
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2007

We're Becoming Bilingual And Biliterate! An Ethnographic Study On How A Dual-language Program In Florida Contributes To The Literacy Development of English-Language Learners

Diane Black
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Black, Diane, "We're Becoming Bilingual And Biliterate! An Ethnographic Study On How A Dual-language Program In Florida Contributes To The Literacy Development of English-Language Learners" (2007). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 3088.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/3088>

“WE’RE BECOMING BILINGUAL AND BILITERATE!”
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY ON HOW A DUAL-LANGUAGE PROGRAM
IN FLORIDA CONTRIBUTES TO THE LITERACY DEVELOPMENT
OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LEARNERS

by

DIANE BECKERMAN BLACK
B.A. Marymount College, 1980
M.A.T. Manhattanville College, 1983

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2006

Major Professors: Martha Lue
Mary Little

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to determine whether participation in a dual-language program by English-language learners (ELLs) contributed to the literacy development of this student population. This qualitative research spanned 5 months and was conducted within an elementary school located in central Florida. It is important to note that the researcher was also a teacher within the dual-language program under study, hence possessed an inside perspective of the program and the progression of several participating students. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in a two-way, dual-language program?
2. What factors contribute to the failure to improve the literacy development for ELLs participating in two-way, dual-language programs?

As an ethnographic study, the qualitative methods of observation, interviewing, and examination of artifacts (i.e., work samples) were employed. ELLs attending the 1st through the 5th grades were observed during their Literacy Block and interviewed regarding their feelings about learning two languages. Parents and teachers were also interviewed to determine their beliefs surrounding the contribution of the dual-language program to the literacy development of the participating ELLS. Work samples, including reading scores and journal samples, were also examined.

The four processes of the W. P. Thomas and V. P. Collier (1997) prism model—sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development—served as the theoretical framework for the data analysis. The

prism model facilitated elaboration of how all processes involved in the development of the ELLs' literacy skills are related and intertwined. After triangulation of the data from the observations, interviews and work samples, ten factors affecting second-language acquisition for ELLs participating in a dual-language program were discovered in this study. Nine appeared to contribute to successful literacy development and one factor appeared to contribute to failure in the acquisition of second-language literacy skills. Based upon the findings, it appears that participation in a dual-language program indeed contributes to literacy development in ELLs. Contributions to the field and recommendations for related future research are presented.

To my parents, Ida and Alan,
who taught me to respect and value all people regardless of their background.
Although you now rest in the loving hands of our God, Mother, I yet believe you are
quite aware of this life milestone; your smile is felt deep within my soul.

To my Aunts Ruth and Velma, and my Late Uncle Rubin
who supported and guided me during my mother's long and arduous illness.

To my husband, Jim,
who was always there for me, waiting to lend a helping hand, regardless of the time of
day or night. If there are indeed angels in human form here on Earth, you must be mine.

To all the wonderful students I have taught over the past 23 years and their parents.
You have touched my life in ways you could never know.

To my colleagues within both New York and Florida,
Your contribution to the education of your students is immeasurable. I am a better person,
as well as a better teacher, after having the privilege of working with you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many very special individuals contributed to this work a *fait accompli*. I am deeply thankful for the unwavering support of my chairperson, Dr. Lue. She never relinquished her belief in me and my ability to bring this dissertation to fruition. I also thank my cochair, Dr. Little, for helping me to organize the dissertation in a manner that caused the contribution so important to me to shine through the volumes of text. All of the members of my committee challenged me to “rise to the task” in ways that left no doubt in their mind that I could indeed accomplish this monumental task. My heartfelt thanks is extended to them, as well as to other University of Central Florida professors who inspired me to “stay the path” throughout the doctoral program. They have contributed to my growth as a teacher, a researcher, and reflective individual.

This research would not have been possible without the cooperation of the study-site principal and the participating dual-language teachers, students, and their parents. The teachers opened their classrooms to me and gave freely of their time, and the support of the school principal and county administrators never wavered. The teachers, students, and parents generously contributed their thoughts to this study. It was their collective “voice” that culminated into this work. I will be eternally grateful for their integrity and devotion.

I also wish to thank my pastors, Dave and Les, for their endless prayer and encouragement. Their assurances that God would see me through to completion were deeply appreciated throughout this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Preface.....	1
Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study.....	3
Ethnographic Study and the Research Setting.....	4
Definition of Terms.....	9
Background.....	13
Advocates and Critics of Bilingual Education.....	14
Dual-Language Programs and the Prism Model.....	18
Significance of the Study and the Research Question.....	20
Design of the Study and Procedures.....	21
Data Collection and Analysis.....	25
Objectivity, Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations.....	27
Study Overview and the Researcher’s Background.....	28
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	30
The History of Bilingual Education.....	31
Permissive and Restrictive Periods.....	32
Opportunist Period.....	33
Dismissive Period.....	35
Proponent View of Second-Language Development.....	37
Native-Language Transfer.....	40
Predictors for Academic Success.....	42
Opponent View of Bilingual Education.....	43
Benefits of Bilingual Status.....	48
Bilingual Education Models.....	50
Goals and Implementation of Dual-Language Education.....	52
Successful Dual-Language Programs.....	54

Theoretical Foundation	59
The Prism Model.....	60
Dual-Language Concerns.....	63
Bilingual Education as an Expression of Compassion	64
Summary	66
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	69
Ethnography and Qualitative Study	70
Pilot Study.....	73
Research Questions and Setting.....	75
Study Participants	78
Data Collection	84
The Classroom	84
Schedules	84
Observation.....	86
Field Notes.....	88
Interviews.....	90
Teachers	90
Learners.....	91
Parents.....	92
Artifacts.....	94
Data Analysis	95
Theoretical Framework.....	95
Technique.....	96
Honesty and the Role of the Researcher, Reliability, and Validity	100
Honesty and the Role of the Researcher	100
Reliability.....	102
Validity	103
Objectivity, Assumptions, Limitations, and Ethics	104
Summary	106

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	108
Factors Contributing to Literacy Development in English-Language Learners.....	110
Factor 1: Validation of Culture and Native Language.....	110
Student Attitude toward Learning Two Languages.....	114
Self Portraits.....	117
Factor 2: The Necessity of a Comfortable Learning Environment.....	119
Factor 3: Transfer of Reading Skills from the Native to the Second Language.....	122
Factor 4: The Incorporation of Literature within the Reading Block.....	128
Factor 5: Additional Linguistic Support across the Content Area.....	133
Factor 6: Development of Thinking Skills.....	136
Factor 7: Strategies Supporting English Speakers of Other Languages.....	140
Factor 8: Creative Activities Integrated within Literacy Instruction.....	143
Factor 9: Language Arts in Both Languages.....	147
Factors Potentially Contributing to Failure in Improving Literacy Development.....	153
Factor 1: The Imbalance of Instructional Time in English and Spanish.....	153
Conclusion.....	156
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	158
Overview.....	158
Interpretation of the Findings.....	161
Research Question 1.....	161
Factor 1: Validation of Culture and Language.....	161
Factor 2: The Necessity of a Comfortable Learning Environment.....	162
Factor 3: Transfer of Reading Skills from the Native to the Second Language.....	163
Factor 4: The Incorporation of Literature within the Reading Block.....	164
Factor 5: Additional Linguistic Support across the Content Area.....	165

Factor 6: Development of Thinking Skills.....	165
Factor 7: Strategies Supporting English Speakers of Other Languages	166
Factor 8: Creative Activities Integrated within Literacy Instruction	166
Factor 9: Language Arts in Both Languages	167
Research Question 2	168
Factor 1: The Imbalance of Instructional Time in English and Spanish....	168
Contributions of the Study	170
Sociocultural Processes.....	171
Linguistic Processes.....	172
Academic Development.....	174
Cognitive Development	175
Application.....	179
Recommendations for Future Research	180
Conclusion	181
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DOCUMENTATION	184
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORMS.....	188
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS	199
APPENDIX D: SELF-PORTRAITS	203
REFERENCES	205

LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary of Study Contributions to the Literature.....	177
--	-----

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Preface

Readers are invited to embark on this ethnographic journey within an academic bilingual program known as *dual language*. The purpose is to investigate whether such programs assist English-language learners (ELLs) to develop literacy skills in their first language (i.e., Spanish), as well as in English. This question arose as a result of the direct involvement of the researcher as a teacher within a dual-language program from the fall of 2000 through the spring of 2006. As one of the original, dual-language teachers within the school district, it has been a privilege for the researcher to have worked with both ELLs and English-speaking students, their parents, and their other teachers over the preceding 6 years. Through this period, interest in their “travels” toward literacy in the English language grew; the result is this body of work. Qualitative methods of observation, interviewing, and examining artifacts (i.e., work samples) have been employed in this study. According to Glesne (1999),

Learning to listen well to others’ stories and to interpret and retell the accounts is part of the qualitative researcher’s role. . . . The researcher becomes the main research instrument as he or she observes, asks questions, and interacts with research participants. (pp. 1, 3)

With the changing demographics across America, schools have assumed the role of leaders in advocating cultural diversity (Fernandez, 1996). Schools must seize the opportunity to celebrate their ethnic population by allowing the voices of their students and their families to be heard and their stories to be told (Nieto, 2000).

Even during the first year of inception, administrative support for the dual-language program at the district level was strong (Anglely, 2000). This was largely because dual language provides the opportunity for children to become bilingual and biliterate, through an enriching curriculum where two languages and cultures are supported and valued.

This current research into dual language includes two prior studies at the doctoral level, both producing favorable results for this field. The first, conducted in 2001, collected data via a parental survey and documented positive results for both ELLs and English-speaking children. In 2004, a qualitative pilot study also produced promising results in terms of dual-language programs increasing the literacy skills of ELLs. Teaching within a dual-language program has given the researcher the perspective of an “insider.” She is able to determine whether the dual-language model indeed contributes to literacy development in ELLs from the perspectives of the students, their parents, and their other teachers.

Readers are invited to “walk in the shoes” of ELLs new to the United States and with a native language (L1) other than English. Imagine entering a new country with no knowledge of its L1. Daily life, coupled with the struggle to understand a new, completely foreign language and all that it entails, is nearly unfathomable. The students participating in this current study all faced this scenario at some point during their education. As Igoa (1995) described, “When immigrant children leave the country that was their home—a familiar language, culture, community, and social system—they experience a variety of emotional and cognitive adjustments to the reality of life in a new

country” (p. xi). Readers are encouraged to continue their review of this study documentation to discover for themselves whether dual-language programs contribute to the literacy skills of ELLs.

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

The debate around bilingual education continues to spark controversy between its detractors and its supporters. The education of linguistic minority students in the United States is a complex issue, involving contrasting theories of education itself, the values of American society, and the extent to which cross-culturalism can be maintained effectively. Although proponents of bilingual education argue that it increases students’ academic success, opponents argue that it leads to academic failure. (Cazabon, Nicoladis, & Lambert, 1998, p. 1)

During the 1980s, intense interest in dual-language programs, which are within the realm of bilingual education, emerged for two primary reasons. One was the need to educate the children of newly arrived immigrants to this country, and another was the rebirth of an interest in foreign languages and how to best teach Anglo children a second language (L2). School districts across the nation began to examine successful models within Miami, Florida; Washington, DC; Chicago, Illinois; and San Diego, California (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Dual-language programs alter preexisting conceptions of the native “tongue” of an ELL as a deficiency to viewing the first language as a resource. As espoused by Ruiz, this fresh point of view serves to raise the status of non-English languages within the United States while concurrently improving relations among ethnic groups (as cited in Gómez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005, p. 146).

There are, however, major differences between dual-language programs and other L2 educational models. ELLs are integrated with native English speakers in a learning

environment wherein both languages are valued. English does not *replace* the first language. Support is continued in the first language while the second language is being learned (Thomas & Collier, 2003). Teachers treat all students with respect and expect high-quality academic work from both ELLs and native English speakers equally. Lastly, students are taught to value all cultures and backgrounds (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The goals of dual-language programs can be divided into three main attributes or features—the linguistic, sociocultural, and pedagogical. The linguistic feature encompasses biliteracy for all students. The sociocultural component is grounded in respect for diversity. The pedagogical aspect consists of academic achievement across all content areas. And, dual-language programs have the unique feature that all three of these attributes are interwoven to provide a successful education for the ELL, as well as, the English speaker (Torres-Guzmán, 2002).

The purpose of this current research was to determine whether participation in a dual-language program by ELLs contributed to the literacy development of this student population. As an ethnographic study, the qualitative methods of observation, interviewing, and examination of artifacts (i.e., work samples) were employed. As described by Glesne (1999), “The researcher becomes the main research instrument as he or she observes, asks questions, and interacts with research participants” (p. 5).

Ethnographic Study and the Research Setting

The controversy over bilingual education provided the impetus for this ethnographic study examining the contribution of dual-language programs to the development of literacy skills in ELLs. In an ethnography, the researcher observes,

interviews, and collects artifacts related to the culture under study. Ethnography is a storytelling institution, and it is ultimately the personal contact by the researcher with the group that lends credibility to the investigation (Van Maanen, 1995). The choice to conduct a qualitative study among the pressure of bilingual-education critics for statistical studies to enable them to prove or disprove the effectiveness of dual-language programs (Rossell & Baker, 1996b) was rooted in the anecdotes of the participants. Their experiences within the program proved to be crucial to the study because “stories matter” (Perry, 2001, p. 17). Detachment is not always the optimal avenue toward thorough understanding (Eisner, 1998):

The presence of voice and the use of expressive language are also important in furthering human understanding. German psychologists call it *empathie*. In English, it is called “empathy.”

Empathy is the ability to don the shoes of another human being. One experiences this in reading Elie Wiesel or Truman Capote. Good writers put you there. Empathy pertains to feeling or to emotion, and emotion, interestingly, is often regarded as the enemy of cognition. I reject such a view. To read about people or places or events that are emotionally powerful and to receive an eviscerated account is to read something of a lie. Why take the heart out of the situations we are trying to help readers understand? (pp. 36–37)

The central Florida county of focus in this study implemented a dual-language program within two schools during the 2000-01 school year with a \$1 million, 5-year, Title VII federal grant. The first to participate were two kindergarten classes, one at each school site. One class was taught entirely in Spanish and one in English. Each year, a pair of classes—one English and one Spanish—was added. Currently, this county offers dual-language programs through the fifth grade at three schools with plans to expand through middle and high school; two schools offer the program through first grade. This

program will be offered to sixth-grade students during the 2006-07 school year; and, another elementary school will add an additional dual-language kindergarten class.

Spanish is spoken within most minority households within the county (Oms & Medina, 2006). The majority of the total student population within the county (52,599 students) are of Hispanic descent (49%). European American students comprise 33.6%, 10.2 % are African American, 4.5% are multiracial, 2.5% are Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.3 % are American Indian or Alaskan (Osceola County School District, 2005). Consequently, the minority language within the dual-language program of the county is Spanish. The dual-language program is perceived to be successful for both the English speakers and ELLs. “The multicultural and bilingual educational experiences that encompass dual language instruction allow students to form a positive self-image as well as expanded understandings of and respect for other cultures and languages” (Soltero, 2004, p. x).

The multicultural department coordinator of the school district participating in this study reported during an interview, “Our mission is to create bilingual, biliterate and bicultural individuals” (as cited in Scheffield, 2005, p. 1). Spanish is just one of the many L2s targeted within dual-language programs across the country. Others have included Arabic, Cantonese, French, Haitian-Creole, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Tagalog.

When an administrator was asked why she had an interest in the program, she replied that it was her desire to give all children the opportunity to become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. It was important to her that non-English-speaking children take pride in their languages and cultures. She also hoped that English-speaking children

would appreciate the languages and cultures of others (M. Luciano, personal communication, March 7, 2006). Importantly, language skills should not be taught in isolation. Effective learning manifests naturally through enriching group activities. Learning occurs by doing, rather than by memorizing (Clark, 1995).

The research setting for this current study is a large urban elementary school within a central Florida county. It is one of five schools offering the dual-language program within its school district; however, it is not one of the two original schools covered under the Title VII grant. Although an administrator from one of the schools had transferred to the study site, grant dollars could not transfer with this individual. Regardless, a dual-language program was subsequently initiated. The administrator valued the program so highly that it was funded through the basic budget of the school.

The study site had been a historically poor-performing school. However, during the preceding 2004-05 school year, the study site's grade rating had risen from a "D" to a "C plus." In Florida, school grades have been issued since 1999 based on the scores from the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) to determine students' mastery of the state's learning standards. This yearly testing is part of Florida's A+ school accountability system. Grades are awarded according to points earned on the FCAT. Students are tested in reading, math writing and science (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Dual language is just one of the many innovative programs the site has implemented, which is viewed as a significant contributory factor to its academic improvement.

According to an online guide of schools known as schooltree.org, which collects data from the Department of Education, the study site is currently a Title 1 school with 91% of its students eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch status (Florida Department of Education, 2005). Due to the transitory nature of families within the county, the study site has a high mobility rate among its student body. Of 835 students, 63.9% are Hispanic, 16.1% are African American, 11.0% are European American, 6.0% are Multiracial, and 3% are Asian or Pacific Islander. 13.2% (111 students) participate in the dual-language program (Oms & Medina, 2006) with 34% of the student body designated as ELLs.

The surrounding neighborhood is comprised of primarily Hispanic families; consequently, the target language within the dual-language program is Spanish. The school adheres to the 50-50 model for dual language, which translates to half of the lessons delivered in English and the other half in Spanish. However, in reality, due to morning announcements and special-area classes such as art, music, and physical education delivered in English, the ratio is closer to a 60-40 model.

During the 2004-05 school year, the study-site elementary school alternated lesson delivery each day between English and Spanish. There were two teachers for the kindergarten and first-grade classes—one for each language. The alternating schedule is crucial to the strict separation needed between the two languages. It facilitates learning for young children to associate English with one teacher and Spanish with the other (Soltero, 2004). However, during the 2005-06 school year, Spanish was consistently taught in the afternoon to adhere to the state mandate of 90 minutes of reading in English each day. Consequently, rather than alternating the language each day, the students now

receive the morning half of their lessons in English each day and the afternoon half in Spanish. During the 2004-05 school year, Grades 2 through 4 were taught by a single bilingual teacher due to low enrollment. She simply alternated the language of her instruction each day, rather than the students moving to a different classroom. Therefore, regardless of whether any class had one or two teachers, all students were taught all subjects in both languages. The high mobility rate continues to affect the student population participating in the dual-language program. During the current 2005-06 school year, one bilingual teacher for the kindergarten through fifth-grade classes was used due to limited enrollment, with the exception of the first-grade class taught by the researcher and her teaching partner who instructs in Spanish.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this study and are defined here for purposes of this research:

Additive bilingualism refers to the learning of a second language without the loss of the native or first language.

Bilingual education incorporates two languages for instruction to facilitate academic and linguistic achievement in both the native and the second language, or in only the second language. Such programs can be either additive in nature, focusing on maintaining the first language, or subtractive where the focus is on English replacing the first language. Additive programs are often referred to as developmental, maintenance, heritage language, or dual-language two-way immersion. Subtractive programs are known as early-exit, late-exit, or transitional bilingual education.

Bilingualism refers to the ability to use two languages.

Biliteracy is the ability to read and write in two languages.

Developmental bilingual education refers to a model of instruction allowing ELLs to learn English while maintaining their first language.

Dual-language education is an additive bilingual education model where equal numbers of students from two language groups are integrated for consistent, enriching instruction using two languages. The goal for all students is literacy development in the first and second language, high academic achievement, and a heightened cross cultural understanding. Dual-language education programs can also be called two-way immersion, two-way bilingual, developmental bilingual education (DBE) or Spanish immersion.

Early-exit bilingual education maintains an instructional focus on learning English; maintenance of the first language is not stressed within these programs.

English immersion is also referred to as “sink or swim” with the aim of developing proficiency in English, rather than maintaining the L1 or culture.

English-language learners (ELLs) are students not yet proficient in English. They are also referred to as limited English proficient (LEP), second-language learners, and language minority.

English as a second language (ESL) is a program designed to help ELLs learn English; it may be content based or grammatically based.

A heritage-language bilingual program is an additive language program maintaining the L1 (e.g., maintaining Spanish while English is being acquired).

Immersion is a term for dual-language or two-way immersion where students from two language groups receive academic and linguistic instruction with the aim of accomplishing bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural goals. The term originates from a Canadian French-English additive form of bilingual education.

Language-majority students speak the official or higher status language, which is typically English.

Language-minority students speak a language other than English (e.g., Spanish) that does not claim the high status of English.

Late-exit bilingual education refers to a bilingual program that allows ELLS to continue developing their first language even after they have acquired English.

Literacy can be defined as the four components of language arts, (a) listening, (b) speaking, (c) reading, and (d) writing.

Maintenance bilingual education is also known as developmental bilingual education wherein the first language and culture is supported while English is learned.

Minority language usually refers to the language that is used by the segment of the population with less influence or power.

Native language (L1) refers to the first language acquired. It is also known as mother tongue, home language, primary language, first language, or heritage language.

Newcomer programs are designed for students with a poor academic foundation and a lack of basic literacy skills within their L1. These models generally serve older students and for a brief duration.

Partial immersion refers to a dual-language program wherein students receive 50% of their instruction in the new language, which is typically English, and 50% of their instruction in the L1. It is also known as the balanced model or the 50-50 model.

Second language (L2) refers to the new language acquired after the first has been learned.

A second-language learner is an individual learning a second language.

Spanish as a second language (SSL) refers to Spanish instruction for English speakers.

Second-language acquisition is the subconscious process of acquiring a second language usually occurring through meaningful interactions with speakers of that language.

Submersion refers to programs where ELLs receive minimal linguistic support and are required to perform much like native English or majority-language speakers.

Subtractive bilingual education is instruction with the purpose of replacing the primary language with the second language, which is typically English.

The *target language* refers to the language being learned. For ELLs, the target language would be English; for English speakers it would be Spanish or the minority language of the respective dual-language program.

Total immersion refers to a dual-language program that delivers 80% to 90% of the instruction in the first language, which is typically Spanish, and 10% to 20% of the instruction in English. The amount of English instruction increases with each ensuing

year; thus, by the fifth or sixth grade, each language receives the same amount of instructional time.

Transitional bilingual education is similar to an early-exit program, with an emphasis on learning English, rather than maintaining the native language.

Two-way bilingual education integrates English-speaking students and ELLs for academic and linguistic instruction. It is also known as dual language and two-way immersion.

Background

Educating students whose first language is other than English continues to be fraught with heated debate. Consequently, educating students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds continues to be a major challenge in schools across the nation (Takahashi-Breines, 2002). As the history of this problem is traced, it becomes evident that, long before the European explorers colonized the continent, several hundred American Indian languages existed in this land (Ovando, 2003). Furthermore, the United States was fully accepting of foreign languages since its colonial days until approximately the late 19th century (Fitzgerald, 1993; Moses, 2000; Ovando, 2003). Indeed, bilingual education can be traced back to the mid 19th century when a number of German-English Catholic schools were established within the Ohio and Missouri regions of the county. Other European languages were spoken in schools throughout the states (Genesee, 1987). With the advent of World War I, however, attitudes turned adverse toward foreign languages. This occurred just prior to ratification of the Naturalization Act of 1906 rendering English a required language for U.S. citizenship (Ovando, 2003).

Advocates and Critics of Bilingual Education

The federal government did not sanction bilingual education until 1968 (Moses, 2000). That was the first time in American history, that the federal government set out to establish an educational program that built its linguistic foundation upon the students' L1, allowing them to learn without being proficient in English, first (Ovando, 2003).

Another landmark event in support of bilingual education was a supreme-court case of 1974—*Lau v. Nichols* (as cited in Ovando, 2003)—requiring educational material to be comprehensible to ELLs. Despite such mandates from the mid to late 20th century to date, the push to return to the restrictive policies of exclusively English within the United States remains at the forefront. As Ovando reported, “beyond Washington, political activists across the nation began to press for a return to the sink-or-swim days and the melting pot ideology” (p. 12).

Despite its critics, bilingual education did have supporters during the 1980s and 1990s. The Clinton administration is noted for reversing some of the “cutbacks” of the Reagan years that would have curtailed bilingual services for ELLs. Advocates continued attempts to counteract the blame placed on bilingual education for the high dropout rates associated with Latinos leaving high school (Ovando, 2003). As explained by Krashen, their school failure can be attributed to a complex set of adverse factors, notably poverty, prejudice, lack of favorable minority role models, a dearth of bona fide reading materials within the home, and a school culture that endorses the status quo and tracking (as cited in Ovando, 2003). Today, there continues to be little consensus on whether ELLs should be schooled within programs supportive of their heritage language or those delivering

solely English instruction. According to Moses (2000), “Even though various research studies have underscored the effectiveness of bilingual education, it is still often the object of criticism and disdain” (p. 333). Advocates of bilingual education espouse the primary language of students as an asset in learning an L2. According to Nieto (2000), “Native language maintenance might act as a buffer against academic failure by simply supporting literacy in children’s most developed language” (p. 194).

Thomas and Collier (1997), researchers within the field of L2 acquisition and proponents of L1 instruction, presented three predictors of success for ELLs. They based their findings upon data collected from five urban and suburban school systems with 700,000 students residing in various regions of the nation from 1982 through 1996 (Thomas & Collier, 1997; Treadway, 2000). Thomas and Collier believe these predictors which have the potential to overcome even such a debilitating factor as poverty, to be more important than any others in determining whether ELLs will succeed within the classroom. And, schools that incorporate them will be more likely to graduate successful ELLs.

The first predictor is challenging academic instruction delivered in the first language at least through the fifth or sixth grade. The second predictor of success is effective curriculum delivery through both languages, using innovative approaches including technology, creative arts, cooperative learning, and discovery learning. The third indicator is a supportive academic environment where ELLs are not segregated to “special” classes and respect for diversity is encouraged (Thomas & Collier, 1997; Treadway, 2000).

However, opponents remain unconvinced and believe that additional time devoted to English instruction will promote more rapid English proficiency (Rossell & Baker, 1996b). Yet, a primary goal of bilingual education is the teaching of English (Fernandez, 1996; Montague, 1997).

Experts and governmental institutions have to grasp how the various competing entities of society have determined the U.S. policies for educating language minorities. All areas of the power structure of today and tomorrow must have a clear perception of the history of diverse groups' successes and failures to totally comprehend their linguistic needs. Similarly, the nation's leaders need to know and appreciate how and why adversaries have succeeded in the past to discredit the benefits of bilingual education pedagogy (Ovando, 2003).

Supporters of dual language—a type of bilingual program—base their views upon several advantages for ELLs. There is evidence that bilingual students enjoy the more cognitive and academic benefits (Cummins, 1998). Additionally, continued instruction delivered in the L1 provides a substantial foundation upon which the L2 can be learned. Literacy skills can be transferred from one language to the next. Consequently, continuing L1 instruction does not detract from eventual English proficiency (Beykont, 1994; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000b). Lastly, diversity is valued within dual-language programs. ELLs recognize that their culture is an important aspect of such programs, and this feeling of acceptance cannot be underestimated (Cummins, 1986; Reyes, 1992).

Critics of bilingual education as a whole explain that the historical mistreatment of ELLs has rendered it impossible to offer instructional techniques that exclude the L1 due to the risk of appearing discriminatory (Rossell & Baker, 1996b). Despite many studies citing reading instruction in the native tongue as advantageous in promoting reading in English, opponents believe it is the duration devoted to English instruction that makes the difference. They concede that instruction delivered in the L1 is helpful only at the onset when basic knowledge of the English language is nonexistent. Critics maintain that, once that foundation has been learned, the time invested in English instruction becomes crucial. Whether the U.S. government should support programs not delivered exclusively in English has even been questioned (Cummins, 1986; Otheguy, 1982; Rossell & Baker, 1996b).

Lastly, critics maintain that many other factors external to instruction in the L1 must be considered. The age, health, and intelligence of students learning English are all influences to success, as are class attendance, family characteristics, the talents of the teacher, and the classroom atmosphere, to name a few. All have mediating effects on the amount of English learned (Rossell & Baker, 1996b). Opponents of bilingual education as a whole believe that, the more time spent in English instruction, the more rapid English proficiency will manifest. Despite the positive research on L1 delivery of English-language education, critics remain unconvinced. They frequently cite the lack of adequate English instruction as the root cause for educational and economic impoverishment of language-minority population groups (Porter, 1996; Schlesinger, 1998).

Dual-Language Programs and the Prism Model

According to Lindholm-Leary (2001),

Dual language education (DLE) is a program that has the potential to eradicate the negative status of bilingualism in the US. The appeal of dual language education is that it combines maintenance bilingual education and immersion education models in an integrated classroom composed of both language majority and language minority students with the goal of full bilingualism and biliteracy. (p. 1)

Dual-language programs are overshadowed by the many fictitious claims assigned to bilingual education. The claim that such programs segregate ELLs is not a scenario experienced with English instruction delivered within dual-language programs. ELLs and Anglos and African American students learn side by side, benefiting from the struggles and accomplishments each endures. Additionally, dual-language programs are not considered compensatory programs. The heritage languages of ELLs are highly valued. The model is based upon adding rather than eliminating a language. The claim that language-majority students perform better than language-minority students within dual-language programs is false (Torres-Guzmán, 2002). Each group masters skills in both their L1s and L2s. The claim that dual-language programs are too expensive is not necessarily true. It is indeed an additional program with operational costs; however, it is the least expensive of all the language programs. It does not require an additional “pull-out” teacher, as is the case with ESL programs (Torres-Guzmán, 2002).

Dual-language teachers, unlike other educators, must be consistently mindful that they are instructing two groups of students—English speakers and ELLs. Creating lessons that are both challenging for English speakers while comprehensible to ELLs can be difficult. Not only must dual-language teachers maintain their awareness of the L2

acquisition process, but the sociocultural issues surrounding the education of ELLs are also critical for this teaching population to consider in all manner of communication with their students (Takahashi-Breines, 2002).

To help educators understand the complex process of L2 acquisition, Thomas and Collier (1997) developed a conceptual model they referred to as the prism model. It was introduced in their longitudinal study conducted from 1982 to 1997. The four components—sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, cognitive development, and academic development—are all interconnected and mutually supportive. Thomas and Collier noted, “The four components are interdependent, and if one is developed to the neglect of another, this may be detrimental to a student’s overall growth and future success” (as cited in Takahashi-Breines, 2002, p. 231).

The prism model (Thomas & Collier, 1997) was the theoretical framework that enabled the researcher of this current study to recognize and organize data gleaned from classroom observation, interviews, and work samples. The sociocultural processes included all of the social and cultural experiences of the participating ELLs within both home and school settings. The linguistic processes included all involved in student acquisition of both their L1 and L2. Academic development will transfer from the first language to the new language. Content acquisition must continue across the curriculum from kindergarten through the 12th grade. Lastly, cognitive development must continue in both languages throughout the education of ELLs. Thomas and Collier believe that language development correlates to cognitive development. If language instruction in the primary languages of ELLs is halted before reaching the final Piagetian stage of formal

operation, the risk of negative academic and cognitive consequences increases, especially as measured by standardized tests. Those teachers whom have a comprehensive understanding of the sociocultural and linguistic issues their students face are more likely to provide them with an equitable learning environment (Takahashi-Breines, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Significance of the Study and the Research Questions

This research examines the influence of the dual-language program on the development of literacy skills in both English and Spanish for ELLs attending the public elementary school in central Florida that served as the study site. Qualitative methods of observation, interviewing, and artifact examination were employed in this ethnographic study. The intent was to allow the data to tell the story of the effects of the program on the described literacy development. Central to the study are the participants; namely, the ELLs, their parents, and their teachers. As defined by Van Maanen (1995), “Broadly conceived, ethnography is a storytelling institution. . . . It is by and large, the ethnographer’s direct personal contact with others that is honored by readers as providing a particularly sound basis for reliable knowledge” (p. 3). The objective of this current ethnographic research was to contribute further knowledge to existing literature on the optimal method of educating and developing the literacy skills of ELLs. The controversy over bilingual education adds to the impetus behind this ethnographic study. Unfortunately, assurance of positive results from bilingual education remains a challenge, even as the 21st century unfolds (Crawford, 2005; Ovando, 2003).

This research will assist in the development of insight into:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in a two-way, dual-language program?

2. What factors contribute to the failure to improve the literacy development of the ELLs by participating in a two-way, dual-language program?

Literacy is defined as a combination of the following four components of language arts: (a) listening, (b) speaking, (c) reading, and (d) writing. All interconnect to influence learning within all subject areas. As Chenfeld (1987) explained,

The language arts are vitally linked to other subject areas. If you cannot communicate in some way (through speech, sign language, writing), you cannot share your experiences, ask questions, or exchange ideas. If you cannot read, you cannot read a book, a newspaper, a magazine, or the warning label on a medicine bottle. If you cannot write, you cannot write down your findings for a science experiment or send a friend happy news in a letter. If you cannot comprehend (listen and understand), you cannot follow a simple arithmetic problem or develop thoughtful responses to situations in your environment that demand sound solutions. (p. 93)

Design of the Study and Procedures

This ethnographic study was conducted to determine whether the literacy skills of ELLs participating in a dual-language program are improved through the voices of those involved; namely, the students themselves, their parents, and their teachers. Evidence of literacy development across both the L1 and the new English language was sought. In an ethnography, the researcher observes, interviews, and collects artifacts related to the culture under study. Ethnography is a storytelling institution; it is the personal contact by the researcher with the study group that lends credibility to the investigation (Van Maanen, 1995). It is important to note that the researcher of this current study was also a

teacher in the dual-language program under study. This enabled her to obtain the perspective of an insider. As further described by Glesne (1999),

A paradox develops as you become more of a participant and less of an observer. The more you function as a member of the everyday world of the researched, the more you risk losing the eye of the uninvolved outsider; yet, the more you participate, the greater your opportunity to learn. (p. 44)

The research questions that guided this study were formulated from a basis grounded in the Thomas and Collier (1997) model for language acquisition known as the prism model. This model elaborates upon all processes for learning English and the manner in which they are related and intertwined. It encompasses four critical elements: sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development. If any one of these components is missing or lacking, the result is reduced learning. The framework provided by the prism model helped to formulate the focus of this study. Consequently, the research would be considered theory based due to the search for examples of this Thomas and Collier construct. Miles and Huberman (1994) believe “that better research happens when you make your framework—and associated choices of research questions, cases, sampling, and instrumentation—explicit, rather than claiming inductive ‘purity’”(p. 23).

The researcher of this study used her experience as a teacher to contribute to a meaningful educational experience for ELLs. She taught the English component of a dual-language program offered to first-grade students. Her teaching partner taught the Spanish component. Each had a homeroom class, and the children alternated between the classrooms. Additionally, the researcher alternated between the roles of an ethnographer

and teacher. A researcher is no longer required to sustain distance from the culture under study. Through immersion into the field of study, a more thorough understanding is gained by the researcher of not only the culture under examination, but of personal thoughts and feelings related to the realm of study (Behar, 1996).

This ethnography was conducted from January 3, 2006 through May 26, 2006. It is important to note that the researcher had also taught some of the ELLs participating in the study, in years past. As a teacher, she was familiar with their literacy development. However, due to the high mobility rate of families within the district, many of the original dual-language students had moved. The classes selected for participation included the first-grade class taught by the researcher, which was conducted entirely in English; the first-grade class taught entirely in Spanish by her teaching partner; the second-grade class; the combination second- and third-grade class; and the combination fourth- and fifth-grade class. Students within the latter three classes attended the English period in the morning and the Spanish period in the afternoon.

The intent was to have at least five ELLs from each of the five dual-language classrooms of the study site to observe during class time and interview regarding their feelings surrounding the program. The exact number of student participants within each class varied according to the number of ELLs and the limitation of parental and individual consent. In actuality 38 ELLs were participants in the study. Seven were from the researcher's homeroom and four were from her partner's. Six were from the second grade classroom. Eleven ELLs participated from the second/third combination class and ten from the fourth/fifth combination class. The artifacts examined consisted of work

samples, reading tests, and self-portraits created by the ELLs during English and Spanish class periods, respectively.

The ELLs who participated in this study were identified as English speakers of other languages (ESOL) through language testing under guidelines established by the school district. Not every child who speaks a language other than English is classified as ESOL. The county had established specific guidelines as to who qualified as ESOL. Simply speaking a language other than English did not equate to automatic qualification for ESOL services. Upon enrollment, if parents indicate that the L1 of their child is other than English, an oral test must be administered (i.e., the Idea Proficiency Test). For ESOL students being enrolled within the fourth through the fifth grades, testing includes reading and writing (D. Azuaje, personal communication, May 25, 2006).

