – also, Oczkus, L. D, 2003).

What becomes crucial in this instructional practice is the purposeful planning for the social integration of ELLs with English language proficient (ELPs) students, working side-by-side on a project (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 15,
citing Saundrs (in Genesse, F. et al, 2006. Also in support are Carrera-Carrillo, L. & Rickert Smith, A, 2006; de Jong, E. J, 2002; Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. et al, 2005; Genesse, F. et al, 1999; Howard, E. R, Sugarman, J. & Christian, D, 2007; Lindholm-Leary, K. J, 2000; Slavin, R. & Cheung, A, 2005). In order for Reciprocal teaching to be highly effective, the students must be thoroughly trained in higher order thinking skills; (Lockwood, A. T. & Secada, W. G, 1999), and collaborative, and interdependent working group ethics (Fitts, S, 2006; Resnick, L. et al, 2004). The students must also be deeply saturated in content-based academic language, in order to develop that English Language proficiency with their peers (Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. et al, 2006; Genesse, F, 1994).

Planning with Optimal Input. Lindholm-Leary (2005) suggests strategic planning with optimal input (Cummins, J. & Schecter, S, 2003, p. 10, see Appendix I), which she defines as having four distinct characteristics. The first optimal input characteristic is level adjustments - that is, instruction is adjusted to the comprehension level of the group of learners (which would argue for homogeneous clusters). The second distinct characteristic of optimal input is relevance of theme, which is an aspect often
ignored in planning. If it doesn’t have some sort of interest factor for the students, they won’t become engaged in the learning process (Smith, M. & Wilhelm, J, 2006). The third optimal input characteristic is sufficient quantity of input. The content being taught must have a bountiful measure of resources from which to draw from, so that a multiplicity of choice is available to the students, in order to encourage a range of learning styles, or competencies (Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y, 2004; Gibbons, P, 2002).

The final optimal input characteristic is that the input be academically challenging. This supports the argument against remedial instruction, which has demonstrated insufficient results (Villarreal, A, 1999; Boone, D, 2006). The students must be challenged, or they will begin to lose interest. This is an argument for accelerated instruction (Robledo Montecel, M. & Danini Cortez, J, 2002).

One program that was built upon these principals was the sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP - Echevarria, Short & Powers, 2003). It is composed of 30 specific strategies grouped into eight components that are systematically used with sheltered instruction. These
sheltering techniques are effectively employed with reciprocal teaching (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 15).

**Mono-lingual Teaching.** One key feature of a DLI program is the academic instruction in two languages (L1 & English). In citing Kowal & Swain (1997) and Valdez (1997), Lindholm-Leary (2005) points out two specific reasons for this standard of instruction in Two-way Immersion (TWI - p.17). First of all, it facilitates continued development of language structures and skills. Secondly, the instruction in L1 facilitates comprehension of the content, so that the students can more easily acquire similar academic content language in English. This argument favors the theory of language acquisition as proposed by Krashen (2003) and his component of comprehensible input. But teaching students in their native tongue is exactly the criticism levied against bilingual education as a whole, in that the students take too long to acquire academic English (Garcia, G. N, 2000), which is directly attributed to the lack of instruction of content-specific English vocabulary.

This critical issue is held at the forefront of a DLI program, since it strictly requires adherence to a mono-lingual instruction format (Lindholm-Leary, K. J, 2005; Robledo Montecel, M. & Danini Cortez, J, 2002; Thomas, W. &
Collier, V, 2002). In other words: when the teacher is giving instruction in the L1, students are strongly encouraged to only utilize the language of the instruction at hand, and then to maintain the content specific vocabulary in said language active in classroom discussion and conversation (especial during group activities). The same policy is maintained during academic instruction in English. The policy applies to all student participants alike; ELLs and ELPs. The vocabulary is always taught through direct instruction, but utilizing SIOP strategies to imbed the meaning of the terms. The vocabulary is then reinforced by the ELPs during their group interactions.

One thing the instructor can do to facilitate the imbedding of academic terminology is to plan the activities so that they require production and use of the academic terminology (Baker, et al, 1995; Manzo, A. et al, 2006). If students are not held accountable for vocabulary taught, they most likely will not use it in conversation willfully. The result is the anticipated goal of dual-language competency, that is, two language groups of students attaining bilingualism and biliteracy in both, the L1 and English. Here is where the professional training and preparation of classroom instructors is crucial. Lindholm-
Leary (2005) affirms that teachers must have high levels of proficiency in the language for the content of instruction because of the need to refrain from language switching (p.18). If this practice had been maintained from the signing of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968, we would be experiencing a totally different paradigm in our social/cultural make-up right now.

**Staff Quality and Professional Development.** The fourth and final characteristic of optimal input is the quality of the staff and the professional development employed to promote its improvement. The staff participating in DLI schools must be properly trained to meet the goals of a dual language ideal (bilingualism and biliteracy). Administrators must ensure that their teaching staff is properly certified in the content areas (multiple subject in K-8, and specialized single-subject in 9-12 grade); fully credentialed in bilingual and ESL practices (in California, this would be the CLAD, or B-CLAD, which have already been defined); fully versed in DLI philosophical goals and above all; bilingual themselves.

**Professional Bilingualism.** In citing Doherty et al (2003) and Ramirez (1992); Lindholm-Leary (2005) gives two justifications for the stipulation of the bilingual
capability of instructors. The first justification is to provide cognitively stimulating instruction and to promote high levels of bilingual academic proficiency in students, in both languages. The second justification is in regards to comprehension of student/teacher communication. If the teacher cannot understand the student’s native tongue, they won’t be able to effectively meet the individual needs of the student in the classroom (p.21). A lot of meaning could be lost in translation. Lindholm-Leary (2005) quotes a startling statistic from the California Education Report on ELLs, stating that only one out of every three ELLs is taught by a properly trained teacher in California (p.22).

**Essential Professional Pedagogical Skills.** Lindholm-Leary (2005) gives six essential skills that each DLI instructor must have, in order to be competent and successful in the classroom. The first four are extrinsically obtained through professional training, but the last two are intrinsically acquired from experience.

The first essential competency skill is knowledge of pedagogy theory (knowing about instructional theories in general). The second essential competency skill is functional knowledge of standard-based teaching skills; that is, the ability to teach a child how to identify the
author’s intent, for example. The third essential competency skill is working knowledge of literacy theory (how children learn how to read). The fourth essential competency skill is knowledge of sheltered instruction techniques, which can easily be obtained from their own school district, but ought to be given by a trained professional at a post graduate program in a university.

These four competency skills are learned skills which must be directly taught. Each one was originally adapted from observations made by researchers in the field, but the final two are directly learned on the job, in the classroom. The fifth essential competency skill is an intrinsic value that one acquires over time and with experience: a high level of expectation that all students can learn. It was Jaime Escalante who once said, “The student will rise to the level of expectancy.” The final essential competency skill of the sextet is to possess good public relations skills, so that the DLI instructor can successfully enlist parental participation in the classroom and at home (p.23).

Lindholm-Leary (2005) emphatically adds that if these essential professional training skills are not in place, then a dual language program cannot succeed (p.23). In
addition, the contentions is made, that DLI teachers ought to consider themselves as teacher-researchers, who are skilled in the art of data collection; data analysis; self-reflection and strategic planning (p.24).

To assist the teachers in this process, Lindholm-Leary (2005) recommends developing an on-going dialogue with a local higher education facility (i.e. university), which can keep educators informed and abreast of the latest developments in the field of research. As part and parcel to the strategic planning, it is also recommended that the staff of the school attend an annual "teacher retreat," where the teachers can dialogue across grade levels, for curriculum development and implementation (p.24).

The necessity of the staff's professional training cannot be overemphasized. All training must be selected in view of the strategic goals of the program (i.e. bilingualism and biliteracy). Second to this (and probably in lieu of the continuous training), a high level of planning and articulation must be associated with the program to maintain success. This would perpetuate the cohesion, collaboration and collegiality of the staff (p.30); within a vertical planning format (i.e. cross grade levels); and horizontally (i.e. within the grade level), as
is done more popularly thru Professional learning Communities (PLC - see DuFour & Defour, et al, 2004, NES).

From a holistic perspective, this collaboration could also facilitate cross-language; cross-cultural and cross-instructional program discourse that can only help to enrich each member of the teaching team; not to mention the forging of stronger collegial bonds.

Program Development

Returning to the seven-pronged determining characteristics of an effective DLI program, the fifth one promoted by Lindholm-Leary (2005) is the program structure itself. By comparing a DLI school to any other high quality school, Lindholm-Leary (2005) specifies at least five definitive characteristics that define a quality program structure.

Quality Program Structure. First and foremost, a program must have a guiding vision and obtainable goals. It must aim at something; otherwise, it is a ship adrift in the NCLB ocean. The second determining program characteristic is having a philosophy of equity for all language groups. No single language (including English) is above another. All languages are uniquely important to the school community and share that privilege.
The third essential program characteristic is the presence of strong leadership. This does not mean that it must be vested in on single individual. As a matter of fact, it is discouraged, simply because of the possibility that if an institutional program stands or falls on the merits of one single individual, when they are gone, the program falls apart. The fourth essential program characteristic is having a process in place that allows for modification of the program. If the design of the model becomes outdated, needing modernization, or requiring refinement, it needs to have that flexibility.

The final essential program characteristic is systematic planning and implementation of the curriculum. Attention is drawn back to the situated design of the program. It must meet the needs of the school community. Therefore, the program must remain organic (p.27).

Emphasis is made of the need for a dual language program to have a clear commitment to a vision and goals that focus on bilingualism (dual language) and biliteracy (fluency in both languages), and multi-cultural competency (p.27). Successful outcomes stem from a model based on sound theory, and best and proven practices associated with
enrichment instructional programs (i.e. rigorous and challenging).

School environment. Lindholm-Leary (2005) also places heavy emphasis on the need for a "positive" school environment. Two requisites are illustrative from such an environment. The first one is a standing discipline policy that enables orderly and safe conduct. The second one is the flip-side of discipline: A healthy sense of nurture, in which the members of the school community sense that they are surrounded by warm and caring personnel (p.28).

Equity plays an important part in fostering such positive environment. In this study, equity is defined as, "The treatment of all participants with justice, fairness, and lack of prejudice (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.28)." By accepting everyone, tolerance is demonstrated, and the inclusion proliferation of diversity is accentuated. Such welcoming atmosphere enhances the self-esteem of individuals, and when a high value is placed on their ethnicity and culture, it stimulates the desire to achieve more.

Additive Bilingualism. In quoting Garcia (1988), Lindholm-Leary (2005) states, "the shared belief that all children can learn is a central operating principle, which
empowers especially ELL students (p.28)." This is reminiscent of what was cited early from Ruiz (1988), in viewing any other language other than English as an asset to be developed, rather than a hindrance to be laid aside. This illustrates the concept of additive bilingualism: The opportunity to acquire the L2 while maintaining the L1.

Additive bilingualism is contrasted with a subtractive bilingualism, which sadly is the norm in most of our schools: It enforces the replacement of the L1 with the dominant language (L2), which psychologically reduces the academic performance of ELLs. This is not an unsubstantiated accusation. Hernandez-Chavez (1984) and Lambert (1984) have documented lower levels of second language acquisition, scholastic achievement, and even psychosocial disorders in relation to the loss of the native tongue (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.28).

There are more positive benefits for ELLs (and English proficient students) who participate in a dual language education, in which both; the home language and the dominant language (which in some places of the USA it’s not always English) are developed at the same time (Carreira, M, 2000; Cheung, A. & Slavin, R. E, 2005; Christian, D. & Genesee, F, 2004; de Jong, E. J. 2002; Gómez, L, Freeman,

**Effective Leadership.** Of course, none of this would be possible without effective leadership. Lindholm-Leary (2005, p. 29) emphatically states that the principal of the school must be the main advocate for dual language (DLI) instruction (Castro Feinberg, R, 1999, as quoted in Lindholm-Leary, 2005).

The principal of the school sets the agenda for the staff each year, and allocates the funding for instructional programs within the local school site. However, a cautionary note is included, concerning a program relying solely upon one individual (again). If they leave the school site, the program dies (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p. 29). Therefore, it is suggested that a program team be established.

There could be a key person who is designated as the coordinator, whose task is three-pronged: They must act as the main advocate of the program and a liaison to the community; they must supervise the development of the DLI model to be implemented together with the planning and
coordination with other instructional models at the school. Finally, the DLI coordinator must also be a facilitator of staff collaboration, cohesion, and collegiality (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.29).

But most importantly, this team must maintain three professional requirements in order to function effectively in the capacity of leadership for a DLI program. The team must possess extensive knowledge of the language education model being implemented at their site. In other words, they must be able to communicate upon demand what the basic philosophical, fundamental, and theoretical premises of DLI are, and how the school is implementing them.

Secondly, the team must possess extensive knowledge of second language development, bilingual instruction, and emersion education theories, and be able to support their position with research (in short, they must keep themselves and their staff informed on the latest changes to bilingual education). Lastly, the team must also share a strong belief in the selected language education model chosen for their site, and also believe that it can work (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.30).

**Assessing Community Needs.** Lindholm-Leary (2005) suggests employing a needs assessment device (p.32) that
could function as a basis for a solidly informed decision making process (this particular method of data collection will be high-lighted in the methodology section of this thesis). Once the data is collected from the community and analyzed, a realistic plan can be developed.

As stated in the onset of this particular study, not all DLI models work for every community (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.9). Each community has its own set of needs. A situated approach is wise when deciding on a specific model, as it has already been demonstrated; there are differences among DLI programs.

Of particular interest is the set amount of time that will be allocated for the transition from the L1 instruction to a mostly English instruction. Some programs have early exits from the DLI model, while others prefer a late exit (Collier, V. P. & Thomas, W. P, 2002; Garcia, G. N, 2000; Howard, E. R, Sugarman, J. & Christian, D, 2007; MacSwan, J. & Pray, L, 2005). Some prefer beginning with a 90/10 allocation (especially in the lower grades), while others prefer to start with a 50/50 right from the beginning, in Kindergarten (or preschool).
Rate of Language Acquisition

In any case, only one thing can be scientifically admitted: it takes more than three years (sometimes even up to ten years), as cited earlier by Haynes (2007); and a minimum of five to seven years for second language learners to acquire the academic standards in another language. This hypothesis corroborates with the seminal research conducted by Krashen (Krashen, S, 1981; 2003) and Jim Cummins (1979) on language acquisition.

Lindholm-Leary (2005) cites a study conducted by the state of California, in reference to 1.3 million ELLs, whom showed that after seven years of instruction, only half of the students had been reclassified from ELLs to fluent English proficient (FEP) - (Hill, 2004). The key to any language program’s success is sustained consistency. According to Thomas / Collier (2002), if a student receives less than four years in a successful program, they will not achieve grade-level requirements (p. 334).

The language program must not necessarily be one that is set in stone (as it has already been argued), but rather one that has a well-established structure upon which it can build (i.e. scaffolding). A framework must be present, but the program must remain organic, so that it can change with
the times and adjust to the needs of the community, which will also change.

Regardless of how much initial time is pre-selected for the L1 instruction (90% or 50%); there is a general consensus that the instruction time must be 10% or more in English, but no more than 50%. Just as important is the amount of participating English language proficient (ELPs) students present in the classroom. The amount of ELP students in the classroom must be no less than 50% at any given time (Lindholm-Leary, K. J, 2005, p.34. - Also, Carrera-Carrillo, L. & Rickert Smith, A, 2006; Christian, D. & Genesee, F, 2004; de Jong, E. J, 2002; Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. et al, 2005; Howard, E. R, Sugarman, J. & Christian, D, 2003; Kerper Mora, J. et al, 2001; Thomas, W. & Collier, V, 2002).

Lindholm-Leary (2005) does point out some research that supports an initial emphasis on the use of the native language, verses English. She states,

To promote the prestige of the non-English language and counteract the dominant status of the mainstream society’s language, the non-English language must receive more focus
in the early stages of an immersion program. (p.35)

There is much empirical evidence to substantiate the argument that students who become literate in their home language (and maintain it), score higher on standardized test scores than students who were merely exposed to English-only instruction (Arlington Public Schools, 1997; de Jong, E. J, 2004; Laija-Rodríguez, et al, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, K. J, 2005; López, M. G. & Tashakkori, A, 2004; Slavin, R. & Cheung, A, 2005; Thomas, W. & Collier, V, 2002). It just makes common sense to instruct a child with academic content in a language with which they already have a pre-existing familiarity, which leads to comprehension (as Krashen would argue).

Lindholm-Leary (2005) even goes so far as to say that if a child does not become proficient in literacy with their native language before they reach the second or third grade, they may never choose to read in their native tongue for pleasure (p.36). Not only would it be a great loss of familial culture, but it will also severely limit that student's potential in a global market place. In an earlier part Lindholm-Leary (2005) states,
Research demonstrates that the less socially prestigious and powerful a language is in a society, the one most subjected to language loss. (citing Pease-Alvarez, 1993; Portes & Hao, 1998; and Veltman, 1998, p.35)

Of the remaining two seven-pronged determining characteristics of an effective DLI program that Lindholm-Leary (2005) outlines, the one that is most significant (and ironically the least analyzed by her) would be the crucial role that the family and community play in the child’s education.

Family and Community. Involvement of the family and community is foundational to any educational enterprise. Parents’ involvement communicates efficacy with positive academic results (Gonzalez, N, 1993; Osterling, J. P, 2001; Smith, P. H, 2001). This is substantiated by various studies that have looked at the importance of the parents’ interest in their own child’s education (Hill, N.E. et al, 2004; Reynolds, A. J. et al, 2007; Texas Department of Education, Center for Public Policy, 1999). But it is even more significant with ELLs (Cloud et al, 2000; Met &

It does not require a great amount of academic background, nor does it require the ability to speak in English. It can be as simple as readying to the child, reading with the child, or simply listening to the child read aloud (Adams, M.J, 1990; Alexander, P. A. & Fox, E, 2004; Pressley, M, 2001; Sénéchal, M, 2006; The Partnership for Reading [No date]).

The parents don’t even have to be present at the school site as volunteers; as much as that is desired. Some studies indicate that the involvement parents have at home; assisting with homework and reading (Ryan, M, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2005; Walker, J. M. T. et al, 2004), has significant more impact than the physical presence at school. However, the presence of another adult in the classroom is a great deterrent of misbehavior. It also goes without saying, that if the child is acquiring English from their educational environment, so will the parent.

One way to engage the parents and students alike is thru the curriculum selection process. The team develops and implements it, but it’s the community support that
enables it. This is a sentiment echoed in the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez study (2002, p.15).

Another factor that is absent from the Lindholm-Leary (2005) study, is the effect of the living history available thru the community by agency of their elders (Gonzalez, N, 1993; Gruenewald, D. A, 2003; Smith, P. H. & Arnot-Hopffer, E, 1998; Smith, P. H, 2001). It is even more prominent when the people of the community are employed in the system of the school, since this provides a natural “bridging” to the population of the community itself, and it authenticates the value of the multi-cultural heritage available within the community (Smith, P. H, 2001, p.263). Situated referencing and Elder traditions are critical factors often overlooked in language-based education models, which seek a multicultural inclusivity.

Support System. The final characteristic of the seven-pronged determining characteristics of an effective DLI program that Lindholm-Leary (2005) outlines, is the support system that will help maintain the DLI program at the school. The attitude perceived from the authority level of a school institution (i.e. district office; state authorities; federal legislation) severely affects the performance of a DLI program.
It goes without saying, that none of this is possible without the effective ability of the program leadership team's (or school principal) ability to secure necessary funding, or resources for the maintenance of the program. Here's where the talent of the community liaison comes into play. With enough public support for the program, the district management or policy makers will be more willing to listen.

Lindholm-Leary (2005) re-emphasizes the critical importance of the principal of the school site in advocacy and resource allocation. She cites Troike (1986) in pointing out that successful language programs are those in which there is vertical unanimity (from the district office down to the local school site) in regards to bilingual education; where it is viewed as integral to the success of student achievement, instead of a temporary attempt to remediate something broken. As mentioned earlier, a systematic restructuring of the educational system needs to be considered.

Fortunately, most parents who are politically involved in their child's education will side with the evidentiary results that the program indeed works. Given
enough time, talent, and treasure, a DLI program will demonstrate documented success.

Even though the law may require the inclusion of a language program (Title III), the negative attitude towards it will limit the funding for it; the adequate staffing for it; the strong leadership to support it, and ultimately its eventual demise (Troike, 1986; Willig, 1985, as cited by Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.42).

In the methodology portion of this thesis, a modified version of DLI which requires little-to-no initial expense will be clearly illustrated. In times like the present, in which budget cuts eliminate much of the capita resource, it is prudent for resourceful educators to strategize on alternative methods for adequately instructing ELLs.

Critical Observations of Two-way Immersion Methods

The strengths have pretty much been established in defense of asserting the DLI model. But an honest approach demands that the negative, or more accurately stated; the detracting aspects of it be discussed. Basically, there are three main complaints hoisted against the DLI model: The time it takes to achieve academic proficiency; the amount of money it requires to be implemented effectively; and the political implications of adopting such programs.
Protestors say it takes too long to produce an outcome that is exemplary of the program (5-7 years). Penny-pincher primarily complain because it requires a significant amount of resources; for staffing; for materials and, space accommodations. Politically conscious people (a great majority of the voting American population) are adamantly against bilingual education, on the grounds that it promotes a disinterest in learning the national language of English; deterring citizens from assimilating into the dominant culture, and even splitting loyalties towards their country, in favor of ancestral origins.

It has already been discussed what qualities are desired in DLI instructors, which can be a great deterrent to someone who is not already familiar with the minority language of choice (e.g. Spanish, French). Another factor is the tendency of the American population to run impatient, and demand instant results. But like any good wine, DLI programs take time and patience. But, oh! The sweet taste of it once the bottle is uncorked! Ironically, most uninformed Hispanic citizens (whether they are naturalized or state-born), tend to disagree with the process of DLI for the same reason as their politically
informed co-patriots: they simply don’t have the patience to wait and see the results.

Synthesis of the Literature Review

Surely, the benefits for the population that a DLI program serves, far-outweigh the mentioned detractors. In her concluding remarks, Lindholm-Leary (2005) asserts that the seven features summarized in her literature review serve as an “effective framework” for language education programs (p.44), regardless of the type of language or location. She also reiterates that, “not all features will necessarily be appropriate in the same way for all programs (p.44).” This is an argument in favor of the organic method in which the planning of such programs must follow to suit its local environment.

Likewise the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) study emphasizes that they did not approach their review of established programs by using a preset standard of characteristics and criteria, but rather, “the criteria emerged by observing and learning from programs that had evidence of achievement for all students (p.19).”

However, Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) do add that their observations can now be used as a frame of reference for schools that are deciding on establishing
dual-language instruction programs; or that may already have a program in place, but it is not being run effectively. They emphatically state that there is always "room for improvement," which again; argues for the organic status of any language program.

Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) do strongly advice that every program maintains a rigorous system of assessment accountability. If it is succeeding, the school will have a reason to celebrate. If it is experiencing difficulties, it will serve as a springboard for finding the areas of weakness, and reinforcing them. In their final analysis Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) state, "student achievement is the ultimate criterion that determines the effectiveness of a program model (p.19)."

Of the three main documents reviewed, Thomas / Collier (2002) provides the most documentation of what the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) study emphasized: academic accountability by means of systematic assessments. Thomas / Collier (2002) observed that of the five school districts examined across the nation, they were all making good "attempts" in addressing the four components of developmental processes that every school-age child goes thru: 1) sociocultural development; 2) linguistic
development; 3) cognitive development; and 4) academic development (p.324). They contend that all four of these dimensions fit within their “Prism Model” for language programs (Thomas / Collier, in Ovando & Collier, 1998, p.89). They state, “These processes develop subconsciously, occur simultaneously, and are independent (p.324).” They reassert the golden standard observed in all dual language programs (DLI), namely the opportunity to develop all four dimensions already mentioned above, in both; their home language and in English (or French, as the case may be for the dominant language of the local community). Thomas / Collier (2002) also advice, that each school context will be different (agreeing with Lindholm-Leary, 2005). Therefore, flexibility in program design in situated learning is an absolute.

Conclusions

This thesis puts forth the concept that the flexibility recommended by the expert opinion of the aforementioned researchers, can be attained at any grade level, thru a modified model. It also promotes the core value of the dual language instruction (DLI) philosophy, of bilingualism and biliteracy without the requirement of a separate language teacher in the classroom (or instruct-
tional aide). It circumvents the preconceived financial hardships required of an effective DLI program, and in fact asserts that the program won’t cost anything to the school, except for what is already provided. Any necessary hardware that would be essential to this modified model of DLI can be obtained from donations of local community businesses. About the only necessary requirement for this modified model of DLI is the full inclusion of the parents and siblings in the process of language acquisition.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Two-way Immersion in Practice

The guiding question throughout this investigation has been, "which methodology is best suited for teaching academic content to students learning English in our public schools?" The methodology for this study will examine one exemplary model of effective implementation defined as the Dual Language (DLI), or Two Way Immersion (TWI) program. Although the documentation presented thus far may be interpreted as comprehensive, in this section a more simplistic, modified model of what has been presented will be described.

It will be shown how such a modified version of a DLI program can be easily incorporated into any school system by the use of "Book Bags," and at the same time, incorporate active members of the local community as a whole, and members of an academic community in part. This has been carefully documented in the work accomplished in a Canadian rural district under the supervision of Jim Cummins (2003).
It is Cummins original study on language acquisition (along with the work of Stephen Krashen) that has served as the catalyst of foundational design and implementation for many language instruction models (Cummins, 1979/1986; Hakuta, K, 2003; Robertson, P, 2002).

The setting for this modified model of a DLI program is the Elementary School of Thornwood, Mississauga, CAN. The entire school staff, students and community volunteers, participated in a professional collaboration between the school and the University of Ontario researchers (Cummins, et al, 2003), to formulate and establish an environment in which ELL’s were allowed to construct their own literacy devices, along with their English Language Acquisition.