Parental interviews were requested by the researcher across the grade levels; however, parental accessibility presented a limitation due to their family and work schedules. The interviews sought to determine the thoughts and feelings of parents surrounding the participation of their children within the dual-language program. Any necessary translation was provided by the Spanish teacher partnered with the researcher. The dual-language teachers were also interviewed to determine if they believed that the program was benefiting the literacy development of ELLs within their classes. Because a journal is an important tool of ethnographic study, allowing the investigator to reflect upon the data collected (Janesick, 2000), the researcher used one at the start of the study to help her separate personal feelings from actual classroom observations. A January 21, 2006 entry read,

By alternating between wearing the cap of a teacher and an ethnographer, I am really learning a lot about how my students learn. I'm noticing little things; but, they expand to show me a great deal on how kids learn a second language. I agree with Behar [1996] – the more you immerse yourself in your work, the more you learn about yourself and the population you are studying.

Data Collection and Analysis

The observation conducted for this study included the ELLs attending the homeroom class taught by the researcher entirely in English, the first-grade class taught by her teaching partner entirely in Spanish, the second-grade class, and the combination classes of second- and third-grade students and fourth- and fifth-grade students. The kindergarten class was not included because the students and parents were all new to the program. The researcher became the main instrument of this study as she sought to paint an accurate portrait of how ELLs were acquiring literacy skills within the dual-language program of the study-site classes under observation (Glesne, 1999; Sanjek, 1990). Field notes were taken by hand and transcribed daily. The observations were maintained in chronological order and the decision was made to not videotape sessions to avoid creating undue anxiety for the students, as well as student exaggeration for the camera. The intent was to maintain an observational setting as natural as possible while causing as little disruption as possible (Eisner, 1998; Ely, 1997).

Eight parents of students participating in the study were interviewed. As noted earlier, the Spanish teacher serving as the teaching partner for the researcher became the translator, as needed. Each of the dual-language teachers and all of the participating students were interviewed. Interviewing became the vehicle used to complement the field notes from classroom observations, as well as the work samples (Holstein & Gubrium,

2003). The original intention was to record the participant responses on a tape recorder. As the study progressed, the machine was deemed too intrusive. The primary concern was for the comfort of the participants; consequently, all responses were documented by hand in a notebook during each interview (Eisner, 1998), transcribing the conversations into a computer following each session. The work samples (i.e., artifacts) examined included student journals, reading folders, reading tests, and self-portraits created in both the Spanish and English classes, as well as individual or group social-studies and science projects. School wide reading assessments were also reviewed to determine growth patterns.

To prevent an insurmountable amount of data from accruing, ongoing analysis is recommended. This can also lead to fresh approaches to data collection (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As noted earlier, this study sought to determine how the four processes or themes of the Thomas and Collier (1997) prism model (i.e., sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development) manifested in the classroom observation, interviews, and work samples. As the researcher immersed herself in the study, she allowed themes to emerge from the data. It is recommended that the ethnographer generate a list of codes to directly relate emerging data to the research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Therefore data were coded as the study progressed. These codes allowed the assignment of labels to similar information gleaned during the course of the study. Data were assigned to each corresponding process of the prism model. *Clustering* expands upon coding by allowing the formation of subcategories. *Factoring* is also an option that allows for expanded categories created by several pieces

of related data. Using the techniques of coding, clustering, and factoring enabled initial assignment of the data into the four main categories of the prism model (i.e., sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Objectivity, Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Because the current study investigated a program that the researcher also administers, objectivity could be questioned. The described techniques for recording and analyzing are intended to minimize such bias. Journaling will also be instrumental in separating the personal feelings of the researcher from the data collected via direct observation (Janesick, 2000). However, it is important to note that, in qualitative research, the personal interpretation of the researcher is a positive distinguishing characteristic (Eisner, 1998; Ely, 1997; Glesne, 1999; Janesick, 2000).

A necessary assumption in this study is that the participating ELLs, their parents, and their teachers all provided honest responses during the interviews. A limitation was the amount of actual classroom observation the researcher was able to conduct during the time period of the study from January 3, 2006 through May 26, 2006. The actual amount of observation of the classes came to approximately 350 hours. Another limitation would be the mental state of the participants. There could exist external forces within the school, family, or community of which the researcher was either unaware or had no control over during the course of this ethnography. Additionally, the potential mentioned earlier of questioned objectivity with the researcher considered an insider to the study site also presents a limitation.

Lastly, the single study site limits generalizability of the results to ELLs within that elementary school. Additionally, participants were selected from the dual-language program existing within the single study site, which consisted of two first-grade classes—one taught in English and one in Spanish—one combination second- and third-grade class, one second-grade class, and another combination fourth- and fifth-grade class. Other schools within the county applied different combinations of dual-language classes depending upon student needs and county requirements.

Study Overview and the Researcher's Background

A scholarly review of relevant literature on bilingual education is critical to this study. The review conducted in chapter two presents a history of bilingual education from the perspectives of both proponents and opponents. Theories of L2 acquisition and the specifics of dual-language programs are also addressed. Chapter three provides further detail on the methodology of this ethnography along with how data were gathered and analyzed. In a discussion of the findings, in chapter four, the observations, interviews, and work samples analyzed are described according to the themes of the Thomas and Collier (1997) prism model—the sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development. Finally, in chapter five, the perception of the researcher with regard to the literacy development of ELLs within the dual-language program studied is presented along with recommendations for future study.

As a nonminority educator, the researcher often ponders the origins of her compassion for L2 learners. Although it is difficult to pinpoint, these roots reach back to childhood. As bicultural partners, her parents raised her in a multiethnic neighborhood.

The researcher believes the exposure to relatives and friends from a variety of backgrounds “paved the way” for eventual understanding of, and appreciation for, children with diverse backgrounds. The message that all people are to be treated with respect was passed on to the researcher from an early age. As expressed by Montague (1997), “As an Anglo bilingual educator, I want all children in U.S. public schools to value their individual cultures and language differences” (p. 335). It was rewarding and enlightening for the researcher to alternate between the roles of ethnographer and teacher. The discoveries of this ethnographic study will make a solid contribution to existing research focused on productive ways of educating ELLs.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

Since 1993, the enrollment of ELLs within American schools has increased by 65%. During 2003 alone, 5 million ELLs attended U.S. public schools. Approximately 1 in 10 students is an ELL, and the majority of these are of Hispanic descent; although, they originate from regions across the globe (Flannery, 2005). Consequently, educating students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds continues to be a major challenge within schools throughout the nation (Takahashi-Breines, 2002). Debate regarding method is ongoing. While many programs accommodate the learning and educational needs of nonnative speakers, many are beset with controversy as to the most effective approach (Moses, 2000; Ovando, 2003). In related research, Takahashi-Breines (2002) posed several practical questions. One excerpt reads,

Educating linguistically diverse children is a great concern in a multicultural country like the United States. How do we educate our English learning students without sacrificing the student's native language and culture? How do we teach English to them without sacrificing their academic development? These are some of the questions driving bilingual education. (p. 213)

The controversy revolves around whether ELLs should be educated in all-English programs or programs supportive of their L1. Politicians, educators, and language theorists have all joined the debate (Akkari, 1998; Bartolome, 1994; Beykont, 1994; Clark, 1995; Cummins, 1998; Gómez et al., 2005; Karabenick & Clemons Noda, 2004; López & Tashakkori, 2004; Mora, Wink, & Wink, 2001; Moses, 2000; Ovando, 2003; Ramírez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991; Reyes, 1992; Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005; Saville-Troike, 1984; Takahashi-Breines, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

This review provides a thorough historical, theoretical, and pedagogical examination of bilingual education and dual-language programs, both pro and con. The intent is to provide readers with the necessary background on bilingual education—both its advocates and its opponents—the theoretical framework behind L2 acquisition, and the dual-language model inclusive of its goals and concerns as they relate to literacy development in ELLs. The prism model (Thomas & Collier, 1997) is thoroughly discussed and suggested as a framework toward the implementation of such literacy instruction.

The History of Bilingual Education

According to Mackay (1978), bilingual education has existed for thousands of years. The ancient world encouraged bilingualism due to its changing geographical boundaries stemming from conquests of the various empires that came to power in Eastern and Western Europe. With the advent of the information age and the global economy, people now interface with one another on a daily basis, making bilingualism more of a necessity than a luxury (as cited in Soltero, 2004). Furthermore, Goble reported that there are more bilingual children in the world now than during the previous century (as cited in Soltero, 2004). This growth may be the direct result of an increasing number of parents who desire the skill of an L2 for their children.

Interestingly although the United States has a history of many nationalities settling within the country and bringing with them their respective languages, the federal government did not extend official support to bilingual education until 1968 (Moses, 2000). American views on bilingualism progressed from an atmosphere of acceptance

during the early years of our nation to one of English exclusivity from the late 19th century into the 20th century (Fitzgerald, 1993). As described by Stritikus (2001),

Bilingual education is not, and never has been, a neutral process. The education of linguistically diverse students is situated in larger issues about immigration, distribution of wealth and power, and the empowerment of students (Cummins, 1996; 2000; Heller, 1994). Policy and practice questions are situated in debates surrounding the legitimacy of the language and culture of diverse groups (Olsen, 1997). The movement to eliminate bilingual education has brought these issues to the centre of public discourse. (p. 306)

The history of bilingual education within the United States can be divided into four distinct periods: Permissive, Restrictive, Opportunist, and Dismissive (Ovando, 2003).

Permissive and Restrictive Periods

The permissive period extended from the 1700s through the 1880s. As immigrants established communities throughout the United States, they were free to promote their heritage language within their schools to sustain their cultural background. As explained by Castellanos, bilingualism was considered an advantage in such aspects of life as religious teaching and trading goods (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1993). Crawford reported that advertisements selling slaves and servants often included their multilingual abilities (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1993). However, bilingual education was not promoted due to its inherent benefits, but rather, due to the lack of external coercion to assimilate linguistically (Ovando, 2003). According to Hakuta (1986), some states even had laws protecting non-English instruction, especially that delivered in German.

The restrictive period extended from the 1880s through the 1960s. It is characterized by the more restrictive policy toward both immigrants and their languages than was evident in the preceding period. This shift was partially a result of diminished

L1 allegiances from many generations of English rule. It was also spurred by the expectation that the numerous waves of immigrants must conform to American ways of life. As the nation shifted from an agrarian to an industrial society, English literacy skills became essential. Both the Spanish American War and World War I further fueled antiforeign sentiments. Although the U.S. Supreme Court supported use of non-English languages within public schools, cases still emerged wherein individuals suffered legal consequences for promoting foreign languages (Fitzgerald, 1993).

The Naturalization Act of 1906 (as cited in Ovando, 2003) rendered speaking English a necessity to procure citizenship. The federal government sponsored programs to teach foreigners English; yet, the educational system concurrently refused responsibility for the success or failure of educating ELLs. If they failed, blame was inevitably placed on the L1 and culture. This sink-or-swim method was later coined as a type of bilingual program. It did not promote retention of the L1; hence, it was referred to as “submersion.”

Crawford (1999) aptly described the political “landscape” of the times in the following excerpt:

As Americanization took a coercive turn, proficiency in English was increasingly equated with political loyalty; for the first time, an ideological link was forged between speaking good English and being a “good American.” . . . The goal was explicitly stated: to replace immigrant languages and cultures with those of the United States. (p. 26)

Opportunist Period

A “rebirth” of bilingual education occurred during the opportunist period from the 1960s to the 1980s. Policies were implemented that affirmed the civil and linguistic rights

of ELLs. An increasing number of programs were designed to meet the needs of a growing population of ELLs throughout the nation (Ovando, 2003). Several significant events precipitated this “milestone” period. Initially, World War II and Sputnik spurred an interest in international affairs and learning foreign languages. Subsequently, the Cuban Revolution of 1959 prompted exiles to create a bilingual elementary school—Coral Way—within Dade County, Florida, which continues as a landmark school to this day. This was followed by the Civil Rights Act enacted in 1964 (as cited in Ovando, 2003), which furthered the rights of ELLs, and the 1965 Immigration Act, which reversed the restrictions of the Naturalization Act of 1906, allowing substantial numbers of immigrants into the country.

The first federal legislation aimed at supporting the education of ELLs via instruction delivered in both their heritage language and English was mandated in 1968—the Bilingual Education Act (as cited in Ovando, 2003). A Texas senator filed the bill stating, “It is not the purpose of the bill to create pockets of different languages through the country . . . but just to try to make those children fully literate in English” (Porter, 1998, p. 1). This Act was introduced as part of President Johnson’s “war on poverty.”

Ovando reported,

For the first time in American educational history, the federal government embarked on an educational experiment that sought to build upon students’ home cultures, languages, and prior experiences in such a way that they could start learning without first being proficient in English. (p. 8)

In 1974, the landmark supreme-court case of *Lau v. Nichols* (as cited in Ovando, 2003) had a profound effect on bilingual education because it required schools to provide meaningful instruction to ELLs. The case was filed due to approximately 1,800 Chinese students failing in school because they could not understand the English instructional material delivered in their San Francisco school district. The Supreme Court ruled in their favor, stating they were denied equal educational opportunities (Carrera-Carillo, 2003). The judge asserted, “There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education” (Crawford, 1999, p. 45). In 1981, *Castaneda v. Pickard* (as cited in Ovando, 2003) continued what *Lau v. Nichols* had begun. This case is considered to be the next most important court decision relating to the education of ELLs. The *Castaneda v. Pickard* decision required all instruction for ELLs going forward to be supported by rigorous pedagogical theory, properly implemented, and checked regularly for effectiveness.

Dismissive Period

The period from the 1980s to the present is viewed as the dismissive period. The battles against bilingual education continue to date. Lobbyists for the exclusivity of English within all public schools persist in their fight to return to the “sink or swim” method of teaching ELLs. The debate surrounding how much of the L1 is needed for their instruction also continues. Meanwhile, proponents point to many studies on the effectiveness of the L1 in facilitating success for ELLs and such research continues to be published (Gómez et al., 2005; Rolstad et al., 2005). Akkari (1998) explains that

according to Cummins (1973), the bilingual debate revolves around two diametrically opposed assumptions. Proponents of bilingual education believe that children need to be educated in a language that they can understand, namely their L1. Meanwhile, the opponents purport that more instruction in English leads to more acquisition of English. They contend that ELLs must be provided with the maximum exposure to English.

With additional federal funds going to English-only instructional programs, and the Reagan reversal of a proposal by the Carter administration that would have required schools to offer appropriate bilingual instruction, the future of bilingual education appeared tenuous at best (Ovando, 2003). The crisis deepened with passage of California Proposition 227 in 1998, which required English to be the primary language of instruction throughout public education within the state. Other states were considering similar action, and Arizona subsequently passed Proposition 223 in 2000, “which virtually eliminated bilingual education for culturally and linguistically diverse students” (Soltero, 2004, p. 3). And ELLs continued to earn fewer high school diplomas and college degrees as compared to their U.S. counterparts, (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003; Fashola & Slavin, 2000).

Despite such controversy, bilingual education did have its political supporters during this period. The Clinton administration ended measures curtailing the amount of time ELLs were given to learn English and restored some of the funding previously cut during the Reagan years from bilingual programs (Ovando, 2003). ELLs are now achieving more success in school due to the bilingual approaches reflecting the latest educational advancements that have been perfected within the past 25 years (Crawford,

1999). “No longer stigmatized as slow learners, language-minority children are achieving at or near grade level by the time they leave well-designed bilingual programs, even in urban schools where failure was once the norm” (p. 12).

The advent of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB) continues to pose barriers for bilingual programs. Federal funds to schools are now based upon student performance in English on standardized tests. ELLs continue to face enormous difficulties passing standardized tests as required by NCLB. Instead of instruction being geared to meet their linguistic and academic needs, ELLs are, now, basically being forced into a “one-size-fits-all” plan (Menken, 2006, p. 538). Santa Ana (2004) explained,

This federal legislation reverses thirty-four years of U.S. language policy in public schools. It ends the Bilingual Education Act (1968). Federal funds will continue to support English language learners (ELLs), but the swift and brief teaching of English takes priority over longer-term bilingual academic skill development. (p. 104)

Proponent View of Second-Language Development

Even though instruction is delivered in two languages, the primary objective of bilingual education is to ensure that students become proficient in English (Fernandez, 1996). Cummins (2000b) reported, “The research literature on bilingual development provided consistent evidence for transfer of academic skills and knowledge across languages. Thus, L1 proficiency could be promoted at no cost to children’s academic development in English” (p. 32). Acquisition of an L2 does not necessarily equate to loss of the L1 (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Martinez & Moore-O’Brien, 1993). Dual-language programs allow ELLs to develop cognitively in both languages. This is what brings academic success (Cummins, 2000b; Lindholm-

Leary, 2001). Vygotsky, an early 20th-century educator committed to reforming educational practices within Russia, expressed that the L1 can facilitate learning the new L2 (as cited in Goodman & Goodman, 1990). Further, he stated, “The advanced knowledge of one’s own language also plays an important role in the study of the foreign one” (p. 230).

Supporters of bilingual education perceive the transfer of literacy skills across languages as an *interdependence hypothesis* (Cummins, 2001). If imagined as an iceberg, all the commonalities between languages would reside together just beneath the surface, while the differences between languages separately jut above the water. The connection between languages is referred to as a *common underlying proficiency*. “In other words, previous learning of literacy-related functions of language (in L1) will predict future learning of these functions (in L2)” (p. 118). Proponents reject the view that the L1 and L2 develop within separate regions of the brain, with the development of skills independent of each other (i.e., the *separate underlying proficiency*).

Cummins explained,

[The] assumption is that inflating the L1 balloon will simultaneously succeed in inflating the L2 balloon *to a greater extent* than if attempts were made to inflate only the L2 balloon. In other words, in the initial grades the SUP [separate underlying proficiency] model is rejected in favor of the CUP [common underlying proficiency] model. However, despite the implicit endorsement of a CUP model in the early grades, transitional programs revert to a SUP model by assuming (without any evidence) that children’s English skills will not develop adequately unless they are mainstreamed to an English-only program. (p. 132)

In other words, the interdependence hypothesis presumes that an ELL will successfully acquire English if he or she has mastered the skill in the L1 (e.g., Spanish). Conversely, a

student who has not mastered basic skills in his or her L1 is hypothesized to do poorly in learning English (Crawford, 1999).

The process of language acquisition is complex. A span of 4 to 7 years for an ELL to reach the proficiency of a native speaker is not uncommon (Collier, 1995; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Native English speakers continue to develop their skills in a school environment designed for them, and as reported by Thomas, they do not wait for ELLs to catch up. A distinction exists between social language, basic interpersonal communication skills and academic language, and cognitive academic-language proficiency (Cummins, 2000b, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 2001; Thomas and Collier, 1997). One can not overlook the fact that it will take a child who is unfamiliar with English longer to learn the language than one who is raised in a home where English is spoken. Meanwhile, that child can fall behind in the other academic subjects (Kobrick, 1972).

Many ELLs can socialize in English (i.e., apply basic interpersonal communication skills on the playground or in the neighborhood) between 6 months and 2 years after their arrival within the United States. However, to understand the content of science, social studies, and math in English (i.e., demonstrate cognitive academic-language proficiency) can take 5 years at a minimum. Consequently, if ELLs appear to be proficient in English during conversation with Anglo classmates, it does not preclude the need for individual assistance during lessons related to academic content (Cummins, 2000b, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 2001; Thomas and Collier, 1997). The following is an

excerpt from the researcher's 2004 pilot study where a dual-language teacher describes her belief that the academic content needs to be presented in the ELLs' native language:

There's a real danger of them shutting down at an early age when the academic content is not in their native language and there's no one to help them at home. Academic language takes longer to learn than the conversational. There'll be very little schema upon which to build an academic foundation. If they don't understand, they're just memorizing. It might take longer because everything's presented in two languages; but, in the long run, it is more beneficial. (V. Torrey, personal communication, April 2, 2004)

Another crucial aspect to successful English-language acquisition is the input of the L2. It must be presented in a manner that is comprehensible to the learner. It is quite normal for ELLs to pass through what is called a "silent period" wherein, for several months, they are listening to the new language while processing it cognitively. During this critical period, meaningful interaction between these learners and their teachers can be extremely helpful, with teacher input approximately one step beyond the current level of the respective learner. It is suggested that teachers modify their speech with ELLs, just as parents would do with their young children. Facial expressions, gestures, and visuals provide additional communication more comprehensible to ELLs than words and syntax (Krashen, 1981, 1982, 1985; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Wong Fillmore, 1991a).

Native-Language Transfer

Research has shown that bilingual programs do not impede, and can actually improve, the English reading ability of ELLs. Dual-language programs, wherein literacy instruction is in both languages, have proven to be particularly helpful in this area of instruction (Slavin & Cheung, 2004). As far back as the early 1880s, in Scotland,

educators noticed that students schooled in Gaelic, their L1, acquired the English language more easily (Thompson, 1841/1998):

Many schools ignored Gaelic entirely, both because it was politically expedient and because there were no Gaelic texts to use. Fortunately, by the early nineteenth century, attitudes had softened somewhat; the Scots had not risen against the English recently, and educators discovered that Gaelic students learned to read English more easily if they had a basic grounding in Gaelic grammar and literature. (pp. x–xi)

Many recent studies focused on L2 development refer back to the Lambert and Tucker (1973) landmark study conducted in Canada from 1965 through 1972. Significant findings related to the transfer of language were emerging at that time.

In an earlier publication, Lambert and Tucker (1972) wrote,

We refer here to the higher-order skills of reading and calculating, which were developed exclusively through the medium of French and yet seemed to be [*sic*] equally well and almost simultaneously developed in English. In fact, we wonder whether in these cases there actually was a transfer of any sort or whether some more abstract form of learning took place that was quite independent of the language of training. These developments took place so rapidly that we had little time to take notice of them. It seemed to us that all of a sudden the children could read in English and demonstrate their arithmetic achievement in that language. (pp. 208–209)

During the mid 1960s, a study was conducted on tribal children within Mexico. It was found that they became more efficient readers in their L2 (i.e., Spanish) after learning to read in their mother tongue, a type of Maya-Quiche language (Modiano, 1968, 1979). More recently, in 1991, Ramírez and colleagues conducted one of the few studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education, which is accepted by both opponents and proponents of such instruction. The study compared students receiving all-English instruction with two groups using L1 instruction (i.e., Spanish)—an early-exit program

and a late-exit program. The first group of students received instruction in English 90% of the time. The early-exit program had lessons delivered in English between 65% and 75% of the time. The late-exit program continued L1 instruction up to the sixth grade, with English added at incremental levels each year, resulting in 60% English instruction by the fourth grade. The findings were consistent with the hypothesis of common underlying proficiency, which promotes the L1 literacy skills of minority students as a viable means toward academic development in English (Collier, 1992; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 1992; Ramírez et al., 1991).

Predictors for Academic Success

In their 1997 study, Thomas and Collier found three predictors of long-term academic success for ELLs. Their study encompassed five school systems and 700,000 students from 1982 through 1996. The first predictor is the academic instruction in the L1 of the ELL through at least the fifth or sixth grade. Thomas and Collier found that children participating in dual-language programs or two-way bilingual classes surpassed others who received instruction in exclusively English. Even more importantly, these gains continued through high school.

The second predictor found by Thomas and Collier (1997) of academic success in ELLs is an innovative curriculum employing sound educational practices. Thematic units and discovery learning with a true partnership between student and teacher is recommended. Language and academic goals are acquired simultaneously. “The curriculum reflects the diversity of students’ life experiences across sociocultural

contexts both in and outside the U.S., examining human problem-solving from a global perspective” (p. 16).

The third predictor requires transformation of the school setting into a truly supportive atmosphere for ELLs. When schools integrate English speakers with ELLs, as in a dual-language program, so the latter are no longer segregated from the rest of the school population, the respective school is progressing toward a supportive atmosphere where language and cultural diversity is an advantage to learning. “Here, the instructional goal is to create for the English Learner [*sic*] the same type of supportive sociocultural context for learning in two languages that the monolingual native-English-speaker [*sic*] enjoys for learning in English” (p. 16).

Thomas and Collier (2002) also conducted a 5-year study throughout the United States on the best instructional practices for ELLs. The findings confirmed those of their earlier 1997 study, which indicated that schooling in the L1, as with dual-language programs, was the greatest predictor of academic success. These researchers reported that ELLs in dual language programs were able to reach the 50th percentile in the L1 and the L2 across all subjects and were able to experience academic success through high school.

Opponent View of Bilingual Education

Critics of bilingual education often insist that, due to years of earlier discrimination suffered by ELLs, L1 instruction became the ethical choice. The political atmosphere rendered it unfair to criticize L1 instruction with exclusively English instruction appearing prejudiced in nature. However, opponents do acknowledge that bilingual education has thrust the plight of the ELL into the “limelight,” allowing for a

gradual educational and social reform. This view became widely accepted, although critics remained unconvinced that any solid evidence existed to support the claim that L1 instruction was superior to that delivered exclusively in English (Baker & de Kanter, 1983; Porter, 1996, 1998; Rossell, 1992; Rossell & Baker, 1996b).

According to Gardner (1986),

No single study can by itself resolve the vexed issues surrounding bilingualism. However, it seems possible that explorations of the “degree of relatedness” between languages, or of the “transfer” of knowledge gained in one language to activities carried out in the second language, could provide links between usually disparate kinds of inquiry as well as offering suggestions about public policy.
(p. 2)

Critics argue that even advocates of bilingual education are unable to support the need for instruction in the L1. Hakuta (1986) reported, “Evaluation studies of the effectiveness of bilingual education in improving either English or math scores have not been overwhelmingly in favor of bilingual education” (p. 219). Opponents of bilingual education have gone to the extent of creating organizations to promote English over native instruction in the delivery of instruction. Founded in 1983, the lead organization of this kind supports legislation that restricts use of the L1 in instructional programs for ELLs. The native language is viewed as advantageous solely within private realms such as the home or church (Harlan, 1991). The opposition insists that when educational programs aim for “balanced bilingualism,” ELLs lose the opportunity to become proficient in English and are then unable to advance within American society. Moreover, they asserted that addressing solely Spanish presents a bias due to the many other languages spoken by ELLs who have emigrated to the United States. Opponents further

allege that bilingual education does more to maintain Spanish than it does to teach English, and more importantly, Latino parents want their children to be taught in English (Porter, 1996; Schlesinger, 1998).

According to Porter (1996), “Without sustained contact between majority and minority children, there will be isolation of the minority group, shamefully like the ‘separate but equal’ policies that kept black children’s schooling separate and unequal” (p. 188). Schlesinger (1998) contributed to the discourse by stating, “Institutional bilingualism shuts doors. It nourishes self-ghettoization, and ghettoization nourishes racial antagonism. . . . Using some language other than English dooms people to second-class citizenship in American society” (p. 113). There are even native Spanish speakers who are not necessarily in favor of bilingual education over exclusively English instruction. Linda Chavez, a prominent voice on the subject, explains that many Hispanic students are behind academically due to the overabundance of Spanish instruction and dearth of education delivered in English (Cummins, 2001). Rodriguez (1982), a Hispanic writer, revealed the following experience:

Supporters of bilingual education today imply that students like me miss a great deal by not being taught in their family’s language. What they seem not to recognize [is] that, as a socially disadvantaged child, I considered Spanish to be a private language. What I needed to learn in school was that I had the right—and the obligation—to speak the public language of *los gringos*. (pp. 17–18)

Those in opposition to bilingual education also do not accept the Cummins (2001) interdependence hypothesis related to the transfer of literacy skills from the L1 to English (Baker, 1992; Porter, 1996; Rossell & Baker, 1996b). Rossell and Baker stated that no one truly knows what mental processes would enable the ELL who reads in his or her L1

to exceed the child who learns only in his L2. Critics also maintain that ELLs are able to learn subject matter in English before they are fluent in English. The more time these learners devote to learning English, the quicker they will acquire the L2. Opponents have asserted that time that is the key factor (Porter, 1996; Rossell & Baker, 1996b). Porter reported, “Increasingly, educators and linguists have concluded that teaching English and subject matter at the same time is the most effective way to develop English-language skills for academic purposes” (p. 70).

Critics of bilingual education recognize that one of the reasons advocates of such instruction include the L1 and culture of ELLs within their curriculum is to enhance the self-esteem of these learners. However, opponents maintain that, once ELLs know English and are successful in school, such self-esteem will naturally manifest (Porter, 1996). This is exemplified in the following excerpt from a superintendent of a Pennsylvania school district: “I believe that if we teach them English and these students succeed in school, get high grades, are competitive, go to college, and get good jobs after high school, they will indeed feel good about themselves” (Doluisio, 2000, pp.77–78).

Those adverse to bilingual education tend to accept that L1 instruction can be effective, but only at the onset because it allows ELLs reprieve from the constant struggle to comprehend in the new language. Others believe that bilingual education is justified only until English is learned; once the new language is understood, they view instruction and task completion in English as imperative (Baker, 1992; Porter, 1996; Rossell & Baker, 1996b; Salazar, 1998).

Those opposing bilingual education also claim there are many other factors to consider in determining time expectations for ELLs to learn English such as the age, intelligence, and home environment, as well as the number of years school has been attended, the ability of the respective teachers, and the classroom atmosphere, to name a few (Baker, 1992; Rossell & Baker, 1996b). Rosenthal, Milne, Ellman, Ginsburg, and Baker (1983) posited, “Once socioeconomic status has been controlled, the effects of language become negligible, especially for learning” (p. 96). Rossell and Baker (1996a) stated,

Bilingual education programs are not a disaster compared to other approaches, and students do learn English in *the average program of native tongue instruction as currently practiced most of the time by most teachers*. If children do leave TBE [transitional bilingual education] programs not knowing how to read and write in English, as critics allege, there is a good chance that they have learning problems, beyond simply not knowing English, that would have delayed their progress in any instructional environment. (p. 186)

Interestingly, some critics support dual-language programs due to the inherent mix of ELLs with English-speakers, presenting benefits for both groups. As Torres-Guzmán, Kleyn, Morales-Rodriguez, and Han (2005) reported, “The growth of dual-language programs is occurring in a political context of opposition to bilingual education, even though these programs are, technically, bilingual education programs” (p. 2). Porter (1996) added, “It [a dual-language program] is particularly appealing because it not only enhances the prestige of the minority language but also offers a rich opportunity for expanding genuine bilingualism to the majority population” (p. 154). The purest definition of bilingual education is instruction in two languages. However, implementation and the goals and target student population can greatly vary (Freeman,

1998). “As a result, what bilingual education means and whether it is effective has been and continues to be a source of confusion and conflict on the policy level, in educational practice, and in the popular press” (p. 3).

Benefits of Bilingual Status

Marcos (1999) reported that the United States would be wise to utilize the plethora of languages that children of immigrants bring to its doors. As they move through the educational system and learn English, their L1 should not be discarded. “In an ever more global economy, we cannot afford to let slip away the linguistic resources we already possess” (p. 1).

The advantages of speaking two languages have been repeatedly cited throughout related literature (Baker, 1995; Bialystok, 1991; Cloud et al., 2000; Cummins, 1973, 1992; Hakuta, 1986; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Ramírez, 1985). However, this has not always been a commonly held belief. Bilingualism was previously considered a disadvantage to learning English (Bialystok, 1991; Cummins, 2001). Bialystok explained,

About thirty years ago, for example, the general wisdom held that bilingualism was a disorder that could be corrected through ruthless instruction in a standard majority language, pushing out of the inflicted child all traces of the invading language. This remedy was imposed despite the fact that the unwanted language was often the language of the child’s home, heritage, and tradition. (p. 1)

Dual-language educators believe that it is quite normal and even advantageous to learn more than one language (Cloud et al., 2000). Bialystok (1991) reported, “Children who were bilingual, irrespective of age or literacy, scored higher than monolingual children on the items demanding higher levels of control of processing” (p. 132). As bilingual individuals apply two languages, they develop a cognitive flexibility that

includes a more complex cluster of mental abilities (Ovando & Collier, 1998).

Incorporated into that cluster would be an improved ability to think creatively and divergently (Collier, 1989).

According to Baker (1995), “The presence of two languages in the operating system of the brain is likely to produce a more richly fed engine” (p. 83). Because the bilingual child is not confined to one language, the ability to perceive larger concepts represented by the respective words is possible. The bilingual child also has the opportunity to view a topic through either language, each providing a unique connotation and hence a more thorough understanding. The bilingual child may be a more empathetic listener, as compared to the monolingual child, because he or she must determine which language to use, where, when, and with whom. Evidence also exists that bilinguals are more imaginative with the ability to use two words for the same referent, aiding in cognitive development (Cummins, 1973). Further, they generally outperform unilinguals on tests of verbal intelligence due to the ongoing comparison between the two languages (Baker, 1995; Cummins, 1973). Because dual-language programs allow for continued development in both languages, students will also often develop a more keen metalinguistic awareness than unilingual pupils (Cummins, 2001). Cummins (1998) concluded,

The educational implication of these research studies is that the development of literacy in two or more languages entails linguistic and academic benefits for individual students in addition to preparing them for a working environment in both domestic and international contexts that is increasingly characterized by diversity and where knowledge of additional languages represents a significant human resource. (p. 206)

Bilingual Education Models

The bilingual models used within the United States to teach ELLs can be divided into two categories—additive and subtractive. Additive programs support the L1 while the primary priority of subtractive models is the acquisition of English, supporting the L1 for as brief a period as necessary (Soltero, 2004). Dual-language programs fall under the additive category because they support the continued development of the L1. The labels assigned to such programs vary (e.g., two-way immersion, enrichment, two-way bilingual, developmental, bilingual immersion, and Spanish immersion or other L1).

True immersion programs are based upon research conducted by Lambert and Tucker within Canada during the late 1960s (Lambert & Tucker, 1972, 1973; Mora et al., 2001). Subtractive models that do not maintain the L1 are referred to as ESL programs, structured English immersion; submersion (i.e., sink or swim), and newcomer centers (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Soltero, 2004). Two-way bilingual, or dual-language programs, are aimed toward three goals—education, socioemotional development, and literacy. Academic benefits extend to both English speakers and ELLs. All students profit, increasing their language proficiency within both their L1 and L2. Socioeconomic advantage, age, and/or level of language proficiency do not counter the effects of the program. This was supported by Calderón and Minaya-Rowe (2003) who reported, “Bilingual students achieve cognitive and linguistic benefits on academic tasks that call for creativity and problem solving” (p. 5).

Job opportunities will be plentiful for bilingual students. Their understanding of cultural diversity will be a significant asset to this nation and other countries during this

age of global trade. During the 1980s, intense interest in dual-language programs emerged primarily due to the educational needs of new immigrants and the rebirth of interest in foreign languages and the best methods of teaching Anglo children an L2. School districts across the country looked to successful programs in Miami, Florida; Washington, DC; Chicago, Illinois; and San Diego, California as models (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). These programs dispel the misconception of first languages as a deficiency and present them as a resource. Ruiz advanced that this positive perception serves to raise the status of non-English languages spoken within the United States and improves relations between ethnic groups (as cited in Gómez et al., 2005, p. 146). When a different language and culture is introduced in an American classroom, not only is the ELL validated, but the experience of the other students within the classroom is also enriched (Montague, 1997).

There are major differences between dual-language programs and other L2 educational models. The dual-language model integrates ELLs with native English speakers and, importantly, both languages are equally valued. English does not replace the L1. Additionally, teachers treat all students with respect and expect high-quality academic work from both ELLs and native English speakers. Lastly, students are taught to value all cultures and backgrounds (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The continued development of the L1 for ELLs provides a secure foundation upon which English literacy skills can be built. The danger lies in removing ELLs from L1 maintenance programs too soon to the detriment of their literacy development (Cummins, 2000). According to Mora and colleagues (2001),

“True” immersion programs take an additive approach to bilingualism and are elective enrichment programs established by parents who wish to give their children the advantages of becoming bilingual and biliterate. With the growing awareness of linguistic human rights, dual language immersion programs are often cited as the best manner to provide minority students with equitable education, as well as developing bilingualism in language majority students. (pp. 420–421)

Goals and Implementation of Dual-Language Education

The goals of dual-language education can be divided into the following three areas for both ELLs and English-speaking students (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003; Christian, 1996; Lindholm-Leary, 2000; Soltero, 2004):

1. Students can be expected to achieve high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy.
2. Students will typically perform at or above grade level in all academic subjects and in both their L1 and L2.
3. Students will express cross-cultural proficiency in their interaction within these diverse classrooms.

Dual-language implementation varies from school to school in terms of time allocated to each language. In total immersion, most of the instructional time is devoted to the L1. This is referred to as either 90-10 or 80-20 (i.e., instruction in Spanish 90% of the time and in English 10% of the time). The amount of English would increase and the amount of Spanish would decrease with each advancing grade until the amount of instructional time for each language would be equal (Soltero, 2004). In partial immersion, the amount of instructional time between the L1 and L2 is equal from the onset (i.e., the 50-50 model). This type of program is typically taught by a team of two teachers. The

children receive 50% of their instruction in Spanish with one teacher and 50% of their instruction in English with the other. Most of the 50-50 models are located in the eastern, southeastern, and midwestern regions of the United States, while the majority of the 90-10 models are within the western states, especially in California (Christian, 1996).