Jim Cummins (2003) and his associates approached the task by asking themselves probing questions. The first guiding question proposed was, what do teachers need to know to teach effectively in linguistically and culturally diverse contexts? (Fitts, S, 2006; Gómez, L, 2000; Gutiérrez, K. D. & Rogoff, B, 2003). The second guiding question was how long does it take second language learners to acquire proficiency in the academic languages of school instruction? (Garcia, G. N, 2000; Krashen, S, 2004; MacSwan, J. & Pray, L, 2005). The third guiding question
was, what are the differences between attaining conversational fluency in everyday contexts, or as Cummins has proposed; basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS), and developing proficiency in the language registers required for academic success, or cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALPS), as Cummins has also proposed? (Cummins, J, 1979).

The fourth guiding question was, what steps should schools take to include parents and other caregivers, whose knowledge of the school language may be limited? How can the school community make the parents feel as though they are indeed partners in their children’s education? (Cummins et al, 2003, pp.1,2; Gonzalez, N. et al, 1993; Mathews, J, 2006).

By taking a brief look at what they did in Thornwood Elementary, and why they chose to approach the issue of student diversity in the way they did; and finally analyze the theoretical methodology that inspired their success, this model can be replicated in any other school community around the world, were Spanish, or any other language is spoken.
Design of the Investigation

In order to answer the first guiding question that the Cummins team proposed (2003, p.1), the team had to determine how many languages were actually represented at Thornwood Elementary. The school boasts a population of diverse ethnicity and cultures. The staff had initially thought they were serving a community with fifteen different languages, but after conducting a language survey, they discovered about forty different languages (Cummins, 2003, p.37).

It is not fiscally possible, nor is it practical to try to provide assistance for all these different language groups as outlined in a typical dual language immersion (DLI) program. This is typically the same problem encountered in metropolitan regions with high population density. The likelihood of their being a multiplicity of languages is pretty high.

In what follows, the DLI Cummins model (2003) at Thornwood Elementary will be compared to the comprehensive literature review presented by Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005), to examine if the Thornwood DLI initiative actually meets all the necessary parameters for language acquisition as presented by Cummins team (2003). The effectiveness of
the model will also be analyzed, in order that it may be assessed as a good two-way immersion (TWI) model to be imitated (in this thesis, dual language immersion and two-way immersion will be used as synonymous terms).

The Cummins research team introduces a theory of Interpersonal Space for Cognitive Engagement (see Appendix I, Fig.2) that facilitates this process and promotes academic progress as well. But it must require a reversal of roles, in which the teachers sees themselves as active learners of culture and language, and the students as partners in learning (Cummins et al, 2003, pp.10-11).

Cummins suggests proceeding in three phases, depending on the progress of the students. The first phase is to focus on language meaning (comprehensible input; critical literacy). The second phase is to focus on language use (generating new knowledge; creating original literature). The third phase is to focus on the concept of language as a whole (awareness and critical analysis). Cummins (2003) contends that this method can help students process meaningful language concepts, deepen their awareness of how their own language works, and learn how to employ that new knowledge in powerful ways to connect with people (p.12). This is critical literacy in practice (p.13).
By providing students with meaningful situations for producing significant writing, and giving real reasons for reading; language opportunities are harvested (that is, every available opportunity is taken to extend the comprehension of language), enabling students to use language powerfully and effectively in their own speaking and writing (p.15).

Although Lindholm-Leary’s (2005) first requirement of assessment and accountability is never addressed in Cummins’ model, the focus at Thornwood was language development initially, not academic proficiency. This is in keeping with Cummins’ (2003) three phase methodology of meaning, use, and then [formal] language. This is also congruent with Krashen’s recommendations of keeping things simple for new-comers, who have no prior experience with the academic language of instruction (Krashen, 2003).

In Lindholm-Leary’s (2005) second characteristic of curriculum development, we find that Cummins’ team (2003) kept the “spirit” of the essential ingredients. In the Thornwood initiative, the team decided to establish what their common sets of beliefs were. They kept it simple, small, and manageable. As a team, they agreed on a commitment to build a stronger home-to-school connection
(this falls in line with Lindholm-Leary’s sixth characteristic of family and community involvement). The Cummins’ team (2003) also agreed on the belief that reading in any language develops a student’s reading ability (which is more related to Lindholm-Leary’s third characteristic of instructional practices). The Cummins’ team (2003) also shared a mutual desire to engage parents in reading with their children at home, with shared literacy experiences (again, supporting Lindholm-Leary’s (2005) sixth characteristic of family and community involvement) — (Cummins et al, 2003, p. 34).

**Book-bags: Tools for Biliteracy**

The most practical vehicle for promoting this function was the formation of “Book Bags.” These bags were equipped with dual-language books and cassette tape players, on which the whole family could participate in the experience of listening to pre-recorded narrations of the books in the bag, in both languages (Cummins et al, 2003, p. 35; Ernst-Slavit, G, & Mulhern, M, 2003). This flows very well with Lindholm-Leary’s recommendations for curriculum development, in that she calls for meaningful and academically challenging activities that promote thematic integration.
across curricular strands, as an enriching experience (Lindholm-Leary, 2005, p.12).

The Cummins team (2003) decided once again to survey the parents in the community of Thornwood Elementary, to discern if there was at least an interest in the project. They received 291 completed questionnaires in return (p.36), which again, coincides with Lindholm-Leary’s emphasis on family and community involvement. The Cummins team (2003) stated,

Parents expressed an interest in a program that would support their children’s acquisition of the English language and also support their desire to have their children maintain their first language and culture. (p.36)

By providing a feasible method of language acquisition in the form of the Book Bags, which contained dual-language texts; both, students and parents would be able to increase their exposure to English Language vocabulary and associate them to familiar vocabulary terms in their native tongue.

Participating students and parents would also adapt themselves to the grammatical structure of the English language by viewing it in print. Effectually, the listening
of the tapes and the viewing of the books would accomplish the language skill of transferring comprehension (Adams, M. J, 1990; Riccio, C. A. et al, 2001) from the first or native language (L1), to the newly adopted language (L2).

Although the strict adherence of English language proficient speakers (ELP) is not maintained directly with this format (that is, inclusion of at least 50% of the student classroom make-up), which is one of the main stipulations of dual language immersion (DLI); the theory is kept in essence. By having the accompanying tape to play along with the book reading, both student and parent are still being exposed to the authentic modeling of the English speech. This practice is in keeping with the third characteristic proposed by Lindholm-Leary (2005), for instructional practices.

In order to put together these Book Bags, the Cummins team had to carefully select culturally-rich texts that would be reflective of the community the school served. This would fall under the category of support and resources, which is the seventh characteristic proposed by Lindholm-Leary (2005). The support aspect in the seven-pronged essentials is probably the one that will be the least dependable, due to finances.
The process of selecting high-quality bilingual texts is not an easy endeavor. Thankfully, other researchers have taken up the task of formulating culturally authentic literary evaluation tools, that can help out any educator perform this daunting job. For example, Higgins (2002) prepared an evaluation checklist designed to judge if a multicultural children’s picture book was actually authentic and of good quality (see Appendix H for modified version).

Higgins also recommends the works of Day (1994), Sims & Bishop (1992); and Slapin, Seale and Gonzales (1992), to name a few, as resources for developing a personal evaluation tool to be used when selecting reading books for the classroom, possessing exemplary authenticity and quality for the students. Multi-cultural books ought to be carefully evaluated for ethnic stereotypes, negative images of cultural groups, and literary quality (Higgins, 2002). Since most of the books had to be ordered by correspondence, this left a very anxious student body at Thornwood waiting on the sidelines, sort of speaking. Not wanting to disappoint them, the Thornwood teachers decided to allow the students to produce their own books. This simple academic practice accomplishes a great deal, and at a
minimum cost to the school (which would eliminate the expensive and arduous task of locating the costly and hard to find books).

The Thornwood teachers encouraged their students to first write out the text of their narrative in their home language. Older siblings or cross-age bilingual peer students were welcomed into the classroom, to facilitate translations of the text. This taught the students that writing is a process that takes time and lots of effort, but its worth the labor (Bear, D. et al, 2006; Knipper, K. J. & Duggan, T. J, 2006; Rubin, R. & Galván Carlan, V, 2005).

Also, parents were encouraged to volunteer in the classrooms, reading these books in their native language, to primary grades, as well as serving as translators and narrators on tape for the student’s original compositions (Cummins et al, 2003, p. 41). As Lindholm-Leary (2005) highlighted in her comments of using Reciprocal teaching methods in the instruction, this would require a reversal of roles in which the student ends up teaching the home-room teacher about their language and culture (Cummins, J. et al, 2006; Gutiérrez, K. D. & Rogoff, B, 2003; Van Sluys, K. and Reiner, R, 2006). This type of curricular planning
certainly meets the quadratic expectations set forth by Lindholm-Leary (2005): level adjustments, relevance of theme, sufficient quantity of content (indeed, what more bounty can a teacher have than student created literature?), and academic challenge (they do struggle thru the language acquisition process).

As far as the fourth characteristic of professional staff development proposed by Lindholm-Leary (2005), the staff would require weekly meetings of vertical trouble shooting (across grade levels), as well as systematic horizontal planning (within grade level). In these meetings, strategies for reading/writing instruction (literacy) specifically designed to address the needs of ELLs can be shared. Professional growth would result from such collegial associations (Francis, D. J, & Rivera, M. et al, Graves, M. F, 2006; Reed, B. & Railsback, J, 2003).

The Cummins' team (2003) viewed the multiplicity of languages as an additive to education. By doing so, this communicated to the community that the school entity (a symbol of the establishment of authority) valued the wealth of the student’s first language, and saw it as a vehicle for promoting the student’s second language acquisition and literacy skills (Cummins et al, 2003, pp.49-50).
In conclusion, it would suffice to quote the dual-language initiative team’s own assessment of the outcome, We attempted to go to the deep structure of our pedagogical mandate by affirming the identities of students, involving parents as powerful contributors to their children’s learning, and ensuring that all students become cognitively engaged in the learning process. (Cummins et al, 2003, p.54)

English language acquisition is something that happens naturally for the students, as they employ their monitoring skills to their original work in their native tongue, and transfer that comprehensible knowledge into their second language (Krashen, 2003). The Learning environment created at Thornwood Elementary affectively allowed this to happen, by giving the impression that the prior knowledge the students brought to this school was valid and important, and something worth sharing with others (Cummins, et al, 2003, p. 49).

By supplying printed materials to the community members in a language that they understood, the school was facilitating comprehension with meaningful input (Krashen, 2004). By high-lighting the use of native tongues, the
dual-language initiative adopted by Thornwood demonstrated how an open-door policy of welcoming community human resources is more inclusive. However, the Cummins team (2003) admittedly declare that the inclusive attitude displayed at Thornwood, incorporates the other two views expressed by Ruiz (1988) indirectly (language as a right and language as a problem). By looking at the problem of how to teach a collective group of students from diverse cultural backgrounds and multiplicity of languages as a challenge rather than an obstacle, the language as a problem view was dissolved.

By accepting and adopting a DLI model as an instructional program, the Cummins team also eliminated any possible discrimination that could arise from depriving the students from their right of using a language that is comprehensible in the classroom. Our fundamental right of freedom of expression has yet to be included in the discussion of legal issues concerning bilingual education in the USA.

As mentioned earlier, in order to make the input comprehensible, it needs to hold a high interest of meaning to the student (Smith & Wilhelm, 2006). This hurdle is overcome by the simple fact that the student is able to
understand their home language easier, and will find accepting English more feasible because of the equity of shared space on the printed page.

**Population Sample Selection**

As mentioned in chapter one, it is estimated that by the year 2020, one out of every two students in the United States will be a person of color (Banks, 1991 - As quoted in Dietrich, 1995). This time-line is not that far off. According to the last census taken by the government in 2000 (census records are collected every ten years, or so. We should be conducting another one in 2010), the Hispanic community is the largest minority in the nation, with a percentage of 12 overall. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the Institute of Education Sciences, by the middle of the twenty-first century, Hispanics are expected to comprise nearly a quarter of the population in the USA (NCES, 2003).

Therefore, the focus of this thesis is to address the needs of students from origins of Spanish speaking countries who populate the schools of the Desert Sands Unified School District (DSUSD) in the Coachella Valley of Southern California. DSUSD serves approximately 7,197 English language learners (ELLs); of which 7,027 are
identified as Spanish speakers (California Department of Education (CDE), 2007).

The author of this thesis currently works at the elementary school of Lyndon B. Johnson, in the suburb city of Indio, CA. The school is under the jurisdiction of DSUSD. Lyndon B. Johnson presently serves about 269 ELLs; all of them identified as Spanish speakers (CDE, 2007). For the past 13 years, the author of this thesis has been involved in the process of educating ELL’s. Frequently, he has hosted a minority group of students (four to five at a time) who are technically classified as levels 1 and 2 of their English language acquisition (ELA) by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), which places them at a beginning, or early emergent learner level of ELA (see Appendix B).

Although the curriculum has been amply supplied and provided by DSUSD, the needs of the students far out-weigh the effectiveness of the ELD and ESL programs designated by the district for such students. This has left the author of this thesis at a loss for resources and needless to say, frustrated with the results of the student’s test scores on the California Standardized Tests (CST’s). In search of alternative methods of instruction for this demographic
group of ELLs, he has found what he considers to be the best and most flexible alternative model of instruction for these students: the dual language initiative of Thornwood Elementary designed and conducted by Cummins et al (2003).

A wonderful discovery was made while conducting research of other schools in Canada, who were confronted by similar dilemmas (meeting the needs of ELLs), and successfully garnered a proficient level of language acquisition for their English language learners (ELL’s), in collaboration of researchers from the local university, and the cooperation of their local community.

The required reading of an article by Cummins et al (2006), led to an on-line enquiry of the dual language initiative program in Thornwood elementary (http://thornwood.peelschools.org/Dual/index.htm). The Cummins et al (2003) research team had actually documented all of the procedures; prior, during and post a dual-language initiative program; and consolidated all the data in a book (Multilingual education in practice: using diversity as a resource, Heinemann, 2003). The book was quickly purchase, and all of its contents consume. It was decided then to attempt to replicate that particular DLI model, here in California.
The next step was to try to acquire as many copies from the resource list included in the book, from free, on-line sources. In the process, many of these resource findings lead to others, in chain-link fashion. Most of these resources are referenced in this thesis paper. The hope is that it would help direct the search for any interested party, who wishes to conduct such endeavor. Some recommendations on how to replicate the Thornwood model will be offered in recommendations of the final chapter.

Procedures Selection

Stephen Krashen provides us with a road map for effectually accomplishing what the Cummins team was able to perform in the elementary school of Thornwood, in a rural province of Canada. Krashen (2003) suggest for beginning levels of language acquisition, to use a lot of visuals, and real artifacts he calls “realia,” and to encourage student participation in learning through total physical response (TPR).

Krashen recommends that teachers modify their speech to make input more comprehensible by simplification, and plan lessons that contain a high level of interest for these students. This is what is referred to as, “going with the flow,” by Smith & Wilhelm (2006): providing students
with a sense of control and competence over their own learning, a challenge that requires an appropriate level of skill, along with clear goals and feedback, with a focus on the immediate experience.

By employing the academic skill of writing and reading, academic instruction appropriate to grade level will be provided, and the students will be encouraged to develop their literacy skills through the daily writing experience known as journal entries. The students should be allowed to write in their native tongue, but also receive the necessary resources, such as illustrated bilingual dictionaries in English and Spanish, as well as English Thesaurus’ and material supplied through the local school district for ELD instruction, including visuals (pictures) and recorded sound tracks of books on tape.

Attempts should be made to include multilingual and bilingual published material from trademark publishers, which can be obtained from local libraries as well as the school library. The example of these books would promote the student’s production of such materials to build an authentic classroom library that is student created and multilingual.
An effort should be made to recruit parent volunteers to assist in the development and ultimate publication of said student-made materials, by acting as translation tutors, literature lectors and recorders of audio multilingual narrations, to be used in the classroom as well as the community at large.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Presentation of the Findings

The critical issue in adopting a stance for the encouragement of establishing alternative methods of instruction for ELLs must be based on final outcomes of existing programs. The question to be answered is always, “will it work?” - This is the bottom line for most interested parties; from the political, to the administrative, even down to the family unit network.

The documentation reviewed has demonstrated that the practice of dual language instruction (DLI) promotes effective and enduring results. The systematic and holistic approach of combining community resources with the best of tested methods, and the most qualified personnel to deliver the academic instruction has yielded phenomenal results.

Thomas / Collier’s work (2002 & 2004) provides us with the evidence of the outcome; the results from DLI across our nation. From the elementary to the secondary levels, DLI does work. The skeptics cannot challenge the documentation.
Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) contextualizes the setting for the positive and effective results from a DLI model. The school is not the sole entity of change in the local community. It just happens to be the "hub" to which the community attends, in order that the primary focus of the school’s purpose takes place: educating the residents of a community in which the dominant language is not English. The Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) research team does include organic characteristics that were identified in the high achieving schools they selected to high-light in their study, which were not mentioned earlier. They are included in this portion of the thesis for clarity of the present discussion (i.e. what works).

Lindholm-Leary (2005) gives us a strategic frame work from which to begin building and designing a DLI program. The seven essential components proposed by Lindholm-Leary (2005) make this task a manageable one. Although this study is not the only one of its kind, it was determined to be the most comprehensive of the most recent research documents published to date.

**Descriptions of Dual Language Immersion Models**

[The following descriptions are derived from the Thomas/Collier (2002) study]
Transitional Bilingual Education Model. The first model is a 50/50 transitional bilingual education model, in which 50% of the instruction is in the L1 and 50% of the instruction is in the L2 (or English) for 3-4 years, followed by immersion in the English mainstream. The second model is a 90/10 transitional bilingual education model, in which 90% of the instruction is in the L1 and 10% of the instruction is in the L2, gradually increasing the instruction in English, until it reaches a 50% share of instruction in content areas in English, until fifth grade. In most cases, the 50/50 pattern remains throughout the formative education of ELLs in their secondary years.

Developmental Bilingual Education Model. The third model is a 50/50 one-way developmental bilingual education model. A one-way program is one language group being instructed in two languages (i.e. Hispanic ELLs). The fourth model is a 90/10 one-way developmental bilingual education model, in which 90% of the instruction is in the L1 gradually increasing English Instruction to 50% by fifth grade and remaining for the rest of their formative grades.

Bilingual Immersion Education Model. The fifth model is a 50/50 two-way bilingual immersion education model. This particular model is viewed in this thesis paper as
being the most efficient one, in which two language groups receive integrated schooling through their two languages (i.e. Spanish and English) in a shared 50% of the time; never mixing or translating the instruction, but maintaining the integrity of one language at a time. The sixth model is a 90/10 two-way bilingual immersion education model (already addressed in the previous descriptions above).

**Sheltered English Immersion Model.** English as a second language (ESL) and English mainstream are the subsequent seventh and eighth models observed (see Appendix E for more detail). The California State Department of Educations' ELL Guidebook (2002) recognizes Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), or structured English immersion (SEI) as synonymous terms for this instructional model. SEI models are defined as content-based instruction in English, incorporating contextual clues, such as gestures, visual aids and any authentic experience-based examples during the guided and direct instruction methods.

**Conclusive Findings**

Thomas / Collier’s (2002 & 2004) conclusive statement is worth repeating: DLI programs are the only one’s found to date that assist students in reaching the 50th percentile
norm (p.7), or reach even higher levels in both L1 and L2 in all subjects. The key element is the time requirement

We propose that all future research on instructional effectiveness in this field emphasize long-term, longitudinal analyses with associated measures of effect size as well as shorter-term, cross-sectional analyses. (p.9)

The researchers did not come to this conclusion based on a single attempt to prove their thesis. It was based on three major studies conducted over a period of seven years (1997; 2002, and 2004). In their first collaboration, Thomas / Collier (1997) surveyed an even larger pool of student results from standardized testing than they did in their more popular study conducted in 2002. After analyzing over 700,000 records of ELLs collected from 1982-1996, Thomas / Collier (1997) propose the Prism Model, which outlines four major components that propel the acquisition of English language: the school's sociocultural environment, linguistic skills, academic program, and cognitive processes (pp. 42, 43).

These four major components can be viewed as the four walls that make up the "shelter" in which effective DLI
programs can prosper unhindered. But all four components must be in place for the DLI program to be successful.

**Thomas / Collier’s Prism Model**

The Sociocultural structure of the school must be one that is inclusive and tolerant of all ethnic and cultural back grounds. According to Gorski (1995) there are seven characteristics of multicultural education: delivery of content, sensitivity of content, materials and methodology, multiplicity of perspectives, critical inclusivity, social and civic responsibility, and assessment accountability. Such was the case in the long-lasting tradition of the Oyster Elementary School, in Washington D.C.

With an emphasis on the linguistic aspect of education, the instruction is heavily designed and programmed to enhance and develop the four aspects of language: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With a language-based curriculum in place, the acquisition of the second language (e.g. English) is more readily accepted by the ELL student, since the school environment is set up to be a literacy community of learners (Gibbons, 2002).

The academic instruction is rigorous by default. When a student is forced to produce a literary piece of
information (whether it be with a math, science, history, or arts theme), they cannot mask it by filling-out a random, multiple choice test; which only serves to denote what a student does not know. By contrast, when a student has to express their thoughts in writing by using academic terminology, and re-phrasing it in their own understanding, an instructor can tell instantly if the student understood the lesson taught, and if they attained mastery of the academic skill or strategy taught (Popham, 2005). This in turn leads into the fourth and final component of the Thomas / Collier (1997) Prism Model: cognitive processes.

Literary development of language accelerates the comprehension of academic language acquisition. It engages all aspects of the brain (Genesee, F, 2001; Haritos & Nelson, 2001; Manzo, 2006; Riccio, 2001). It helps the ELL student develop synopsis connections that would not take place otherwise. There have even been studies that tend to indicate, that ELLs will outperform their contemporaries in graduate and post graduate course work, simply by possessing the ability to think in two different languages (Llagas / Snyder, 2003; Thomas / Collier, 2002).
Statistical results from Thomas / Collier

Thomas / Collier (2002) looked primarily at the results from the reading comprehension sections on standardized tests. This study is significant in the fact that it tracked a population of students in five different regional school districts, from the time the students first enter the school system, until they exited the upper elementary (fifth) grade (p.12). The size of the sample group is also significant. The researchers collected 210,054 student records.

Over eighty different primary languages were represented in this study. The researchers also point out that seventy five percent of these ELLs are primarily Spanish speaking students. Thomas / Collier (2002) synthesized their findings into eight different instructional models, as stated above (these models are further summarized in Appendix E, under Oregon State).

They classified the program into which the students were placed, and compared the outcomes from each program’s effectiveness of promoting the acquisition of English in ELLs. The summary results concluded that:

ELLs placed in English mainstream classes had a large drop in their reading and math scores by the time they
reached the fifth grade. This group also had the largest number of dropouts in High School, and those remaining finished 11th grade at the 25th NCE (p.2). For ELLs who participated in ESL content classes for a minimum of 2-3 years, followed-up by immersion into English mainstream, and graduated from High School; their scores in reading and math ranged from the 31st to the 40th NCE (p.2).

ELLs who received 50 percent of their content instruction in English and 50 percent of their content instruction in Spanish in a transitional bilingual educational program for 3-4 years, and then transferred into English mainstream, achieved the 47th NCE by the end of their junior year in High School (p.3). Those who began their transitional bilingual education in a 90/10 instructional program achieved a little bit less (40th NCE) by the time they reached 5th grade (we recall that 90% means instructional time in minority language, while 10% means instruction time English language).

ELLs place in a one-way 90/10 developmental bilingual program only attained one more percentile (41st NCE), but those who went through the 50/50 one-way developmental bilingual program for a duration of four years scored the
highest of all the groups tracked (62⁴ NCE - though they were from high performing schools, p. 3).

ELLs placed in a 90/10 two-way bilingual immersion program performed above grade level (normative standard) by the end of 5ᵗʰ grade at the 5¹ˢᵗ NCE. Those placed in a 50/50 two-way bilingual immersion program performed significantly higher than the previous group (58% of these students met or exceeded Oregon state standards in English reading by the end of 3ʳᵈ and 5ᵗʰ grades; although they are a high-mobility, high-poverty student population, p. 3).

When these same students were allowed to test in Spanish in the same subject areas, “In reading achievement across the curriculum, native-Spanish speakers outperformed native-English speakers for Grades 1-8, regardless of the type of bilingual program the students received, p. 4).”

**Conclusion from the Thomas / Collier Study**

Conclusively, the Thomas / Collier (2002) study reveals that students can perform up to the level of expectancy when they are provided with the necessary linguistic tools that facilitate comprehension. Although the results don’t prove an outcome that may seem acceptable (near, or above the 5⁰ᵗʰ percentile in NCE), this is the normative
standard that the federal government has set for grade level proficiency, which is what is demanded by the public.

Criticism of the Thomas / Collier Study

Although there seems to be no apparent difference among each DLI program other than the amount of language instruction time, one cautionary note must be included at this juncture: not all schools had the same demographic or social-economic status (SES); and neither were all students tracked from the same grade levels; but rather of multiple grade levels. This has been a grave criticism levied against this study (Krashen, S, 2004; Slavin, R. & Cheung, A, 2005).

Other studies produced which vigorously contend against the practice of bilingual education as a whole have also used the Thomas / Collier study (2002) to argue their cause (Medina, L. 2003). In counter-argument to this criticism, it could also be argued that the federal government views a 50th percentile as normative, or proficient, on a bell curve scale. It is important to keep this in mind whenever reviewing statistical results when compared to standardized benchmarks required by the federal government, since they are the entity which sets the bar for academic proficiency.
This is the cornerstone argument in education: can a student meet or exceed standardized benchmarks, and by doing so proof their academic success. It is recognized that no single student can achieve success all on their own. It requires the collective participation of all interested parties (academic community, familial community, and governmental authorities) to assist the student and remediate when ever necessary. In lieu of this argument, we proceed with the summary of the second quantitative study of Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002).