It is recommended that dual-language students first develop a strong literacy base in their L1. Students participating in such programs are typically separated by language dominance into two groups. When two teachers are team teaching, the Spanish-dominant students (i.e., ELLs) would receive their literacy instruction from the Spanish-speaking teacher. The English-speaking students would concurrently receive their literacy instruction from the English-speaking teacher. In the case of a bilingual teacher, literacy instruction would be delivered to each group while the other group works on independent activities (Soltero, 2004). The students are subsequently heterogeneously grouped for content teaching and socialization. They are later grouped again by language dominance for L2 instruction. The Spanish-dominant students (i.e., ELLs) would receive ESL instruction from the English-speaking teacher while the English-dominant students would receive SSL instruction from the Spanish-speaking teacher. Again, in the case of one teacher, lessons addressing ESL and SSL would be taught at different times during the day by the same instructor.

Spanish is just one of many target languages, other than English, addressed by dual-language programs. Others have included Arabic, Cantonese, French, Haitian-Creole, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Tagalog. The other language is defined by the common minority language of the respective region.

Related literature stresses the importance of the proper design and implementation of dual-language programs toward effective scheduling and use of instructional time in both languages. Such education cannot be superimposed onto existing programs. Dual-language programs are not subtractive; they do not insist on English development at the expense of the L1. They are also not remedial. Furthermore, language skills should not be taught in isolation. Learning a new language can manifest quite naturally via enriching activities. Learning occurs by doing, rather than by memorizing (Clark, 1995). Dual-language education is based upon standards, and quality proficiency is expected in both languages (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003).

Successful Dual-Language Programs

It is evident that, for dual-language programs to be successful, they must be implemented correctly (Soltero, 2004). Students must remain in the program for its duration of a minimum of 6 years. Academic language takes longer to develop than conversational language; students therefore need time to develop academic and literacy proficiency. Removing them from the program after solely 1, 2, or 3 years will impede their academic and language growth. Because the same students move from grade to grade, gaining familiarity with each other, they typically develop a sense of well-being and a sufficient comfort level with trying the new language (Carrera-Carillo, 2003). Parents must actively support and participate in the program. Parent involvement is considered to be one of the most important components of the dual-language program. Parental training workshops focusing on such topics as L2 acquisition and literacy skills are recommended. Just as importantly, dual-language teachers must view parents as

assets. Furthermore, community needs must be surveyed, and parents must be supported by educators as they attempt to assist their children at home, whether in the L1 or L2 (Carrera-Carillo, 2003; Soltero, 2004).

An equal number of ELLs and native English students attending dual-language classes is ideal; they will mutually support language learning. When students have a need to communicate with each other, the language-acquisition process becomes more real and attainable. They should be integrated as much as possible for optimal development in all subject areas. With fewer numbers in any one language group, the need to communicate, and thus the need to learn the new language, is greatly reduced (Soltero, 2004). Each language must be separated from the other during instructional time, which prevents students from relying unnecessarily upon their L1. Language can be separated by having two teachers—one for each language—between whom the students would alternate. Or, with one bilingual teacher, the languages can be separated by time and/or subject. Allotting time to the L1 is important because it establishes its equal status with the L2. Research has also shown a strong development in bilingualism when a language can be associated with a particular individual/teacher (Deuchar & Quay, 2000; Soltero, 2004).

Schools should make every attempt to adhere to the language-immersion model (i.e., 90-10 or 50-50). Time lost can result in less acquisition in that language (Soltero, 2004). It is also recommended that dual-language teachers participate in ongoing professional development. Training in L2 acquisition, literacy, and classroom management is especially relevant due to the heavy emphasis on reading in two languages and managing various instructional groups (Carrera-Carillo, 2003; Treadway,

2000). All students must receive quality instruction in both languages across all content areas. It is through their active engagement in learning activities, rather than rote drills, that will allow both English speakers and ELLs to acquire a new language (Soltero, 2004). Isolated individual desk work is not recommended for ELLs. They need active participation through discussion, group work, and reading aloud (Goldenberg, 1996).

Teachers must implement sound teaching methods to allow all students to reach their highest potential. They must be aware of the cultural needs of their ELLs and work consistently to bring English speakers and ELLs together within the learning communities of their classrooms. Integrating multicultural themes into the curriculum is crucial to the development of mutual respect between both student groups (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). As described by Miller (2002), “Real classroom communities are more than just a look. Real communities flourish when we bring together the voices, hearts, and souls of the people who inhabit them” (p. 17). Consequently, dual language becomes a model of enriched education, rather than simply a remedial program (Cloud et al., 2000; Coy & Litherland, 2000). Thomas and Collier (1997) conveyed that an innovative dual-language curriculum would include “cooperative learning, thematic lessons, literacy development across the curriculum, process writing, performance and portfolio assessment, uses of technology, multiple intelligences, critical thinking, learning strategies, and global perspectives” (p. 50). According to Calderón and Minaya-Rowe (2003),

Some of the best ways to teach second-language learners are to focus on strategies that make any language comprehensible, such as hands-on activities, peer interaction, small-group learning, and technology. These activities enable students to hear, see, speak, and analyze new information in various ways and give them automatic practice with the new learnings. (p. 85)

Educators must acknowledge that academic standards cannot be lowered for ELLs. Research has shown that teachers tend to have higher expectations for White, middle-class students, as compared to minority students of lower socioeconomic status (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Reyes, 1992). For example, ELLs must be exposed to quality literature from the onset of their education. “Low expectations for working class students, and for bilingual students in general, prevent them from using literature in meaningful ways and submit them to unchallenging literacy activities where it is not expected they use or develop critical thinking” (Martínez-Roldán & López-Robertson, 1999, p. 271). Both ELLs and English speakers must be taught that the ultimate goal of reading is to gain meaning. Literature circles, wherein groups of students read the same literary selection, discussing the content together as they progress through the book, are recommended. Such group activities allow students to make connections between the books they read and apply the content to their own lives (Freeman & Freeman, 2000).

Teachers who focused on meaning, rather than skills in isolation, produced more efficient readers (Freeman & Freeman, 2000; Krashen, 2003). It is also recommended to give students time to read independently. Allowing them to read their own selections can assist in the transition from a conversational use of language to a more academic focus (Krashen, 2003). Krashen stated, “Free voluntary reading may be the most powerful tool we have in language education” (p. 15). Literacy scholars agree that, when students must

learn to read in an L2, they are not forced to learn to read again from the beginning stage of the process.

Rather, once a learner has developed an understanding of print concepts, the alphabetic principle, text structures, and how to use graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic cues to derive or create meaning from text in the primary language, the learner transfers this knowledge to the process of reading in the second language. (Soltero, 2004, p. 34)

Educators must be careful when comparing students of differing language proficiencies. As explained by Baker, a monolingual student exemplifies a different type of language proficiency than a bilingual or trilingual student (as cited in Escamilla, Mahon, Riley-Bernal, & Rutledge, 2003). Consequently, authentic assessment and portfolio assessment are considered optimal methods toward evaluating ELLs participating in a dual-language program (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003). Calderón and Minaya-Rowe explained that the teacher, being an essential part of the evaluation process, must assess in both the L1 and the L2 across all subject areas. If the subject matter is presented in the L1, it must be assessed in the L1; likewise material taught in the L2 must be assessed in that language.

Administrative and local school-district support is also recognized as crucial. For any dual-language program to be successful, administrators must integrate it within the entire school, ensuring that all staff understand its precepts and processes. The necessary funds and instructional materials must be allocated for successful implementation (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

School administration must also understand the theory of language acquisition that grounds a dual-language program. Attending national conferences on bilingual

education and visiting school sites implementing such programs is recommended for both teachers and administrators. Additionally, school principal(s) must support dual-language teachers (Cloud et al., 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Due to time constraints, it is common for administrators to appoint a lead teacher to assume duties of the instructional leader for the dual-language program. This educator must also serve as the spokesperson for the program. This necessitates a solid background in the history and theory of L2 acquisition (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Theoretical Foundation

The zone of proximal development is one of Vygotsky's (1978) best known theories. The basic premise is that those skills children are able to perform with help today, they will be able to perform independently tomorrow (Diaz, Neal, & Amaya-Williams, 1999; Faltis, 2006). Vygotsky defined the zone of proximal development as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). This theory plays a significant role within the dual-language program. The L2 that will be eventually learned is not within immediate grasp. However, through the meaningful instruction of the program, both ELLs and English speakers will indeed eventually internalize the new language.

Krashen theorized that "the key to L2 is a source of L2 input that is understood, natural, interesting, useful for meaningful communication, and approximately one step beyond the learner's present level of competence in [the] L2" (as cited in Ovando &

Collier, 1998, p. 95). Collier (1995) stated, “Academic skills, literacy development, concept formation, subject knowledge, and learning strategies developed in the first language will all transfer to the second language” (p. 5).

According to Pérez and Torres-Guzmán,

One of the teacher’s functions, then, is to create learning contexts in the classroom where the social tools and processes are used to interact with others. The ideal teacher creates an environment in which students are engaged in collaborative activities that combine their interest and experiences with the four language domains: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. (as cited in Soltero, 2004, pp. 41–42)

Genesee posited that language learning occurs as a result of the academic content integrated with the literacy instruction, rather than due to direct language tutoring (as cited in Treadway, 2000). The dual-language teacher offers sufficient assistance to allow ELLs to participate in program activities from the onset. Gradually, less and less *scaffolding* is needed and the zone is expanded due to new areas of knowledge being learned (Carrera-Carillo, 2003; Faltis, 2006).

The Prism Model

As noted earlier, to help educators understand the complex process of L2 acquisition, Thomas and Collier (1997) developed the theoretical framework known as the prism model. Their premise is that language development is directly correlated with cognitive development. The dilemma, however, is that, while English speakers continue to make linguistic and academic gains, they do not wait for ELLs to catch up with them. Transforming instruction to exclusively English can further delay the cognitive development of ELLs for several years, placing English speakers even further ahead. If

language instruction in the L1 is halted before ELLs reach the last Piagetian stage of formal operations, these learners run the risk of experiencing negative academic and cognitive consequences, especially as measured by standardized tests.

Thus, the simplistic notion—that all we need to do is to teach language minority students the English language—does not address the needs of the school-age child. Furthermore, when we teach only the English language, we are literally slowing down a child’s cognitive and academic growth, and that child may never catch up to the constantly advancing native-English speaker! (p. 41)

As noted earlier, the Thomas and Collier (1997) prism model is characterized by the following four processes considered instrumental in L2 acquisition:

1. Sociocultural processes, which were defined by these researchers as “central to . . . language [acquisition and inclusive of] all of the surrounding social and cultural processes occurring through everyday life within the student’s past, present, and future, in all contexts—home, school, community, and the broader society” (p. 42).

2. Linguistic processes, which include “the acquisition of the oral and written systems of the student’s *first and second languages* across all language domains, such as phonology, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, and paralinguistics (nonverbal and other extralinguistic features)” (p. 43).

3. Academic development, which involves:

academic knowledge and conceptual development transfer from the first language to the second language. Thus, it is more efficient to develop academic work through students’ first language, while teaching the second language during other periods of the school day through meaningful academic content. (p. 43)

4. Cognitive development, which “is a natural, subconscious process that occurs developmentally from birth to the end of schooling and beyond” (p. 43).

All of the processes within the prism model are interdependent and neglect of any one will result in slower acquisition of the L2. Academic success will also be adversely affected. As expressed by Collier (1995), “It is crucial that educators provide a socioculturally supportive school environment that allows natural language [and] academic and cognitive development to flourish” (p. 4).

Meanwhile the challenge remains for dual-language teachers. With two groups of linguistically and culturally different students to teach on a daily basis, the charge to ensure instruction is challenging to English speakers while concurrently comprehensible to ELLs requires consistently focused education skill (Takahashi-Breines, 2002).

Additional training in the dual-language education model, second-language acquisition, multicultural education, cooperative learning and classroom management is highly recommended (Cloud et. al; Lindholm-Leary, 2000; Soltero, 2004).

Dual-language programs within this country or, as referred to by Thomas and Collier (1997), developmental bilingual programs, concentrate on all components of the prism model. Instruction in the primary language is maintained throughout the curriculum, along with English instruction, within a supportive atmosphere. Other programs such as ESL-Pullout only address the linguistic portion of the prism model and fall short of closing the achievement gap between ELLs and English speakers. As advanced by Thomas and Collier,

The more L1 academic work provided, the higher their achievement in the long term. . . . When the focus of the program is on academic enrichment for all students, with intellectually challenging, interdisciplinary, discovery learning that respects and values students' linguistic and cultural life experiences as an important resource for the classroom, the program becomes one that is perceived positively by the community, and students are academically successful and deeply engaged in the learning process. (pp. 56, 59)

Dual-Language Concerns

Over the years, public media has advanced unproven claims surrounding a lack of effectiveness within bilingual education. However, any such poor performance of true bilingual education is typically related to funding shortages, crowded classrooms, improper instruction methodology, and/or inadequately trained teachers, rather than to ineffectiveness of the program itself (Soltero, 2004). Although dual-language programs have been quite successful, “no program for ELLs is a panacea” (Gómez et al., 2005, p. 149). Additionally, there is always the possibility that opponents will point to a poorly designed dual-language program to condemn all bilingual education (Gómez et al., 2005; Torres-Guzmán et al., 2005).

Dual-language programs are becoming increasingly appealing to Anglo parents choosing to enrich the education of their children with an L2. Hence, Anglo children are now learning Spanish, for example, as a new language along with ELLs learning English as a new language. Educators must continue to uphold the success of both groups (Valdes, 1997).

As described by Valdes,

For minority children, the acquisition of English is expected. For mainstream children, the acquisition of a non-English language is enthusiastically applauded. Children are aware of these differences. The reporter who writes a story on a dual-language immersion program and concentrates on how well a mainstream child speaks Spanish while ignoring how well a Spanish-speaking child is learning English sends a very powerful message. The next day, after the reporter is gone and everything seemingly returns to normal, all may appear to be well. I suspect, however, that children are deeply wounded by such differential treatment. This is clearly an issue that must be attended to by educators. (pp. 23–24)

Bilingual Education as an Expression of Compassion

In 2006, children from cultures across the globe are attending American schools. Along with themselves, they bring their culture and language. With the diversification of America, the education of ELLs has become tantamount (Igoa, 1995; Wong Fillmore, 1991b). Teachers must guide ELLs through the transition to life in America and learning English. For their success within the classroom, and later within society, these learners need teachers who will uplift them by valuing their culture and heritage language while concurrently teaching them English (Bartolome, 1994; Cummins, 2001; Delpit, 1995; Fernandez, 1996; Igoa, 1995; Manning, 2000; Nieto, 2000; Reyes, 1992).

Teaching within a dual-language program is very similar to what Ladson-Billings described as “culturally relevant” teaching (as cited in Takahashi-Breines, 2002, p. 217). “Specifically, culturally relevant teaching is a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, pp. 17–18). Advocates of bilingual education believe that ELLs can retain their L1 and culture while learning

English and assimilating into the American way of life (Zimmerman, 2000). Zimmerman posited,

Bilingual education can be the bridge between the socialization offered by schools and the cultural-identity formation of language minority students. The person who is bilingual has the security of a cultural identity, while English provides the security of being part of the larger American society. (p. 124)

Bilingual education can be viewed as part of the solution, rather than part of the problem, as some critics contend. With a new language and a new society, it can take time for ELLs to adjust. Demanding that they relinquish their L1 is harmful. However, with dual-language programs, their culture and language are valued, eliminating the need for forced replacement (Cummins, 2001; Miller & Endo, 2004). It is important for teachers to avoid replicating the unjust powers of society within their classrooms (Cummins, 2001). A keen awareness of what instructional practices and school policies are teaching children about their self-worth and cultural heritages must be maintained. Teachers must strive to create a humanizing classroom environment where a mutual sense of value between teachers and students is commonplace (Bartolome, 1994; Drake, 1979). As expressed by Drake, “To empower children, we need to affirm each child’s unique expressions of his cultural heritage and of his ongoing environment” (p. 211).

Immigrants to this country have traditionally felt the need to give up their L1 to become a “true” American (Griego-Jones, 1994). “Because the United States historically has promoted monolingualism in order to break immigrant ties to native lands, language usage is strongly associated with political power, and bilingualism is suspect and devalued” (p. 5). Within dual-language classrooms, ELLs are allowed to learn through

their L1, instilling confidence toward learning English. Additionally, as they observe English-speaking children learning their L1, a healthy sense of self-esteem is rapidly developed (Andersson, 1969; Reyes, 1992). According to Cummins (1994), “Research suggests that students who are valued by the wider society (and by the schools that inevitably tend to reflect that society) succeed to a greater extent than students whose backgrounds are devalued” (p. 40). The aim of literacy—the most powerful self-empowering skill a student can develop in school—should be to motivate learners toward a desire to make the world a better place (Hudelson, 1994; Igoa, 1995). As expressed by Kobrick (1972),

Bilingual-bicultural education is perhaps the greatest educational priority today in bilingual communities. Its aim is to include children, not exclude them. It is neither a “remedial” program, nor does it seek to “compensate” children for their supposed “deficiencies.” It views such children [ELLs] as *advantaged*, and seeks to develop bilingualism as a precious asset rather than to stigmatize it as a defect. (p. 57)

Summary

A plethora of research has been conducted within the field of bilingual education that both supports and opposes this method and form of instruction. As Moses (2000) expressed, “Indeed, language, in general, and bilingual education in particular, get to the heart of issues of heritage, culture, assimilation, and quality of life” (p. 333). The primary objective of bilingual education within the United States is to ensure that students become proficient in English, even though instruction is delivered in two languages (Fernandez, 1996). Nieto (2000) explained, “Native language maintenance might act as a buffer against academic failure by simply supporting literacy in children’s most

developed language” (p. 194). Furthermore, an effective bilingual program encourages the use of English, and if designed well, ELLs will indeed learn English (Krashen, 1999). According to Krashen, “In no case do children educated using their home language do worse than comparison children, and they usually do better” (p. 36).

Paulston proposed,

Bilingual education is the use of two languages, one of which is English, as a medium of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which encompasses part or all of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the children’s self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures. (as cited in Akkari, 1998, p. 103)

However, there is enormous pressure on ELLs and their families to assimilate into American society. Opponents of bilingual education believe that maintenance of the L1 precludes the learning of English (Curiel, 1988; MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000). Other critics believe that bilingual education is justified only until the student learns English. Similarly, others espouse the notion that instruction in the L1 is warranted only to allow ELLs a reprieve from the constant struggle of learning from instruction delivered in a new language (Baker, 1992; Salazar, 1998).

Dual-language programs, which are within the realm of bilingual education, have become increasingly popular in many regions of the country (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). They hold particular promise for ELLs because they are one of the few programs found to “close the achievement gap for English learners and provide a superior education for native English speakers” (Thomas & Collier, 2003, p. 64). A dual-language program differs from the more traditional bilingual model in that it does not force ELLs to

relinquish their L1 while learning English. Instructional time is equally divided between English and the L1, with the expectation that both must be acquired. ELLs are integrated with native English speakers in a supportive environment where all ethnicities and languages are valued (Cummins, 2000b; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Charles Glenn posited,

The best setting for educating linguistic minority pupils—and one of the best for educating any pupil—is a school in which two languages are used without apology and where becoming proficient in both is considered a significant intellectual and cultural achievement. (as cited in Christian, 1996, p. 66)

The dual-language model brings ELLs and English speakers together in a caring and educationally challenging environment where they share the goals of biliteracy, high academic achievement, and cross-cultural competence (Treadway, 2000).

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether participation in a dual-language program by ELLs contributed to the literacy development of this student population. As an ethnographic study, the qualitative methods of observation, interviewing, and examination of artifacts (i.e., work samples) were employed. As described by Glesne (1999), “The researcher becomes the main research instrument as he or she observes, asks questions, and interacts with research participants” (p. 5). During the course of this ethnography, ELLs participating in a dual-language program at a Title 1, urban elementary school within a central Florida county were observed and interviewed. The student sample consisted of ELLs attending two first-grade classes—one taught by the researcher and the other led by her teaching partner—one second-grade class, and two combination classes (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades). Both student and parental consent forms were obtained (see Appendix B). Some of the parents directly participated in the study by agreeing to be interviewed regarding their beliefs surrounding the literacy development of their children within the dual-language program. The final group of participants were dual-language teachers who were interviewed regarding their beliefs surrounding the literacy development of ELLs within the particular program implemented at the study site (see Appendix B).

It is important to note that the researcher is also a teacher within the

dual-language program at the study site. During the 2005-06 school year, she taught the English component of the first-grade class participating in this study and took notes on the literacy development of these students throughout the research. Literacy can be defined as the following four components of language arts: (a) listening, (b) speaking, (c) reading, and (d) writing. All are interconnected and influence student learning in all subject areas (Chenfeld, 1987). This study sought evidence of literacy development across both the L1 and L2 of the ELLs within the dual-language program implemented at the study site. Observation was conducted during the language-arts period of the class during both English and Spanish class segments. The other dual language teachers and the ELLS, themselves helped the researcher with any necessary translating. The work samples examined were student journals, vocabulary notebooks, reading workbooks, reading assessments and creative social-studies and science projects in both languages. The processes of the prism model served as the collective organizational framework for the data gathered. These processes are crucial for the continued literacy development of ELLs and, as noted earlier, include sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Ethnography and Qualitative Study

The selection of a qualitative study was motivated by a desire to have the voices of the participants—namely, the ELLs, their parents, and their teachers—tell their stories (Chambers, 2000). Chambers aptly explained, “Much of the value of ethnography lies in [its] narrative—in the telling of a story that is based on cultural representations” (p. 856). The intent of this study was to recreate the experiences of ELLs participating within the

dual-language program of the study site toward making a contribution to existing related literature. By immersion into fieldwork, a more thorough understanding of the problem under study is gained (Behar, 1996). According to Behar,

The tendency is to depersonalize one's connection to the field, to treat ethnographic work (only a small part of which is done personally by the principal investigator) as that which is "other" to the "self," and to accumulate masses of data that can be compared, contrasted, charted, and serve as a basis for policy recommendations, or at least as a critique of existing practices. (p. 25)

Nonetheless, it is commonly accepted that qualitative studies require researchers to remain objective. "Qualitative research design is an act of interpretation from beginning to end" (Janesick, 2000, p. 395). Furthermore, the interpretations of the researcher are based upon all prior experiences that shaped his or her life (Eisner, 1998; Ely, 1997; Glesne, 1999). Eisner outlined the following six features of qualitative research that also portray the rationale behind the selection of this type of research for the current study:

1. Qualitative research is "field focused" (p. 32). During the course of this current study, honest presentation of the literacy development of participating ELLs was sought. "On the whole, however, qualitative researchers observe, interview, record, describe, interpret, and appraise settings as they are" (p. 33). Eisner recommended using qualitative research to document changes within the school system. The addition of the dual-language program, which was still in its 6th year of implementation at the time of the study, could be categorized as such a change because it is a relatively new program within the participating school district.

2. Eisner explained that, in this type of research, it is the self that is the instrument. As he recommended, the researcher immersed herself in this study. Her insight was crucial to its outcome. Eisner posited,

This means that the way in which we see and respond to a situation, and how we interpret what we see, will bear our own signature. This unique signature is not a liability but a way of providing individual insight into a situation. (p. 34)

3. The interpretive character of qualitative research is another important characteristic. Researchers interpret their data according to who they are and what comprises their schema. The data collected in this current study were interpreted with a foundation of many years of teaching experience as a “backdrop.” According to Eisner,

Meanings are construed, and the shape they take is due, in part, to the tools people know how to use. Different disciplines employ different tools. Thus, which meanings become salient is a function not only of the qualities “out there,” but of which tools people bring to them. (p. 36)

4. The use of voice is a necessary facet of qualitative research; neutrality is not a common feature of qualitative work. According to Eisner, “The presence of voice and the use of expressive language are also important in furthering human understanding” (pp. 36–37). The voice of the researcher is evident throughout this current study, which is that of an advocate of beneficial learning environments for ELLs.

5. This feature, best described in the following excerpt by Eisner, most strongly expresses the rationale for the choice of qualitative study in this current research:

For statistical procedures to be used, data have to be created. The form data take to be statistically treated is numerical. When this transformation occurs the uniqueness of particular features is lost. What emerges is a description of relationships, almost disconnected from the particulars from which the data was [*sic*] originally secured. (p. 38)

When field notes were compiled in the current study, care was taken to capture the special triumphs and failures of participating ELLs, which were exhibited through their facial expressions, body language, verbal reading, thoughtful comments and questions, written projects, and daily interaction with their teachers and classmates across both languages. A statistical study would have undoubtedly lost these invaluable contributions, attempting to prove the worth of the dual-language program through numerical comparison to another type of program. Perry (2001), another qualitative researcher, echoes these exact sentiments in the following excerpt:

Stories matter. Had I asked a question that required a statistics-based result, I probably would have dismissed this conversation with Kennedy as being peripheral to my study – certainly not part of the data. But those two minutes *were* significant to this study, especially when they were put together with dozens of other interactions with and observations of Kennedy. (p. 17)

6. A strength of qualitative research is that it utilizes data from multiple sources (Eisner, 1998). “In qualitative research there is no statistical test of significance to determine if results ‘count’; in the end, what counts is a matter of judgement [*sic*]” (p. 39). In this study, data emerged from classroom observation; student, teacher, and parent interviews; and analysis of student work samples (i.e., artifacts). Qualitative data from multiple sources is known to produce more trustworthy conclusions (Eisner, 1998; Ely, 1997; Glesne, 1999; Porter, 1994).

Pilot Study

For qualitative researchers new to a field of research, a pilot study can be helpful (Glesne, 1999). Having taught in the dual-language program for 5 years prior to this research, the researcher developed an early interest in the impact of the program on the

literacy development of ELLs. In the spring of 2004, a pilot study was conducted at the school that later served as the site for this primary study. ELLs within the dual-language classroom taught by the researcher were used to alleviate any anxiety on the part of participants toward revealing accurate data. 15 first- and second-grade ELLs participated. How these students learned in both the English and Spanish classes within the study site was observed. These learners were also interviewed regarding their feelings surrounding both classes because their opinions mattered. Their work samples and self-portraits were also examined. Data related to actions taken by the researcher, as their teacher, to assist in their literacy development were included in the final analysis.

Three sets of parents were interviewed in the pilot study regarding their feelings surrounding the participation of their children within the dual-language program. Additionally, seven teachers were interviewed regarding how they envisaged the dual-language program in terms of being instrumental in securing a strong academic foundation for their ELLs. All interviews were recorded on a tape recorder and subsequently transcribed. An interpreter was used in the interviews of one Spanish-speaking teacher and two parents. Lastly, all data were color coded to assist the search for clear, dominant themes, and selected examples from the literature were documented to support the conclusions drawn.

A strong theme emerged within the realm of literacy development, namely, that the L1 does not impede L2 (English) acquisition and can actually help with the process. The pilot study indicated that the literacy development of ELLs participating within the dual-language program of the study site would be a worthy exploration for a dissertation

because the field observations, interviews, work samples and self-portraits all dovetailed together to show that this type of program can be beneficial for children learning English as a second language.

Research Questions and Setting

The researcher approached the current study with the purpose of developing a clearer understanding of how participation by ELLs in a two-way, immersion dual-language program supportive of the L1 while English is simultaneously taught affects the literacy skills of the students. The data gathered through qualitative approaches to research will possibly provide important information and extend the conversation about the most effective ways to facilitate the literacy development of ELLs. Further, the research was guided by the aspiration to understand the factors associated with the immersion dual-language program may contribute to the participants' literacy development.

The research will assist in the development of insight into:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in a two-way, dual-language program?
2. What factors contribute to the failure to improve the literacy development for ELLs participating in a two-way, dual-language program?

According to Janesick (2000), "The description of persons, places, and events has been the cornerstone of qualitative research" (p. 393). The research setting for this study was a large Title 1, urban elementary school within a central Florida county. The majority of the total student population within the county (52,599 students) are of Hispanic

descent (49%). European American students comprise 33.6%, 10.2 % are African American, 4.5% are multiracial, 2.5% are Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.3 % are American Indian or Alaskan (Osceola County School District, 2005). Consequently, the minority language within the dual-language program of the county is Spanish. The Osceola County Multicultural Department (2005) stated the following goals for its dual-language program:

Our vision is to create a comfortable multicultural learning environment, where our students will be exposed to endless opportunities, as a result of the acquisition of two languages. It is our hope that our students enter a competitive international world with pride and self confidence [*sic*] in which they will be successful. (p. 1)

During the 2000-01 school year, the school district participating in this study implemented a dual-language program at two school sites. The funding was covered under a Title VII grant. However, the elementary school serving as the study site in this research was not one of the two original schools covered under the grant. This school instituted its dual-language program 1 year later when an administrator from one of the two original schools transferred to the study site with a positive view of the program. In lieu of grant funds, the independent budget of the school was used to fund the program, which continues to date. The study site is one of five schools offering the dual-language program within this Florida school district. Two more schools implemented the program during the 2005-06 school year. As mentioned previously, an additional elementary school will offer kindergarten classes taught in English and Spanish, and the program will expand to the sixth-grade for graduating dual-language fifth graders for the 2006-07 school year.

The study site is located along a busy thoroughfare of a small city within one of many Hispanic sections of a central Florida county. The county population is predominately Hispanic at 63.9% of total residents. Consequently, the L1 of Spanish follows suit with the rest of the county (Oms & Medina, 2006). According to the online guide to schools—schooltree.org—which collects its data from the Department of Education, the study site is currently a Title 1 school with 91% of its students eligible for the Free or Reduced Lunch program (Florida Department of Education, 2005). The school has a high mobility rate with withdrawal of over one half of the original dual-language students. Of a student body comprised of 835 students, 63.9% are Hispanic, 16.1% are African American, 11.0% are European American, 6.0% are multiracial, and 3% are Asian or Pacific Islander. Those participating in the dual-language program number 111 of the total student body or 13.2% (Oms & Medina, 2006). ELLs comprise 34% of the total student population of the school (D. Azuaje, personal communication, May 25, 2006).

The study site initially implemented the dual-language program within two kindergarten classrooms and two first-grade classrooms during the 2001-02 school year. Due to redistricting, some students were rezoned to the study site from other schools. Because some of the transferred students had been participating in dual-language programs in kindergarten at one of the two schools originally funded to offer the program, it was necessary to establish a dual-language first-grade class to meet their needs. It is important to note that the researcher was one of the kindergarten teachers at one of these original schools offering dual language during the 2000-01 school year. The

following year, she transferred to the study site to assist the administrator with implementation of the program. The researcher taught first grade through the initial year of the program within the study site and continued in that role through the end of the 2005-06 school year. At the time of this study, 111 of the total 835 students who attended the study site (13.2%) participated in the dual-language program; 21 were enrolled in kindergarten and 33 attended the first grade. Seventeen dual-language learners attended the second grade and 20 were enrolled in the third grade. Lastly, 20 dual-language students attended the combination class (Oms & Medina, 2006). These numbers include both the ELLs and the English-speaking students.

Study Participants

According to Van Maanen (1995), “Broadly conceived, ethnography is a storytelling institution. . . . It is by and large, the ethnographer’s direct personal contact with others that is honored by readers as providing a particularly sound basis for reliable knowledge” (p. 3). The time frame for this ethnography was from January 3, 2006 through May 26, 2006. ELLs between the first and fifth grades comprised the 38 student participants. As noted earlier, 17 of these participants were taught by the researcher prior to the year of this study. Consent forms were distributed to all parents of students identified as ESOL within her first-grade class, the first-grade class of her teaching partner, the second-grade class, and the two combination classes (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades).

As a teacher, the researcher is familiar with the literacy development of former students. As noted earlier, however, due to the high mobility rate of the study site, many

of the original dual-language students she taught had moved on by the time of this study. Withdrawals could occur at any point of the school year.

Study participants were ELLs identified as ESOL. In Florida, when a child enrolls in a public school, there are three questions that the parent is asked. If the first question is answered affirmatively, the child can be tested; however, if the last two are answered affirmatively, the child has to be tested:

1. Is there a language other than English in the home?
2. Does your child have a first language other than English?
3. Does the child speak a language other than English?

The students who are in grades kindergarten through third grade, an oral test, the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) is administered. For the fourth through fifth grade students, the testing involves more reading and writing (D. Azuaje, personal communication, May 25, 2006).

Among the five dual-language classes under study, only one set of parents did not give consent for study participation. Many of the parents knew and trusted the researcher because she was either the current teacher of their child or had taught their child in the past. It is important in qualitative research to establish rapport with participants (Treadway, 2000). A relationship of trust was sought diligently with students unfamiliar with the researcher. Ultimately, 38 students participated in the study. Included in the 38 total were four students who were added approximately halfway through the fieldwork. One was a student from the homeroom taught by the researcher, one was in the second-

and third-grade combination class, and two attended the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class. Both parental and student consent were obtained.

All of the teachers within the dual-language program of the study site were familiar with the researcher; they had worked together in previous years. The role of the researcher as a teacher within the program served to facilitate the study (Eisner, 1998). The teachers were comfortable with the observation of their classrooms and were always available for any clarification needed regarding their students. It was necessary to establish rapport with a substitute teacher who replaced the instructor for the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class in January. The school hired a long-term substitute because a full-time credentialed teacher was not possible at that point in the school year.

As documented by Glesne (1999),

Whether with adults or children, rapport, like access, is something to be continually negotiated. Negotiating rapport means conscious attunement to the emerging need of a relationship. . . . Maintaining rapport is associated with becoming informed about your setting's social and political structure so that you can shape your conduct with the sure-footedness that such knowledge affords. (p. 101)

Seven ELLs attending the first-grade homeroom taught by the researcher were eligible and participated in the study. One student had been taught by the researcher prior to the study year. Out of these seven students, five were more dominant in Spanish literacy; two were more dominant in English literacy. Within the homeroom of the researcher's teaching partner, four out of the five ELLs were eligible and participated in this study. The researcher had not taught any of the students from this class previously. Three demonstrated stronger proficiency in Spanish literacy, and one was stronger in

English literacy. All six of the ELLs within the second-grade class participated in the study. The researcher had taught five of them the previous year in the dual-language program. Four of the six demonstrated stronger proficiency in Spanish. One student demonstrated greater proficiency in English literacy, and another exhibited equal proficiency in both languages.

All 11 ELLs attending the second- and third-grade combination class participated in the study. Six were second graders and five were third graders. The researcher had taught all but one of the six second graders the previous year in the first-grade dual-language program. She had only taught two of the third graders 2 years preceding the study in the first-grade dual-language program. Out of the second graders, three students were more proficient in Spanish literacy; three were equally proficient in both Spanish and English. Out of the third graders, two were more dominant in Spanish; three were stronger in English.

Ten ELLs from the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class participated in the study. Seven of the students were fourth graders and three were fifth graders. The researcher had taught three of the fourth graders 3 years prior to the study when they were attending the first grade. She was the second-grade English reading teacher for four of these students 2 years prior to the study. During this time (i.e., the 2003-04 school year), the dual-language students rotated between several teachers for instruction in reading, writing, and math in both Spanish and English. After that school year, the administration abandoned this departmentalized structure for the traditional approach more conducive to the dual-language program.) None of the three fifth graders

participating in this study were taught by the researcher during past years. As mentioned, the study site has a high mobility rate; hence, quite a few of the students no longer attended the school. Out of the seven fourth graders, five were more dominant in Spanish; two were equally proficient in both English and Spanish. One of the fifth-grade students was equally proficient in both languages; two were stronger in English. Language dominance was determined by observation and by consulting with the ELL's current teacher. As mentioned previously, the researcher had been the primary teacher of 16 of the ELLs and currently taught the two groups of ELLs in the first grade classrooms.

All of the teachers participating in this study signed consent forms including the ESOL compliance specialist (ECS) for the study site (See Appendix B). The (ECS) is charged with ensuring that the ESOL students, or ELLs, are receiving the services guaranteed to them under the law.

The ECS was appointed by the administration of the study site as the designee for the dual-language program as well. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and a Master of Arts in ESOL. Her background is in administration and teaching at an international middle school within Venezuela.

As the first-grade instructor within the dual-language program, the researcher has taught a variety of elementary grades during the past 22 years, 17 within the school district participating in this study. The researcher holds a Bachelor of Arts in Drama and a Master of Arts in Teaching. She possesses a Florida Professional Teaching Certificate in the areas of elementary education, primary education and varying exceptionalities (special education).

The researcher's teaching partner, in charge of the Spanish component, came to Florida from Puerto Rico in the fall of 2003 with a number of years background in administrative service. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics in both Elementary and Secondary Education. She also holds a Master of Arts degree in Administration and Supervision. She is currently pursuing an additional Master's Degree in Guidance. She possesses a Florida Professional Teaching Certificate in elementary education, math, Spanish, and administration.

The second-grade teacher has taught in New York, California, Puerto Rico, and Florida. Her background encompasses approximately 30 years of teaching many different grade levels including high school and bilingual education. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Bilingual Education and 36 credits toward a Master of Arts in that area. Her Florida Professional Certification is in elementary education.

The teacher of the second- and third-grade combination class within the program came to Florida the year preceding the study. She taught a kindergarten class within a dual-language program; and, prior to that, she taught kindergarten and other bilingual programs within California for 10 years. She has a Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education and a Florida Professional Certificate in elementary education.

The teacher of the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class has a 5-year background educating students in the upper elementary grades. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Spanish and Elementary Education. Her Florida Professional Teaching Certificate is in elementary education. She left her position with the study site shortly after the research began to fill a position within a county office. A long-term bilingual

substitute with a background in business was hired approximately 1 month following her departure who remained with the class throughout the balance of the school year. The study site was unable to hire a permanent bilingual teacher for this combination class.

Data Collection

Miles and Huberman (1994) described the use of instrumentation in a manner that runs parallel with the views held by the researcher of this study in terms of its use within this ethnography. They stated,

The lion's share of fieldwork consists of taking notes, recording events (conversations, meetings), and picking up things (documents, products, artifacts). *Instrumentation* is a misnomer. Some orienting questions, some headings for observations, and a rough and ready document analysis are all you need at the start—perhaps all you will ever need in the course of the study. (p. 35)

This research was conducted over 5 months. Due to the experience of the researcher within the field of education, less time was needed than would have been required by a novice educator. The quality of the fieldwork is the crucial key (Eisner, 1998). As Eisner advanced, “The question is not so much the length of time as the quality of the evidence the researcher has to support descriptions, interpretations, and appraisals” (p. 192).

The Classroom

Schedules. The study site adheres to the 50-50 model of dual language; however, in reality, it is closer to 60-40 with the special-area classes and morning announcements in English. The 50-50 model provides an equal amount of instructional time between the two languages; hence, it is often referred to as a balanced program. A team-teaching structure is frequently employed with this type of model, with students alternating between the English teacher and the Spanish teacher to receive instruction across content

areas within both languages (Soltero, 2004). Both the researcher and her teaching partner were assigned homerooms between which the students alternate. The researcher teaches in English and her partner teaches in Spanish. Each teaches her respective class for approximately 2 hours. The researcher teaches the 90-minute Reading Block to one class in the morning and to the other class in the afternoon. Every child is required to receive a 90-minute block of reading instruction, per the state guidelines implemented the year of the study. Consequently, the 90-minute block is repeated for the other student group in the afternoon.

The Scott Foresman reading series was adopted for all schools within the central Florida district participating in this study. Creative writing, artistic activities, and other literature activities are integrated during the reading session. A computerized reading comprehension program known as Accelerated Reader (AR) was also implemented. Additionally, the researcher teaches math following the Harcourt Brace math series adopted by the county. While one class is receiving instruction under the direction of the researcher, the other class receives instruction in Spanish literacy with her teaching partner who follows the same reading series in Spanish and also teaches social studies, science, and a computerized math program known as Accelerated Math (AM). Both the AR and AM programs are published by the Renaissance Company. Within the self-contained second- through fifth-grade classrooms, each teacher is bilingual. Consequently, these teachers alternate the language of instruction by time of day (Soltero, 2004). All students received their block of 90 minutes of reading in English each morning. Math, social studies, and science in both languages are taught in the afternoons.

All teachers use the county-adopted series for reading and math, as well as the same computerized math and reading programs.

Observation. The classroom observation for this research began on January 3, 2006 and ended on the last day of school, May 26, 2006. As expressed by J. Deets (personal communication, April 8, 2004), researcher immersion into a scenario under investigation is pivotal. The intent in the current study was to form a picture of literacy development within each classroom through the observational field notes (Glesne, 1999). Ethnographers often speak of making the familiar strange and the strange familiar with the objective of gaining a fresh perspective (Ely, 1997). Ely expressed, “I keep reminding myself that as a qualitative researcher I am interested in understanding my participant’s story, and questioning, listening, and observing are the tools that can help me” (p. 66).

The observation conducted across the five dual-language classrooms of the study site sought to determine student levels of comfort with, and ease in, using the languages, as well as how students interacted with each other and their teacher(s), how they approached their assignments in English and Spanish, and the effort they extended toward their work. As described by Glesne (1999), “Your eyes, ears, and hands, join forces to capture the details of a setting in your field notes, particularly early on in your fieldwork, when you are trying to capture a picture of the setting and its people” (p. 51). The researcher in this current study desired to gain a perspective of the classroom through the eyes of the student participants. During observation, she often asked herself, “Would I want to be a student in this class?”

As Ely (1997) documented,

Achieving empathetic understanding is crucial for the therapist who wants to comprehend the client's experience with a minimum of distortion or bias. Likewise, in ethnographic research, the investigator wants to understand the minds and hearts of the research participants in as total and unadulterated a way as possible. (p. 122)

At the onset of this study, many of the participating ELLs were familiar with the researcher, which motivated natural behavior and honest responses. As the year progressed, the researcher became an expected fixture within the classrooms and the children simply extended a quick "Hello" and continued with their activities as she came and went within their environments. According to Ely,

Familiarity with the subject at hand – the subculture, the jargon, the unwritten codes of behavior – may enable a researcher to delve deeply into the research without having to do all of the preliminary work, such as learning a new lingo, becoming acquainted with the norms, and developing a level of comfort within the environment being studied. (p. 124)

Over the course of the research, the ELLs were observed individually, with another student jointly working on a project, working within small groups both with and without adult guidance, and with their entire class while their teacher taught the main lesson related to their literacy development (Perry, 2001; Sanjek, 1990). Informal interviews were also conducted in this research, if it seemed appropriate during classroom visitations (Ely, 1997). Ely supported such activity stating, "Some interviews are done 'on the hoof' during participant-observation when the time is available and the spirits are amenable" (p. 57). The easiest access to participating ELLs was naturally through the first-grade class taught by the researcher and the class of her teaching partner. It wasn't always easy, but the researcher became comfortable with balancing her role as a teacher and ethnographer as the study progressed; she trained herself to take notes during

the course of a lesson (Ely, 1997). Although some ethnographers choose to videotape or audiotape their participants (Ely, 1997; Glesne, 1999; Perry, 2001), this method of data collection was avoided to maintain as natural a setting as possible (Eisner, 1998). The taking of field notes while teaching became less tedious as the value gleaned became increasingly apparent (Behar, 1996). The researcher used her planning and lunch periods to observe the other classrooms. When her teaching assistant had the class under control, she would sometimes leave for a brief observation of another classroom attended by one of the program participants. All of these small additions to the data summed to a large contribution over the course of the study between January and May, culminating to approximately 350 hours. Ultimately, 1.5 personal days were needed to immerse herself completely in the fieldwork without concern over concurrent teaching duties. During that time, the researcher spent time within the first-grade class taught by her partner, the second-grade class, and the two combination classes through the fifth grade. This observation period was highly productive with the time restrictions eliminated.

Field Notes

According to Jackson (1995), “Fieldnotes [*sic*] are created documents that share some features with novels, paintings, and musical compositions: they are new, and yet they affirm already existing truths, sometimes extremely powerfully” (p. 68). From the onset of the observation of participating ELLs, field notes were maintained within a bound notebook. The notebook became the primary recording tool (Glesne, 1999). Notes were maintained in chronological order and headed according to the respective group under observation. The researcher immersed herself in the study, using all of her senses

to collect data. She would ask herself, “What do I hear, see, and feel in this classroom?” (Richardson, 2000). Her notebook remained with her at all times during the day because great effort was taken to never miss an encounter. She often spoke to participants in the halls, and they frequently had spontaneous pearls of wisdom to offer (Eisner, 1998).

Eisner explained,

What researchers record when they take notes depends initially upon their ability to perceive what is meaningful and significant: this too is the act of imagination at work. What is significant does not announce itself for all to hear. It does not carry an identification badge. The observer’s task is both to see and to remember. Note taking is a way of remembering. (p. 188)

Each night, the researcher reread the field notes and mentally digested them (Glesne, 1999; Perry, 2001). The research never ended upon school dismissal. The following advice of Glesne was practiced: “Read through the day’s notes. Fill in remembered descriptions, clarify and expand briefly noted events or actions, and then reflect on the day and write your thoughts” (p. 55). The researcher transcribed the field notes to an expanded form according to the general themes or codes she began to see emerging. The data were concurrently coded within the computer document. Miles and Huberman (1994) recommended that researchers code their data as the collection progresses, rather than waiting until all data are retrieved. Each day, the most appropriate code was assigned to the observations conducted. Miles and Huberman defined codes as “tags [or] labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information completed during a study. . . . For our purposes it is not the words themselves but their *meaning* that matters” (p. 56).

Interviews

In a discussion of study interviews, Holstein and Gubrium (2003) described interviewing as “a way of generating empirical data about the social world by asking people to talk about their lives” (p. 3). Interviewing allows the researcher to learn more about the participants than can be readily observed (Ely, 1997; Glesne, 1999; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, pp. 332–342). (The interview protocol is included in Appendix C). Each interview in this study was conducted with a predetermined set of questions. As is recommended, the questions were modified according to time constraints and the most valuable information needed (Glesne, 1999). The questions were further revised as the heart of the study was entered, which was reflective of the very nature of qualitative work (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Verbal discussion with teachers and students can provide a wealth of information related to the activities and interaction within the classroom. As mentioned earlier, the decision against use of tape recorders was made to allow the highest comfort level possible for the participants (Eisner, 1998).

Teachers. Interviews were conducted with the Spanish first-grade teacher, the second-grade teacher, the teacher assigned to the second- and third-grade combination class, the long-term bilingual substitute for the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class, and the ECS. The interview questions were sent via e-mail to the original teacher of the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class.

The interview protocol provided in Appendix C served as a guide. Specifically, questions 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 13 were asked. Questions can be adapted to fit the particular interview situation; this process is called “question formation” and it is highly

recommended in qualitative research (Glesne, 1999, p. 68). Other topics were discussed such as reading, testing, and types of dual-language programs. The interviewee responses were recorded by hand within the field notebook and subsequently transcribed to computer each night.

Learners. According to Dunbar, Rodriguez, and Parker (2003), “The art of interviewing entails framing questions in a way that allows interviewees [in this case, children] to maintain their dignity while they tell the stories that are important to them. This means allowing subjects their humanity” (p. 146). When interviewing children, it is recommended that the sessions are held during an activity already familiar to the interviewees. Furthermore, it is important to interview children within a group because group situations equalize the power differential between children and adults (Eder & Fingerson, 2003). Consequently, the researcher took approximately four or five ELLs to a familiar picnic area on the school grounds and interviewed them during their lunch period. To increase their comfort level, she engaged them in “small talk,” asking about their families and recalling fun experiences shared together. While the students talked, their responses were noted in the field notebook. They were already familiar with the notebook because they had observed the researcher using it many times within their classroom.

The classes were divided into manageable groups for the study interviews. In the homeroom of the researcher, all seven participating students were interviewed in one group. The four ELLs from the class of her teaching partner were interviewed in a different session. The six second graders were subsequently interviewed together, and on

a separate occasion, five of the six second graders from the second- and third-grade combination class were interviewed. One second grader was absent. The five third graders from that class were then interviewed as a separate group. With the fourth- and fifth-grade combination class, the researcher made an exception. Due to time constraints, it was necessary to interview the seven fourth graders and three fifth graders together.

The interview protocol served as a guide. (See Appendix C). Questions 1-5, 7, 10, 11, and 14 were asked. Other topics were discussed as is the nature of qualitative work (Glesne, 1999), such as such as future jobs and the language of their thoughts. The researcher was careful to monitor the children and keep them as comfortable as possible during the interview. It was important to her that they felt as secure as possible so they would share their thoughts freely on the dual-language program (Eder & Fingerson, 2003; Holstein & Gubrium, 2003). The researcher captured all the data by writing the children's responses in her notebook and transferring them to her computer at night.

Parents. As mentioned earlier, the intrusion of a tape recorder was eliminated in the study interviews in favor of noting key phrases from the interviewees by hand in a notebook. The comfort level this gained was especially true for the participating parents of ELLs (Eisner, 1998). Great effort was taken to maintain two-way interactive sessions with the parents interviewed. Their comfort level was consistently monitored with close attention to their facial expressions, tone of voice, and body language. Most of the parents brought a translator with them; however, the researcher's teaching partner was always available if needed for this purpose. The beliefs of the researcher surrounding dual-language programs were shared with all of the parents interviewed, as well as the

benefits of bilingual status (Dunbar et al., 2003). As Dunbar and colleagues expressed, “The notion that the researcher should shelve his or her experiences, values, and beliefs to maintain objectivity does not always serve us well in the pursuit of rich interview data” (p. 144).

Due to the tedious family and work schedules maintained by the parents of ELLs within the dual-language program of the study site, the researcher was only able to interview eight parents, despite follow-up notes sent home and phone calls attempting to schedule additional sessions. Two of the interviews were the mother and grandmother of one of the first-grade students attending the class taught by the researcher, and another was a mother of a first grader attending the Spanish homeroom of her teaching partner. Two were mothers of second graders, and the child of one mother was from the combination second- and third-grade class. The other was the mother of a student attending the regular second-grade class, and both parents of a second grader from the combination class participated. Finally, a mother of a fourth grader also agreed to be interviewed.

The interview protocol served as a guide and questions were selected from it (Glesne, 1999). The researcher’s main intent was to empower the interviewees, namely, the parents, by allowing them to tell their own story (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003). (See Appendix C). Specifically, questions 1-4, 6, 7, 9, and 12 were used. As mentioned earlier, the comments that the parents made were written in the researcher’s notebook as they spoke; and later that night entered into her computer.

Artifacts

Various work samples (i.e., artifacts) of the ELLs participating in this study were examined. The analysis included their journal entries, reading folders, reading workbooks, and reading records, and science and social-studies projects. The researcher compared the ELLs' reading scores on an English reading test and a reading test given in Spanish. The English reading test was the STAR Early Literacy for the first grade and the STAR Reading Test for the ELLS in grades two through five. The STAR Early Literacy tests beginning reading skills while the STAR Reading Test requires more in-depth sentence reading. Both are published by the Renaissance Company which also publishes the Accelerated Reader Program that the study site uses as part of its reading instruction. The Spanish Test used was the Aprenda, published by Harcourt Assessment Inc., which assesses thinking skills in Spanish-speaking students.

Additionally, the children were asked to draw self-portraits illustrating how they viewed themselves in the English class and in the Spanish class (see Appendix D). It was critical to determine if the self-portraits complemented or contradicted their interview responses (Hodder, 2000). According to Hodder, "The challenge posed by material culture is important for anthropological and sociological analysis because material culture is often a medium in which alternative and often muted voices can be expressed" (p. 714). This current study also sought to ascertain how the participating ELLs felt about learning two languages (Griego-Jones, 1994). Griego-Jones posited that "in short, students' feelings about their native language and second languages can't be separated from their feelings about self as learners and members of society" (p. 2).

Researcher interpretation was considered in the analysis of ELL work samples to reinforce the themes emerging from the classroom observation (Glesne, 1999). As Glesne explained, “Documents corroborate your observations and interviews and thus make your findings more trustworthy. Beyond corroboration, they may raise questions about your hunches and thereby shape new directions for observations and interviews” (p. 58).

Data Analysis

Theoretical Framework

According to Fetterman (1998), “Theory is a guide to practice; no study, ethnographic or otherwise, can be conducted without an underlying theory or model” (p. 5). The data collection, and ultimately the data analysis, in this study was designed under the Thomas and Collier (1997) model for language acquisition known as the prism model. This model provided the framework around which the qualitative data could be organized and, just as importantly, helped to determine the pivotal aspects on which to focus (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994; Takahashi-Breines, 2002). The prism model facilitates elaboration of the manner in which all processes involved in how ELLs learn English are related and intertwined. As noted earlier, it encompasses four critical elements: sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development. If any one of these components is neglected, reduced learning will result (Thomas & Collier, 1997). According to Takahashi-Breines, “The model shows the interrelationship among the four components that influence language acquisition in a school context for bilingual children” (p. 217). The sociocultural processes include all communal and ethnic structures influencing children. All aspects of linguistic processing

within the L1 and L2 are encompassed within the linguistic processes. The third component—academic development—includes all content areas across all subjects from kindergarten through the 12th grade. The last component—cognitive development—must be continued in the L1 of the ELL through at least the elementary-school years (Takahashi-Breines, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

The type of sampling employed in this study would be considered theory based. The qualitative data collected from classroom observation, analysis of ELL work samples, and the study interviews were grounded in the Thomas and Collier (1997) theoretical construct. Miles and Huberman (1994) documented, “We believe that better research happens when you make your framework—and associated choices of research questions, cases, sampling, and instrumentation—explicit, rather than claiming inductive ‘purity’” (p. 23). For purposes of the data collection performed for this study, as well as the subsequent analysis, the four processes or themes of the prism model were implemented (Takahashi-Breines, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997). The researcher sought to determine how each of the factors operated together as the classroom observation and interviews were conducted. As she immersed herself in the study, the data collected were categorized according to the themes of the prism model.

Technique

Janesick (2000) stated, “Qualitative research design is an act of interpretation from beginning to end” (p. 395). Van Maanen contributed to this discussion with the following excerpt: “Broadly conceived, ethnography is a storytelling institution. . . . It is by and large, the ethnographer’s direct personal contact with others that is honored by

readers as providing a particularly sound basis for reliable knowledge” (p. 3). There are many ways to analyze qualitative data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Early and ongoing data analysis is recommended, which can also lead back to fresh approaches to data collection. Several techniques were used in this study to prevent an insurmountable amount of uncategorized data. One technique was to code data as it was collected. Coding provided a designated location within which to insert the data, allowing it to be subsequently retrieved when needed in an organized fashion. As defined by Miles and Huberman, “*Codes* are tags [or] labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information completed during a study. . . . For our purposes it is not the words themselves but their *meaning* that matters” (p. 56).

As noted earlier, another technique for data analysis is known as clustering, which is similar to coding. However, it allows the researcher to become more abstract with the established categories (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Miles and Huberman described this technique as “the process of inductively forming categories, and the iterative sorting of things—events, actors, processes, settings, sites—into these categories” (p. 249). Clustering was used in this study in conjunction with coding to help form categories with greater flexibility. Factoring provided yet another technique, which is derived from statistical studies and allows the creation of categories for several types of details. In turn, a smaller number of groupings result, simplifying the analysis. This technique was applied in this research to categorize the data collected from the observation, interviews, and examination of work samples into the framework of the prism model (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

For the final analysis, the researcher color-coded the data as themes or factors that emerged based on the prior coding, clustering and factoring. Each particular category that the data revealed became a factor contributing to either the literacy development for the ELLs or the failure to improve their literacy. Then, the particular data presented as vignettes (Glesne, 1999; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983) were aligned with the particular corresponding factor(s).

Qualitative data from multiple sources produces more trustworthy conclusions (Eisner, 1998; Ely, 1997; Glesne, 1999; Porter, 1994). Ely reported that triangulation can be the union of data collected by different methods such as observation, interviewing and the collection of artifacts, as well as, with the same data gathered over a period of time. The data collected from observation across the five dual-language classrooms was triangulated with that collected from the interviews conducted with ELLs, their parents, and their teachers, as well as from the analysis of student work samples. Fetterman (1998) posited, “Triangulation always improves the quality of data and the accuracy of ethnographic findings” (p. 95). The essential principle of triangulation is that the more evidence the researcher can gather toward defending a conclusion, the more believable that position will appear (Porter, 1994). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), “If you self-consciously set out to collect and double-check findings, using multiple sources and modes of evidence, the verification process will largely be built into data collection as you go” (p. 267).

Different researchers have adopted different terms for triangulation. Richardson (1994) extends the meaning, however, with use of the term “crystallization” (as cited in

Janesick, 2000, p. 392). A crystal provides a researcher with multiple views of the data. “Crystals grow, change, and alter, but are not amorphous” (as cited in Janesick, 2000, p. 392). Triangulation can be described as similar to structural corroboration where multiple sources of data are used to support any generalization (Eisner, 1998). Eisner advanced, “In seeking structural corroboration we look for recurrent behaviors or actions, those theme-like features of a situation that inspire confidence that the events interpreted and appraised are not aberrant or exceptional, but rather characteristic of the situation” (p. 110). This study applied the concept of crystallization in the interpretation of qualitative data. There is no “right” way to analyze the data. Just as a crystal presents a wide array of color, depending upon the light refraction, the concept of crystallization provides a layered and multifaceted interpretation of subject matter. As Richardson (2000) documented,

Crystallization, without losing structure, deconstructs the traditional idea of “validity” (we feel how there is no single truth, we see how texts validate themselves), and crystallization provides us with a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial, understanding of the topic. Paradoxically, we know more and doubt what we know. Ingeniously, we know there is always more to know. (p. 934)

The researcher kept a journal at the start of the study to facilitate the delicate balance between ethnographer and teacher. The record became an outlet for both successes and frustrations as she learned how to balance the two roles. It was necessary for the researcher to have a constant awareness of this balance throughout the school day, as well as cognizance of within which role she was operating at any given moment

(Ely, 1997). A journal is a way for the researcher to track his or her ever-changing viewpoint (Janesick, 2000). On January 21, 2006, an entry read,

It is so fascinating to really keenly observe how children learn. By alternating between wearing the cap of a teacher and an ethnographer, I am really learning a lot about how my students learn. I'm noticing little things; but, they expand to show me a great deal on how kids learn a second language.

Honesty and the Role of the Researcher, Reliability, and Validity

Honesty and the Role of the Researcher

The researcher approached the study with an open mind with the strong desire to report the truth regarding literacy development in the dual language program at the study site. Furthermore, she saw her role as that of empowering her participants, namely, the ELLs, their parents and their teachers, by allowing their voices concerning literacy to be heard (Behar, 1996). It was very important to the researcher that the study be conducted in as ethical a manner as possible, as well; and, throughout the entirety of the study, total respect for the rights of the participants was foremost in her mind. "Ethics is not something that you can forget once you satisfy the demands of institutional review boards and other gatekeepers of research conduct" (Glesne, 1999, p. 113).

Because the researcher was the main instrument in this study, she entered school each morning with the intent to observe as many of the participants as the daily schedule would allow (Glesne, 1999). Each day, she would ask herself, "What can I observe today that answers the research question regarding how dual-language contributes to the ELLs' literacy development?" As Janesick (2000) advanced, "The description of persons, places, and events has been the cornerstone of qualitative research. I believe it will

remain the cornerstone, because this is the qualitative researcher's reason for being" (p. 393). The goal was to obtain as much information on the manner in which the ELLs learned and how they felt about learning two languages (Griego-Jones, 1994) across as many learning situations as possible (Perry, 2001). Throughout the course of this study, the researcher discovered that her role as an ethnographer was facilitating her own growth toward becoming an insightful educator, as well. This is indeed an advantage of qualitative research; it can "help us deepen our insights in more than one area" (Ely, 1997, p. 202).

As Richardson (2000) so aptly stated, "The ethnographic life is not separable from the Self" (p. 939). The personal feelings, intuition, imagination, and hunches of the researcher were considered during the course of this study. She approached the research with a strong background within the field of education, which could not be suspended during data collection and analysis (Behar, 1996; Eisner, 1998; Okely, 1994; Perry, 2001; Richardson, 2000). As Okely advanced,

The anthropologist-writer draws also on the totality of the experience, parts of which may not, cannot, be cerebrally written down at the time. It is recorded in memory, body and all the senses. Ideas and themes have worked through the whole being throughout the experience of fieldwork. (p. 21)

Another aim of this study was to add to the perceived worth of qualitative research. Consequently, great care was taken to record all that was observed and heard within the field journal (Sanjek, 1990). The researcher continuously reflected on the following words of Sanjek: "If we are to come back from the field with anything more

than empathy, a rapport high, and headnotes, then the relationship of our fieldwork documentation to ethnographic writing must be clear and sharp” (p. 238).

Reliability

Miles and Huberman (1994) added, “The underlying issue here [for reliability] is whether the process of the study is consistent, reasonably stable over time and across researchers and methods” (p. 278). Major considerations are:

1. Are the research questions clear?
2. Was the role of the researcher clear at all times?
3. Are the findings consistent across data sources?
4. Can established theories be applied to the paradigms of the study?
5. Were data collected across the full range of the research setting without modifications weakening the findings?
6. Were coding checks in place?
7. Were quality checks made throughout the study to avoid bias?
8. Were peers invited to review the findings?

To ensure optimum reliability, the researcher always kept her role tantamount in her mind. To avoid bias, she would remind herself to accurately observe the happenings in each of the classrooms. The research questions were clear and she always referred back to them during her classroom observations. All the data was categorized properly as the study progressed. And, her findings triangulated from the classroom observations, interviews and work samples over the course of the study. Linguistic theories found in

the field could be applied to this research. The data was collected across the entire research setting and the researcher sought both the positive and negative contributions that the data could bring to light.

Validity

Using different sources to collect data adds to the validity of the research study. The key is to seek “the truth” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 278). The findings must speak the truth in a way that is comprehensible to all readers. The more sources of data supporting conclusions, the more trustworthy the study (Glesne, 1999; Janesick, 2000). “The aim is to pick triangulation sources that have different biases, different strengths, so they can complement each other” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 267). The following questions were applied throughout this study to ensure its validity:

1. How meaningful are the descriptions? Can they be compared to similar studies?
2. Would the study seem real or convincing to readers?
3. Are the data linked to a theory or construct?
4. Are the concepts related?
5. Were any appropriate areas of uncertainty found?
6. Were any findings dissimilar to the original construct? Was there any attempt to find any disconfirming evidence?
7. Have the stories of participants been accurately recounted?
8. Could these findings be replicated in future study?
9. Have the participants been empowered in any way by the study?

To ensure the maximum validity, the researcher made every effort to contribute contextually rich data descriptions to the study. The study would seem convincing to readers because the researcher truthfully recorded (in her notebook) what she saw and heard. And, the researcher empowered her participants by explaining to them that their feelings and opinions were important to her; they were allowed to share their stories with her. By following the qualitative methods of observation, interviewing and studying artifacts (work samples), the findings could be replicated in a future study. The data are related and can be linked to theories in the field of L2 development (Cummins, 2001; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Finally, the researcher did look for disconfirming evidence and one negative factor was discovered.

Objectivity, Assumptions, Limitations, and Ethics

According to Chambers (2000), “The long-term and relatively intimate acquaintance with research subjects that is characteristic of much ethnography provides rich, contextual information that can increase the depth of our knowledge of particular subjects” (p. 862). To eliminate personal insight would require the dismissal of the great works of film, art, history, and literature that have contributed deeply to understanding of the world (Eisner, 1998). Qualitative researchers “are interpreters who draw on their own experiences, knowledge, theoretical dispositions, and collected data to present their understanding of the other’s world” (Glesne, 1999, p. 157).

The primary assumption necessary in this study was that the participants—namely, the ELLs, their parents, and their teachers—answered honestly during the research interviews. The study was limited by the amount of actual classroom

observation the researcher was able to conduct from January 3, 2006 through May 26, 2006. Another limitation was the mental state of the participants. There could have existed external forces within the school, family, or community of which the researcher was either unaware or over which she had no control during the course of this ethnography.

Due to the population sample of ELLs within the dual-language program of one elementary school, the results cannot be generalized to other schools or regions. Further, the participants were drawn from a dual-language program that consisted of two first-grade classes—one English and one Spanish—one second-grade class, one second- and third-grade combination class, and one fourth- and fifth-grade combination class at this particular school. Other schools in the county will vary in this mix of classes within their dual-language programs, as well as the time allotted for each language across all subject areas.

As noted earlier, the objectivity of the researcher could be called into question due to her status as a teacher within the study site and hence an insider to the research. A researcher must be cautious to avoid any form of presumption, especially related to any familiarity with the research setting. Just as importantly, a researcher must not impose his or her own preconceived notions on the participants (Ely, 1997). As expressed by Ely, “Knowledge of others’ hearts, minds, and experience simply cannot be assumed, regardless of familiarity, or perhaps especially when one is familiar with their subcultural landscape” (p. 125). However, it is still necessary to acknowledge any personal biases to glean a truthful understanding of the participants and their feelings. Ely explained,

To do so, s/he [the researcher] must attempt to recognize personal prejudices, stereotypes, myths assumptions, and other thoughts or feelings that may cloud or distort the perception of other people's experiences. I do not believe that we loose [sic] subjectivity, for human perception is by nature and definition subjective. I do believe that by recognizing and acknowledging our own myths and prejudices, we can more effectively put them in their place.
(p. 122)

This ethnography was approved by the Internal Review Board of the University of Central Florida during November 2005 (see Appendix A). Only those students who submitted signed parental consent and child assent forms were included in the study. The parental consent form was translated into Spanish for the comfort of Spanish-speaking parents (see Appendix B). All participating teachers signed the adult participation consent form for inclusion in the study (see Appendix B). A sample of a self-portrait page is provided in Appendix D.

Summary

The purpose of this ethnographic study was to determine whether participation in a dual-language program by ELLs contributed to the literacy development of this student population. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in two-way, dual-language programs?
2. What factors contribute to the failure in improving the literacy development for ELLs participating in two-way, dual-language programs?

The qualitative methodology of observation, interviewing, and examination of artifacts has been described. Numerous citations from the field of qualitative research have been provided in support of the rationale behind the use of a qualitative approach.

The demographics of the study site and a description of the data-collection process have been detailed. The data analysis incorporated the prism model (Thomas & Collier, 1997), and the Richardson (2000) concept of crystallization provided invaluable insight during the analysis. The approach to this study ran parallel to the perception of Richardson, as exemplified in the following excerpt: “I see the ethnographic project as humanly situated, always filtered through human eyes and human perceptions, bearing both the limitations and the strengths of human feelings” (p. 937).

CHAPTER FOUR FINDINGS

This ethnographic study investigated how the L1 and L2 literacy development of ELLs in a Title 1 elementary school within a central Florida county was affected by participation in a dual-language program. Qualitative data were gathered through classroom observation of ELLs during their literacy block, interviews with the same learners and their parents and teachers, and examination of their work samples. The four processes of the prism model served as the organizational framework for the data collected. These interrelated processes are essential for the continued literacy development of ELLs and, as noted earlier, include sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development (Thomas & Collier, 1997). This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in a two-way, dual-language program?
2. What factors contribute to the failure in improving the literacy development for ELLs participating in a two-way, dual-language program?

Classroom observation of the dual-language program implemented during the reading and language-arts periods within the two first-grade classrooms; the English and Spanish homerooms; the second-grade classroom; and the two combination classrooms (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades) were conducted over the course of 5 months between January 3, 2006 through May 26, 2006. The participating ELLs, their teachers, and several of their parents were interviewed to determine their views on the

dual-language program implemented by the school. In addition to the observation and interviews, the self-portraits drawn by the ELLs and their literacy-related work samples, including reading tests, were examined.

Because ethnography allows the data to tell the story, a narrative style is recommended to present the findings (Glesne, 1999; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). Consequently, the words of the study become tantamount (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 7). According to Hughes (1994), the query “What’s the main story here?” must be asked throughout the study (p. 45). With consideration to these recommendations, the data of the current research is presented in the form of short narratives or vignettes, each identified with the respective date of observation documented within the notebook maintained by the researcher (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983).

The notebook quotes presented are organized around the factors discovered through the research questions and within the theoretical framework of the prism model (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Ten factors were discovered, nine contributing to successful literacy development for the participating ELLs and one contributing to failure in improving literacy skills. With regard to Research Question 1, this data analysis found nine factors that appeared to contribute to improved literacy development for ELLs in the two-way immersion program implemented by the study site, which is supportive of the L1 as English is concurrently taught. All of the factors corresponded to the four processes of the prism model.

Within the category of sociocultural processes, two factors emerged—(a) validation of the culture and native language, and (b) the necessity of a comfortable

learning environment. Within the category of linguistic processes, two factors were discovered—(a) the transfer of reading skills from the L1 to the L2, and (b) incorporation of literature within the Reading Block. Within the component of academic development, four factors emerged—(a) validation of the culture and native language, (b) additional linguistic support across the content area, (c) development of thinking skills, and (d) strategies supporting English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). Two factors were discovered within the component of cognitive development—(a) creative activities integrated within literacy instruction and (b) language arts in both languages.

With regard to Research Question 2, one factor emerged during the course of the study that appeared to contribute to failure in efforts toward improving literacy development for participating ELLs. This was the imbalance of instructional time between the English and Spanish classes, which would be categorized within linguistic processes.

Factors Contributing to Literacy Development in English-Language Learners

Factor 1: Validation of Culture and Native Language

By accepting the native cultures of ELLs into the classroom as an important reality of life and learning, teachers are validating these vital roots (Bartolome, 1994). This study found instances of perceived sociocultural support provided to participating ELLs by their teachers and the assistants throughout each school day. Observation of facial expressions and body language, as well as, listening to classroom interaction found what appeared to be a level of comfort exhibited by ELLs during both the English and Spanish instructional periods. Both English and Spanish were spoken by the ELLs as they

worked with other students. Many instances were observed of students translating for an ELL struggling to understand English communication. When an ELL appeared to learn a new word in English or increased their English communication, the other students demonstrated pleasure with the progress of their ELL peer.

The ECS at the study site explained why use of the L1 creates a learning environment more conducive to ELLs, as described in the following excerpt from the ethnographic notebook maintained by the researcher:

[5/25/06, ECS Interview]: [The ECS gives reasons for her belief in dual language for the ELLs.] She feels that dual language provides a smoother transition and a kinder way for ELLs. “It allows them the comfort to use their native language at least for part of the day. It is better for their self-esteem and their adjustment.” The ECS says that she has to look at it psychologically. “The ELLs will feel better about the learning environment because it is half and half.”

The research journal also contains examples of language validation within the first-grade classrooms, supporting the need for teachers to view the learning of the L2 as an *addition* to the L1 and culture of ELLs, rather than a replacement (Cummins, 2001). The ethnographic notebook reflects the following related notations:

[3/1/06, 1st Grade, English]: This morning, while I am counting the money for the field trip, I ask one of my ELLs if her mom had signed the permission slip. I don't see the signature on the English side. Then, I realize that her mom would have signed on the other side [the Spanish side]. The student is excited as she tells me, “My mom is learning English!” And I tell her “I am learning Spanish!” When I point out that I am learning Spanish, the kids look excited.

[1/19/06, 1st Grade, English]: I have 4th graders help them [the ELLs] with the AR tests and I have instructed them to translate the English questions into Spanish so they will be able to use their most comfortable language to answer the questions. It seems to be working, as many are getting 100's or only 1 wrong.

[1/20/06, 1st Grade, English]: The ELLs are starting to write in English. Although it is only a sentence or two with approximations of the words, I am pleased that

they are at least trying to put something on paper. To make it easier, I tell them that writing is “talking written down.” I let them draw the picture first if they need to. That seems to help them. I tell them that I am so proud of them. I work hard at building up their self-esteem. If they think they can, they will be that much more successful.

One first grader is actually writing quite a bit, with close approximations to the actual words. I encourage them to use the Word Wall and the holiday and vowel charts. I see another first grader using the vowel charts to spell words like cat. One student shares that he thinks about it [his writing] and then he is able to write. I see that another student is able to use the Word Wall quite competently; he finds *grandmother*. I help him spell *grandpa*. He wrote the *g-r-a-n-d* part; but he needs to ask me how to spell *pa*.

[2/1/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: In the afternoon, my class is working on syllables in the Spanish class. One ELL, who tends to be quiet in the English room, raises his hand to volunteer an answer. He has a happy look on his face. Another ELL looks more comfortable, too. Two others are eagerly answering the question [in the workbook]. They have to choose the word for the picture and then divide it into syllables.

[2/2/06, 1st Grade- Spanish]: In Spanish class, one ELL is able to show me what to do. As I read the words silently to myself, he gets excited that I am learning Spanish! My wanting to learn it, validates his language and self-esteem and confidence goes up.

The exercises include a picture and a choice of two words. My teaching partner asks them to describe the picture and then pick the word. They all repeat the sentence together. Next, she asks each kid, “¿Cómo te llamas?” [What is your name?] They have to answer with their name and then ask another person. They all get excited when I do it.

[2/7/06, 1st Grade, English]: *If I had a magic wand, I would...* is the writing prompt for the journal, today. A student translates for one of the ELLs. She says *perro* [dog]. I am accepting of the Spanish and the student’s whole face lights up as I write *dog* for her.

[3/27/06, 1st Grade, English]: One student jumps right in to help our new ELL! I say the lunch in English and she translates the menu quickly for her without me even asking her. I find that the kids really look out for each other. Another student comments that she [the new ELL] is learning a great deal of English. The student looks proud of herself when she shares with me, “I know the alphabet in English!” The other kids hear her and celebrate her success!