**Systematic Components for Success in a Dual Language Immersion Program**

The guiding question that propelled the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) study was, “What contributed to the success of a bilingual education classroom as evidenced by LEP student academic achievement?” (p.3). Unlike the previous study (Thomas / Collier, 2002); Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) only used a range of three year observation, although they began with a set of norms compiled over a period of twenty five years.

In addition to the guiding question, they also considered other factors that would indicate a “successful”
program (success being identified as, “evidence of academic achievement” - compared to district and/or state standards - for LEP students in bilingual education programs). They looked at student outcomes for oral and written language proficiency by LEP (limited English proficient) and non-LEP percentages (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 1999). They also looked at student outcomes for content area mastery in English and the native language, by LEP and non-LEP percentages (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 1999).

**Highly Effective School Environment**

Eight elementary schools, two high schools, and one middle school participated in the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) research study. The participating schools were identified by eight profile characteristics: a high rate of low socio-economic status (ESE) student population; a high participation of students in bilingual education programs; a low retention rate (that is, students repeating grade); a low annual drop-out rate (that is, students quitting school in the secondary levels); a high representation of ELLs in gifted and talented education (GATE) programs; a low representation of ELLs in special education programs; and a low percent of migrant workers
represented (p.6). The student enrollment for the 10 schools ranged from 219 to 1,848 students.

Categorized by demographic zones (located in Texas, Oregon, Illinois, Utah, Florida, Massachusetts, California, New York, and Washington D.C.), there were seven urban schools, three rural schools, and one reservation school. It is noted that some of these geographic locations have been the same historic locations of former dual language pilot programs.

There was also a diversity in ethnic representation: Hispanic students ranged from 40% to 98% of students enrolled; Asian students made up 2% to 41% of students enrolled in the schools; Russian students ranged from 12% to 32% of students enrolled in the schools; and Native Americans comprised 3% to 98% of students enrolled in the schools (Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez, 2002, p.5).

Congruent with the previous study (Thomas / Collier, 2002) this one also highlights a dominant Hispanic student population. It is the norm that is evident throughout the Literature reviewed. Although that is an obvious distinction of DLI programs, they do have a pattern on inclusive multiplicity of cultures.
The Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) study (sponsored by the Intercultural Development Research Association - IDRA), used its extensive national network of contacts (created after 26 years of advocacy in bilingual education) to identify successful bilingual education programs, based on student and school outcomes. Their documentation validates long-standing proof of effective programs, which is an argument in favor of effective bilingual education.

Conclusion from the Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez Study

In their final analysis, Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) state, “student academic achievement is the ultimate criterion that determines the effectiveness of a program model.” (p.19). Their conclusive opinion would argue in favor of the current trend of assessment driven instruction that predominates most public school systems, due to the federal requirements of grade-level standards as imposed by the No Child left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001). This method of accountability is not likely to change, nor fade away. Therefore it behooves administrators, educators, curriculum developers, program analysts and decision makers as a whole, to consider how best to incorporate the
accountability process of standardized testing into models of DLI which promote the acquisition of English in a timely manner.

Effective Classroom Practices

The Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez (2002) study identified seven classroom practices that help to promote a successful academic outcome. The first of these characteristics is recognizing and valuing diversity of culture and language. This is in argument in favor of additive bilingualism.

The second characteristic is a rigorous academic program. By rigorous, it is understood that the program itself will set high expectations for achievement from the students. Having a standardized system of grade-level norms helps to construct such a model.

The third characteristic is having an appropriate, meaningful, and relevant approach to instruction. By appropriate it is understood that the pedagogical practice is adjusted to meet the needs of the predominant student’s level of academic ability. The SIOP methodology would be an effective example of such appropriate pedagogy.

The fourth characteristic is heterogeneous co-operative groups. By heterogeneous groups, it is understood
that the student core is a mixture of differentiated abilities. In the case of dual language programs, it is essential that there be at least a 50/50 mix of English language learners (ELLs) and English proficient learners (ELPs). This is a standard requirement of all DLI models.

The fifth characteristic is a substantial amount of bilingual materials across the curricula, including technology (this point is supported in the third quantitative study analyzed). Since one of the foundation principles of DLI is biliteracy, it is crucial that both ELLs and ELPs have frequent exposure to, and easy access to print matter in both the dominant language of the larger culture (English, or L2) and the minority language (most frequently in Spanish, or L1). It is even better if the text on the printed media is side-by-side, so that assimilation of the language being acquired is accelerated. This practice is the central piece of the Book-Bag, modified DLI model presented in this thesis.

The sixth characteristic is a supportive staff for intervention. As it has already been argued, it would be best if the staff members are bilingual in the minority language and English, so as to facilitate comprehensible explanations of material, concepts, or general knowledge of
the instructional topic. It is noted that such intervention is to be used on a basis of need, and that students do not get placed in these programs indefinitely. The whole purpose for assistance is promotion out of remediation.

The seventh characteristic is writing work that is based on student’s background, that is; their culture and their language. It could be easily argued that language is culture, and vice versa. This critical practice becomes central in the methodological applications in this thesis.

**Community and Parental Involvement**

Two other critical components that were very visible in these schools were the active presence of community involvement and parent participation in the educational process. Robledo Montecel / Danini Cortez, (2002) point out the parents are not viewed as "helpers," but as integral components of their child’s education (p.13). Since the students’ parents are extended members of the community at large (by means of consumerism and employment), they can also act as agents of recruitment for alternative resources (such as office products, or environmental products), when monetary resources are scarce.

What becomes immediately obvious in reviewing studies that investigate the validity of DLI programs, is the
organic style in which the programs are forged together at these ten highly-successful schools. It was not the product of a single, dynamic individual; but rather the collective, collaboration of the whole community, which was involved throughout the entire process. Everybody has “buy-in” to the program in order for it to be a success: School faculty and staff, business partners of the community, parents, etc... and in some cases, university experts who act as advisors; all play an active, not passive role in the educational process of the future community members in their midst - the children.

Common Essential Characteristics of Dual Language Immersion

The final quantitative study reviewed was conducted by Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary (2005) for the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA). Since this study was used as a systematic pattern for organizing the main textual argument of this thesis, not much more will be said in this present section.

After reviewing all pertinent documentation, Dr. Lindholm-Leary outlines seven characteristics of successful dual-language programs (compare with Carrera-Carrillo, L. &
Rickert Smith, A. (2006) and their “Seven Steps” publication, comparing them to other highly effective schools that are not necessarily classified as Two-way Immersion (TWI) schools (in this thesis, TWI and DLI are synonymous terms). The following quote from her research serves as a purpose clause,

This review includes all relevant reporting of research and studies that would inform dual language programs; that is, it reviews research relating to effective schools, studies of particular effective schools that serve “at risk” or “low-performing” students, and English language learners... (p.8)

The seven characteristics or factors that define the parameters of the Lindholm-Leary (2005) study are: Assessment accountability, curriculum development, instructional practices, staff quality and professional development, program structure, family and community involvement; and support and resources.

Situated Considerations

The panel of experts that Lindholm-Leary (2005) gathered together conducted a thorough analysis of the documentation. They had this to say about the quality and
integrity of any program so suited for the type of students it serves,

According to Christian et al (1997), “Context is an important lens through which to understand one’s own program. What works in one community or with one particular population of students or teachers may not work as effectively in another community.” (p.9). In other words, any program has to be defined by its own unique situation, to meet the specific needs of its own community (i.e. situated curriculum - see Brownlie, Feniak and Schnellert, 2006). Thomas / Collier (2004) found this to be true when the Franco-community of the North-eastern schools they tracked (p.50) was compared to the Hispanic communities of the central, south-west (p.117). The needs of the students were the same (they needed to learn English), but the attitude of the parents and community at both regional school sites were in direct opposition to one another. The Franco-community was insisting on the students learning their native tongue (French) so that they could pass-on its legacy to the next generation. The Hispanic community was more concerned about their students
learning English effectively. Retaining the native tongue was not a significant issue for them.

As Cummins et al (2003) recommended, every school who may view a systematic program change, and who may be considering a DLI program, must begin by assessing the needs of the community.

Discussion of the Findings

Most minority parents surveyed during the wave of propositions on state ballots that aimed at changing bilingual education as it has been known for the last three decades contended that they wanted their children to learn English (Crawford, J, 1997; Krashen, S, 2001). It can safely be said that this goal is the central issue that all parties agree on. The only debatable issue still remains: which method is best for instructing ELLs in academic English? The real question should probably be reconfigured to ask, “Which English do we want students to learn?”

Cummins work (1979) on language acquisition answered this question long ago. What takes ELLs the longest time to acquire is the comprehension of cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALPS); which has already been establish as requiring an instructional window of five to seven years, depending on the literacy level of individuals
These academic skills are essential for the successful academic progression of any student, especially if they intend to pursue a graduate course of study.

**Long-term Results**

It is also argued that the successful completion of a graduate level course will improve the living standards of the great majority of low socio-economic status (ESE) minority students. The percentage of Spanish speaking ELLs that attend college and graduate, has been growing steadily during the same time period in which bilingual education was established as a federally funded entitlement program (Llagas & Snyder, 2003; Keper Mora, J, 2007).

The ability of graduates to engage intelligently at a professional business level requires the dominance of the language of the culture of power that they live in, which in the USA it is currently English. Being that the USA is the current leader in business and commerce (Augustine, 2007) around the world, most students in other developing countries are instructed to acquire English as a second language (ESL), in order to confidently trade with American businesses.
Considerations for Future Planning

The counter challenge for preparing the next generation of world leaders is this: is the USA helping to do likewise for their own developing generation of future business people, by giving them the language tools to engage in meaningful dialogue with business executives from other cultures from around the globe? Immersing American students in foreign languages at a critical age (Freeman & Freeman, 2004; Hakuta, K. 2003 - See Appendix B) is tantamount to facilitating this task. Currently, the USA is the only modern country in the world that does not mandate a policy of multicultural education (and by multicultural, it is understood that it is multi-lingual) for their youngest citizenry. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics, only 31% of American elementary schools (and 24% of public elementary schools) report teaching foreign languages, (Colby, .2006).

The basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) that are so effortlessly observed as being acquired by ELLs are those that arise from social contact. It is argued that these interpersonal skills are as valuable (if not more so) than the academic skills, for it is these abilities to communicate on a daily basis, on many common subject
matters that most minority citizens require for survival in the dominant society (Cummins, 1979). It has been argued that this development is a natural progression that occurs in every social context (Montague, 1997), and that it forms a basis upon which to scaffold the more difficult academic (or more technical) vocabulary that is content based.

**Contextual Considerations**

Social interaction within the school environment is just as critical as the successful attainment of the prestigious standardized test outcomes. It could be argued that without this foundational basis upon which to build the more difficult context, so as to facilitate comprehension; the later will be quite difficult to ever attain. It is during the peer, social interchange that more language acquisition is "caught," than with the direct, methodical instruction of subject matter (Krashen, 1999). However, in saying this, it has also been argued that at the very least, educators can design learning experiences that would require the inclusion of content based vocabulary (Baker, 1995), so that the terminology may become imbedded in the working knowledge of the student. This rigorous, task oriented, project based method of instruction (Zehler, A, 1994) is at the very core of a dual
language instruction (DLI) program (Lindholm-Leary, K, 2005).

**Linguistic Considerations**

Krashen’s work (2003) is another well established theory in language acquisition that has helped mediate Cummins’ theories (1979). Krashen’s pivotal hypothesis of comprehensible input (2003) is at the very center of the argument in favor of dual language instruction (DLI). The argument is a very simple one: Won’t children respond better to content based instruction delivered in a language they can understand already (home language other than English)? Wouldn’t it be prudent to allow them to learn English along parallel lines of the academic content, so that they are not frustrated with the pressure to learn both at the same time? Doesn’t it make sense to teach the student learning English, what the English word, or term is for that specific item they are required to know for a test; after they have already acquired it in their own language?

**Psychological Considerations**

Congruent with Krashen’s hypothesis of comprehensible input, is another from his quintet of hypothesis: the affective filter (2003). Basically, Krashen proposes that
this "filter" can make-or-brake the educational experience. It surfaces as an impenetrable wall, caused by stress, anxiety, fear... things that will detract from the actual acquisition of the academic content. - What is the cause of all the fret? - Lack of comprehension.

In essence, the student forms a "protective field" of sorts that will psychologically keep them from harm, although the fear is unfounded, but the mind of the student doesn't perceive that. All it perceives is that the student is in an unfamiliar environment in which the coded messages are incomprehensible.

However, not everything is a dense fog. Once the awareness of the conscious mind adheres to a recognizable message and tries to make some kind of contextual meaning out of it, the one delivering the coded message (the teacher) has already proceeded to the next two or three points of interest. The ELL student feels lost, and shuts down their perceptive filter, disallowing any instruction to penetrate to the conscious mind.

Instead, the ELL student resolves to adopt a familiar behavior, or task (which is usually incongruent with the subject matter), in an attempt to restore normalcy in their psyche. Ironically, it is yet another of Krashen's quintet
hypothesis that intervenes in the process, which yields to the anxious ridden affective filter: The monitor hypothesis.