Later, during Reading Time, the student, again, helps the ELL by explaining the story to her. When I ask a comprehension question, the ELL

answers in Spanish and when the other translates, I can see that she is starting to understand it.

Examples of cultural or language validation are evident across the other dual-language classrooms, as described in the following continued quotes from the ethnographic notebook of the researcher:

[2/9/05, 2nd Grade]: After lunch, the class is reading a story in Spanish. To start the lesson, they all gather in the story corner where the second grade teacher draws a word web. *La Mascota de Patricia* [Patricia's Pet] is the title of this week's story. *Mascota* [pet] is in the middle with lines pointing to *tortuga* [turtle], *pez* [fish], *perro* [dog] and *gato* [cat]. The teacher has picture cards to reinforce the vocabulary. As she asks the questions, she points to the Spanish question words on the sentence chart.

Before they read it together, the teacher takes a picture walk through the story. She asks them questions to get them using the vocabulary. The kids speak easily in Spanish. They repeat a word if it is a new one. To help with decoding they clap and count the syllables. She reinforces how to use "ito" to show that the word becomes a smaller version. For instance, *gatito* [kitten] from *gato* [cat]. The story is about a girl who wants a pet that will play with her. After the teacher reads the story, the kids read it. She calls on different kids to read and answer questions. Two of the ELLs answer the questions easily. To review the story, the teacher holds up a large poster of a hand with the question words what, where, when, why and who written in Spanish on each digit.

Next, the students go back to their seats to complete a worksheet about the story. The top has *Acabo de leer* [I just finished reading] where they put the title of the story. The middle has a box for them to draw the main idea: *Se trataba de* [Is about...]. At the bottom, they copy the words that they can read: *Palabras que ahora se leer y escribir* [Words that I can now read and write].

[2/9/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: The students are arranged by grade level. The second graders sit in a group of eight desks put together to form a team. The third graders sit at teams of four. There are science words in English on the board with the Spanish equivalent beside them. When I come in, they are finishing up reading AR books and are ready to do a writing prompt. They can write about why they like to go to the town library or what new hobby they would pick. The second/third grade teacher tells them to try to invent a new sport for their hobby.

All are eager to write! The atmosphere is productive. The children can talk as long as they are quiet. They look comfortable in here.

Four of the ELLs write about the library. All were writing with ease. I notice that one of the ELLs has continued to grow in her English skills, since she

was in 1st grade with me two years ago. She is able to write *cheerleading* and she only leaves out the “a.” One could tell me all about the Practice Workbook that goes with the Basal Reader. “First you read the Reader and then you do the Practice Workbook.” A third grader is reading her own page in the workbook.

During this time, the teacher goes to each third grader to show them which pages they have to finish or redo in their portfolio. The portfolio is crucial because it can be used as evidence that they have mastered 3rd grade skills, if they do not pass the FCAT. The third graders have to read stories from the reader and then redo the skills page, if necessary. One of the ELLs looks excited about a story that she has already read.

[3/10/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: I sit next to one of my former students in the second/third grade classroom. She remembered having me last year and says, “I liked being in your class!” I’m glad that I had an impact on the kids.

In fact, earlier today, one of my students said to me, during our discussion on Former President John Kennedy, “When you learn something, you tell us, and we get better; and when we grow up, we will tell our kids!” I did share with them, that it is very important to me that I tell them very important things so that they can grow up to be very successful and feel good about themselves. I think that the kids appreciate that I am so sincere about my feelings about my teaching!

[2/22/06, 4th/5th Grade]: Today, when I come in, the ELLs are so excited to show me their autobiographies. Many of them have pictures of where they are from on a big poster to complement their writing. They had the choice of using magazine pictures, photographs or drawings of the countries of their birthplaces. I see that they are so happy and excited to share their “creation” with me. One shares with me that he lived in Venezuela; and another that she lived in Puerto Rico. With this assignment, I am seeing validation of their culture.

Student attitude toward learning two languages. The positive sentiments expressed by the ELLs with regard to learning English while their L1 is maintained were echoed by parents. The following notations following a parent interview and conference illustrate this parental concurrence:

[3/29/06, Interview with parents of a 2nd Grader]: The second grader’s parents understand that English has to be stressed. “This is the language of the country.” They are very positive about the Spanish for keeping the family together. “We don’t have to explain something to him [their son] in Spanish like some people we know have to. Everyone in the family understands each other!” They explain that

their son translates for them – “I talk to him and he tells me right away. He finds the word in Spanish.”

[5/1/06, First Grade Parent Conference]: The ECS mentions the transfer of language skills in our parent meeting today. That is the benefit of the dual language program as she explains to a parent. He [the parent] is happy to hear that and decides to keep his child in the program rather than put her in an all-English class.

Students shared their feelings on learning two languages. Excerpts from their interviews were documented in the researcher’s notebook in the following manner:

[5/1/06, Interview for 2nd Grade from second/third grade combination class]: On learning 2 languages: One second grader is excited because he speaks Portuguese at home and wants to learn 3 languages. “If you speak English and you learn Spanish, you can go to any country and speak Spanish. If you speak Spanish and you learn English, you can go to another country and speak English there.” A second student replies, “If you learn 2 languages, you know more stuff.” A third student replies, “I like Spanish; it is my favorite.” A fourth student says, “I like English time. First I learned Spanish and now I am learning English. If I work in a restaurant like my dad, I could speak in Spanish to them.” A fifth student explains, “I like Spanish because we speak Spanish at home.”

All of the kids are very excited about the languages that they are learning. We discuss what being bilingual and biliterate mean. A sixth student expresses, “I like both. You could write a note in French or something, if he didn’t understand English. You would understand everyone in the movie theatre.”

At the mention of being put in an all-English class, they [the ELLs] look aghast! One student puts his hand on his heart and says, “I would miss it [Spanish]!” They all say that they want to learn English and Spanish together.

Parallel sentiments of perceived security with participation in a dual-language program were expressed by two fourth graders new to the United States, as illustrated in the following research journal record:

[5/2/06, 4th/5th Grade]: Upon my asking them why they like being in a dual language class, they both respond that this way, they can learn English while they keep up with their Spanish. Student 1 says, “This way, you get one lesson in English and one in Spanish.” She knows that it is important to maintain Spanish in order to communicate with her family. She, also, knows that she has to learn

English. Student 2 understands that he has to learn English in America; but this way he can maintain his native language, as well.

Both kids have not been in the U.S. for very long. The dual language program is helping to build a bridge between the community that they left and their new home here. I tell them that I am proud of them for being brave enough to start again in a new place with a new language. I share that it would be hard for me to have to go to a place where they only speak Spanish. I think that they appreciate me sharing that with them!

The importance of maintaining the L1 within the classroom for cultural and linguistic reasons was conveyed by the first-grade Spanish teacher. The researcher recorded the comments by noting,

[5/12/06, Interview with the 1st Grade Spanish Teacher]: When I ask my teaching partner whether she feels that the dual language program is helping the ELLs, she replies, “With the dual language program, the ELLs can retain their Spanish, which is very important for the family. It is important if they ever have to move back to their country that they don’t lose it. This way, they would have their language and their culture.”

Student enthusiasm for Spanish was noted during observation of various dual-language classrooms. The study journal reflected the following descriptions:

[1/9/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: In the Spanish first grade class, one student goes ahead. The Spanish first grade teacher is doing the phonics book. Another student is able to do more on her own. “I’m just sounding the words out so I can figure out all the words. I can sound them out in English and I can sound them out in Spanish!” A third ELL says English is easier for her. A fourth ELL says, “Spanish is more easier for me. I’m learning English.”

[3/10/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Finally, I can get back into the classrooms. The two weeks of FCAT have disrupted my field observations. In the second/third grade classroom, kids are working on their vocabulary folders. They have vocabulary words in Social Studies, Science, and Math. The second/third grade teacher puts them on the board in English. They use a Spanish/ English dictionary to find the equivalent in Spanish. All the kids are pretty positive about the project!

One student shares that she has fun doing the words in two languages. Another is excited about looking in the dictionary. She shows me the two words.

She has something interesting to say about the worth of the assignment, “So people could learn how to write better. People who are Spanish could learn English and people who know English could learn Spanish!”

[1/4/06, 4th/5th Grade]: When I walk into the fourth/fifth grade class and ask a fourth grader what language he is most comfortable reading, he says that both are the same for him. He is reading a book in English. Another fourth grader says that Spanish helps him. He is reading a book in Spanish.

[1/9/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Later, I see a second grader in the hall on her way back from the library. She is already reading blue dot books and she had just started to read in English with me last year. I remember that she caught on to the English right away. “I can read in English and Spanish! It is harder for me to write in Spanish.”

[5/5/06, Dual Language Classes]: Today, we are having a Cinco de Mayo celebration. It involves all of the dual language classes. It is one great big validation of the ELLs’ culture. The kids and teachers have decorated the outside of the rooms so that the area looks like a festive street fair. Teachers and students wear Mexican costumes. They have brought Mexican food for a grand feast that everyone gets to participate in. Hispanic music is piped in for everyone to hear. The children look like they feel proud of their costumes and are excited to see their teachers dress up, as well.

Self-portraits. The positive sentiments expressed by participating ELLs with regard to learning English while the L1 is maintained were also exhibited via the self-portraits they drew. Griego-Jones (1994) reported a number of factors that influence the willingness of a child to learn an L2 including the status of the L2 within the society as a whole. The self-portraits illustrated a perceived satisfaction with learning both languages. The ELLs depicted themselves in what appeared to be a state of happiness across environments associated with both languages. When they drew themselves learning something during the English segment of the day, they duplicated the same activity within the Spanish segment.

Interestingly, the ELLs were not instructed to write in English when illustrating an activity from their English class or Spanish for an activity from their Spanish class; yet, that is how they approached their self-portraits. A first grader drew his family and wrote the names of each member near each figure within the Spanish area of the self-portrait; however, he placed his illustration of himself within the English section of the portrait. Another first grader drew himself with a big smile on his face within both the Spanish and English spaces. A second grader drew himself walking into both the English classroom and the Spanish classroom with a smile on his face. He wrote “Welcome” on the English door and “Bienvenidos” [Welcome] on the Spanish door.

A third grader communicated within her self-portrait that she is happy reading English books and that Spanish is a little difficult for her. A fourth grader wrote, “I feel happy in English; but sometimes I don’t understand the language.” For Spanish, he wrote, “*Yo me siento muy orgulloso porque es mi lenguaje*” [I feel very proud because it is my language]. Another fourth grader drew himself with a big smile and added “I am happy” within both the English and Spanish spaces of his portrait. A third fourth grader drew a detailed picture of herself copying multiplication problems from the board and wrote that she is learning multiplication in both languages. Another fourth grader wrote that he learns new words in English and in Spanish. He also commented inside the portrait that talking in two languages is important. A fifth grader wrote that she is proud that she learned English in Florida and Spanish in Puerto Rico.

Factor 1 correlates with the perceived sociocultural support of the prism model framework (Thomas & Collier, 1997). The research notebook entries pertaining to related

researcher observation and participant expression clearly indicate ELLs' teachers providing such support throughout each instructional day. Cultural and language validation were consistently observed within this dual-language program. As the researcher moved in and out of the classrooms, she never observed ELLs made to feel ashamed of their culture in any way.

Factor 2: The Necessity of a Comfortable Learning Environment

Evidence of what appeared to be a comfortable learning environment consistently emerged throughout the study observation of the first-grade classrooms within the dual-language program of the study site. The necessity of a comfortable learning environment is espoused by Krashen (1982) because low stress levels within a nurturing classroom promote greater L2 growth. The following related entries were made within the ethnographic notebook maintained by the researcher:

[1/12/06, 1st Grade, English]: Two of my ELLs are talking loud in Spanish...they feel comfortable. One is explaining how to do the Reading Log in Spanish to his friend. He feels comfortable doing so because he knows that Spanish is accepted here. I try to take it one step further by celebrating it! I make a big deal about how they can speak two languages. I'll ask them how to say something in Spanish, too.

[1/25/06, 1st Grade, English]: How does it feel to be a student in my class? I think that it would feel good. There are numerous books to read, stuffed animals, decorations and songs. I make learning fun. I am flexible as to where the kids can work. We are all learning together. I just get angry when they don't respect me or another student or don't do their work.

I think that my flexibility provides them with an environment where they can thrive and feel free to make a mistake. They are not punished for speaking Spanish; in fact it is celebrated! Today, I put my big stuffed Valentine heart – "Heartman" on the ELLs' table. They look happy about that.

[1/31/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: They [the ELLs] look like they feel comfortable in the first grade Spanish homeroom class. My teaching partner addresses them with

Spanish endearing terms such as *mi amor* [my sweetie]. That validation of their culture and language must make them feel good.

During observation of the second-grade and combination classrooms (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades), the researcher perceived a sense of security and well-being among the ELLs. None of the ELLs appeared to be isolated from the English-speaking students (Cloud et al., 2000). They were drawn aside by the assistants or teachers only for short periods of time as linguistic support was needed. Children can become L1 models and heterogeneous groupings make that more feasible. Related research journal entries read in the following manner:

[2/9/06, 2nd Grade]: Spanish Reading is after lunch. When I walk into the second grade teacher's room, all the students have the Spanish Basal on their desks. I notice a contented smile as the teacher talks to them in Spanish.

[2/9/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: The students are arranged by grade level. The second graders sit in a group of eight desks put together to form a team. The third graders sit in teams of four. There are science words in English on the board with the Spanish equivalent beside them. When I walk in, they are finishing up reading AR books and are ready to do a writing prompt. They could write about why they like to go to the town library or what new hobby they would pick. The second/third grade teacher tells them to try to invent a new sport for their hobby.

All are eager to write! The atmosphere is productive. The children can talk as long as they are not too loud. They look comfortable in here. Four of the ELLs write about the library. All are writing with ease. One student has continued to grow in her English skills, since she was in 1st grade with me two years ago. She is able to write cheerleading and she only leaves out the "a." Another student could tell me all about the Practice Workbook that goes with the Basal Reader. "First you read the Reader and then you do the Practice Workbook." A third student is reading her own page in the workbook.

[1/5/06, 4th/5th Grade]: I walk in during Free Reading Time. The students can read in Spanish or English. The kids are working independently, relaxed, spread out across the room. One fourth grader comes back from the library. She is excited and exclaims, "I'm back! I really enjoy reading!" When I ask another fourth grader what language he is most comfortable reading, he said that both are the same for him. He is reading a book in English. One ELL says that Spanish helps him. He is reading a book in Spanish.

[4/19/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The two new fourth graders are dominant in Spanish. They are starting to read simple books in English. As I observe them, they speak freely in Spanish. Without knowing English, this is a more comfortable setting for them. Spanish is accepted here.

The study interviews drew similar findings related to the importance of a comfortable environment for students learning English. Ethnographic notebook entries read,

[5/25/06, ECS Interview]: [The ECS gives reasons for her belief in dual language for the ELLs.] She feels that dual language provides a smoother transition and a kinder way for ELLs. “It allows them the comfort to use their native language at least for part of the day. It is better for their self-esteem and their adjustment. Plus, they can achieve a stronger academic foundation because the other academics will be in their language. Yes, they will hear the subject matter in English and when they hear it in their own language, it will click. It becomes tedious for them to hear the new language, English, all day without a break. It is mentally exhausting to listen to it for extended periods of time. Processing a new language is tedious. With dual language, they get a ‘break’ from it. Your brain gets tired and it can only absorb so much.”

[3/10/06, Interview with a Parent of a 2nd Grader]: Mom is very happy about the dual language program because she explains that her daughter’s growth in English occurred so quickly! She shares that it would have been hard for her to have been in an all-English class in the beginning. However, now, her mother feels that she would be okay in an all-English class.

[4/26/06, Interview with a Parent of a 2nd Grader]: Today, I am speaking with a second grader’s mother. I comment that her son has more confidence than last year. We all credit the dual language program with his increased self-assurance and self-confidence.

[5/18/06, Interview with the 2nd/3rd Grade Teacher]: When I interview the second/third grade combination class teacher about the dual language program, she explains that it is helpful for the ELLs because their first language is Spanish. “They feel more comfortable in their language. They are gaining more confidence. They are more free to express themselves.”

Both the validation of the culture and native language of the ELLs (i.e., Factor 1) and the necessity of a comfortable learning environment (i.e., Factor 2) fit within the

sociocultural processes of the prism model (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Additionally, they both have a direct impact on learning the new language as ELLs involve all the cultural influences of their environment. As Valdes (1997) emphasized, “The key point is that while language is important, it is only one of many factors that influence school achievement for language-minority and –majority [*sic*] children” (p. 395).

Factor 3: Transfer of Reading Skills from the Native to the Second Language

Numerous instances of the perception of the L1 (i.e., Spanish) assisting in learning the L2 (i.e., English) emerged during both the formal and informal interviews of ELLs conducted in this study. This was also evident in the study observation of the dual-language classrooms throughout the course of the research. This is reflected in the following notations from the ethnographic notebook:

[1/12/06, 4th/5th Grade]: [The researcher notices that] she [an ELL] is speaking more English than a few years ago.

[1/12/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: An ELL writes a lot of words in English. I remember from last year, that she did. She is strong in Spanish, too.

[1/12/06, 2nd Grade]: A student shares with me that it helps him to have the words in Spanish first. When I ask another student about Spanish, her whole face lights up!

[1/17/06, 1st Grade, English]: Both ELLs are reading easily in English. They are strong readers in Spanish. Evidence of transfer? Both get very excited about books in either language. One is able to predict what would happen in one of our books.

[2/13/06, 1st Grade, English]: Later, walking to Block, one student just says to me, out of the blue, “You have to share. Sit in a chair.” He is noticing the similarities between the two digraphs. I differentiate the *ch* from the *sh*. For someone new to the language, the two sound very similar. He reads very well in Spanish; so it is interesting that he is chunking parts of words in English now.

[3/10/06, 1st Grade, English]: I listen to the ease at which one of the ELLs will tell another one something in Spanish, if I need a translation. I recall that this ELL's mother has shared with me that even though her niece has been in the states longer, her daughter is more comfortable with English. The first grade Spanish teacher has shared with me that this student is a strong reader in Spanish.

[1/17/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: This third grade student is reading with more ease; she always was a good decoder. Now she is working on a skills page, reading about vitamins [in English]. She has to fill in the blanks with the correct vitamin. I wonder if it is the dual language program where she can continue her skills in Spanish. She mouths the words and uses the pencil to help keep her place.

[3/10/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: The new third grader shares with me that he is from Puerto Rico. He's glad to be in the dual language program because "I don't know a lot of English and it helps me to hear it in Spanish." He has been here since early February and has fit into the class very well. He is more comfortable in Spanish. I've seen the teacher go over to him and speak to him in Spanish. The student is very interested in doing his work and is very enthusiastic whenever I see him. He tells me that he enjoys doing the vocabulary in both languages.

[1/20/06, 4th/5th Grade]: Around 11ish, they do their 90 minute reading block. When I walk in, everyone is reading independently, even the teacher. Everyone is "into" their book; you can hear a pin drop! I notice posters around the room in both English and Spanish. I am so happy to see the reading level that one of my former students is reading at! She began reading in English with me, two years ago. She is so excited about what she reads, too!

When I come back in around 2ish, they are doing their Spanish literacy. The substitute is going over vocabulary with the fifth grade; apparently they will have a test on Monday. The kids answer aloud what the meanings of the words are. Meanwhile, the fourth graders are working on a vocabulary sheet. One ELL shares with me that it is easy for him.

[2/7/06, 4th/5th Grade]: One fourth grader shares with me that it the FCAT writing test was easy. He is a fluent reader/writer in Spanish as well as English; so I am not surprised. He has confidence in his abilities. I can recall back in 1st grade that he was confident, as well! He'll just tell you, like it is nothing, "I can do both!" Often times the Spanish teacher and I will compare notes and [we have found that] the kids that struggle in Spanish reading struggle with me in English reading. And, just as importantly, those who read well with me, read well in Spanish!

[2/16/06, 4th/5th Grade]: Before I leave for the trip [with the first grade classes], I stop by the fourth/fifth grade room. There is a new student sitting next to one of the ELLs. She explains to me that the new student doesn't know any English. I

am surprised to find out that when this ELL came to my class, two years ago, she said that she [herself] didn't know any English. Now, she is quite comfortable speaking English. She can do her subjects in English, as well. The beauty of the Dual Language Program shows through here. This fourth grader explains that she was moved to Dual Language, back then, because she didn't know enough English; and she wasn't understanding what was going on. I can recall her teacher, last year, sharing with me that she was making good progress in learning to speak and read in English.

[3/6/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The students are taking a spelling test in Spanish when I walk in. Two of the ELLs look very comfortable taking the test. I look at another's paper – it looked good. A fourth grade student appears quite proud of what he is doing. I ask him if the test is easy. His reply is, “Yes, because I am Spanish!”

[4/24/06, Student Interview, 1st Grade, English]: The researcher asks the ELLs whether they prefer hearing stories read aloud to them in English or Spanish. One student answers, “I like both. When you and Mrs. [names Spanish homeroom teacher] read, I learn more words.” Another student shares, “I like all the stories you read cause I get more schema in my brain. I hear the words in both languages and it helps me. Everything in my schema is getting better. The power of words gets in my brain!”

[4/25/06, Student Interview, 1st Grade Spanish]: When I ask the group if they think that the Spanish helps them to learn English, they all answer affirmatively. “Cause you learn words in English and Spanish.” When I ask them if they like learning two languages, one student replies, “It shows you how to speak in English and in Spanish; and you read in English and read in Spanish.” A second student says, “It is good; you learn more words in English.” When I ask the children which class is their favorite, English or Spanish, a third student shares, “I like both. If you already learned one [language], you can learn another.” The second student tells me she likes both. “It is good to learn English and Spanish cause you don't forget.”

When I ask them about which language they prefer to hear stories in, they all reply that they like both. The second student shares, “Cause I can learn more words in English and Spanish.” The third student explains, “If you read a story in Spanish and English the same day and you don't know a word, the teacher helps you and someone can learn a new word.”

The dual-language teachers were asked during the study interviews whether they believe the L1 (i.e., Spanish) helps the ELLs attending their classrooms to learn English.

The study journal contained the following related excerpts:

[5/12/06, Interview, 1st Grade Teacher, Spanish]: When I asked [my teaching partner] if she feels that the Dual Language Program is helping the ELLs, she replied, “It is the best program for them because it provides for the transfer from the first language to the second language.” We discuss the reading progress of our ELLs. We find an interesting comparison – those who read well with me in English, read well in Spanish with her. Those who struggle with me in English, struggle as well in Spanish. And, I have found this to be true going back to the first year that I started the program. Those students that read well in one language would inevitably read well in the other language. More confirmation to the Common Underlying Proficiency Theory that language develops in one part of the brain.

[5/12/06, Interview, 2nd Grade Teacher]: “Hearing their native language makes the ELLs more comfortable,” explains the second grade teacher. When I ask her whether she sees a transfer, she says that she definitely does. The second grade teacher believes that the ELLs translate mentally what the teacher is saying because they think in Spanish. She feels that the cognates like transportation help with the understanding of the new language. This teacher points out how well two of the ELLs are doing in English, now, at the end of the year, as compared to the beginning. And, they are dominant in Spanish. Furthermore, she shares that their vocabulary has improved in both languages.

[5/18/06, Interview, 2nd/3rd Grade Teacher]: Today, I am speaking with the second/third grade teacher. She feels the program is helpful for the ELLs because their first language is Spanish. When I ask her about the first language helping the second, she says that she agrees with the theory. The teacher shares that she can see the literacy growth [of her ELLs] from the beginning of the year to now.

[4/12/06, Interview, 4th/5th Grade Teacher]: The dual language program definitely helps the ESOL students [ELLs] to acquire the second language if the student is placed in the program before second grade, writes the fourth/fifth grade teacher via e-mail. Research shows that after a few encounters with the foreign language the brain naturally transfers all the information taught to the child.

Parents of the ELLs observed that continued use of the L1 (i.e., Spanish) is helping their children learn English. The following notebook notations reflect this perception:

[3/7/06, Parent Interview, 1st Grade]: A mother of a first grader expresses her pleasure with her son's progress. She comments to me, "He has a balance with the two languages."

[3/10/06, Parent Interview, 2nd Grade]: She [student's mother] shares with me that she is very happy about the dual language program because her daughter's growth in English occurred so quickly.

[3/29/06, Parent Interview, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Both parents tell me that they want to share with the principal how much they feel that the dual language program benefits their son. Both parents feel that being bilingual will be better for their son's future. The father explains, "I'm a server and I talk to people who are happy with bilingual programs." . . . In any emergency, it helps [to be bilingual]." . . . "Everything that we can put into his [their son's] brain is better!"

[4/26/06, Parent Interview, 2nd Grade]: She [student's mother] wants to keep her son in the program and shares that it is important to her that he learns two languages. "Since we live in America, he needs to learn English. His Spanish is helping him learn English."

[5/3/06, Parent Interview, 4th Grade]: The fourth grader's mother shares with me that Spanish has acted as the connection in school for him and it helps with the English. She maintains that it is easier to learn English if you maintain the Spanish. "The future is better for him due to knowing two languages. I would like him to learn a third possibly."

Throughout the course of this study, the researcher attempted to glean an appreciation for the process that the ELLs were undergoing throughout their journey toward English-language acquisition. Researcher thoughts within the study notebook included:

[2/2/06]: When I am trying to understand what is being said to me in Spanish, I visualize the words and translate them into English in my mind. That must be what the ELLs are doing with English, only in reverse of what I'm doing.

[4/27/06]: From going in and out of the Spanish classroom, I am noticing that more of the words are making sense to me. I visualize them in my mind as units of meaning. That's how English must sound to these ELLs – foreign - and then, through experience, the words start to make sense. But this process takes time.

Through numerous discussions focused on their mutual students, the researcher and her teaching partner continually noticed that the literacy skills of the ELLs appeared to transfer from the L1 to the L2. The students, who read proficiently in their L1, typically read as competently in the L2. Other teachers expressed the belief that the process of reading appeared to be the same across both languages. Whether reading is with material in the L1 or the L2, readers analyze print in the same manner across languages to ensure accurate comprehension (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001).

Upon comparison of the reading test in Spanish, the Aprenda, and reading tests in English, either the STAR Early Literacy or the STAR Reading across the languages, a pattern emerged. Test scores on sentence reading, vocabulary, and comprehension were compared across the L1 and the L2. Participating ELLs who maintained good scores on Spanish tests also did well on tests in English. ELLs weak in their L1 also scored poorly in the L2. Consequently, it appears that proficiency in both the L1 and L2 can contribute to literacy development within this student population (Cummins, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 2001).

Factor 4: The Incorporation of Literature within the Reading Block

Field notes were recorded during the 90-minute Reading Block within the first-grade classroom taught by the researcher, as well as during the Spanish homeroom, the second-grade classroom, and the two combination classrooms (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades). Instructional practices that appeared to be supportive of the ELLs toward bilingualism and biliteracy were sought. It was found that literature was incorporated throughout the literacy block within all classes of the dual-language program. Within her own classroom, the researcher worked to help ELLs understand that reading was more than simply decoding (Miller, 2002). Through a “socioculturally relevant approach” (Hammerberg, 2004, p. 654), ELLs were empowered with the knowledge and confidence that they indeed possessed the ability to comprehend the reading material and make the necessary connections to their lives. Because ELLs will vary in reading proficiency, care was taken to also vary the instruction according to the unique needs of each student (Cappellini, 2005).

Related excerpts from the notebook maintained by the researcher read in the following manner:

[2/13/06, 1st Grade, English]: In the new story, one student reads ahead. When the ELLs work on the vocabulary page, my assistant explains to me that they can decode but the comprehension is hard. That would make sense, as they are learning a new language. My assistant goes back to the story to show them the parts and that helps a great deal. I am amazed that this student gets the comprehension questions right. He is catching on to the new vocabulary. Just like with English speakers, the ELLs have different learning rates. A second student and the original student go to help another ELL with the vocabulary. I don't tell them to do that; they do it on their own. Hearing the story a second time really reinforces the vocabulary to such an extent that they feel competent to help another kid!

Because I don't overdo "worksheets," I tend to focus on more creative ways to reinforce the skills; when my students get them, they are not tired of doing them. Endless worksheets are not what is best to develop competent readers and writers. But, they do have a place in the reading curriculum, as they force the students to rely on their decoding strategies rather than picture clues. Furthermore, the skills sheets are in the format that the students will be tested in, in later years.

At Calendar Time, the first student takes out a Big Book, *The Three Billy Goats Gruff*. I can not keep him away from books! He proceeds to read it aloud.

[3/1/06, 1st Grade, English]: I am reading them [the researcher's students] a funny spoof of a mad scientist – *Tomatoes From Mars*. In the story, the Earth gets attacked by gigantic tomatoes and the scientist figures out that squirting them with salad dressing would get rid of them. One of the ELLs enjoys it. He shows the class the first page, "The tomatoes are coming!" And, then, he points out the last page. "The tomatoes are leaving!" It is interesting to note that he finds this pattern important. Another ELL is eager to read the book after I read it. They all draw beautiful illustrations of the tomatoes.

I like to give the children good quality literature. They can not solely have easy decodable readers. They need to learn how to make those important connections between their life and the lives of the characters. I make sure that I give my ELLs a balance. We spend time on the phonics for that base. BUT, next, I enrich their lives with quality literature. I emphasize the imagination and jumping into the story with the characters. We divide reading into two parts: First, you decode or break the code. Second, you form a mental image of what you read.

I do work on the comprehension with the ELLs, by working on oral, as well as, vocabulary expansion. I, also, want them to have a love of books. Our classroom has many groupings of books and we get excited about all of them!

[5/12/06, Teacher Interview, 1st Grade, Spanish]: When I ask my teaching partner about her approach to reading, she says that during the first semester, she concentrates on the oral comprehension of the story including the vocabulary and the events. She provides the prior knowledge that is necessary for the comprehension. Then, in the second semester, she lets them read the story on their own. She is now able to put the assignments for the Reader and the Workbook on the board and they can read it by themselves.

[2/9/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: [At the start of the school day], I walk into my partner's Spanish room. Lessons for the day are written on the board in Spanish with the date: *Hoy es jueves, 9 de febrero de 2006* [Today is Thursday, February 9, 2006]. The Word Wall has Spanish words from A-Z. The desks are arranged in teams of fours. She talks to the teams in Spanish giving directions to color their coloring sheet. It was a picture of farm animals. One ELL teaches me the

difference between *patitos* [ducklings] and *pollitos* [chicks]. They are thrilled that I am learning Spanish! I am validating their language. My teaching partner disciplines them, giving directions in Spanish and they understand.

The students are learning about the farm so the worksheet has farm animals on it. Then, the teacher has a Big Book of the vocabulary of the farm animals to match it. There is also toy food to show the products that we get from the animals. She is also reinforcing the sound of “v” with *vaca* [cow]. There is an additional worksheet where they have to color, cut out and then paste the baby farm animal with its mother.

The Spanish teacher allows them to speak in English or Spanish at their tables. When she speaks to them, they can answer in English and then, she will tell them the Spanish word. Or another kid will tell them. “The most important thing is the comprehension”, she maintains. She wants to make sure that they understand what she is saying. She will have someone translate to her English speakers to ensure that they understand. It is the reverse of what I do in my room. Yes, the dual language program can work for both speakers.

The teacher asks her students what they see on their paper of farm animals. Next, they have to read the animal name from the Big Book. She asks them what sound it makes. She helps the students with the sounds. One ELL reads the words aloud to the class. Then, she rereads them to herself as another student speaks. She looks very comfortable in the Spanish environment. Another ELL watches intently as each kid reads. Next, my partner plays a song. The lesson has a good combination of visuals, realia and music. I notice that the ELLs are very happy with the song. After the song, they match the farm animals on their worksheet. One is delighted to show me how to pronounce *caballo* [horse].

[3/28/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: When I go to my partner’s room to pick up my class, she tells me that they have all taken an AR Test. One student comes running over to me shouting, “I got a 100! I always get 100!” There are some tests available in Spanish. This way they get a balance. I do them in English and my partner does them in Spanish. That is the beauty of the program as a parent said in one of the interviews – that there is a balance.

It was noted during observation of the second-grade class and the second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades combination classes that the teachers focused on literacy skills through the stories of the basals and accompanying literature that was either read to the students or that they read independently. The teachers presented lessons to the class as one group, followed by class discussion and/or independent and small-group work.

Although biliteracy development is optimal for dual-language programs (Soltero, 2004), English literacy seemed to take precedence over Spanish due to the state-mandated, 90-minute English Reading Block. The following related entries were made within the study notebook:

[2/9/06, 2nd Grade]: I walk in in time for English Reading Time. Prior to that, the class had worked on a writing prompt. The room has a matching calendar in both Spanish and English: *All About Today* and *Nuestro día*. The desks are arranged in teams of fours. The second grade teacher gives them a new story from the Basal Reader each week. By the end of the week they have to complete the skills sheet and take a vocabulary test. Meanwhile, they read library books on their own and take their AR quizzes. Each student has two folders. One is to save the AR reports; the other is for the skills sheets and graphic organizers. The teacher uses a lot of graphic organizers to process the information such as setting, characters, plot, etc. from the story. She arranges the students into color groups according to their skill level.

The teacher teaches her class the saying from our Scott Foresman Basal Reader, “Reading is at the heart of everything we do!” Yes, you could describe this classroom as exemplifying this saying! She focuses on meaning by making it clear that “Reading is understanding literature!” One ELL reads in Spanish and English. He reads [a] story from the Basal [in English] to me. I am delighted to see so much progress in a little over a year. When I listen to two others read, I am similarly pleased!

The second grade teacher has the readers who need help with her at the carpet. She sits in a rocking chair in front of them. She puts the new words on index cards and then displays them in the sentence chart. They read the story. They end up reading the paragraph that has to do with the vocabulary card that she holds up for them. Meanwhile, she reinforces contractions. After they read the story, they discuss story elements. All the students know what they have to do, whether it is to read, do a skills sheet or take an AR test. The atmosphere is productive and quiet.

[5/18/06, Teacher Interview, 2nd/3rd Grade]: When I asked the second/third grade teacher if she read stories aloud, she replies that she reads the Spanish stories in the basal aloud while the kids read the English stories to themselves. That is a nice balance – stories read aloud in Spanish and read silently in English. She explains that the stories in the Spanish Basal and the English Basal match each other. This has become a clever and skillful way to fit in literacy in both languages. “We talk about the vocabulary in the morning in English and the vocabulary in Spanish in the afternoon.”

[2/9/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Reading in Spanish is beginning, as I walk in. The second/third grade teacher is reading *Tomás y la señora de la biblioteca* [Thomas and the Library Lady] aloud to both groups. The Spanish words from the story are on the board. The teacher is using gestures to make it come alive. Three ELLs are following along well with her as she reads. They all have a good understanding of the story. One student is doing some actions from the story. Two others answer the comprehension questions easily.

After the story, the teacher asks what various words mean. She reads it in its sentence from the story to give it some context. With their answers, I could tell that they were feeling quite comfortable with Spanish. Just as in the second grade classroom, the kids here go to work on their Practice Workbook after the story. They have to make compound words today. One ELL is laughing about them; she looks very relaxed. Next, the students have to match vocabulary to the picture. One student goes ahead of the teacher!

Next comes Writing Time. They use a journal entitled *Mi Diario* [My Journal]. It has a big section on the top for drawing and tracks on the bottom for writing. The instructions were to write four sentences about *Tomás y la señora de la biblioteca* [Thomas and the Library Lady] and illustrate it. Three ELLs say it is easier to write in Spanish. One adds, "I love Spanish!" I notice that two of the students have quite a bit written in their journals!

Good literature is considered an essential component of a balanced literacy program, and all children have the right to be enriched and challenged by it (Goldenberg, 1996; Martínez-Roldán & López-Robertson, 1999; Peregoy & Boyle, 2001; Soltero, 2004). When former ELLs were asked to describe classroom strategies that facilitated their proficiency in English, literature was most often cited (Thompson, 2000). It is through the experiences of literary characters that children come to a deeper understanding of themselves as individuals with unique thoughts and feelings (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001). Both Factor 3 (i.e., the transfer of reading skills from the L1 to the L2) and Factor 4 (i.e., the incorporation of literature within the Reading Block) would be considered within the linguistic portion of the prism model, which is the second component of the model. This component consists of all aspects of language and literacy

development across both the L1 and the L2 (Thomas & Collier, 1997). In this current study, it appeared that L1 skills facilitated the development of skills in the L2 (Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 1992).

Factor 5: Additional Linguistic Support across the Content Area

Observed strategies adding perceived linguistic support for the ELLs participating in this study are described in the following excerpts from the study notebook:

[1/10/06, 1st Grade, English]: I use a variety of approaches for reading. A *Treasury of Dick and Jane and Friends* helps them learn sight words in a fun way. Two ELLs are eagerly reading it. One has trouble remembering the sight words. The other is counting the number of pages she has read. She is proud of the fact that she is reading. A third ELL helps the kids around him with the reading comprehension page. I am showing the kids how to go back to the story to find the answers. Later when we do a 2nd grade phonics page and the group is having trouble reading *dolphins*, this student reads it easily.

[1/11/06, 1st Grade, English]: For reading comprehension, an ELL colors the different lines of the passage. He and another student work together well. Both are starting to sound out in English. Transfer of skills? Another first grader uses the magic wand to follow along in the reader. Using a more kinesthetic approach helps her. I am seeing this a great deal with the ELLs. Using a tool of some type or colors helps. One student likes to go ahead as if he is having a race with himself. He eagerly says, "I go fast! I figure it [a word] out by my brain."

[2/21/06, 1st Grade, English]: I know that idioms can be difficult for ELLs. In the story I am reading to them [my class] today, the character is referring to something costing "an arm and a leg." One of the ELLs is looking at me and thinking about it. I ask him if he wants to sit by my assistant who could translate for him and he nods, no. After I point to my arm and leg and say it really means expensive, the student just smiles! I can tell that he really doesn't need the translation! Again, those ESOL strategies are so vital! And, that I take the time to explain to everyone really helps all of the students!

[4/4/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today being an AR Day, we read *The Magic Fish*. I make it so much more than simply hearing a story and taking an AR Test. The combination of singing and changing my voice for the character helps them [the students] to understand. We make connections to our lives and talk about the difference between asking for something and being greedy for more. The children

are eager to work on their graphic organizers. I let them draw pictures for the story elements.

The room was just a “buzz” of activity. Even the ELLs choose some of the more complicated graphic organizers. One ELL’s was hard – the plain semantic web. Others are reading library books on their own and getting excited about taking AR tests.

[5/17/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: The first grade Spanish teacher reads a story with the students in the reader and they discuss the parts. They copy the vocabulary into their workbook which has a page . . . entitled *Palabras que ahora se leer y escribir* [Words that I can now read and write]. They have to draw a picture of the main ideas, as well. This activity matches the activities that I have in my reading workbooks. All the students are engaged copying the words or drawing a picture. There are about twenty words, so they are expected to learn quite a bit of vocabulary. In other words, the Spanish literacy component is not watered down.

My partner has high expectations for the students, both the English speakers and the Spanish speakers. She seats a Spanish speaker at the same team as an English speaker so one can help the other with the literacy. Another validation of their language; that it is valuable. The kids are comfortable with the Spanish. By their expressions, I can tell that it is a normal part of their instructional time for them, just as English is. The story is about a boy, Juan Bobo, who lost the water that his mother asked him to fetch because he put it into baskets instead of pails. The kids could identify with him as they make mistakes, as well. One ELL is able to explain the story to me in English. I am amazed at how well he goes back and forth between the two languages.

Observation and interview notations related to additional perception of linguistic support practiced within the other dual-language classrooms were also recorded in the research journal.

[5/12/06, Teacher Interview, 2nd Grade]: When I ask the second grade teacher if she lets her ELLs “slide” due to them not knowing English, she emphatically replies, “NO! I help them, but I don’t let them slide!” This teacher uses quite a few of the graphic organizers like KWL to help readers identify what they know and what they want to learn before reading an expository passage. After reading, they evaluate what they actually did learn. She uses other ESOL strategies to help her ELLs learn the vocabulary in English. She shows pictures, uses the overhead and incorporates realia into her lessons.

The teacher’s example she uses for me is the example of a stapler. She says the word in Spanish to me and asks me if I know what it is. I say, “No.” Then, when she picks up the stapler and attaches the word to it, then, it makes

sense. That is an example of what she does with the English words for her Spanish Speakers. When I ask her what her approach to reading is, she says that it is skills oriented. She tells her students the skill that they are working each time. Using prior knowledge to set the scene for them is important to use, as well, she explains to me.

[4/27/06, Student Interview, 2nd Grade]: I ask them if they like learning two languages. The first student tells me, “We like both languages because it is fun doing the writing and the reading. We try to figure out the words in both languages.” The second student shares, “We do social studies and science in English and Spanish.” The third student says, “I like the English part. You get to read books and take tests.” The fourth student tells me, “In the afternoon we do Spanish.” The fifth student explains, “Because if someone talks to you in Spanish, you will know. If someone talks to you in English, you will know.” I ask them if they like listening to stories in English or Spanish. The fifth student continues, “I like Spanish stories so I can learn more words.” The first student says “I speak in Spanish and I read easy Spanish books.” The third student shares, “I read AR books in Spanish.”

[4/3/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Today, when I come in, the teacher is at an appointment. Her teaching assistant is substituting. The students are listening to a story being read aloud in Spanish. The assistant would read a little bit and then pause to ask the kids questions in Spanish. Some of them want to answer in English. She reminds them that it is Spanish class. One ELL is comfortable answering in Spanish; so are two others. One has difficulty; he wants to answer in English. The assistant emphasizes that in a dual language class, they need to be able to speak both.

[1/9/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The children are finishing their writing prompts, when I come in. Some are having them be peer-edited. Most of the prompts are in English. Two ELLs are having a peer help them. Another ELL prefers to copy his over by hand. Many are doing the final draft on the computer. One shares with me that it is easier to write in English. Another says it is easier to read and write in English, rather than in Spanish. “But I can talk in Spanish.”

[1/18/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The kids are working independently on a story in the Spanish reader as I walk in their room. They have a worksheet to complete, as well. One ELL says it is the same for him in English and Spanish. Another says that the Spanish helps him with English. A new kid has joined the class. One ELL is excited about him. She shares with me, “He speaks Spanish and we’re teaching him English!” I see an excitement in all the class about having Spanish as part of the school day.

[1/30/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The assistant is going over the Practice Writing Prompt with one of the ELLs. He is listening intently. The assistant is just pointing out some grammatical word changes that he needs to do. He also reminds the student to use a web to organize his thoughts. The student is very open to all suggestions. He is always pretty excited about everything that he is learning.

[5/10/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The long-term substitute shares with me what she does to help the ELLs: “I’ve started to encourage the two new ELLs to read chapter books in English. While they are reading a story in English, I encourage the ELLs to look up any words that they don’t know in a Spanish/English dictionary and, then, to read the story again.”

The vignettes relating to Factor 5 illustrate the additional linguistic support provided by the participating teachers of ELLs throughout each school day. These classrooms can be viewed as workshops where students have opportunities to work both independently and in groups on their literacy skills (Hudelson, 1994). It is advantageous to include language instruction within daily lessons to ensure that ELLs continue to improve both academically and linguistically (Met, 1994).

Factor 6: Development of Thinking Skills

Learning a new language is not separated from cognitive development. Each contributes to the other (Genesee, 1994). The following examples from the study notebook illustrate how the thinking skills of the ELLs participating in this study appeared to develop throughout the school day, beginning within the first-grade class taught by the researcher and her teaching partner:

[2/3/06, 1st Grade, English]: I take the opportunity to read a book recommended for visualization. I emphasize, first we decode and then we visualize with our imagination. Each page of the book utilizes a different sense, e.g. the smell of flowers, the feel of water, the sound of the trains, the dew on the spider webs and the taste of honey. All the ELLs enjoy the extra explanations that I add to the beautiful script and illustrations of the book. Next, I ask them to draw their

favorite image in their journal. No matter what language, we use our imagination. Our thinking skills get sharpened with mental exercises such as these.

[2/9/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: The Spanish Homeroom teacher allows them [her students] to speak in English or Spanish at their tables. When she speaks to them, they can answer in English and then, she will tell the Spanish word. Or another kid will tell them. “The most important thing is the comprehension,” she maintains. She wants to make sure that they understand what she is saying. She will have someone translate to her English speakers to ensure that they understand.

[4/10/06, 1st Grade, English]: The story in the Reader focuses on gardens and I go around the circle and ask each student what connection he/she can make to his/her life. I try to make the readings meaningful for the children. They need to be able to make connections to books so they can understand more about themselves in relation to the world.

One ELL says that people like gardens because it gives them happiness. When I mention that gardens wouldn't have trucks, one student corrects me. I like that. That shows that he is thinking. He asks, “What about the trucks that help to plant the plants?” Then he makes a connection to his life – when his dad got stung by a bee. He is able to describe the whole incident in great detail. His English is getting stronger and stronger every day. Sometimes, he even helps another ELL and it used to be the other way around! Later, he asks me what the difference between *to* and *too* is. By virtue of this question, I can tell that he is really trying to understand the innuendos of English! Another ELL shares that she thought of a garden that had fruit. Another student tells us about a garden in Puerto Rico that she remembered when she was very young. Every day, I see that one of my ELLs is making connections, book to book, book to self, book to world. He even makes up his own categories!

[2/24/06, 1st Grade, English]: With it being Presidents' Week, I am reading a story about George Washington to them [my students]. The beautiful portraits of Washington help the kids to visualize what I am telling/reading about him. One particularly powerful one is the one where Washington is praying while he kneels by a tree in Valley Forge. Even though the material was a bit complex for an average 1st grader, not to mention an ELL, I am pleased at how well they attend. One ELL is sitting quite close to me and is quite entranced with the paintings. I can see that visuals continue to be extremely important for second language learners.

For our song, *Abraham, Martin and John*, I pick a student to hold the book with that particular man on the cover. This makes it less abstract for them. One student looks through the book on John Kennedy and becomes quite entranced with the picture of a young Kennedy and Jackie sitting together on the lawn. I

explain who she is. I am pleasantly surprised at how interested the students are in the books. I wasn't sure how interested first graders would be in men who were alive a long time ago. They ask good questions!

I was able to find a family portrait of the Kennedys; so I am finally able to point out what Bobby Kennedy looked like. He is mentioned in the *Abraham, Martin and John* song, so it is important for them to see him. Although, I mentioned that Bobby was John's brother, when they see the family portrait, the resemblance really hits home. Some of the ELLs say, "He looks just like John!" I reply that that is because they were brothers. Kids really need to explore and see things for themselves, especially if they are learning a second language. One student wants to know who is the oldest; so I line them up in order with a different kid holding that particular book – Washington, Lincoln, Kennedy and King.

[3/14/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today, we read a story in our reader about a girl who kept the lighthouse lit while her father was away. When I ask them [my students] what true means, I am pleased with one ELL's answer. He makes the connection between Martin Luther King having really existed, being true, and the lighthouse story having really happened is true, as well.

[4/24/06, Student Interview, 1st Grade, English]: The researcher asks the ELLs whether they prefer hearing stories read aloud to them in English or Spanish. One student answers, "I like both. When you and Mrs. [names Spanish homeroom teacher] read, I learn more words." Another student shares, "I like all the stories you read cause I get more schema in my brain. I hear the words in both languages and it helps me. Everything in my schema is getting better. The power of words gets in my brain!"

Examples were also recorded within the study journal depicting how the thinking skills of the participating ELLs seemed to develop throughout the school day, beginning within the other dual-language classes.

[1/5/06, 2nd Grade]: The second grade teacher shows me that the students have to complete a story map of a book read independently before they can take an AR Test. The story map divides the parts of the book into *Beginning, Middle and End*. She also shows me a checklist for writing including capital letters, & punctuation so they can monitor themselves. Students who can work on their own do, while the teacher works with those who need help. The teacher shares with me that it is important that the students be able to understand what they read, hence the use of the story map.

[1/12/06, 2nd Grade]: The second grade teacher has to use the English social studies and science books. There are none in Spanish. However, she talks through the lesson in Spanish as she wants to continue challenging them as she continues with the L1. She shares her frustration with me about the texts.

[2/6/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Today, the second/third grade teacher is teaching them math vocabulary. She writes the word in English and Spanish [on the board], as well. Then, she goes around the room and everyone has a turn to say the term in English and Spanish. Meanwhile, they have to copy them. She has to help some of the kids with their pronunciation of Spanish. That is probably because these are terms that they don't use very often in their day-to-day speech. I see that one third grader reads well in both. Another needs help with Spanish. Then, when she reads a second time, she's okay. A second grader is following along very well. Two other second graders are fine with the pronunciation, too! The kids look excited about the two languages!

[5/1/06, Student Interview, 2nd /3rd Grade]: I ask them what language they think in. One ELL shares, "[I think] first in Spanish and then in English." Another says, "Spanish." A third one tells me, "[I think] sometimes in Spanish and sometimes in English." A fourth student says, "Spanish."

[1/26/06: 4th/5th Grade]: The kids are using a venn diagram to make a comparison between two teachers. After they complete it, they write an account about it. They compare Mrs. [name of their former teacher] to the teacher that they had last year. They are all very excited about it. Each one tells me about the two teachers that they choose. They are involved in peer editing and eagerly read each other's papers. They continue to miss Mrs.[name of their former teacher] very much!

[1/30/06, 4th/5th Grade]: Everyone is working in their science books. I am amazed at how they can find the information in the chapter to answer the questions. They know how to read the captions and go back in the reading. One fourth grader is really positive and reminds another that he helped her. She answers, "I wish we were doing math!" He agrees, "With math, you have to use your brain!" She and another ELL look happy about being able to do the science questions. Another fourth grader is busily writing the new vocabulary at a furious pace. He is doing quite well.

[5/10/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The long-term substitute shares with me what she does to help the ELLs: "I've started to encourage the two new ELLs to read chapter books in English. While they are reading a story in English, I encourage the ELLs to look up any words that they don't know in a Spanish/English dictionary and, then, to read the story again."

These vignettes exemplify how it appeared that both young children and L2 learners can learn to improve their thinking skills with teachers who help them to become aware of how they think (Miller, 2002).

Factor 7: Strategies Supporting English Speakers of Other Languages

Because academic language develops more slowly than social language (Cummins, 2001), scaffolding techniques are recommended to render the material more comprehensible (Herrel & Jordan 2004). Many instances of this type of support were observed within the dual-language program implemented at the study site.

The following ethnographic notebook excerpts describe those practiced within the first-grade classrooms:

[1/10/06, 1st Grade, English]: I repeat acting out the words to a song; this time for *Ebony and Ivory*. To make the words ebony and ivory more clear, I use a black and white crayon. It is a hard song to act out; but no one loses their enthusiasm. One ELL likes to get up close to the paper that I am explaining.

[1/11/06, 1st Grade, English]: For reading comprehension, an ELL colors the different lines of the passage. He and another student work together well. Both are starting to sound out in English. Transfer of skills? Another first grader uses the magic wand to follow along in the reader. Using a more kinesthetic approach helps her. I am seeing this a great deal with the ELLs. Using a tool of some type or colors helps. One student likes to go ahead as if he is having a race with himself. He eagerly says, "I go fast! I figure it [a word] out by my brain."

[1/30/06, 1st Grade, English]: I'm noticing when I pair up an ELL with a more fluent reader and they have to read together, it helps them. One student reads each word competently and his partner repeats after him. He takes the role of Leader without me assigning it to him and she [his partner] is perfectly comfortable with that.

[2/8/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today, I am doing a writing project that will help the children to write a sentence. I put the *who* part in one box and the *what* part in another box. I explain that the *who* is a noun – an animal or a person and the *what* is an action with "ing" at the end. Then I put the period and the *the, a, this, that* at

the beginning. The whole arrangement is very visual, like a graphic organizer. All the ELLs experience success with this format as I watch them write their own sentences!

[2/9/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: In the Spanish room, the students are learning about the farm so the worksheet has farm animals on it. The first grade Spanish teacher has a Big Book of the vocabulary of the farm animals to match it. There is also toy food to show the products that we get from the animals. There is an additional worksheet where they have to color, cut out and then paste the baby farm animal with its mother.

[2/24/06, 1st Grade, English]: With it being Presidents' Week, I am reading a story about George Washington to them [my students]. The beautiful portraits of Washington help the kids to visualize what I am telling/reading about him. One particularly powerful one is the one where Washington is praying while he kneels by a tree in Valley Forge. Even though the material was a bit complex for an average 1st grader, not to mention an ELL, I am pleased at how well they attend. One ELL is sitting quite close to me and is quite entranced with the paintings. I can see that visuals continue to be extremely important for second language learners.

For our song, *Abraham, Martin and John*, I pick a student to hold the book with that particular man on the cover. This makes it less abstract for them. One student looks through the book on John Kennedy and becomes quite entranced with the picture of a young Kennedy and Jackie sitting together on the lawn. I explain who she is. I am pleasantly surprised at how interested the students are in the books. I wasn't sure how interested first graders would be in men who were alive a long time ago. They ask good questions!

I was able to find a family portrait of the Kennedys; so I am finally able to point out what Bobby Kennedy looked like. He is mentioned in the *Abraham, Martin and John* song, so it is important for them to see him. Although, I mentioned that Bobby was John's brother, when they see the family portrait, the resemblance really hits home. Some of the ELLs say, "He looks just like John!" I reply that that is because they were brothers. Kids really need to explore and see things for themselves, especially if they are learning a second language. One student wants to know who is the oldest; so I line them up in order with a different kid holding that particular book – Washington, Lincoln, Kennedy and King.

Freeman and Freeman (2000) emphasized that, when ELLs are engaged in reading that is meaningful to them, they will learn more vocabulary. The key is teachers who know how to make stories more comprehensible for ELLs. The following notebook

notations describe ESOL strategies used by teachers to also assist with the ELLs' literacy development within the other dual-language classrooms:

[2/9/06, 2nd Grade]: The second grade teacher gives them [her students] a new story from the Basal Reader each week. By the end of the week they have to complete the skills sheet and take a vocabulary test. Meanwhile, they read library books on their own and take their AR quizzes.

Each student has two folders. One is to save the AR reports; the other is for the skills sheets and graphic organizers. She uses a lot of graphic organizers to process the information such as setting, characters, plot, etc. from the story.

[2/9/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: Reading in Spanish is beginning, as I walk in. The second/third grade teacher is reading *Tomás y la señora de la biblioteca* [Thomas and the Library Lady] aloud to both groups. The Spanish words from the story are on the board. The teacher is using gestures to make it come alive. Three ELLs are following along well with her as she reads. They all have a good understanding of the story. One student is doing some actions from the story. Two others answer the comprehension questions easily.

[1/12/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The fourth graders are doing a research project on a country. I find them in the school's library. They search through library books and the internet on a South American country of their choice. As they find facts, they write each one on a slip of paper. And, then they organize the slips into categories to prepare for the writing. All the slips that correspond are put into a separate small plastic bag. Later, they are to take all the slips from each bag and write a paragraph about that particular piece of information. As I look around, I see that all the ELLs are actively engaged in searching through the internet, books, writing the facts on the slips of paper, and categorizing them according to their content. Their faces show me that the project is challenging, yet interesting, at the same time. The librarian and the classroom assistant help them as needed. My first thought is that this project is very visual and kinesthetic.

Sociocultural, linguistic, and cognitive support, as outlined by the prism model, must be provided for ELLs during instructional time throughout the school day. Factor 1 (i.e., the validation of the culture and native language), Factor 5 (i.e., additional linguistic support), Factor 6 (i.e., development of thinking skills), and Factor 7 (i.e., strategies supporting ESOL) would be categorized as academic development within the prism

model. Thomas and Collier (1997) explained that academic development includes all subject matter across all content areas and extends beyond high school. Teachers must not develop language skills at the expense of academic development (Takahashi-Breines, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Factor 8: Creative Activities Integrated within Literacy Instruction

Observation conducted for this research noted that, when ELLs under study participated in an artistic endeavor, new English vocabulary seemed to be learned more naturally (Cloud et al., 2000). Creative activities incorporate student imagination, which forms a significant amount of the cognitive processes implemented by young children. The imagination is so vital to human development that a school focus solely on facts will be at the expense of student growth (Eisner, 2002). The following excerpts from the study notebook explain how creative activities appeared to help the ELLs attending the first-grade classrooms participating in this study:

[1/3/06-1/6/06, 1st Grade, English]: I use songs with visuals to learn the words – to associate the word with the picture – *My Favorite Things* book, pictures of family and [the] song. *Ebony & Ivory* – we pretend to play instruments to try to get different part of the body involved

[2/6/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today, I am starting the new songs, *The Candy Man* and *Abraham, Martin and John*. Showing the pictures of the candy and Lincoln, King, and Kennedy really helps. Then, I kind of act it out. In *Abraham, Martin and John*, I pretend that I am looking for the characters. This makes it more alive for the ELLs.

[3/3/06, 1st Grade, English]: In the afternoon, I continue my project on the presidents. Today, I am reading about Lincoln. I write: I like _____ because _____. For their president project, they have to complete the sentence. The kids are excited about which president they will choose. Many say they like all of them because they tried hard to help people. The illustrations they draw are very nice!

This [project] can be complicated for the ELLs. However, the illustrations in the books are very helpful. One ELL writes *country* correctly on his project about the favorite president. When I ask him how he knew how to spell *country* correctly, he shows me one of the books about George Washington. He knows where to find the word! He has looked in the table of contents and found the word. I am amazed at how well his reading skills have transferred to English. He looks very proud of himself after I tell him how proud I was of him!

Next week, I will continue with Kennedy and let the kids finish. To help one ELL, I point out the *M* because she wants to put Martin Luther King [on her paper]. Sometimes even a little hint can go a long way to make the information more comprehensible for the ELLs.

When I read the book on Lincoln, I changed my voice as it is told in the first person. I even added facial expressions so I could pretend to be the character. It really helps to make the book more comprehensible. It is a hard book – on the fourth grade level. I explained the vocabulary, too. It is important to expose the children to oral language that is above their reading level so that they can acquire more vocabulary. Once it has become familiar to them, when they encounter it, later, in the written form it will be that much easier to read.

[4/4/06, 1st Grade, English]: Amazing how well they [the ELLs] are reading the Reader's Theatre scripts! One ELL tells the kids in his group when they don't know the words. Another ELL is figuring out more words than before. Reader's Theatre gives them a purpose for the reading.

[4/25/06, 1st Grade, English]: Just like I had done with our other songs, I have the kids act out the lyrics of the song *Camelot*. The acting makes it more concrete for the children. In the morning, the kids insist on keeping the soundtrack on for background music. One ELL follows along well with the lyrics while the song is on.

[1/4/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: In the Spanish Homeroom, my teaching partner uses songs [to reinforce science and social studies concepts]. The children follow along as the CD plays.

[2/9/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: My [homeroom] class is in my partner's room in the afternoon getting the same lesson that her class got in the morning. She has a CD in the computer that she is using to help the children identify the farm animals. When you click on the animal, it makes a sound. One ELL is so eager to do it that he gets up before his turn! After everyone has a turn, they complete a coloring/cutting sheet to match the sound to the animal it goes with. My group is very comfortable with Spanish. For many of them, it is their native language.

After that, the teacher plays a song about the animals. She gives each of them a picture of a farm animal. When the song calls out their animal, each kid

has to come up front and join the line. What fun! The kids are absolutely ecstatic! The computer program and the songs provide a different outlet for learning. Would I be happy in this class? Overwhelmingly, yes! The creative activities are a lot of fun and reinforce the vocabulary. The last thing they do is to make a puppet. They color and cut out a cardboard animal. My partner attaches a string on a popsicle stick. They walk around the room acting as the animal that they are holding.

Throughout this study, the first-grade ELLs appeared to periodically need a respite from the complexity of learning English. Two observations noted in the research notebook read,

[1/18/06, 1st Grade, English]: After the phonics pages, three of the ELLs draw. I allow that. It seems like art acts as a sort of release. The phonics work was tedious.

[1/24/06, 1st Grade, English]: One ELL likes helping me put out the Homework Books. Again, I find that it is the kinesthetic or artistic break that gives them a break from the barrage of the new language.

ELLs within the other dual-language classrooms also benefited from creative activities, as is evident in the following journal notations:

[2/9/06, 2nd Grade]: In the Practice Workbook, the second grade teacher goes over verbs. All the students continue to be excited about the Spanish! They have to circle the verb that shows the action the picture is describing. At the end of the day, they do their workbook: *Escribir Para Leer* [Writing to Read]. The kids like it as it is self-directed with various reading and writing activities interspersed with coloring.

[2/9/06, 2nd Grade]: The second grade teacher makes movies [about the stories they read] with the children, often. Here, we see an alternate form of learning. Today, I see that one student reads the story, while another one acts out what the character is doing. Props, simple costumes and masks are used. Other characters join in as needed. The children are taught how to use the camera. The teacher also shows them how to edit unwanted scenes.

[1/6/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: When I come in the class is writing. They have to write a different ending to a fairytale. I do notice that daily the teacher gives them an imaginative writing prompt.

[1/12/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: When I walk in, they [the students] are finishing up their AR books and are ready to do an imaginative writing prompt – *If your desk could talk, what would it say?*

[4/3/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: After [their teacher] returned, the kids excitedly tell me that they are doing a play on a fairy tale. Some children have the Spanish script and some have the English one. I watch the kids rehearsing the Spanish script. They look very happy. They have a special smile on their faces as if to say, “We get to do Spanish!” So when they do Spanish, it is validating for them. It is a shame that they can’t do it more often.

[1/6/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The whole class is involved in English Literature Circles when I come in around 11ish. The fourth/fifth grade teacher shares with me that she is using a type of innovative workbook that explores four classic stories, *Black Beauty, Tom Sawyer, Romeo and Juliet, & The Tempest* brought down to an elementary school level.

The children are in groups of four answering literacy questions from the workbooks. The teacher explains that she has divided them according to their interest. As I observe, all students are actively engaged in discussing the story and completing the questions. They look comfortable as they are spread out on the floor in various sections of the room. The discussions are lively, yet not out of control.

[3/31/06, 4th/5th Grade]: They [the students] are making a movie on fire safety, as I walk in. This provides, yet, another channel for the language. One fourth grader is excited that he has to act so scared that he falls out of his chair! Another student is excited to be the Fire Chief.

These vignettes exemplify how the dual-language teachers have incorporated creative activities throughout their content areas. An active learning environment with optimum student participation is recommended to obtain the academic, literacy, and sociocultural goals of dual language (Soltero, 2004). Creative activities within the classroom appear to be valuable because they allow children the opportunity to incorporate their imagination, thereby improving their cognitive skills (Eisner, 2002).

Factor 9: Language Arts in Both languages

The L1 acts as a conduit, allowing for the transfer of cognitive skills to the L2. This is why it is critical that instruction is delivered in both languages (Soltero, 2004). However, literacy instruction in the L2 must be adapted and modified for ELLs because it is the newer language (Cloud et al., 2000). This additional assistance was observed within the dual-language classrooms of the study site. The teachers provided their ELLs with many opportunities to learn the new language through drama and used various strategies designed for ESOL such as graphic organizers, songs, pictorial representation, repetition, gestures, movement, quality literature, art, realia, peer tutoring, and cooperative learning.

Students across all grade levels in this study expressed that they liked learning two languages and having their instruction split between their L1 and L2. They described their thought processes as occurring across both languages. A second grader stated, “We like both languages because it is fun doing the writing and the reading. We try to figure out the words in both languages.” Another reported, “We do social studies and science in English and Spanish.” A third grader remarked, “When I’m doing my work in English, I think in English; when I’m doing my work in Spanish, I think in Spanish.” A parent commented that, with dual language, the students get a balance, and another remarked that his son can now translate easily for the family.

The researcher recorded examples of language arts observed within the English and Spanish first-grade classrooms. They read in the following manner:

[1/12/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: One student follows along easily [in the Spanish classroom]. He reads the words as the first grade Spanish teacher reads them. Another can follow well. He says, “Look what happened!” He is very excited

about the story. He gets excited in English class about our stories, too. He says it is easier to read in Spanish. A third student is able to participate more in Spanish class. The kids have to pick the answer to the comprehension question to the story. Another shares with me that Spanish is easier for her.

[1/17/06, 1st Grade, English]: Two of my ELLs are reading easily in English. They are strong readers in Spanish. Both get excited about books in either language. After I do a presentation on Martin Luther King, they eagerly go to get the book.

[2/1/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: In the afternoon, my class is working on syllables in the Spanish class. One ELL raises his hand to volunteer an answer. He has a happy look on his face. Another looks comfortable, too. Two others are eagerly answering the question. They have to choose the word for the picture and then divide it into syllables.

[2/3/06, 1st Grade, English]: In the afternoon, one of the ELLs is the first one sitting on “the magic carpet” for the story.

[2/6/06, 1st Grade, English]: [Earlier this week] I had showed them [the class] a book about Anne Frank to get them motivated for journal writing. It has really helped! They are always asking for that book. One ELL eagerly looks through it and says, “Look!” when she sees the picture of Anne writing in her diary. She wants to show everyone! Another student is very interested, too.

[2/24/06, 1st Grade, English]: I had written the Morning Message with mistakes included such as spelling, punctuation, capitalization and spelling [on the board before the students came in]. My goal is to reinforce these sentence rules. I color-coded the sentences for easier identification. [When the students come in] one ELL goes to the board to erase the “7” in 2007 to make it 2006. I have to explain to him that I made a bunch of mistakes and not to correct it until the whole class is together with me.

[3/14/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today, we read a story in our reader about a girl who kept the lighthouse lit while her father was away. When I ask them what true means, I am pleased with one ELL’s answer. He makes the connection between Martin Luther King having really existed, being true, and the lighthouse story having really happened is true, as well.

[4/3/06, 1st Grade, English]: During Guided Reading, one ELL tells another kid who is having trouble reading a word, “Just like when I get in trouble with a word, I put my two fingers on it and I sound out the word!” She is very proud of

herself. I'm glad that some of the reading strategies that I've taught are becoming automatic for the ELLs.

[4/27/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today I am reading *Pepita Talks Twice* aloud to the class. It focuses on a girl who learns the value of speaking two languages. The kids really appreciate the message. The significance of Dual Language really hits home. The book has text in Spanish so it can be read in both languages – which shows that both Spanish and English are valued.

[5/16/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today, we are jumping into the pictures [for creative writing]! I used two Spring pictures. One shows a couple going out in their Model-T car. The other shows two oxen pulling some children through a field of flowers. These pictures are probably about life 100 years ago. We hold a pre-write discussion about how things were different long ago.

I model how authors use their imagination to write about the picture. To ease the fear, I remind them that writing is simply talking written down. I explain that an author doesn't write a book in one day! I also model the mechanics, as well. I use the two posters that show the writing process. One went from thinking through the editing/revising process to the finished product. The other has a mouse reminding us about punctuation and capital letters.

[5/17/06, 1st Grade, Spanish]: The Spanish first grade teacher reads a story with them in the reader and they discuss the parts. They copy the vocabulary into their workbook which has a page which is entitled *Palabras que ahora se leer* [Words that I now know]. They have to draw a picture of the main ideas, as well. This activity matches the activities that I have in my reading workbooks.

All the students are engaged copying the words or drawing a picture. There are about twenty words, so they are expected to learn quite a bit of vocabulary. In other words, the Spanish literacy component is not watered down. My teaching partner has high expectations for the students, both the English speakers and the Spanish speakers.

She seats a Spanish speaker at the same team as an English speaker so they can help with the literacy. Another validation of their language, that it is valuable.

The kids are comfortable with the Spanish. By their expressions, I can tell that it is a normal part of their instructional time for them, just as English is.

Recorded observation of the second-grade classroom and combination classes (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades) reveal that the students seemed to be engaged in independent reading. An AR test on the respective book would often be

independently administered. Students borrowed books from the library on a daily basis either preceding or following their group literacy lesson. Allowing students to select their own books and read independently continues to be one of the most meaningful activities for ELLs (Routman, 1991), as reflected in the following research journal notations:

[1/5/06, 2nd Grade]: The second grade teacher shows me that the students have to complete a story map of a book read independently before they can take an AR Test. The story map divides the parts of the book into *Beginning, Middle and End*. She also shows me a checklist for writing including capital letters, & punctuation so they can monitor themselves. Students who can work on their own do, while the teacher works with those who need help. The teacher shares with me that it is important that the students be able to understand what they read, hence the use of the story map.

[4/27/06, Student Interview, 2nd Grade]: I ask them what language they think in. The first student shares, "First, it was Spanish because I'm a Puerto Rican; and now, it is English." The second student says that it is the same for her. The third student shares that he thinks in English. I remember from last year that he has been consistently dominant in English. The fourth student says he thinks more in English now. I remember from last year that he was dominant in Spanish. The fifth student shares, "I can think in both." The sixth student explains that she translates in her brain.

[2/20/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: When I walk in, the 3rd graders are taking a unit test on reading. The 2nd graders are taking AR tests independently. One second grader goes right over and takes his test [in English] and I can tell by the look on his face that he is very proud of himself. I do notice another third grader concentrating on her work [the test]. She is very intent upon completing it.

[5/15/06, 2nd/3rd Grade]: When I walk in, the kids are working on a lesson in punctuation and prefixes and suffixes out of the Spanish Basal Workbook. One ELL translates for another on what to do. They have to write a sentence describing the picture of a lemonade stand. Most [of the ELLs] are very comfortable writing in Spanish. I really only saw one looking around for help. Three of the ELLs are quite fast at completing it. The first ELL looks very comfortable with the Spanish literacy.

The next part of the lesson involves adding *des* to the beginning of words to make them the opposite. For example, *hacer* means to do; so *deshacer* would mean to undo. One ELL is very comfortable explaining it to me. Another page involves putting *au* or *eu* in the middle of words, *autora* [author]. Some of the

kids ask the teacher to slow down. She does not. And, she holds them accountable for keeping up with the Spanish literacy, just as she does for English literacy. But she does praise them for getting it right. She even praises an English Speaker for figuring out the middle vowels!

[5/1/06, Student Interview, 2nd /3rd Grade]: I ask them what language they think in. One ELL shares, “[I think] first in Spanish and then in English.” Another says, “Spanish.” A third one tells me, “[I think] sometimes in Spanish and sometimes in English.” A fourth student says, “Spanish.”

[1/6/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The whole class is involved in English Literature Circles when I come in around 11ish. The fourth/fifth grade teacher shares with me that she is using a type of innovative workbook that explores four classic stories, *Black Beauty*, *Tom Sawyer*, *Romeo and Juliet*, & *The Tempest* brought down to an elementary school level.

The children are in groups of four answering literacy questions from the workbooks. The teacher explains that she has divided them according to their interest. As I observe, all students are actively engaged in discussing the story and completing the questions. They look comfortable as they are spread out on the floor in various sections of the room. The discussions are lively, yet not out of control.

[1/12/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The fourth graders are doing a research project on a country. I find them in the school’s library. They search through library books and the internet on a South American country of their choice. As they find facts, they write each one on a slip of paper. And, then they organize the slips into categories to prepare for the writing. All the slips that correspond are put into a separate small plastic bag. Later, they are to take all the slips from each bag and write a paragraph about that particular piece of information.

As I look around, I see that all the ELLs are actively engaged in searching through the internet, books, writing the facts on the slips of paper, and categorizing them according to their content. Their faces show me that the project is challenging, yet interesting, at the same time. One of the ELLs shares with me that the research project is hard. I notice that she is speaking more English than she was when she was in my class two years ago.

The librarian and the classroom assistant help them as needed. My first thought is that this project is very visual and kinesthetic.

[3/31/06, 4th/5th Grade]: When I come in, I notice that the kids have their corrected Spanish vocabulary tests on their desks. They had to divide the sentence into subject and predicate. One of my former ELLs has 100%. He is very comfortable in both languages.

[4/5/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The kids are excited about turning one of their stories from the Spanish Reader into a play. They are making masks and posters when I came in. They will show it to our 1st grade classes.

[5/15/06, Student Interview, 4th/5th Grade]: I ask them what language they think in. Four share that they think in English. Two share that they think in Spanish and one tells me that he can think in both. I explain to them, that when I go into the Spanish room and I hear the words, in my mind, I put them into English. We talked about how new ELLs would do the reverse. The kids agree.

Examples have been provided of creativity within the respective content area and language arts across the L1 and L2, demonstrated within the dual-language classrooms of the study site. These two factors would be categorized within the cognitive-development component of the prism model (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Thomas and Collier explained that cognitive development manifests subconsciously at birth and growth continues beyond secondary schooling. Instances of cognitive support given to the ELLs under study in this research by their teachers and teaching assistants during instructional periods were observed.

It is important that educators of ELLs avoid a sole focus on the attainment of language skills at the expense of cognitive development. The L2 can be learned through challenging learning activities interwoven throughout the content area (Takahashi-Breines, 2002). As explained by Genesee (1994),

Because second language students find it difficult to learn new language skills which refer to abstract concepts, cognitive operations or experiences which are not yet part of their intellectual repertoire, they should first be given opportunities to learn language in conjunction with experiences that are compatible with their current abilities and knowledge. In this way, learning new language skills to talk about what is already known or has already been experienced will be facilitated. Once learned, these new language skills can serve as tools to acquire and master other concepts and skills. (p. 4)

Factors Potentially Contributing to Failure in Improving Literacy Development

Factor 1: The Imbalance of Instructional Time in English and Spanish

Although biliteracy development is optimal for dual-language programs (Soltero, 2004), English literacy seemed to take precedence over Spanish due to the state-mandated, 90-minute English Reading Block. Although an even allotment of Spanish and English instruction is prescribed for dual-language programs, many instances demonstrative of this precedence were observed over the course of this study. With the advent of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, schools must show progress in English to qualify for federal funds. English acquisition has become more tantamount than long-term L1 maintenance. The ELLs in the fourth-fifth grade combination class expressed their feelings on learning English and Spanish during the interviews conducted for this research and documented in the study notebook.