Critical Analysis Considerations

We all have an innate, pseudo personality that always wants to find order and "correctness" in all that we do. This has sometimes been identified by the metaphor of a personal secretary. This personal secretary is critical to learning, since it will enforce the "rules" of grammar, and force us to pay closer attention to the language. However, this should only be allowed once something concrete or physical is set before the student's visual awareness, so that the secretary can go about doing their job (Krashen, 2003, p.3).

However, an inexperienced student does not have the practical ability to control their monitor device until after they have produced a visual, literary product. The secretary will always try to usurp the legitimate right of the student to simply allow the "flow" of the conversation to take its course, and ingest the totality of the coded messages (which is an argument in support of Whole language instruction). Krashen actually contends that teaching, or the acquisition of knowledge is very simple: all that must
be done is to deliver comprehensible input, or knowledge. It follows a "natural order" of learning. In fact, Krashen states, "We acquire language in only one way: when we understand the messages... comprehending messages is the only way language is acquired (Krashen, 2003, p.4)."

This is the fundamental basis of the present thesis: Learning can only take place when the instruction is understood, and it will be best understood in a language that is already familiar. The English co-relevant terminology can easily be adhered to the existing knowledge base. Practical experience has demonstrated that even for students who speak only English, it is difficult to understand the academic terminology. Other strategies must accompany the delivery of the content, so that the learner can adapt the new knowledge to something they already understand. Here is where learning modalities (Love, 2004) take a more active role. Such is the methodology included in systematic approaches to pedagogy. Some examples would be the SIOP method (Echevarria & Short, 1999), and reciprocal teaching (Palinscar & Brown, 1984 & 1986). Other theories of thinking and learning are also helpful, such as multiple intelligences (Garner, 1983), objective/subjective instruction (Kant, 1762), etc... The more arsenal of
educational theories and applied practices the instructor has, the better equipped they’ll be to give instruction to anyone.

Inferences from the Discussion

What can be derived from this discussion is that the answer to the initial guiding question (are there alternative methods to teach ELLs), is: YES. There are several successful methods that have been introduced in this thesis, and primarily a language base program called dual language immersion (DLI) that has shown tremendous results across the nation. The Two-way Immersion (TWI) directory listed on the web-server page for the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), last reported 332 individual schools in 27 states that are now registered as TWI, or DLI schools, and the numbers continue to increase each year (source, CAL, @ http://www.cal.org/twi/directory/index.html).

The success rate of correctly implemented, research tested methodology will promote the acquisition of English, and bilingualism/biliteracy skills in the long run (minimum 4 years, maximum 7 years) for students who are effectively serviced in a DLI program. The professional requirements of staff and faculty in a DLI are rigorous, just as the program demands. However, the modified version presented in
this thesis, as derived from Cummins et al (2003) can be implemented in any school, regardless of the prerequisite professional training expected of the formal DLI programs.

The participation of community members, including the parents and siblings of the students who participate in a DLI program (especially the modified version) are essential to the success of the program. The other absolute element of a formal DLI program is the participation of English language proficient (ELPs) students in the daily activities and instruction of the classroom. Although 50% equivalency of student population in the classroom is the best arrangement in DLI programs, they can be adequately maintained with a 30% ELPs presence in the classroom. This is an encouraging note for school districts that cover the vast territory that borders the USA/Mexico border, which is the most crossed border in the world.

Another encouraging component of the modified version of a DLI program, as presented in this thesis, is that it does not require much initial investment (for hardware, such as tape player/recorders), which could be donated by community businesses by solicitation. It requires little, to no additional investment to maintain it throughout the academic calendar year, and it can successfully promote the
academic literary skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening, of the students who participate in the program.

The transfer of Book-Bags to-and-from the school and home can also help to promote the English acquisition of the parents, without them ever setting foot in the school, by means of the recorded, dual-language tapes, of the student created literary works.

In short, this language-based literary program can yield great results, at a limited expense (if any) to the school, but with great investment by the teaching personnel; and it may even shorten the acquisition rate of English for ELLs (especially if they are literate from their place of origin), in as little as two years of effective implementation.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Research

The documentation reviewed can be consolidated into four distinct components that are considered as essential requirements to have, not only an effective dual language immersion program, but any effective school instructional framework. The four essential components (or considerations) for an effective instructional framework are: the environment in which the instruction is delivered; the venue of language as a means for delivering the instruction; the content itself for the instruction; and the ultimate purpose in delivering the instruction. The argument being made in this thesis is that the most effective vehicle for promoting all four of these effective components of an instructional framework is the proposal of a Book-bag program, using dual-language, student created books.

Book-bags and the Instructional Environment. The location in which instruction of English language learners (or any developing student) takes place should be one that is inviting, and inclusive. By this it is understood, that
the student would feel like s/he is wanted; that is, that their presence is desired. Even more so, that the story they carry inside of them is greatly desired to be heard. The story of their life experience as viewed through their own lens, which can only be told by them, using the talents that they possess and the voice to express it with. By talents, it is understood, that the richness of the language, and the culture that it inherently brings with it; is what is in mind. Every single person that comes through the doors of a classroom brings with them an entire repertoire of abilities and skills that have been acquired prior to their formal schooling experience.

The combination of these life-experiences can only serve to enrich the educational experience. These are much to be desired in the classroom, and the student ought to know that they are valued by what they possess in cultural/lingual treasure. Writing this story in their native language, and translating it into the new language they are acquiring, will help other people appreciate their unique history that much better. This is what additive bilingualism is all about. This is very feasible with a Book-bag program.
Book-bags and the Medium of Language. Instruction for those learning another language, and by implication, the cultural significance attached to it; need as much exposure to the language as possible. The experience of language acquisition takes time, and needs to be phased-in at appropriate developmental stages (or ages). Exposure to the new language must be properly modeled, but in a natural situation, or setting. These situations can be embedded in a social-interactive task. The task can be oriented towards immersion in the new language. By retelling personal narratives, the students will be allowed many opportunities of expression.

The four classic genres of language have already been previously discussed. If it’s in speaking, the student should be allowed to practice what they have been learning. If it’s in listening, the student should be encouraged to pay close attention to the messages, so that they may search for meaning within the message. If it is in reading the language, it ought to be supported by another, familiar language they already know, and be taught the associative properties of both languages (i.e. cognates), and the grammatical symbolism attached to the new vocabulary being learned. DLI books facilitate this process.
In a language-based program, the writing component occupies the central place of the instruction. Through the graphic representation of language, the literary sense of the language is acquired. Along with the graphic representation of the language, the grammatical structures of the language will also be taught. Spelling and sentence structure will be the final pieces of literacy to adapt, since these are the most critical components of any language. This is bilingualism and biliteracy in action.

In providing ELLs with opportunities to express themselves with graphic representations in a language they understand, side-by-side with the second language they are acquiring in the text of DLI books; their comprehension and rate of acquisition will grow exponentially. Such was the experience in Thornwood elementary, in the Cummins (2003) writing initiative.

Using Book-bags with Instructional Content. The material that is used to communicate meaning in a new language ought to be language based. Hence, it is strongly recommended that the content work from the central component (i.e. writing) outward, in concentric circle fashion. This means that in the classroom, the curricular core matters are expanding circles of language. That is, in
math, the students will acquire math terminology through their writing skills, and the associative vocabulary (which in and of itself, is another language altogether) that is required for grade-level proficiency.

This being said, it ought to follow suit, that the curriculum be designed to meet the standards of the grade, rather than following a pre-conceived, prepackaged product. This is a radical statement to make, but it necessitates the discussion of two related issues associated with curriculum design and implementation: who prepares it, and how are they rewarded for doing so.

Professional Preparation. It is understood that a professionally trained instructor is hired for their expertise in the subject matters they teach. They have taken the course work approved by state and local authorities, and have proven proficiency in mastering the content by earning a passing grade at a higher academic level. Therefore, they ought to be prepared in theory and subject matter content. Whatever they may be lacking in experience, they will learn on the job, or acquire through their professional peers.
Professional Collaboration. Professional instructors have been required to participate in professional learning communities (PLCs), due to the No Child Left behind (NCLB) legislation. If their school is underperforming, they are required to meet over assessment results, discuss their findings, make recommendations for improvements, and suggest possible pedagogical strategies to implement the missing skills that their students have not yet acquired. This is one of the positive outcomes from the NCLB legislation. By doing so, professional accountability has become commonplace in the public school systems across America. This is something that was previously missing from professional practice in the educational profession.

Professional Planning. Since all of this cross-examination and implementation of skills and strategies are taking place in the schools and, since teachers are keeping each other accountable to succeed in their instructional duties, does it not follow suit that they are also qualified and capable of creating their own curriculum? Since their instruction has to match the required standards by grade level already, and they know the immediate needs of the students in their classrooms, wouldn’t they be the best person to make appropriate decisions, in regards to
instruction, for their own school site? This is an argument in favor of site-based management, in which the principal and their staff have more sovereign, decision-making power over the school in which they work.

In the classical dual language immersion (DLI) model, this would also include the local community. Typically, these types of associations already exist in the form of Parent and Teacher Organizations (PTOs). The proposition being made here is in favor of site-based curricular design. Also, the proposition is that Book-bags are a preferred method for promoting an effective community of literacy. - This is critical literacy in practice.

Professional Pay. By implication, all of this extra-hard work ought to be recompensed adequately. If teachers are paid a generous salary, they would not object to doing something that they are eminently qualified to perform already. Since the parents participating in the school planning and program can see for themselves what takes place on a day-to-day basis, they would side in favor with their local school instructors, and recommend salary compensation commensurate with the performance and quality of instruction at their local schools.
The Use of Book-bags in the Ultimate Purpose. The primary goal in all of instruction is to promote the academic skills and strategies of students to the next attainable level. This is congruent with Vygotsky’s theory of zone of proximal development (ZPD). It is argued in this thesis that it is best accomplished through the medium of language instruction. It is also argued that the best method for promoting the acquisition of language is in a dual language immersion (DLI) program. The modified version embodied in a Book-bag program can effectively aid in this acquisition process.

It has also been argued that the value of adopting a DLI program of instruction has long-term effects that are ultimately observable in secondary and graduate academic work. This argument has been confirmed by multiple field research and quantitative studies on academic outcomes.

Conceptual Framework of Dual-language Immersion

The concept behind the DLI program is based on the theory of second language acquisition as proposed by Cummins (1979) and Krashen (2003). More specifically, it has been argued in this thesis that the hypothesis of comprehensible input is the critical component in a DLI program. Children acquiring a second academic language
(e.g. English) can best acquire it by using their first language as a platform on which to build on (e.g. scaffolding).

The second language is practiced with generational peers who are dominant in the second language (e.g. English). Most of the language experience is oral, but it has to find its way to a textual framework, since this is the method of assessing academic progress; hence, the emphasis of including writing skills across all core content.

The development of acquiring the second language takes time, since the expectation is to arrive at the mastery level. The language being acquired is conducted in an academic setting, which makes the acquisition process a technical endeavor.

The ultimate goal of DLI is for students from two language origins to master the other’s language, linguistically and literarily. This is the reason why an emphasis is placed on all four methods of language expression: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The writing component is the one high-lighted in the modified model of a DLI, as embodied in the Book-bags program.
Modified Methodology Review

It has been proposed in this thesis that the likelihood of being able to find qualified bilingual instructors to fill the posts of all the classrooms, in all the schools adopting DLI methods (which is the recommended methodology for instruction delivery), is highly unlikely. Therefore, it has been proposed in this thesis that an alternative method could be adopted, that parallels the DLI theoretical framework. One such model has been introduced, exemplified in the Cummins team (2003) DLI initiative in Thornwood Elementary. It has been slightly modified to meet the needs of the Hispanic population of the Coachella Valley, in Southern California, since most of the teachers employed in the local three school districts are not bilingual teachers. The vehicle of Book-bags has been kept from the Cummins (2003) model. However, the requirements of a bilingual teacher have also been kept from the traditional DLI model, in order to facilitate accuracy of translation in the classroom.

Another critical issue for recommending that this modified DLI model be used by a bilingual instructor is the fact of limited budgets in the present financial situation of the state of California. It could be replicated as it
was done in Canada with the Cummins (2003) team, but the authenticity of the language translation might be inferior, due to the lack of the academic language transfer from the first language (Spanish), to the second language (English), and vice versa. Current models of language translation software where not included in this present study.

Since the Book-bags will be the main source of disseminating information (initially assumed to be in narrative form), and the recipients of the information will also be the parents and siblings of the students in the DLI program, it is absolutely necessary that the translated material be 100% accurate.

**Significance of This Study**

The modified model of DLI that is proposed in this thesis can work in any classroom. But the concept of implementing the modified DLI model was created with the Coachella Valley region in mind, in which there are currently three school districts: Palm Springs Unified (PSUSD), Desert Sands Unified (DSUSD), and Coachella Valley Unified (CVUSD).

The host district for this modified DLI Book-bag program would be the Desert Sands School District (DSUSD) which serves a current student population of 28,776
students, of which 64.4% are Hispanic, according to current California State Demographic records webpage (http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DistEnr2.asp?TheName=desert+sands&cSelect=3367058DESERT+SANDS+UNIFIED).