[5/15/06, Student Interview, 4th/5th]. I ask the ELLs whether they like being in a dual language program. Student 1 says, "I don't like being in dual language. I don't like to speak Spanish." When I ask him how his mother feels about it, he replies that his mother lets him choose. He shares with me that his mom knows English but when she has to write something, he translates for her. Student 2 explains, "I like talking in Spanish and English because I have to talk in Spanish in my home." Student 3 states, "I like speaking in Spanish; it is my culture. But I have to speak English because I am in America." Student 4 expresses, "I get to learn more Spanish. I already know English. But, when you grow up, you get more money if you can speak both languages." When I ask her about translating for her parents, she replies, "I explained a word to my mom on the cell phone in the middle of a text message." Student 5 tells me, "I like English more than Spanish. I help my mom spell words on the e-mail." Student 6 shares "Because my Mom doesn't know English, when I speak to her in English, she doesn't understand so I speak to her in Spanish."

I see that all the children are aware of the higher status of English at this age; whereas, I do not detect this with the younger ones. By the time they get to 4th and 5th grade, the push for English is evident. Some realize the value of retaining the Spanish for the family ties. The kids are quick to understand that

when necessary, they will talk in Spanish for their parents and translate for them, as well.

Cummins (2000a) supported conclusions drawn from the observation conducted for this study by explaining that children learn that English is key to opportunity; thus, maintenance of the L1 becomes less important than L2 proficiency. Related observation notes from data collection in the current research read in the following manner:

[1/9/06, 4th/5th Grade]: The teacher reminds them [her students] to talk in Spanish during Spanish Literacy Time. I still hear a lot of English, as I walk around.

[3/10/06, Parent Interview, Second Grade]: Mom has noticed, though, that English is stressed over Spanish in the class. The 1st Grade Spanish Homeroom teacher and I explain to her that that is due to the testing being in English. I, too, am concerned about all the emphasis on English. In a dual language program, the two languages are supposed to be given equal status. However, that is the era we are in now.

Teacher interviews and classroom observation throughout the course of this study indicated greater accountability in English and less available time for the acquisition of Spanish literacy. Even within the primary grades, the plethora of testing in English was observed. Related notations from the study notebook illustrate this emphasis.

[5/15/06, Teacher Interview, 2nd/3rd Grade]: We talk about the push for English. She laments that she doesn't have the time to teach more of the Spanish grammar so the children could improve their writing skills in Spanish. "We don't have the time to concentrate on the Spanish." She explains that the class doesn't have enough time to do the basics in Spanish grammar to be proficient writers, although they can speak it and have good oral comprehension. The second/third grade teacher comments that with her third graders, she had to spend a great deal of time getting ready for the FCAT. "Time is a factor. I would like to be able to concentrate on the Spanish."

She explains to me that she gave them a spelling test on basic Spanish words and she noticed that they needed help in blends, digraphs, plurals and diphthongs. When the teacher describes her approach to reading (in English), she says that she concentrates on the essential skills. Before it was time to prepare

heavily for the FCAT, she did have literacy centers for her students. They consisted of Listening, Words, and Computer with one group working with her.

[5/12/06, Teacher Interview, 2nd Grade]: When I ask her about the balance of English and Spanish, she says that she feels more pressure to do English due to most of the testing being done in English.

[2/9/06, 2nd Grade]: During my observations in the second grade classroom, the teacher shares with me that she knows “they” are looking at English. “The push is English!”

[1/20/06, 1st Grade, English]: Today, we are doing the [school’s quarterly] writing prompt. It is in English – write about your favorite pet. One student explains in Spanish to another student what to do. The second student is initially frustrated and goes under the desks. He says that he doesn’t like the picture that the first student had drawn for him and starts to cry. I don’t think that it is the picture, at all. It [the writing prompt] being in English must be difficult for him. He is just now learning how to speak and read in English. How much harder [it] is to write in a new language!

After I get them [the ELLs] all talking about their pets, they start to feel better. The second student is starting to write in English. The others are writing too. Although it is only a sentence or two with approximations of the words, I am pleased that they are at least trying to put something on paper. A third student is actually writing quite a bit, with close approximations to the actual words. I encourage them to use the Word Wall and the holiday and vowel charts. I see a fourth student using the vowel charts to spell words like cat. A fifth student explains that he thinks about it and then he is able to write.

[4/25/06, 1st Grade]: This week, I am administering a district level test in reading. For an ELL, there is too much testing in a brand new language. I can see the signs of exhaustion on their faces. I’ve been building it [the test] up mentioning that they can show how many words they know in an attempt to relieve some of the testing anxiety.

[1/4/06, 4th/5th Grade]: When I walk in, although it is Spanish Literacy Time, the children are doing a practice writing prompt for the FCAT.

[2/7/06, 4th/5th Grade]: Today, the fourth graders had the writing test for the FCAT. When I walked in, they share some of their feelings with me: One student says it was easy. Another tells me that it was hard. A third shares with me that she was nervous. A fourth ELL confides in me that the night before she had prayed. And during the day of the test, she had to wipe away a tear. There is too much anxiety for these kids! They can not use their heritage language, either.

Additional testing is scheduled into the next school year, even for the ELLs, as noted in the following excerpt from the study interview conducted with the ECS:

[5/25/06, ECS Interview]: [She shares with me that the] next school year (2006-07), due to *No Child Left Behind*, there will be even more testing for the ELLs. The testing will involve more academic rigor, as in the FCAT. The ECS, then, compares a dual language program with a NES class [Non-English Speaking, designed to help ELLs learn English; L1 is not maintained]. She clarifies that “With the NES class, the expectation is a “quicker” transition to English. This type of class would be beneficial for a child who receives little help at home. With dual language, the kids will get there; but it might take longer. Initially, you won’t see the same growth because they are learning two languages. But, there are long-term benefits. And, of course, the long-term result is that you are bilingual. . . . Unfortunately, in the political climate of our day, the ELLs are expected to learn English quickly. Teachers have high expectations. The U.S. isn’t patient in how fast these kids learn English.”

Conclusion

As noted earlier, this ethnographic study sought to assist in the development of insight into:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in two-way, dual-language programs?
2. What factors contribute to the failure to improve the literacy development for ELLs participating in two-way, dual-language programs?

The factors of this study were organized around the four processes of the prism model—sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development (Thomas & Collier, 1997). All components are interrelated, and if they are not developed simultaneously, the future success of ELLs is in jeopardy.

With regard to Research Question 1, data analysis revealed nine factors appearing to contribute to improved literacy development for the ELLs participating in the two-

way, immersion dual-language program of the study site supportive of the L1 as English is concurrently taught. All factors corresponded to the four processes of the prism model developed by Thomas and Collier (1997).

Within the category of sociocultural processes, two factors emerged—(a) validation of the culture and the native language (i.e., Factor 1) and (b) the necessity of a comfortable learning environment (i.e., Factor 2). Within the category of linguistic processes, two factors were discovered—(a) the transfer of reading skills from the L1 to the L2 (i.e., Factor 3) and the incorporation of literature within the Reading Block (i.e., Factor 4). Four factors were found within the component of academic development—(a) validation of the culture and the native language (i.e., Factor 1), (b) additional linguistic support across the content area, (i.e., Factor 5); (c) the development of thinking skills (i.e., Factor 6); and (d) strategies supporting ESOL (i.e., Factor 7). Two factors were revealed within the component of cognitive development—(a) creative activities integrated within literacy instruction (i.e., Factor 8) and language arts in both languages (i.e., Factor 9). With regard to Research Question 2, one factor emerged during the course of this study that seemed to contribute to failure in improved literacy development for ELLs participating in a two-way, immersion dual-language program. This was the imbalance of instructional time in English and Spanish, which relates to the category of linguistic processes.

CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION

Overview

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine whether participation in a dual-language program by ELLs contributed to the literacy development of this student population. The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs through participation in two-way, dual-language programs?
2. What factors contribute to the failure to improve the literacy development for ELLs participating in two-way, dual-language programs?

The research setting was the dual-language program within a large Title 1, urban elementary school within a central Florida county. It is important to note that the researcher was a teacher within this same program and study site. During the school year of the study (i.e., 2005-06), the researcher taught the first-grade English component of the program.

The primary focus of this research was on the literacy development of ELLs. Literacy can be defined as the four components of language arts—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—which are all interrelated to influence learning within all content areas (Chenfeld, 1987). A qualitative study was selected for this investigation, as opposed to a statistical methodology, allowing the voices of the ELL participants, their parents, and their teachers to tell their story (Chambers, 2000). “Much of the value of ethnography lies in its narrative—in the telling of a story that is based on cultural representations”

(p. 856).

Classroom observation of the dual-language program implemented by the study site was conducted during the reading and language-arts instructional periods. This included two first-grade classrooms (i.e., the English and Spanish homerooms), a second-grade classroom, and two combination classrooms (i.e., second-third grades and fourth-fifth grades). Observation was conducted over the course of 5 months between January 3, 2006 and May 26, 2006. The researcher recorded field notes during the 90-minute Reading Block within all classrooms participating in the study. All observation sought indications of instructional practices that appeared to be supportive of the development of ELLs toward bilingualism and biliteracy. The participating ELLs, their teachers, and several of their parents were interviewed to determine their views of the dual-language program. In addition to the observations and interviews, ELL self-portraits depicting their experience of learning both languages were examined along with literacy-related work samples and reading tests.

The four processes of the prism model served as the organizational framework for this research. These interrelated processes are essential for the continued literacy development of ELLs and, as noted earlier, include the sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Numerous instances of support, as outlined by the model, were observed throughout data collection.

The data drawn from the field notes during classroom observation, interviews, and examination of artifacts have been presented in the form of short narratives, as is

recommended for ethnographic study (Glesne, 1999; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983).

Ten factors were discovered during data analysis, nine contributing to successful literacy development for participating ELLs, and one contributing to failure in the improvement of literacy skills among this population sample.

With regard to Research Question 1, data analysis revealed nine factors contributing to improved literacy development for the ELLs participating in the two-way, immersion dual-language program of the study site supportive of the L1 as English is concurrently taught. All factors corresponded to the four processes of the prism model developed by Thomas and Collier (1997). Within the category of sociocultural processes, two factors emerged—(a) validation of the culture and native language (i.e., Factor 1), and (b) the necessity of a comfortable learning environment (i.e., Factor 2). Within the category of linguistic processes, two factors were discovered—(a) the transfer of reading skills from the L1 to the L2 (i.e., Factor 3), and the incorporation of literature within the Reading Block (i.e., Factor 4). Four factors were found within the component of academic development—(a) the validation of the culture and native language (i.e., Factor 1), (b) additional linguistic support across the content area (i.e., Factor 5), (c) the development of thinking skills (i.e., Factor 6), and (d) strategies supporting ESOL (i.e., Factor 7). Two factors were revealed within the component of cognitive development—(a) creative activities integrated within literacy instruction (i.e., Factor 8), and language arts in both languages (i.e., Factor 9). With regard to Research Question 2, one factor emerged during the course of this study that seemed to contribute to failure in improved literacy development for these ELLs participating in a two-way, immersion dual-

language program. This was the imbalance of instructional time in English and Spanish, which relates to the category of linguistic processes.

Interpretation of the Findings

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked, “What factors contribute to the improved literacy development for ELLs participating in two-way, dual-language programs?” With regard to Research Question 1, analysis of the qualitative data gathered in this study revealed nine factors contributing to improved literacy development for the ELLs participating in the two-way, immersion dual-language program of the study site. All factors corresponded to the four processes of the prism model developed by Thomas and Collier (1997).

Factor 1: Validation of culture and native language. The triangulation of data collected from the classroom observation, student self-portraits, and interviews indicated the impact that validation of the L1 and culture has on the academic success of ELLs. The satisfaction of the participating ELLs, their parents, and teachers with regard to the dual-language program implemented at the study site was clearly evident. Continued maintenance of their L1 while English was concurrently taught was at the root of the positive perception. Classroom observation confirmed that an acceptance of the L1 as an integral facet of the curriculum was indeed practiced.

The self-portraits presented ELLs with happy faces during both the English and Spanish instructional periods of the school day. Parents expressed delight that Spanish was being maintained because it would facilitate the family connection. Teachers

described growth in both English and Spanish literacy. They explained that allowing the ELLs to use their L1 increased student self-esteem. The ELLs themselves expressed a happiness surrounding the dual-language program because it allowed them to communicate with both Spanish-speaking individuals and English speakers. They were also proud of their ability to translate for their parents.

Factor 2: The necessity of a comfortable learning environment. The triangulation of data collected from the classroom observation, student self-portraits, and interviews also indicated the impact of a comfortable learning environment on the academic success of ELLs. These students were observed while engaged in either Spanish or English literacy activities in what they apparently perceived as a comfortable learning environment. No instances were observed wherein students were made to feel ashamed of their language and cultural background; rather, they were consistently made to feel proud of their heritage. The participating ELLs seemed happy whether engaged in Spanish or English literacy activities. Because Spanish was accepted and even promoted within the dual-language program, they were not afraid to make a mistake in their attempts to learn their L2, nor were they ever isolated from their English-speaking peers. They were only taken aside, briefly, as their academic needs indicated was necessary. Consequently, both English-speaking students and ELLs were allowed to learn from each other; serving as language models for one another (Cloud et al., 2000).

It was observed that, whenever the teacher validated the L1 of the ELLs by making an effort to speak in Spanish, ask about their culture, or allow the students to

converse among themselves in the L1, student comfort level and receptiveness to English instruction seemed to increase. Evidence of supportive learning environments was evident across all classrooms participating in this study. The second-grade teacher explained that she helped the ELLs; however, she never “let them slide.” When they did not know a word in English, she figuratively attached a concrete object to the word, allowing it to be learned in the context of something tangible and visible. The teacher of the second-third grade combination class read the stories in the Spanish Reader aloud, despite the pressure to achieve in English; however, daily vocabulary exercises reinforced the words across content areas and both languages. ELLs within the fourth-fifth grade combination class learned about their cultural background by completing autobiographies and researching a South American country of their choice. Parental and teacher interviews also yielded data on the comfort of the dual-language learning environment, and the ELLs themselves expressed a sense of security due to their ability to use both their L1 and L2.

Factor 3: Transfer of reading skills from the native to the second language. The triangulation of data collected from the study interviews, field notes, and examination of artifacts indicated a transfer of skills from the L1 to the L2. The ELLs themselves explained that it helped them to hear the material in their L1 first. The parents noticed the quick transfer from the L1 to the L2 by their children within the dual-language program. The teachers witnessed growth in the literacy skills of these students across both languages as the year progressed. They agreed that the same thought processes were used, whether the reading was in the L1 or L2. Comparisons of reading records in

Spanish and English indicated that students with strong L1 literacy skills also exhibited strong L2 literacy skill.

Observation of the academic growth of participating ELLs over the span of this study caused the researcher to appreciate the extent to which maintenance of the L1 could help these students learn their L2. The ELLs were observed conversing or reading across both languages. They all enjoyed being able to speak in Spanish while learning English, even though they were at different points in their English-language acquisition. Within the first-grade classrooms, the ELLs could switch between the L1 and the L2 automatically. The strong readers in Spanish were the strong readers in English. Indeed, one of the mothers of a first-grade ELL commented that, with the dual-language program, her son receives an instructional balance with lessons presented in Spanish and English. A mother of a second-grade student expressed her surprise at how quickly her daughter acquired English. A mother of a fourth grader asserted that it is easier to learn English when the Spanish is maintained.

Factor 4: The incorporation of literature within the reading block. When former ELLs were asked to describe classroom strategies that helped them become proficient in English, literature was cited the most often (Thompson, 2000). Study observation revealed that literature was incorporated throughout the Literacy Block of all the classes within the dual-language program of the study site. Reading became more than just “decoding.” It was noted that the teachers focused on literacy skills throughout the stories of the basals, supplementing them with accompanying literature that was either read to them or that they read independently. Group lessons were often followed by discussion

and/or independent and/or small-group work. Good literature is considered to be an essential facet of a balanced literacy program, and all children have the right to be enriched and challenged by it (Goldenberg, 1996; Martínez-Roldán & López-Robertson, 1999; Peregoy & Boyle, 2001; Soltero, 2004). It is through the experiences of the literary characters that children come to a deeper understanding of themselves as individuals with unique thoughts and feelings (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001).

Factor 5: Additional linguistic support across the content area. It is advantageous to include language instruction within daily lessons to ensure that ELLs continue to improve academically, as well as linguistically (Met, 1994). The provision of supplemental linguistic support by teachers was practiced throughout the dual-language classrooms of the study site. A variety of approaches were implemented to help ELLs learn English and to render the material more comprehensible for them. Such strategies included using combinations of phonics and literature and sight word work, which was conducted with entire classes and within small-group settings. Traditional workbook and drill instruction were combined with more creative activities such as Readers' Theatre and movie making. Graphic organizers, CDs, color coding of text, songs, computer exercises, Big Books, and other visuals were incorporated across all of the dual-language classes.

Factor 6: Development of thinking skills. Study observation revealed how the thinking skills of the participating ELLs appeared to develop within the dual-language program of the study site. Learning a new language is not a function separate from cognitive development; each contributes to the other effort (Genesee, 1994). While

learning instructional content across both languages, the thinking skills of this group of ELLs were developed within both the L1 and L2. The first-grade English class was taught by the researcher to imagine what they read by explaining that they have the capability to enhance comprehension by visualizing or creating a movie in their mind. Field notes recorded that the other dual-language teachers also focused on comprehension of the stories, rather than merely decoding. Songs, literature, and other visuals were used to enhance the curriculum. Many of the ELLs explained that they could now think in both English and Spanish. One parent commented that, with dual-language program, her son had developed a balance between both languages.

Factor 7: Strategies supporting english speakers of other languages. Academic language develops over a longer period of time than social language (Cummins, 2001). Consequently, supporting ELLs with scaffolding techniques is recommended (Herrel & Jordan, 2004). Such strategies incorporate visuals; repetition; gesturing; kinesthetic approaches; songs; modeling (i.e., teacher demonstration); and small-group work and were observed in practice across the dual-language classrooms. Peer tutoring (i.e., one student assisting another); vocabulary exercises across both languages; color coding of reading material; and the use of visuals (i.e., both graphic organizers and posters) were particularly beneficial in helping the ELLs learn their L2.

Factor 8: Creative activities integrated within literacy instruction. As the researcher as a teacher interacted with the ELLs participating in this study, it was noted that, when the students were involved in an artistic endeavor, learning new English vocabulary seemed to occur more naturally (Cloud et al., 2000). Consequently, rather

than limiting literacy endeavors to traditional paper and pencil, the researcher sought to incorporate the arts with her own first-grade class as one avenue toward L2 retention. The incorporation of creative activities such as singing, movement, and acting provided this additional channel. Such practice was observed across the other dual-language classrooms, as well, with the incorporation of learning activities such as interactive CDs, making movies, art activities, drama, literacy circles, and creative writing. The creative activities also provided a needed rest from the barrage of new information related to the new language. Constant focus on a new language without mental “breaks” can prove to be very tedious and possibly even slow ultimate mastery.

Factor 9: Language arts in both languages. The L1 acts as a conduit allowing the transfer of cognitive skills to the L2 (Soltero, 2004). Throughout the course of this study, numerous literacy activities conducted in both the L1 and L2 were observed. It was apparent this was an important factor in the literacy development of the participating ELLs. Within the first-grade classes, the students rotated between the English and Spanish teachers, allowing lesson content to be delivered in both languages. Although, there was more emphasis on gains in English, the second-grade and combination-grade teachers ensured that Spanish instruction was provided whenever possible. Because academic language is developed later than conversational language (Cummins, 2001), content also delivered in the L1 is important to overall literacy development.

It was advantageous for the first-grade ELLs to receive instruction in the L1 with subjects such as social studies/science and instructional themes related to community workers and the farm. Within the second-grade class, no texts were available in Spanish

for social studies and science; hence, the teacher talked through the lesson in Spanish, which was highly beneficial to the ELLs. In the combination classes, the children developed vocabulary in both languages across each content area and use of bilingual dictionaries was encouraged. All teachers, students, and parents involved in the dual-language program implemented by the study site felt it was beneficial to continue academics in both the L1 and L2.

As described by the ECS,

It [dual language] allows them the comfort to use their native language at least for part of the day. It is better for their self-esteem and their adjustment. Plus, they can achieve a stronger academic foundation because the other academics will be in their language. Yes, they will hear the subject matter in English and when they hear it in their own language, it will click.

Research Question 2

Factor 1: The imbalance of instructional time in english and spanish. Research Question 2 asked, “What factors contribute to the failure in improving literacy development for ELLs participating in two-way, dual-language programs?” Although biliteracy instruction is the optimal method for dual-language programs and participating ELLs, English literacy does take precedence over Spanish due to the state-mandated, 90-minute English Reading Block. Throughout the course of this study, such precedence was repeatedly observed, as opposed to the even allotment of instruction in both Spanish and English, as prescribed for dual-language programs.

The main factor that impeded literacy development for the participating ELLs was the forced emphasis on English over Spanish, resulting from the high-stakes testing in English that was mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002. Solely the

preparation for these tests replaces valuable instructional time in Spanish, which in turn, leads to reduced literacy development in the L1. The political climate made it difficult for the dual-language program to maintain the required balance of instructional time between the L1 and L2.

Santa Ana (2004) described the current political situation in the following manner:

It [the No Child Left Behind Act] ends the Bilingual Education Act (1968). Federal funds will continue to support English Language Learners (ELLs), but the swift and brief teaching of English takes priority over longer-term bilingual academic skill development. Moreover, schools now must make annual English assessments. (p. 104)

The dual-language teachers participating in this study expressed strong desires toward additional classroom time to devote to Spanish instruction; however, they were very much aware that emphasis would remain on developing English skills. The ECS explained that today's ELLs are expected to learn English at an extremely rapid pace. As a first-grade teacher, the researcher often witnesses the frustration that manifests within ELLs struggling with the many formal tests in English. The second-grade teacher also acknowledged the necessity for an English emphasis. The teacher of the second-third grade combination class explained in an interview that she also desired additional time to develop Spanish literacy in her ELLs. However, preparation for the FCAT Test in English took precedence, especially during the second half of the school year. Within the fourth-fifth grade combination class, Spanish Literacy Time was sometimes used for test preparation in English.

Interestingly, parents of children within the dual-language program implemented at the study site were not critical of the English emphasis. They were keenly aware of the vital need for their children to learn English. However, they concurrently appreciated any time devoted to the maintenance of the L1 for cultural reasons.

The numerous interviews revealed that, by the time students reached the fourth or fifth grade, they realized that American society emphasizes English over Spanish and other diverse languages (Wong Fillmore, 1991b). According to Wong Fillmore, “They can tell by the way people interact with them that the only language that counts for much is English: the language they don’t yet speak” (p. 342). As a proponent of continued L1 instruction, Lee (2006) posited that,

Unfortunately, policy decisions on bilingual education have generally been made by politicians or the community at large based on influences from special interest groups, whose primary interest may not be the pedagogical value embedded in bilingual education but one based on adherence to a partisan social ideology—protecting English. . . . That is, there is a prevailing perception and attitude that a language other than English in the United States is a threat to national unity and character. (p. 109)

Unfortunately, discontinuing instruction in the L1 can have serious effects on all aspects of ELLs development (Cummins, 2001; Goldenberg, 1996; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Wong Fillmore, 1991b).

Contributions of the Study

This current study also makes a contribution toward the theoretical framework of the prism model: sociocultural processes, linguistic processes, academic development, and cognitive development (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Sociocultural Processes

The contribution the dual-language program can make toward the acceptance and validation of the L1 and culture of ELLs cannot be overstated. Over the 6 years of her involvement with the program, the researcher has witnessed great joy expressed by both students and their parents at the maintenance of the L1 and acceptance of their culture. This also manifests as increased self-esteem in the ELLs. Parents frequently express their gratitude because the program helps their children retain their L1, which is so crucial for maintaining family ties. Because the L1 is maintained while learning English, the ELLs can continue to communicate with their parents and extended family without gradual loss of their heritage language. The ELLs convey their happiness at being able to help their families translate from the L1 to L2, which also results in increased self-esteem for all.

Because the mother tongue becomes a language to celebrate within appropriately delivered dual-language programs, the higher status of the native culture and L1 produces well-adjusted students who are more willing to learn the L2. These students are not just vessels waiting to be filled with English; they are children with feelings, thoughts, and many hidden talents waiting to be released. They are far more receptive to learning a language that is new to them in an environment where they feel accepted and appreciated.

Educators can take this precept one step further by infusing pride within each student. Because the L1 and culture is celebrated within the dual-language program, the classroom becomes an extension of the family, rendering it a comfortable place for students new to English. Because dual-language teachers are familiar with the process of acquiring an L2, they can empathize with ELLs. This close relationship also contributes

to a comfortable and productive environment conducive to learning a new language under minimal stress. Educators must be aware of the complex and stressful process involved in learning a new language. Placing themselves “in the shoes” of their ELLs may allow them to imagine this awesome task. These children will acquire the new language; however, it will take time. Unfortunately, the current political era is not as patient with the process.

Linguistic Processes

Through witnessing the academic growth of the participating first-grade ELLs over the span of several months, as well as that of some of the second, third, and fourth graders over several years, the researcher gained a strong appreciation for instructional maintenance of the L1. *Theory* of language transfer (Cummins, 2001) is one end of the spectrum; it is yet another to actually experience it. Over the 6 years of involvement in dual-language instruction, the researcher noted that ELLs who were proficient readers in their L1, also read capably in their L2. Upon comparing notes with her teaching partner, it was found that ELLs who were strong readers in Spanish, also exhibited similar literacy skill in English. Conversely, ELLs lacking basic skills in their L1, were generally unable to master the same skills in their L2.

The dual-language program continues to be advantageous for ELLs because it allows them the time they need to learn English (Collier, 1995; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Equally important, because ELLs have not mastered English, does not mean they have no language. Albeit not English, they indeed have a first language. In this study, the acquisition of English was not impeded by continued instruction in Spanish. The L1 only

benefited the effort to learn the L2. The ease with which the participating ELLs were able to switch between the two languages was repeatedly observed. They all enjoyed the ability to speak in Spanish while learning English, even though they were at different points in their English-language acquisition. The students expressed that it was helpful for them to hear the material in Spanish, and instructional use of the L1 also gave them a needed break from the constant barrage and tedium of information received in a new language.

Within the dual-language program, not only are ELLs learning English, but English speakers are learning Spanish. This presents another benefit for ELLs as they become the linguistic models for the English speakers. The pride they feel in becoming models for their L1 also provides more of an impetus to learn the L2. The attitudes of children toward learning new languages must also be considered (Griego-Jones, 1994). The observation conducted for this study revealed that, whenever the researcher validated the L1 and culture of the ELLs by making an effort to speak in Spanish or by asking about their culture or allowing them to converse among themselves in their L1, the students seemed far more comfortable and receptive to receiving the English instruction.

The important thing is to instill pride in the heritage language, and to truly understand the plight and challenges of children learning a language new to them and upon which general success in life within their home country depends. For the educator within the dual-language classroom, empathy is key. Observation within the Spanish classes of the study site brought the ELL experience to light. As a nonbilingual, the

researcher visualized the words in Spanish and subsequently translated them into English mentally. She hypothesized that this was the process the ELLs used in reverse.

As ELLs begin their journey toward English acquisition, it is important to celebrate their early successes, focusing on what they are saying in English, rather than how. In time, the correct syntax will manifest as an increasing amount of English is internalized.

Throughout the course of this study, the dual-language teachers expressed their desire to spend additional time in Spanish instruction. A balance between the L1 and L2 must be maintained, regardless of the difficulty during this era of standardized testing in English. More valuable results would be gleaned if the ELLs were tested in their L1, especially if they are new to learning English; however, legislation has precluded this alternative.

Academic Development

Because dual-language teachers are charged with two groups of students to teach—those learning English and those learning Spanish or another target language—adapting the curriculum to meet the educational and linguistic needs of both student groups becomes a combination of art and skill. As with their English-speaking students, dual-language educators must also expect quality work from their ELLs. The present task of learning English does not release ELLs from the responsibility of optimal academic performance. However, alternate assessments are recommended for ELLs, especially for those just beginning to acquire English. Alternative ways to express mastery would alleviate relying upon tests in English, a language they are still learning.

Additional use of the L1 and activities involving other modalities is recommended.

Paper-and-pencil tests in English cannot accurately assess a student new to English. It is not difficult to imagine the adverse scenario of moving to a different country and being assessed within the local language before sufficient time was allowed for even partial mastery.

Bilingual instruction is made more comprehensible through the use of effective groupings, L1 and L2 modifications, a variety of learning styles including the arts, and continued use of strategies designed for ESOL. It would be advantageous for mainstream teachers to incorporate these same instructional strategies into their curriculum because few of today's public-school classrooms are void of L2 learners.

The dual-language program establishes a unique type of laboratory where the interweaving of language and academics provides growth in both areas. Observation conducted for this study revealed such an environment. Drilling exercises were unnecessary because comprehension of the L2 occurred quite naturally through the instructional activities. Hearing the academics in both the L1 and L2 provides a more acceptable setting for children learning a new language because, if understanding is not achieved in the L2, a second opportunity is presented in the L1. This distinctive atmosphere allows for the academic material to remain challenging without the grade-level curriculum being compromised.

Cognitive Development

Because cognitive and linguistic growth are so intricately linked, one cannot be developed at the expense of the other (Soltero, 2004; Takahashi-Breines, 2002). Due to

instruction delivered in both languages within dual-language classrooms, thinking or cognitive skills are allowed to develop across both languages. Throughout this study, ELLs proudly expressed their ability to think across two languages. One student announced, “When I’m doing my work in English, I think in English; when I’m doing my work in Spanish, I think in Spanish.” The basic premise of the Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal development is that, what a child can perform with help today, the same child will be able to perform independently tomorrow. This theory can easily be applied to a dual-language program. The newer language is one developmental step beyond the immediate grasp of an ELL. However, it is through the meaningful literacy and academic instruction across both languages that the skills will transfer. Over time, the intense linguistic support needed by ELLs will lessen as an increasing amount of the L2 is acquired.

Creative activities seem to provide an alternate channel by which an L2 can be learned. Because art, music, movement, and drama invoke the imagination and provide another channel of expression, both linguistic and cognitive skills are enhanced. Table 1 presents a summary of the contributions this study makes to the Thomas and Collier (1997) prism model.

Table 1

Summary of Study Contributions to the Literature

Sociocultural processes	Linguistic processes	Academic development	Cognitive development
Validation of L1 and culture	Strong readers in one language are strong readers in the other language	Teachers are skilled in teaching two groups of students—ELLs and English speakers	Occurs across both languages
Classroom as extension of family produces less stressful environment	Time is necessary to learn L2 despite political climate	High expectation for ELLs	ZPD occurs naturally providing initial security and later independence
Instill pride to make L2 learning more desirable	L2 acquisition not impeded by instruction in L1 (Each language helps the other)	Alternative assessments	Creative activities provide an alternative channel for L2 acquisition
Empathize with process involved in learning new language	Program provides a break from the constant barrage of a new language	Employ strategies to make content comprehensible	Encourage higher level thinking skills

Sociocultural processes	Linguistic processes	Academic development	Cognitive development
Attempt balanced instruction of languages despite current political climate	Program raises status of ELLs as they act as language models for English speakers	Include content objectives and language objectives in lessons	
	Program is beneficial for ELLs regardless of English proficiency level	No drilling	
	Focus on <i>what</i> ELLs say rather than <i>how</i> in early stages of L2 acquisition		

Note. L1 = native language; L2 = second language; ELL = English-language learner;

ZPD = zone of proximal development.

Application

Four concepts have emerged in this study toward the success of ELLs—(a) maintenance of the L1; and (b) pride, (c) empathy, and (d) high expectations through the incorporation of comprehensible, challenging, and creative instruction. Instruction must continue in the L1 while the L2 is being learned, allowing skills from the first to transfer to the second. Awareness of this dynamic is critical for dual-language educators. However, learning a new language remains a complex process requiring time. In this era of standardized testing, ELLs are required to make a prompt and often unrealistic transition to English comprehension.

Dual-language teachers must instill a sense of pride in ELLs with regard to their L1 and culture. This will concurrently instill a far greater willingness to learn English. Celebrate, rather than ignore, the L1 by including it within the classroom on any level within all activities. Bilingual teachers must also empathize with the complexity of the process ELLs are undergoing as they learn a new language. As noted earlier, it is not difficult to imagine the adverse scenario of entering a new country and being assessed almost immediately in the new language. This is reality for ELLs within school districts across this country. Instruction must be delivered in an understandable manner through use of strategies designed for ESOL such as peer tutors and creative activities.

Creative activities have both linguistic and cognitive merit for ELLs. They become more than simply enjoyable activities, possibly providing another channel for L2 acquisition. However, all instruction must remain concurrently challenging. Delivering demanding academics in their L1 can help prevent these students from slipping

hopelessly behind. Learning a new language does not automatically exclude ELLs from engaging in, and benefiting from, demanding instructional work. Teachers must hold expectations for their ELLs that are as high as those they hold for their English-speaking students. Learning English will not stop ELLs from producing a high level of quality in their work.

Recommendations for Future Research

“True research does not end. Instead, it points the way for yet another search” (Glesne, 1999, p. 199). Opponents to bilingual education emphasize that ELLs must learn English to succeed in American society (Porter, 1996; Rodriguez, 1982; Rossell & Baker, 1996b; Schlesinger, 1998). Yet, any sound bilingual program teaches English, contributing to the future success of ELLs (Fernandez, 1996; Krashen, 1999). A statistical comparison of reading-test scores between ELLs in a non-English-speaking class (NES) (i.e., where English is stressed and the L1 is not maintained) and ELLs in a dual-language program (i.e., where instruction continues in both the L1 and L2) could prove to be a fruitful area of study. This type of research would also be accepted by opponents of bilingual education because they prefer statistical analysis over qualitative narratives to “prove” the value of the bilingual approach (Rossell & Baker, 1996b).

A long-term study tracing the literacy development of ELLs within a dual-language program from kindergarten through high school would be valuable in determining how bilingualism affects academic progress across content areas (Carrera-Carillo, 2003).

Additionally, an investigation into the relationship between the L1 and the L2 to determine the optimal balance between the two languages for maximum literacy development would make a significant contribution to the existing knowledge base. This type of research is also likely to yield answers with regard to how literacy instruction should differ for an ELL with developed L1 skills compared to an ELL who has yet to develop such skills (Treadway, 2000).

Since both English speakers and ELLs participate in dual-language programs, future research could also document how English-speaking children learn an L2 such as Spanish. This could yield valuable information leading to knowledge surrounding how all children learn a new language.

This current study has contributed a glimpse into how creative activities, such as music, dance, art, and drama, appear to facilitate L2 acquisition. Examining how the arts provide an additional channel for English acquisition would contribute to existing research on best instructional practices for ELLs. Consequently, the inclusion of creative activities in a future study focused on programs enhancing L2 acquisition is recommended.

Conclusion

One of the benefits of ethnographic study for this research was the access it allowed to ELLs over an extended period of time to actually observe their progress. Improvement in English-literacy skills was observed among the student sample across the dual-language classes. Through research immersion in field work, a more thorough understanding emerges of not only the culture under study, but of personal thoughts and

feelings. By balancing the roles of teacher and ethnographer, greater sensitivity to the needs of ELLs developed for the researcher.

If dual-language programs can be maintained at a 50-50 balance between instruction in the L1 and L2, greater literacy development for ELLs across both languages will result. There is consistent evidence that literacy skills developed in the L1 can provide the foundation for skills in the L2; and, continued development in the L1 does not weaken skills later developed in English. Lastly, the development of a heightened sense of self due to the celebration of both the ELLs' language and culture is a final caveat of dual-language programs (Cummins, 2001).

Preparation for the standardized testing administered in English indeed reduces instructional time in the L1. However, as posited by Thompson (2000), although teachers do not have direct control over policy, "When the classroom door is shut, the teacher becomes the most powerful individual in the classroom" (p. 137). The researcher and other teachers of the study site did what they could to celebrate the cultural identities of their ELLs and promote their L1 literacy development, regardless of the pressure to focus more heavily on English. The dual-language program implemented by the study site does teach English to its ELLs; however, its worth extends far beyond that function.