Of these Hispanic students, 7,027, or 97.6% are identified as ELLs (CDE/ Educ. Demographic Unit). DSUDS is the largest of the three districts in this rural area of California.

All three districts in the Coachella Valley combined, serve an ELL students population of 26,038 combined. That equals to 36% of the total student population in the Coachella Valley, and it is expected to increase each year.

How well equipped is DSUSD to meet the needs of this vast number of ELLs? DSUSD has 1,300 teachers currently contracted. Of those teachers, only 201 are Hispanic (source, CBEDS, 2008). Of those 201 Hispanic teachers, only 13 are providing primary language instruction to ELLs. Of the remaining staff, 889 are providing SDAIE, or ELD/ESL instruction (source, CDOE, Educational Demographics Unit, Language Census, 2008). DSUSD District records indicate that the official method of instruction for ELLs is Sheltered English Instruction (SEI).
These are the hard facts. It is quite likely that the local authorities of DSUSD in Coachella Valley don’t agree with a language-based approach to teaching, in spite of listing the option on their English Learner Master Plan on their website (http://cms.dsusd.k12.ca.us/education/sctemp/90f79cdaa4f8e3dc7adfd18fc5c96cd7/1209963922/VII Teaching and Learning.pdf Table 7.1).

Based on web-published public disclosure information, DSUSD has no primary language instruction models being used in their schools at the present time. The 13 teachers cited earlier providing primary language support, do so in their own classrooms, which officially; all teachers at DSUSD are SEI teachers. When correspondence was sought from this district, very little response was forthcoming.

Judging from the present conditions of staffing and student demographics at DSUSD, the modified DLI Book-bag model proposed in this thesis would be an efficient method of accelerating the rate of acquisition in the ELLs of the DSUSD. A proposed sequence of implementation is offered below under recommended procedures.
Recommended Procedures

Initially, it is recommended that this model be tried as a pilot program in a classroom with a good concentration of ELLs. It is suggested that they be selected from a pool of learners designated as level 1 (beginners) by their California English language development test (CELDT) scores. If the classroom allotment is about 20 students, the estimated size of this targeted group could be 3 to 5 students. This would be the control group, which would follow the modified Cummins (2003) model. The other ELL students would most likely be a level two (early production) or three (speech emergence) on their CELDT tests scores. These students would only receive instruction from the required text material for English language development (ELD), or from an English as a second language (ESL) program. The more advanced students would only participate in the dual-language model as volunteer peer-tutors, or translators. The levels 2 and 3 students should not be allowed to check out books in Spanish from the school’s library, whereas the control group would be. This is necessary to validate the effects of the modified DLI, literature and language based program.
An invitation would be extended to the parents of all the students in the class, to include them as narrators/recorders, as well as translators/lecturers with in the classroom. One critical way to accelerate the English acquisition of these EL1 (beginners), is to strongly encourage the parents of this control group to attend an English as a Second Language (ESL) class for adults, for the period of one year, in exchange for the Book Bag used throughout the calendar year by their child. The incentive would be that they are able to keep the Book Bag at the end of the term. One way to supply the necessary resources for creating the Book Bags is to obtain the participation of community businesses that could supply necessary materials and/or equipment to package the Book Bags for the control group.

The control group would be allowed to write their first drafts in their home language (Spanish), but would also be instructed on how to utilize illustrated bilingual dictionaries and English thesauruses to conduct their text translations over a period of one quarter (ten weeks) per project. It is anticipated that they would join their classmates in writing four major projects due at the end of each quarter.
Through this process, the participating students will acquire the dominant language of the school community (English), and increase their cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALPS). At the same time, they will acquire literary skills through writing lessons conducted in small group settings (Graves, 1994). This activity will help to expand their working vocabulary of English words. The lessons learned in the Writer’s Workshops would also help the ELLs to improve the quality of the DLI books being used in their Book-bags.

They should also be instructed in the strategy of identifying cognates in both languages, since these are words which carry the same meaning in both languages, and are spelled in similar fashion (see Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y, 2006 - B). The participating students could also be encouraged to check-out independent selections of leveled reading books in English (Krashen, 2003), to help increase their fluency in reading English (Rasinski, 2006).

Throughout the school year, the students ought to produce four printed products of literary value in both their L1 (Home language) and L2 (School language, or English), always progressing in their acquisition of English as a second language. As a culminating event, the
class could host an Arts and Authors Fair, in which the student’s school published books may be auctioned off to the highest bidder (usually their own parents), reserving the funds to continue the program in the following year.

**Sequence of Implementation**

At the beginning of each thematic unit in the Language Arts program (for example, Houghton Mifflin), the students are exposed to the over-arching theme for the unit. For example: “Journeys.” Typically, a writing project is launched upon the introduction of the theme. Probing, open-ended questions (the kind that require more than a simple, “yes/no” answer) could be asked of the students in the class; such as, “If you could travel to any place in the world, where would you like to go and why?”

Subsequent questions that solicit a higher order of thinking skills could be added each day, building the text of the theme of writing. At the end of the first week, each student should be allowed to choose the literary piece of writing that best displays their writing abilities (this would be auto-selected by the student). The teacher could guide them through this selection during the small group, Writer’s Workshops (Graves, 1994) conducted on a daily basis.
Small Group Intervention. It is in these work shops that grammatical, syntactic, and semantic lessons take place, and in which the student’s literary development soars. Many different activities can be derived from such sessions. For example: Word sorting, Spelling patterns, cognate collections, semantic web mapping, etc… - As the work begins to take on a life of it’s own, the other dimensions of writing are developed as well. Most of these would be acquired along with their English development. Some effective programs, such as “6+1 Traits” (Spandel and Culham, 2007) are highly effective in facilitating this transitional methodology (see NWREL website listings).

Process of Documentation. Copies of any and every final product in writing could be kept in the student’s growing portfolio of writing. This portfolio can serve as a basis for a qualitative assessment process, when measured against preselected writing rubrics, such as those posted on the California department of education’s website (STAR release questions from the writing proficiency tests - http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/documents/cstgr4writingguide.pdf). It must be re-emphasized that a DLI program always strives for the highest possible standards, in order to
maintain the rigorous level of requirements stipulated in
the documentation reviewed in this study.

**Monitoring Progress in English Acquisition.** The
progress of the students in a control group could be
closely monitored by weekly Language Arts end of selection
content quizzes. They could also be measured by end of
Thematic units tests in reading comprehension, Spelling and
Vocabulary (Gentry, 2006), writing and grammar skills, and
reading fluency. By end of each semester, the students
could take a cumulative test of content instruction
material received. As mentioned previously, it is recom-
mended that these students be tested in their home language
first, and then in English if necessary (Brantley, 2007).

A personal daily journal could also be maintained by
each participating student. At the end of each week, the
students can be allowed to select what their best writing
was for that week (with help from their teacher), and
copies can be made of them, to file in their cumulative
progressive portfolio. The participating students’ writings
could spring from a central theme, which can be the anchor
from each thematic unit in their Language Arts curriculum.

The long term goal is to keep track of the ELL
student’s progress in their CELDT scores, anticipating a
quick progression from level one through level three, within the period of two years in English language instruction. The Cummins (2003) team was able to accomplish this goal within two academic years at Thornwood Elementary, with students representing over 40 different languages. The suggested DLI Book-bag program can work.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Goal of Program</th>
<th>Typical Program Names</th>
<th>Native Languages of Students</th>
<th>Languages of Instruction</th>
<th>Language of Content Instruction</th>
<th>Language Arts Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on developing literacy in two languages:</td>
<td>Two-way Bilingual Education</td>
<td>Ideally, 50% English-speaking and 50% LEP students who share the same native language</td>
<td>Both English &amp; LEP students' native language (NL), usually throughout elementary school</td>
<td>English &amp; NL; typically begins with less English and moves to 50% of curriculum in each language</td>
<td>English &amp; native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Immersion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Language Immersion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-way Immersion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Bilingual Education</td>
<td>All students speak same native language</td>
<td>Both English &amp; students' native language</td>
<td>English &amp; NL; more NL at lower grade levels, transitioning to all English</td>
<td>English &amp; native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-exit Maintenance Education</td>
<td>All students speak same native language</td>
<td>Both English &amp; students' native language</td>
<td>English &amp; native language</td>
<td>English &amp; native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage language</td>
<td>All students speak same native language</td>
<td>Both English &amp; students' native language</td>
<td>English &amp; native language</td>
<td>English &amp; native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous language program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on English acquisition, rapid transfer to English-only class</td>
<td>Early-exit</td>
<td>All students speak same native language</td>
<td>Both English &amp; students' native language</td>
<td>First, both languages, with quick progression to all or most instruction through English</td>
<td>English; native language skills developed only to assist in transition to English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional bilingual education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on developing literacy in English</td>
<td>Sheltered English</td>
<td>Students can share the same NL or be from different language &amp; cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>English adapted to students' proficiency level, &amp; supplemented by gestures, visual aids, manipulatives, etc.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Language for Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second language (ESL)</td>
<td>Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) Only ELL students in class, preferably from 1 NL</td>
<td>English, but teachers should have receptive skills in students' NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured English Immersion (SEI)</td>
<td>Only ELL students in class, preferably from 1 NL All instruction in English, adapted to students' proficiency levels</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language development (ELD)</td>
<td>Students can share the same NL or be from different language backgrounds; generally no support for NL</td>
<td>English adapted to students' proficiency level &amp; supplemented by gestures &amp; visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Pull-out</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English; students leave their English-only classroom to spend part of the day receiving ESL instruction often focused on grammar, vocabulary, &amp; communication skills (no content)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs, as adapted from Zelasko and Antunez (2000). (NCELA - Aug. 2007). Downloaded from, http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/about/lieps/4_desc.html
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## STAGES OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Approximate Time Frame</th>
<th>Teacher Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preproduction</td>
<td>The student</td>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>● Show me...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has minimal comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Circle the...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not verbalize</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Where is...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nods &quot;Yes&quot; and &quot;No&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Who has...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draws and points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Production</td>
<td>The student</td>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td>● Yes/no questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has limited comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Either/or questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produces one- or two-word responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>● One- or two-word answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participates using key words and familiar phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses present-tense verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Emergence</td>
<td>The student</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>● Why...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has good comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>● How...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can produce simple sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Explain...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Makes grammar and pronunciation errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Phrase or short-sentence answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequently misunderstands jokes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Fluency</td>
<td>The student</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>● What would happen if...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has excellent comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Why do you think...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Makes few grammatical errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Fluency</td>
<td>The student has a near-native level of speech.</td>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>● Decide if...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Retell...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTIONAL/PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES IN THE STATE OF OREGON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Goals</th>
<th>SHEIELDERED INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH</th>
<th>NEWCOMER PROGRAMS</th>
<th>TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL BILINGUAL</th>
<th>SL/FL IMMERSION</th>
<th>TWO-WAY IMMERSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.1.2 academic English proficiency</td>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td>Transition to all English instruction</td>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.1.2 cultural proficiency</td>
<td>Understanding of and integration into mainstream American culture</td>
<td>Understanding of and integration into mainstream American culture</td>
<td>Integration into mainstream American culture and maintenance of home/mother tongue culture</td>
<td>Understanding of and appreciation of L2 culture and maintenance of home/mainstream American culture</td>
<td>Maintenance/Integration into mainstream American culture and appreciation of other culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Academic Goals | Same as district/program goals for all students | Varied | Same as district/program goals for all students | Same as district/program goals for all students | Same as district/program goals for all students | Same as district/program goals for all students |

| Student Characteristics | Limited or no English; Some programs mix native and non-native English speakers | Limited or no English; Low level literacy; Recent arrivals; Variety of language/cultural backgrounds | Limited or no English; All students have same L1; Variety of cultural backgrounds | Limited or no English; All students have same L1; Variety of cultural backgrounds | Limited or no English; All students have same L1; Variety of cultural backgrounds | Limited or no English; All students have same L1; Variety of cultural backgrounds |

| Grades Served | All grades (during transition to English) | K-12; most prevalent at middle/high school levels | Primary and elementary grades | Elementary grades | Early immersion serves K-8, preferably K-12 | K-8, preferably K-12 |

| Entry Grades | Any grade | Most students enter in middle or high school | K, 1, 2 | K, 1, 2 | K, 1 | K, 1 |

| Length of Student Participation | Varied; 1-3 years or as needed | Usually 1-3 semesters | 2-4 years | Usually 6 years (+K), preferably 12 years (+K) | Usually 6 years (+K), preferably 12 years (+K) | Usually 6 years (+K), preferably 12 years (+K) |

| Participation of Mainstream Teachers | Yes; preferable if mainstream teachers have SI training | Yes; mainstream teachers must have training in SI | Yes; mainstream teachers must have training in SI | No; stand-alone programs with its own specially trained teachers | Yes; mainstream teachers teach English curriculum | Yes; mainstream teachers with special training |

| Teacher Qualifications | Often certified ESL or bilingual teachers and content teachers with SI training; Preferably bilingual | Regular certification; Training in SI; Preferably bilingual | Bilingual certificate | Bilingual certificate; Bilingual proficiency | Regular certification; Training in immersion pedagogy; Bilingual proficiency | Bilingual/L2 certificate; Bilingual immersion certification; Bilingual proficiency; Multicultural training |

| Instructional Materials, Texts, Visual Aids | In English with adaptations; visuals; realia; culturally appropriate | In L1 or in English with adaptations | In L1 and English; English materials adapted to students' proficiency levels | In L1 and English; English materials adapted to students' proficiency levels | In L2 (with adaptations as needed), plus English texts, where appropriate | In minority language and English, as required by curriculum of study |

Table 3

APPENDIX D

WEB-SURVEY OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR ELLs IN THE COSTAL SOUTH-WEST, USA.
South-western states comparative table of ELL Instructional Programs.

*originally compiled by Robert Arias (2008).

Table 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States with Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way Immersion/Dual-language Immersion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Bilingual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional Bilingual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Language Immersion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English as a Second Language (ESL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Comer Class (recent arrival)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structured English Immersion (SEI)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF STATE-BY-STATE PROGRAMS
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Introduction

The region that predominantly serves the largest population of Spanish speaking English language learners is the South-western United States. This geographic area spans the southern states from Texas to California, and extending all the way up the western-pacific coast (the historical region of the ancestral genesis for the Mexican people), including the states of Arizona; California; Colorado; New Mexico; Nevada; Oregon; Texas and Washington. Each State's officially posted Education Department materials, as derived from their web-sites, are summarized below.

The states are listed in order of quantitative instructional programs, from the most diversity offered, to the least diversity of alternative instructional programs. It is noted that attempts to contact English language learners (ELLs) educational department heads for each state were conducted with limited response.

The State of Washington

Washington uses almost exclusively a highly publicized quantitative study commissioned by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE), conducted by Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (2004), who propose eight types of identifiable ELL programs.
The first is a two-way bilingual immersion (90-10) model in which 90 percent of instruction is initially delivered in the minority language (primarily Spanish), and 10 percent of instruction is in English, gradually evolving to 50-50 instruction over five years.

The second model of two-way bilingual immersion is the 50-50 model. The two language groups receive half their instruction in English and half in the minority language (e.g. Spanish). An ideal two-way bilingual classroom is comprised of 50% English speaking students and 50% ELLs who share the same native language. The goal is for both language groups to become bilingual and biliterate in both languages over a period of time (usually 5-7 years).

The third model is called a one-way developmental bilingual education program (90-10). In one-way bilingual programs, one language group is taught using two languages. As explained in the previously mentioned 90-10 program, 90 percent of instruction is initially delivered in the native language, 10 percent in English, evolving to a 50-50 mixture. The goal is for them to become fluent in both languages; however, they lack the support of the interaction provided by English speaking classmates. All of the modeling is conducted by the instructor.

The fourth model is a 50-50 one-way developmental bilingual education program. One language group receives half the instruction in the Native language and half in English. This
model is aimed at accelerating the process of acquisition. The typical time frame is three to five years.

The fifth model is a 90-10 transitional bilingual education program. In this particular model, ELL students receive 90 percent of their instruction in their native language and 10 percent in English until grade 5, followed by immersion in the English main-stream. As in the other one-way models, there are no counter-groups of English language proficient (ELPs) students. The instructor is responsible for all modeling in English.

The sixth model is the 50-50 transitional bilingual education program, in which ELL students receive 50 percent of their instruction in English and 50 percent in their native language over three or four years, followed by immersion in the English main-stream. Here again, the purpose is to accelerate the acquisition process.

The seventh model is the traditional English as a second language (ESL) class. ELL students receive bilingual and ESL instruction for two or three years, followed by immersion in the English mainstream. As in all the previous one-way models, the only modeling in English is conducted by the instructor.

The eighth and final model is the English mainstream instructional model. All bilingual and ESL services are refused, and the student is initially placed in the English only, or
mainstream class, in which all of the classmates are typically English language proficient (ELPs) students. These programs are highlighted in the documentation that follows in the literature review.

The States of California and Texas

The state of Texas shows a similar framework for ELL instructional models as the state of California, in that both have a “smorgasbord” approach to the methodology for instructing ELLs. They include all but one of the eight methods (Dual language immersion, developmental bilingual, transitional bilingual, foreign language immersion, heritage language, English as a second language, structured English immersion, sheltered instruction, and newcomer’s class) highlighted in table 3 (See Appendix D).

The State of Oregon

Oregon uses six main programs for English instruction: Mainstream English, structured English immersion, dual language, early transition bilingual, late transition bilingual and native (Heritage) language literacy. The state of Oregon implements these programs through sheltered English instruction (SEI) techniques in an English language development (ELD) discipline of instruction (see Appendix C). In the last two years, the state of Oregon has dramatically changed the way they teach English to ELLs. English as Second Language (ESL) strategies are use for teaching students the components of the English language in a
very explicit way (Hammond, 2008). The department of education in state of Oregon reports above fifty percent rate of fluency success over the last two years on standardized testing measures.

The State of Colorado

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) lists five identifiable programs for instruction in English for ELLs (citing, Antuñez, 2001).

Two-way bilingual - (also known as bilingual immersion or dual language immersion). The goal of this model is to develop bilingualism in ELLs and in English proficient students.

The second model used is the late exit model (also known as developmental bilingual education). This model is similar to the two-way bilingual model with a goal to develop bilingualism in ELLs. However, the late exit model utilizes the native language for instruction and gradually introduces English, transitioning the language of instruction from the native language to English as students’ English language skills develop. (According to the Washington State Department of Education, this period is not to exceed more than six years; from K-6).

The early exit model (also known as transitional bilingual education), like the late exit model, works with ELLs who share a common native language. With a goal of English acquisition, this model utilizes the student’s native language and English at the beginning of the program but quickly progresses to English-only
instruction. Native language skills are developed to a limited extent and only with the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of English. (According to the Washington State Department of Education, this period is not to exceed more than four years; from K-5).

Content-based ESL (also known as sheltered English, or specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), or structured immersion), is a model that works with students from any language background. Instruction is classroom based, delivered in English, and adapted to the students' proficiency level. Content based ESL incorporates contextual clues, such as gestures and visual aids, into the instruction. Emphasis is placed on the necessity of the instructor being highly trained in SDAIE methods; also know in its current application as sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP). It also helps if the instructor happens to be bilingual in the minority language of the student population, which in the south-western states will most likely be Spanish.

The fifth model employed by the state of Colorado is a pull-out ESL program. This model is designed for students who do not share a common native language, although it also can be used with groups who do speak the same native language. The goal is English acquisition. Like content based ESL, a pull-out ESL program model adapts the instruction to the students' proficiency level. Instruction is given to students outside their English-only classrooms and grouping of students by age and grade is flexible due to a low student/teacher ratio.
New Mexico is the only official bilingual state in the USA, according to Thomas & Collier (2004, p.117). New Mexico lists four distinct dual-language immersion (DLI) programs. It is the only state who systematically utilizes DLI throughout the state, and it shares the responsibility of preparing state educated teachers with the University of New Mexico, who has an extensive on-line resource network for DLI.

The first model is two way immersion (90/10 or 50/50); emphasizing the need to have language models of both the minority and majority languages, learning side-by-side in the classroom for the majority of the day. The non-negotiable issues for Two-way Immersion programs are, a balance of language minority and language majority students (at least 1/3 -2/3 ratio for either language), and integration of language minority and language majority students at least 50% of the time at all grade levels.

The second distinct model identified in the state of New Mexico, is the Heritage language model. In this instructional model, the aim is in retaining the student’s native tongue no longer spoken at home. This serves a student population that does not command a fluency in the language of their heritage (in New Mexico, this would include the New Mexican Hispanic or Chicano Student who no longer uses the Spanish language in their home environment). It is a service of preservation of the cultural heritage of the
student’s ancestral language, even though the parents may not speak it at home.

The third distinct model identified in the state of New Mexico, is the developmental bilingual model. This educational model serves predominantly minority language students and does not have the 1/3 representation of strong majority language models participating in the program. As mentioned before, the responsibility of modeling the correct manner of English speech falls on the homeroom educator.

The fourth distinct model identified in the state of New Mexico is a foreign language immersion model. This model serves predominantly majority language students, and does not have the 1/3 representation of strong minority language models participating in the program. The responsibility of "modeling" the minority language falls mainly on the instructors in the classroom, and any community persons wishing to assist in the classroom.

The States of Arizona and Nevada

Nevada employs ESL methods of instructing ELLs as Oregon does, and it also employs SIOP strategies as Colorado does. Likewise, the state of Arizona employs SEI and SIOP strategies.
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The Hayes and Ahrens Report

Common and Uncommon Words in Speech and Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENT WORDS</th>
<th>RARE WORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults talking to children</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults talking to adults (college grads)</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime-time TV: adult</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's books</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic books</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular magazines</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts of scientific papers</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hayes & Ahrens, 1988, as cited by Krashen, 2003)

"The development of lexical knowledge beyond basic [5,000] words requires literacy and extensive reading across a broad range of subjects."

Fig. 1 - Different Registers in Speech and Language. - Adapted from, Krashen's, Explorations in language acquisition and use: the Taipei lectures (2004). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
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NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SPEAKERS PER LANGUAGE IN THE ENTIRE US
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Speakers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215,423,557</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46,951,595</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>All languages other than English combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,101,052</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Spanish or Spanish Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,022,143</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,643,838</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>French (incl. Patois, Cajun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,383,442</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,224,241</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,009,627</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,008,370</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894,063</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706,242</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667,414</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614,582</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564,630</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>Portuguese or Portuguese Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477,997</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453,368</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>French Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418,505</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>African languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365,436</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317,057</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312,085</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262,900</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235,988</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>Gujarathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233,865</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>Serbo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>203,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native North American languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>202,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>195,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Khmer, Cambodian</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>181,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>178,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>178,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao, Hmong</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>168,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian languages</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>162,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>149,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>120,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>117,973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table not true to scale.*
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### MULTICULTURAL CHILDREN'S LITERATURE EVALUATION TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical Inquiry</th>
<th>YES/TRUE</th>
<th>SOMEWWHAT</th>
<th>NO/FALSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. THE STORY IS WELL WRITTEN.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The story itself is interesting and engaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax, grammar, word usage, etc. makes the story easy to read for children of the age for which it is written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. THERE ARE NO DISTORTIONS OR OMISSIONS OF HISTORY.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various perspectives are represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cultures involved are represented accurately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. THERE IS NO STEREOTYPING IN THE TEXT OF THE ETHNIC GROUP BEING PORTRAYED.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no derogatory overtones used in the text to describe the characters and culture in the story (such as “savage,” “primitive,” “lazy,” or “backward”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic characters are portrayed as individuals, not as combinations of culturally stereotypical characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. THE ILLUSTRATIONS ARE AUTHENTIC AND NON-Stereotyped.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The illustrations do not generalize about aspects of the cultural being portrayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters of the same ethnic group are depicted as individuals and do not all look alike; the illustrations show a variety of physical attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. LIFESTYLES OF THE CHARACTERS ARE CULTURALLY ACCURATE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lifestyles of the characters are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.             | *The dialogue used is culturally authentic.*  
The characters use speech that accurately represents the oral tradition from which they come |
| 7.             | *Standards of success are consistent across cultures.*  
The ethnic characters are not portrayed as helpless, or in need of the assistance of a white authority figure.  
Ethnic characters do not have to exhibit extraordinary qualities to gain acceptance or approval with the majority. |
| 8.             | *The role of females, elders, and family are culturally accurate.*  
Women and the elderly are portrayed accurately within their culture.  
The significance of family is portrayed accurately for the culture. |
| 9.             | *Effects to a child’s self-image are taken into consideration.*  
There is nothing in the story that would embarrass or offend a child whose culture is being portrayed.  
You would be willing to share the book with a mixed-race group of children. |
| 10.            | *The author’s and/or illustrator’s background is relevant to the culture portrayed.*  
The author and illustrator have the qualifications and background needed to deal with the cultural group accurately and respectfully  
The author and illustrator are members of the cultural or ethnic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> <strong>RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERS FROM DIFFERENT CULTURES ARE RELEVANT AND AUTHENTIC.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites do not possess the power while cultural minorities play a supporting or subservient role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The minority characters are leaders in the community and solve their own problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> <strong>HEROINES AND HEROES ARE PORTRAYED AUTHENTICALLY WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE CULTURES.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroines and heroes are defined according to the concepts of and struggles for justice appropriate to their cultural group. They are not those who avoid conflict with and thus benefit the white male establishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> <strong>THE COPYRIGHT DATE REFLECTS THE CURRENT UNDERSTANDING OF THE DYNAMICS OF THE CULTURE BEING WRITTEN ABOUT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The book was originally written within the past decade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

APPENDIX I

INTERPERSONAL SPACE FOR COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT
APPENDIX I

INTERPERSONAL SPACE FOR COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT

Focus on Meaning
- Making input comprehensible
- Developing critical literacy

Focus on Use
Using language to
- Generate new knowledge
- Create literature and art
- Act on social realities

Focus on Language
- Awareness of language forms and uses
- Critical analysis of language forms and uses

Fig. 2
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