According to Zimmerman (2000),

Bilingual education can be the bridge between the socialization offered by schools and the cultural-identity formation of language minority students. The person who is bilingual has the security of a cultural identity, while English provides the security of being part of the larger American society. (p. 124)

Throughout the course of this ethnography, by listening to their conversations and viewing their creative work, the researcher came to view the participating ELLs as much more than simply children learning English. These students are richly endowed with numerous creative abilities and talents. Teachers need only to discover the right approach to draw them to the surface. The beauty of the dual-language program is that ELLs are encouraged to express themselves in various ways rather than solely through the English language. Although standardized tests in English have their place, educators are cautioned against relying upon them as the sole vehicle by which to assess L2 learners. This is absolutely necessary if teachers, and ultimately American society as a whole, are to glean the true potential of this diverse population.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DOCUMENTATION



Office of Research & Commercialization

November 8, 2005

Diane B. Black
2917 Duchess Oak Court
St. Cloud, FL 34769

Dear Ms. Black:

With reference to your protocol #05-3020 entitled, **“We're becoming bilingual and biliterate!” An ethnographic study on how a Dual Language Program in Florida contributes to the literacy development of English Language Learners,**” I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office. **This study was approved on 11/7/05. The expiration date will be 11/6/06.** Should there be a need to extend this study, a Continuing Review form must be submitted to the IRB Office for review by the Chairman or full IRB at least one month prior to the expiration date. This is the responsibility of the investigator. **Please notify the IRB office when you have completed this research study.**

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board through use of the Addendum/Modification Request form. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

Barbara Ward
Barbara Ward, CIM
UCF IRB Coordinator
(FWA00000351, IRB00001138)

Copies: IRB File
Martha Scott Lue, Ph.D.

BW:jm

UCFIRB Form

55-3020

The complete IRB packet must be submitted by the 1st business day of the month for consideration at that monthly IRB meeting. Please see page 6 of this manual for detailed instructions on completing this form.

1. Title of Project: "We're becoming bilingual and biliterate!" An ethnographic study on how a Dual Language Program in Florida contributes to the literacy development of English Language Learners

2. Principal Investigator(s):

Signature: Diane B. Black Signature:
Name: Diane B. Black Name:
Mr./Ms./Mrs./Dr. (circle one) Mr./Ms./Mrs./Dr. (circle one)
Degree: MAT Degree:
Title: Doctoral Student Curriculum and Instruction Title:
Department: Educational Studies Department:
College: Education College:
E-Mail: savpryan@worldnet.att.net E-Mail:
Telephone: (407) 343-7330 x221 Telephone:
Facsimile: Facsimile:
Home Telephone: (407) 957-2734 Home Telephone:

3. Supervisor:

Signature: Martha Scott Lue Degree: Ph.D
Name: Martha S. Lue, Ph. D Title: Professor
Mr./Ms./Mrs./Dr. (circle one) Telephone: (407) 823- 2036
Department: Educational Studies Facsimile: (407) 823-5144
College: Education E-Mail: mlue@mail.ucf.edu

4. Dates of Proposed Project (cannot be retroactive): From: 12/1/05 To: 5/31/06

5. Source of Funding for the Project: (project title, agency, and account number) Self-funded

6. Scientific Purpose of the Investigation: to find out if Dual Language Programs contribute to elementary ESOL students' (English Speakers of Other Languages) literacy development. In my study, I refer to these children as English Language Learners (ELLs) because they are learning English.

7. Describe the Research Methodology in Non-Technical Language: (the UCFIRB needs to know what will be done with or to the research participants) (Please see attached)

8. **Potential Benefits and Anticipated Risks.** (Risks include physical, psychological, or economic harm. Describe the steps taken to protect participant. The only risk is some nervousness that may occur during the interview process. If any participant feels uncomfortable with the recording of the interview, I will write down what they say instead. The participants have to agree to be interviewed. I will interview the students in groups to alleviate their nervousness. The benefits for the participants might include fulfillment that their thoughts are being used in a research study on determining whether a Dual Language Program contributes to the literacy development of ESOL students.

The participants' privacy will be protected through the use of pseudonyms. All material will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. And tapes will be erased at the end of the study.

9. **Describe how participants will be recruited, the number and age of the participants, and proposed compensation (if any):** The participants will be recruited through the Dual Language Program at Central Avenue Elementary School in Kissimmee, Florida. The children will range between six and eleven years of age. The parents and teachers will be over 18 years of age.

10. **Describe the informed consent process: (include a copy of the informed consent document)**
(Please see attached)

I approve this protocol for submission to the UCFIRB.

 1/18-27-08

Department Chair/Director Date

Cooperating Department (if more than one Dept. involved)

Department Chair/Director Date

APPENDIX B
CONSENT FORMS

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

November 1, 2005

Dear Parent/Guardian:

You are invited to participate in a study of Dual Language Programs.

My name is Diane Black. You know me as your child's current or former teacher. I am also a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida under the supervision of a faculty member, Dr. Martha Lue. As part of my graduation requirements, I will be conducting a research study on whether Dual Language Programs contribute to the literacy development of ESOL students. In my study, I refer to these children as English Language Learners (ELLS). When the research is completed, I will write up my findings in the form of a formal dissertation. The dissertation is a graduation requirement for the doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction.

The purpose of this study is to find out whether Dual Language Programs contribute to the literacy development of ESOL students. With more and more ESOL students entering the school district, the results of this study may help future teachers improve at their ability to help ESOL students learn English and their other subjects, as well. These results may not directly help your child today, but may benefit future students.

I will be observing your child in his/her classes throughout the day. I will be taking notes on how your child is learning. With your permission, your child will be interviewed during a non-instructional period. He or she will be interviewed in a group of about four or five students to alleviate any nervousness. The interview will last about thirty minutes and your child will not miss any academic time. I will ask your child questions about how s/he feels the Dual Language Program is contributing to his/her education. I will be recording the interview on a small tape recorder.

I will be the only one who has access to the observational notes and the recordings. I will transfer the observational notes and the interview notes to my home computer. The identity of the children will be protected, as pseudonyms will be used right from the start of the study and any identifying details will be eliminated. All study-related materials will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. At the end of the study, the tapes will be erased.

Participation or nonparticipation in this study will not affect the children's grades or placement in any programs. Any children who are not part of the study would just continue with their normal classroom routine. The study will take place within the time framework of 12/1/05 through 5/31/06. Your child will not miss any academic time as a result of being part of this study. Furthermore, s/he might enjoy being asked questions, as an "expert".

As parents of children in a Dual Language Program, I would also like to interview/record you with your consent. I would like to ask you if you feel the program is contributing to your child's literacy development. A translator will be provided, if necessary. You would be interviewed in private so you would feel free to make any comments that you

wish to. Just as with your child, a pseudonym will be used for you so that your privacy will be kept. All study-related materials will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. At the end of the study, the tapes will be erased

You and your child have the right to withdraw consent for either you or your child's participation at any time without consequence. There are no known risks to the participants. No compensation is offered for participation. The results of this study will be available in August, 2006 upon request.

I will be presenting my findings about the Dual Language Program in a formally written dissertation presented to my committee composed of professors from the University of Central Florida in July or August of 2006.

Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to: UCFIRB Office, University of Central Florida Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 301, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

You have the opportunity to ask, and to have answered, any questions you may have about this research at any point during the study. If you have such questions, you may call me, Diane Black, at (407) 957-2734 (home) or (407) 343-7330 x26604 (work) or my Dissertation Chairperson, Dr. Lue at (407) 823- 2036.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you have agreed for you and your child to participate.

I will provide you with a copy of this form. The original copy with your signature will remain in my files.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Diane Black

_____ I have read the procedure described above.

_____ I voluntarily give my consent for my child, _____, to participate in the Dual Language Program Study.

_____/_____
I voluntarily give my consent for my child, _____, to be interviewed/recorded as part of the study.

_____/_____
_____ I voluntarily give my consent to be interviewed/recorded as part of the study

_____ / _____

Parent/Guardian

Date

_____ I would like to receive a copy of the procedure description.

_____ I would not like to receive a copy of the procedure description.

_____ / _____

2nd Parent/Guardian

Date

(or Witness if no 2nd Parent/Guardian)

SPANISH TRANSLATION OF PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

1 de noviembre del 2005

Estimados Padres / Guardián:

Le invitamos a participar en un estudio del Programa de Dos Idiomas.

Mi nombre es Diane Black. Usted me conoce como la maestra de su niño(a) Además, soy una estudiante graduada de la Universidad Central Florida bajo la supervisión de Dr. Martha Lue, miembro de la facultad. En mi estudio, me referiré a los niños como Estudiantes del Idioma Inglés (ELLS). Cuando complete la investigación escribiré, los hallazgos en una disertación formal. La disertación es un requisito de graduación para el grado doctoral en Instrucción y Currículo.

Con más y más estudiantes ESOL entrando (matriculándose) en el distrito escolar, los resultados de este estudio pueden ayudar a futuros maestros a mejorar sus habilidades en la enseñanza del Inglés a estudiantes ESOL. Los resultados tal vez no ayuden a su hijo(a) hoy, pero beneficiará a futuros estudiantes.

Estaré observando a su hijo(a) en sus clases durante el día. Estaré anotando como su hijo(a) está aprendiendo. Con su permiso, su hijo(a) será entrevistado durante un horario que no sea el de instrucción. El o ella será entrevistado en un grupo de 4 ó 5 estudiantes para de esta forma aliviar toda la nerviosidad. La entrevista durará alrededor de 30 minutos y su hijo(a) no perderá tiempo académico. Le preguntaré a su hijo(a) como el / ella cree que le Programa de Dos Idiomas le ayuda en su educación. Estaré grabando la entrevista con una pequeña grabadora.

Yo seré la única persona que tendrá acceso a las notas tomadas durante las observaciones y las grabaciones. Yo transferiré las notas de mis observaciones y las entrevistas a mi computadora personal. La identidad de los niños será protegida, usaré nombres ficticios y cualquier detalle que les pueda identificar será eliminado. Toda información y materiales relacionados con el estudio estarán guardados en un archivo bajo llave (asegurado). Al concluir el estudio, la grabación será borrada.

La participación o no participación en este estudio no afectará las calificaciones o ubicación de su hijo en ningún programa. Los niños que no serán parte del estudio continuaran con su rutina normal en la sala de clases. El estudio se efectuará durante el lapso de tiempo del 1 de diciembre de 2005 al 31 de mayo de 2006. Su hijo no perderá

tiempo académico como resultado de su estudio. Es más, el/ ella tal vez disfrute el que se le haga preguntas , como a un “experto”.

Se le proveerá un traductor de ser necesario. Igual que con su hijo(a) se usara un nombre ficticio para proteger su identidad. Toda la información y materiales relacionados con el estudio estarán guardados bojo llave. Al concluir el estudio la grabación será borrada.

Usted y su niño tienen el derecho de retirar su consentimiento de participar ,sea el de usted o el de su hijo en cualquier momento sin consecuencia alguna. No hay riesgos alguno para los participante. No se ofrece compensación alguna por participar. Los resultados del estudio estarán disponibles al solicitante en agosto de 2006.

Estaré presentando los resultados sobre el Programa de Dos Idiomas en una disertación formal ante mi comité compuesto por profesores de la Universidad de Central Florida en julio o agosto de 2006.

Las investigaciones en la Universidad de Central Florida que involucren participaciones de personas están a cargo del “Institutional Review Board”. Preguntas o inquietudes acerca de los participantes en la investigación pueden ser dirigidas a la oficina “Institutional Review Board” de la Universidad de Central Florida(UCFIRB), “University of Central Florida, Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 301,Orlando, L.32826”. Las horas de oficina son de 8:00 a.m. hasta 5:00 p.m.,de lunes a viernes excepto los días festivos oficiales de la Universidad de Central Florida. El numero telefónico es (407) 823 – 2901.

Su firma a continuación indica que usted ha leído la información provista y que usted esta de acuerdo con la participación suya y/o la de su hijo(a). Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de este proyecto de investigación, favor de comunicarse conmigo al (407)957-2734 (mi hogar) o al (407)343-7330 x26604 (mi trabajo) o con mi supervisor en la facultad, Dr.Lue al (407)823 – 2036.

Le proveeré una copia de este formulario. La original con su firma permanecerá en mis archivos.

Gracias por su cooperación.

Sinceramente,

Mrs. Diane Black

_____ He leído los procedimientos descrito arriba.
_____ Voluntariamente doy mi consentimiento para que mi hijo(a),
_____ participe en el estudio del Programa de Dos Idiomas.

_____/_____
Padre/ guardián / Fecha

Voluntariamente doy mi consentimiento para que mi hijo(a),
_____ sea entrevistado /grabado como parte del
estudio.

_____/_____
Padre/ guardián / Fecha

_____ Deseo Recibir una copia de los procedimientos descritos.
_____ No deseo recibir una copia de los procedimientos descritos.

_____/_____
2do padre/ guardián / Fecha
(o Testigo si no hubiera
2do padre o guardián)

Procedimiento para el estudio de la Señora Black sobre como el Programa de Dos Idiomas contribuye al desarrollo comprensivo de los estudiantes del Idioma Inglés (ELLS)

1. Observaré a los niños mientras están en la clase de inglés y español. Tomaré notas acerca cómo ellos aprenden.
2. Tomaré muestras de sus trabajos, para comparar sus logros tanto es la clase de inglés como en la de español.
3. Le pediré a los niños que me dibujen un retrato de cómo ellos se sienten cuando es la clase en español. Le pediré a los niños que me dibujen un retrato de cómo ellos se sienten cuando es la clase en inglés. Le pediré que escriban una palabra en cada dibujo que describa sus sentimientos.
4. Entrevistaré a cada estudiante en grupos de cinco o seis para preguntarles cómo ellos se sienten siendo parte del programa de Dos Idiomas. Estas son las preguntas que le haré a los niños.
 - a. ¿Cuál es mas fácil para ti , el día que tomas la clase en inglés o en español?
 - b. ¿Cómo te preparas para el día que tomas la clase en inglés?
 - c. ¿Por qué una es más difícil que la otra?
 - d. ¿Qué tu piensas acerca de poder entender y usar dos idiomas?
 - e. ¿A quién tu le hablas en español? ¿A quién tu le hablas en ingles?
 - f. ¿Crees que es un beneficio poder leer y escribir en dos idiomas?
 - g. ¿Por qué es importante saber dos idiomas?
 - h. ¿Piensas que un patrono estará más dispuesto a emplear a una persona que hable dos idiomas? ¿Por qué?
 - i. ¿Es más fácil para ti leer en inglés o español? ¿Por qué?
 - j. ¿Qué te ha ayudado más en el programa de Dos Idiomas?

5. Fijaré una sección donde entrevistaré a los padres para conocer su sentir acerca del programa de Dos Idiomas (probablemente un miércoles por la tarde). Les proveeré un interprete para que se sientan cómodos.
6. Entrevistaré a los maestros de la XXX Elementary que son parte del programa de dos idiomas.
7. Recopilaré la información obtenida de las observaciones, entrevistas y muestras de trabajos para observar que patrón emerge entre los datos obtenidos.
8. Escribiré mis hallazgos en una disertación, como es requerido para el grado de Ed.D en Educación y Currículo. Espero completarlo para julio de 2006

CONSENT FOR ADULT PARTICIPANTS

November 1, 2005

Dear Educator:

My name is Diane Black; you know me as a fellow teacher at XXX Elementary School. However, I am also a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida, in the College of Education. I am under the supervision of my Dissertation Chairperson, Dr. Martha Lue. As part of my requirement for graduation, I am conducting a research study for my dissertation on whether Dual Language Programs contribute to the literacy development of ESOL (English Speakers of Other Languages) students. In my study, I refer to these children as English Language Learners (ELLs). With more and more ESOL students enrolling in the Osceola County School District, your input could add to the body of knowledge on teaching ESOL students. The timeframe for the study will be 11/14/05-5/31/06.

I am asking you to participate in an interview because you have been identified as a highly successful educator and one who has experience teaching in a Dual Language Program, as well. Interviewees will be asked to participate in an interview lasting no longer than 45 minutes. You will not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer. Your interview will be at XXX Elementary School, for your convenience. With your permission, I would like to audiotape this interview. Only I will have access to the tape, which I will personally transcribe to my home computer, removing any identifiers during the transcription. Your identity will be kept confidential. Furthermore, your identity will not be revealed in the final manuscript of the study as I will make use of pseudonyms. All study materials will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. At the end of the study, the tape will then be erased.

I will also be observing how you set up a comfortable environment for your ESOL students, encouraging their class participation and effort to do their best. I will be looking to see how language activities are integrated throughout the day so the ESOL students will be able to learn English and Spanish. I will also be observing how they interact with you and the English-speaking children. I will record my notes on a legal pad which I will then transcribe to my home computer. No one else will have access to those field notes. They will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. Again, your privacy will be assured through the use of pseudonyms.

There are no anticipated risks other than some initial nervousness at being recorded. However, you might enjoy answering questions about teaching ESOL students and being a sort of “expert” on the topic. There will be no compensation offered to you as a participant in this interview. I will proceed to interview you and observe your classroom only after I have received a copy of this signed consent from you. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the interview at any time without consequence.

Research at the University of Central Florida involving human subjects is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be address to UCFIRB Office, University of Central Florida Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 301, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

You have the opportunity to ask, and to have answered, any questions you may have about this research at any point during the study. If you have such questions, you may call Diane Black at (407) 343-7330 x 221 (work) or (407) 957-2734 (home) or my dissertation coordinator, Dr. Lue at (407) 823-2036.

I have read the information provided above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I will provide you with a copy for your records. The original copy will remain in my files. By signing this letter, you give me permission to report your responses anonymously in the final manuscript of my dissertation to be submitted to my committee as part of my graduation requirements.

Sincerely,

Diane Black

_____ I have read the procedure described above for the Dual Language Interview assignment.

_____ I voluntarily agree to participate in the interview and classroom observations.

_____ I voluntarily agree to have my interview taped on a small tape recorder.

_____ I would like to receive a copy of the final manuscript of the interview.

_____ I do not wish to receive a copy of the final manuscript of the interview.

_____/_____
Participant Date

CHILD ASSENT SCRIPT

November 1, 2005

Mrs. Black is a teacher at XXX Elementary School. Well, she is also a student at the University of Central Florida. She is researching whether Dual Language Programs help children to read and write in Spanish and English. I agree to participate in her study as long as my parents have given their permission.

I understand that Mrs. Black will be observing how I learn. She will ask me to draw a picture of myself in Spanish class and English class showing how I feel. She will also ask me questions in an interview on whether I feel the Dual Language Program helps me learn to read and write in English and Spanish. She will talk to me and three or four other students at a time, so I feel comfortable. She will record my responses on a tape recorder. However, if I am not comfortable with a tape recorder, Mrs. Black will not use it.

The interview will last about 30 minutes. I understand that my answers will help Mrs. Black and other teachers become even better teachers. No one other than Mrs. Black will have access to the tapes. The tapes will be kept in a safe place. The materials will be stored in a locked file cabinet and erased after the study is completed. My real name will not be used; so my privacy will be protected. I understand that nothing bad will happen to me or my family if I decide to stop my participation in this study. My grades will not be affected by participating or not participating in this study. I don't have to answer any questions during the interview that I don't want to.

When I sign my name to this page, I am indicating that this page was read to (or by) me and I am agreeing to participate in this study. I am showing that I understand what will be required of me and that I may stop at any time. Mrs. Black's study will be from December 1, 2005 through to May 31, 2006.

I will receive a copy of this signed form from Mrs. Black. She will keep the original one for her files.

Signature of Dual Language student – Date

Signature of Researcher – Mrs. Black - Date

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Interview Protocol for Teachers

1. Do you feel that instruction in the native language of ELLs helps them to learn English? Please give some examples.
2. Do you feel that the dual-language program is benefiting ELLs?
3. Do you have as high a standard for the ELLs in your class as you do for your English speakers?
4. What do you, as a teacher, do to make ELLs feel welcome in your class?
5. How do you validate their culture? Do you incorporate multicultural themes into your curriculum? Please give some examples.
6. How do you encourage mutual tolerance and respect among all students of all ethnicities within your class?
7. How do you involve the family and community in the dual-language program?
8. Do you give extra help to your ELLs?
9. How do you help them develop their language skills in both English and Spanish at the same time?
10. Do you incorporate any cooperative learning or group work into your daily class schedule?
11. How are the ELLs grouped within your class for cooperative learning?
12. Do you incorporate any center time? Does that help the ELLs attending your class?
13. What is one thing you wish you could do to help your ELLs?
14. Is there an area of educational training from which you feel you would benefit?

Interview Protocol for English-Language Learners

1. Do you like learning two languages?
2. Which language is your favorite?
3. Which day or class is your favorite—Spanish or English?
4. When you speak, are you better in Spanish or English?
5. When you read, are you better in Spanish or English?
6. When you write, are you better in Spanish or English?
7. Do you prefer listening to stories in English or Spanish?
8. Are you proud of your Spanish heritage? Why?
9. How do the kids in your class get along?
10. Do you think that dual-language programs help kids from different cultures get along better?
11. Do you translate at home or at school? Do you like to? Why or why not?
12. Do you have more Spanish-speaking friends or English-speaking friends?
13. Do you speak more Spanish or English at home?
14. Do you like being in a dual-language class, or would you rather be in an all-English class?

Interview Protocol for Parents

1. Why is it important for your child to maintain Spanish while he or she is learning English?
2. Do you believe that the dual-language program is helping your child to become biliterate?
3. Does a foundation in Spanish help your child learn English?
4. Does the dual-language program support your culture?
5. Do you think the program helps to establish Spanish as a language of value and with equal status to English?
6. Do you think your child's future will be enhanced with proficiency in two languages?
7. Would you consider placing your child in a monolingual English class? Why or why not?
8. Do you think that dual-language classes encourage children of different ethnicities to get along?
9. Does your child help with translating at home or within the neighborhood?
10. Do you feel welcome in your child's class?
11. Do you volunteer at school?
12. Do you help your child with his or her Spanish homework? Do you help him or her with English homework?

APPENDIX D
SELF-PORTRAITS

This is me in the English class.
Este(a) soy yo en la clase de Ingles.

This is me in the Spanish class.
Este(a) soy yo en la clase de Espanol.

REFERENCES

- Akkari, A. (1998). Bilingual education: Beyond linguistic instrumentalization. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22(2–4), 103–125.
- Andersson, T. (1969, March). Bilingual schooling: Oasis or mirage? *Hispania*, 52(1), 69–74.
- Angley, N. (2000, November 11). Bridging language barriers. *Osceola News - Gazette*, pp. 1, A2.
- Baker, C. (1995). *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism* (Vol. 5). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, K. (1992). Misled by bad theory [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 63–89.
- Baker, K. A., & de Kanter, A. A. (Eds.). (1983). *Bilingual education*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Bartolome, L. I. (1994, Summer). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 173–194.
- Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Beykont, Z. F. (1994). *Academic progress of a nondominant group: A longitudinal study of Puerto Ricans in New York City's late-exit bilingual programs*. Doctoral thesis, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Boston.
- Bialystok, E. (Ed.). (1991). *Language processing in bilingual children*. Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Calderón, M. E., & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2003). *Designing and implementing two-way bilingual programs: A step by step guide for administrators, teachers, and parents*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cappellini, M. (2005). *Balancing reading and language learning: A resource for teaching English language learners, K-5*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Carrera-Carillo, L. (2003). *Some of us are learning Spanish and some of us are learning English: A comparison of second language programs in Texas*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

- Cazabon, M. T., Nicoladis, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1998). *Becoming bilingual in the Amigos Two-Way Immersion Program*. Retrieved June 6, 2005, from <http://www.cal.org/crede/pubs/research/rr3.htm>
- Chambers, E. (2000). Applied ethnography. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 851–869). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chenfeld, M. B. (1987). *Teaching language art creatively* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Christian, D. (1996, Spring). Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *Modern Language Journal*, 80(1), 66–76.
- Clark, E. R. (1995, Summer/Fall). How did you learn to write in English when you haven't been taught in English? The language experience approach in a dual language program [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(3–4), 611–627.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle.
- Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *Tesol Quarterly*, 23(3), 509–530.
- Collier, V. P. (1992). A synthesis of studies explaining long-term language minority data on academic achievement [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 187–212.
- Collier, V. P. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in Language & Education*, 1(4), 1–12.
- Coy, S., & Litherland, L. (2000). *From a foreign language perspective: A snapshot view of a dual language program in two inner-city high poverty elementary schools* (Report No. FL026465). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED446450)
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Crawford, J. (2005, March/April). Bush budget short-changes ELLs. *NABE News*, 28(4), pp. 3–7, 33.

- Cummins, J. (1973). *A theoretical perspective on the relationship between bilingualism and thought* (Report No. FL0006664). Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, Education Department. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED122584)
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18–36.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Bilingual education and English immersion: The Ramírez report in theoretical perspective [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 91–104.
- Cummins, J. (1994). Knowledge, power, and identity in teaching English as a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 33–58). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1998, February). *Beyond adversarial discourse: Searching for common ground in the education of bilingual students*. Retrieved February 19, 2005, from <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/cummins.htm>
- Cummins, J. (2000a). Foreword. In S. Nieto, *Affirming diversity* (3rd ed., pp. xiv–xvi). New York: Longman.
- Cummins, J. (2000b). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Curiel, H. (1988). *Bilingual education & the American dream: A bridge or a barrier?* (Report No. RC017036). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, School of Social Work. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED305216)
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Deuchar, M., & Quay, S. (2000). *Bilingual acquisition: Theoretical implications of a case study*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Diaz, R. F., Neal, C. J., & Amaya-Williams, M. (1999). The social origins of

- self-regulation. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 127–154). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Doluisio, T. J. (2000). Bethlehem, Pennsylvania's English acquisition program. In R. P. Porter (Ed.), *Educating language minority children* (Vol. 6, pp. 76–80). Washington, DC: READ Institute.
- Drake, D. M. (1979). Empowering children through bilingual bicultural education. In H. T. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), *Bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice* (pp. 209–214). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Dunbar, C., Jr., Rodriguez, D., & Parker, L. (2003). Race, subjectivity, and the interview process. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 131–150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eder, D., & Fingerson, L. (2003). Interviewing children and adolescents. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 33–53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of the mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Ely, M. (1997). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Escamilla, K., Mahon, E., Riley-Bernal, H., & Rutledge, D. (2003). High stakes testing, Latinos, and English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 25–49.
- Faltis, C. J. (2006). *Teaching English language learners in elementary school communities: A jointfostering approach* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Fashola, O. S., & Slavin, R. E. (2000). Effective dropout prevention and college attendance programs for Latino students. In R. E. Slavin & M. Calderón (Eds.), *Effective programs for Latino students* (pp. 67–100). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fernandez, G. E. (1996). *Perceptions of Florida elementary school principals*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando.

- Fetterman, D. M. (1998). *Ethnography step by step* (2nd ed., Vol. 17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fitzgerald, J. (1993, Winter/Spring). View on bilingualism in the United States: A selective historical review [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 17(1–2), 35–56.
- Flannery, M. E. (2005, January). 425 first languages. *Neatoday*, 24(4), 25–30.
- Florida Department of Education (2004). *2004 guide to calculating school grades*. Retrieved December 17, 2006, from <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0404grades-tap.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education. (2005). *Schooltree.org* [Data File]. Available from Florida Department of Education Web site, <http://florida.schooltree.org>
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2000). *Teaching reading in multilingual classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, R. D. (1998). *Bilingual education and social change*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner, H. (1986, October 23). The bilingual blur [Electronic version]. *New York Review of Books*, 33(16), 1–10.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Genesee, F. (1994). Introduction. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (2nd ed., pp. 1–12). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Goldenberg, C. (1996, January). Commentary: The education of language-minority students: Where are we, and where do we need to go? *Elementary School Journal*, 96(3), 353–361.

- Gómez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50-50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 145–164.
- Goodman, Y. M., & Goodman, K. S. (1990). Vygotsky in a whole-language perspective. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 223–250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Griego-Jones, T. (1994, Spring). Assessing students' perceptions of biliteracy in two way bilingual classrooms. *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 13. Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/jeilms/vol13/assess13.htm>
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hammerberg, D. D. (2004, April). Comprehension instruction for socioculturally diverse classrooms: A review of what we know. *Reading Teacher*, 57(7), 648–658.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Harlan, J. (1991). *Bilingualism in the United States: Conflict and controversy*. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Herrrel, A., & Jordan M. (2004). *Fifty strategies of teaching English language learners* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 703–715). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (Eds.). (2003). *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hudelson, S. (1994). Literacy development of second language children. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 129–158). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, C. (1994). From field notes to dissertation: Analyzing the stepfamily. In A. Bryman & Burgess R. G (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 35–46). London: Routledge.

- Igoa, C. (1995). *The inner world of the immigrant child*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jackson, J. E. (1995). Dejà Entendu: The liminal qualities of anthropological fieldnotes. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Representation in ethnography* (pp. 36–78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 379–399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Karabenick, S. A., & Clemons Noda, P. A. (2004, Spring). Professional development implications of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English Language Learners [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), 55–75.
- Kobrick, J. W. (1972, April 29). The compelling case for bilingual education. *Saturday Review*, LV(18), 54–58.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman
- Krashen, S. D. (1999). *Condemned without a trial: Bogus arguments against bilingual education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreammakers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1973, September). The benefits of bilingualism. *Psychology Today*, 7(4), 89–94.

- Lee, S. K. (2006, Spring). The Latino students' attitudes, perceptions, and views on bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(1), 107–122.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2000). *Biliteracy for a global society: An idea book on dual language education*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- López, M. G., & Tashakkori, A. (2004). Effects of a two-way bilingual program on the literacy development of students in kindergarten and first grade [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), 19–34.
- MacGregor-Mendoza, P. (2000). Aquí no se habla Español: Stories of linguistic repression in southwest schools [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 333–345.
- Manning, M. L. (2000, Winter). Understanding diversity, accepting others: Realities and directions [Electronic version]. *Educational Horizons*, 78(2), 125–127.
- Marcos, K. (1999, October). *Are we wasting our nation's language resources? Heritage languages in America*. Retrieved June 14, 2005, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/langlink/1099.html>
- Martinez, J., & Moore-O'Brien, J. A. (1993). Developing biliteracy in a two-way immersion program. In J. V. Tinajero & A. F. Ada (Eds.), *The power of two languages: Literacy and biliteracy for Spanish-speaking students* (pp. 276–293). New York: Macmillan.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M., & López-Robertson, J. M. (1999). Initiating literature circles in a first-grade bilingual classroom. *Reading Teacher*, 53(4), 270-281.
- Menken, K. (2006, Summer). Teaching to the test: How No Child Left Behind impacts language policy, curriculum, and instruction for English language learners. [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 521-546.
- Met, M. (1994). Teaching content through a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 159–182). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Miller, D. (2002). *Reading with meaning: Teaching comprehension in the primary grades*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Miller, P. C., & Endo, H. (2004, June). Understanding and meeting the needs of ESL students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(10), 786–791.
- Modiano, N. (1968). National or mother language in beginning reading: A comparative study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 2(1–2), 32–43.
- Modiano, N. (1979). The most effective language of instruction for beginning reading: A field study. In H. T. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), *Bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice* (pp. 282–288). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Montague, N. S. (1997). Critical components for dual language programs [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(4), 334–342.
- Mora, J. K., Wink, J., & Wink, D. (2001). Dueling models of dual language instruction: A critical review of the literature and program implementation guide [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(4), 417–442.
- Moses, M. S. (2000). Why bilingual education policy is needed: A philosophical response to the critics [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 333–354.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Okely, J. (1994). Thinking through fieldwork. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 18–34). New York: Routledge.
- Oms, D., & Medina, D. (2006, January). *Dual language program*. Paper presented at the National Association of Bilingual Education, Phoenix, AZ.
- Osceola County Multicultural Department. (2005). *Dual language programs* (Rev. ed.) [Brochure, electronic version]. Kissimmee, FL: Author.
- Osceola County School District. (2005). *Osceola County School District student demographics* [Data file]. Available from Osceola County School District Web site, www.osceola.k12.fl.us
- Otheguy, R. (1982). Thinking about bilingual education: A critical appraisal. *Harvard Educational Review*, 52(3), 301–314.

- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1–24.
- Ovando, C. J., & Collier, V. P. (1998). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2001). *Reading, writing & learning in ESL: A resource book for K-12 teachers* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Perry, J. A. (2001). *Negotiating meaning, demonstrating understanding: Perceptions and intentions in fifth-graders' mathematical communications*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando.
- Porter, M. (1994). Second-hand ethnography: Some problems in analyzing a feminist project. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 67–88). New York: Routledge.
- Porter, R. P. (1996). *Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Porter, R. P. (1998, May). *The case against bilingual education: Why even Latino parents are rejecting a program designed for the children's benefit*. Retrieved January 16, 2005, from <http://www.ceousa.org/READ/porter1.html>
- Ramírez, A. G. (1985). *Bilingualism through schooling: Cross-cultural education for minority and majority students*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ramírez, D. J., Yuen, S. D., & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children*. Retrieved June 4, 2005, from www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/reports/ramirez/longitudinal.htm
- Reyes, M. D. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(4), 427–446.
- Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 923–948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Ritchie, J., & Spencer, L. (1994). Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 173–194). New York: Routledge.
- Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez*. New York: Bantam Dell.
- Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K. S., & Glass, G. V. (2005). Weighing the evidence: A meta-analysis of bilingual education in Arizona. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 43–67.
- Rosenthal, A. S., Milne, A. M., Ellman, F. M., Ginsburg, A. L., & Baker, K. A. (1983). A comparison of the effects of language background and socioeconomic status on achievement among elementary-school students. In K. A. Baker & A. A. de Kanter (Eds.), *Bilingual education* (pp. 87–111). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Rossell, C. H. (1992, Winter/Spring). Nothing matters? A critique of the Ramírez, et al. longitudinal study of instructional programs for language-minority children [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 159–186.
- Rossell, C. H., & Baker, K. (1996a). *Bilingual education in Massachusetts: The emperor has no clothes*. Boston: Pioneer Institute.
- Rossell, C. H., & Baker, K. (1996b). The effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30(1), 7–71.
- Routman, R. (1991). *Invitations: Changing as teachers and learners K-12*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Salazar, J. J. (1998, Winter). A longitudinal model for interpreting thirty years of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22(1). Retrieved from http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/text/salazar_longitudinal_model.pdf
- Sanjek, R. (Ed.). (1990). *Fieldnotes: The makings of an anthropology*. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Santa Ana, O. (Ed.). (2004). *Tongue-tied: The lives of multilingual children in public school*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *Tesol Quarterly*, 18(2), 199–219.

- Scheffield, D. (2005, November 11). Learning another language at early age: Bilingual program at 5 county schools [Electronic version]. *Osceola News-Gazette*, 1, p. 1.
- Schlesinger, A. (1998). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society* (Rev. ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2004, March). How do English language learners learn to read? *Educational Leadership*, 61(6), 52–57.
- Soltero, S. W. (2004). *Dual language: Teaching and learning in two languages*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Stritikus, T. T. (2001). From personal to political: Proposition 227, literacy instruction, and the individual qualities of teachers [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(5), 291–309.
- Takahashi-Breines, H. (2002, Summer). The role of teacher-talk in a dual language immersion third grade classroom [Electronic version]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(2), 213–235.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Retrieved March 27, 2005, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/resource/effectiveness>
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long term academic achievement*. Retrieved June 6, 2005, from http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language [Electronic version]. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 61–64.
- Thompson, E. (Ed.). (1998). Introduction. In R. MacDougall, *The emigrant's guide to North America* (pp. vii-xxix). (D. Livingston-Lowe, Trans.). Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: Hignell Printing. (Original work published 1841)
- Thompson, G. L. (2000, Winter). The raw deal on bilingual education: Former language-minority students discuss effective and ineffective instructional practices. *Educational Horizons*, 78(2). Retrieved from www.pilambda.org/horizons/v78-2/thompson.pdf
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (2002, Spring). Dual language programs: Key features and results. *Directions in Language and Education*, 1(14), 1–16.

- Torres-Guzmán, M. E., Kleyn, T., Morales-Rodriguez, S., & Han, A. (2005). Self-designated dual-language programs: Is there a gap between labeling and implementation. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2). Retrieved from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3722/is_200507/ai_n15715862/
- Treadway, E. E. (2000). *A qualitative study of dual language immersion education in Southern New Mexico*. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN.
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual-language programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3). Retrieved from <http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/GV.htm>
- Van Maanen, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Representation in ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1991a). Second language learning in children: A model of language learning in social context. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 49-69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1991b). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Research Quarterly*, 6(1), 323–346.
- Zimmerman, L. W. (2000). Bilingual education as a manifestation of caring. *Educational Horizons*, 78(2). Retrieved from <http://www.pilambda.org/horizons/v78-2/zimmerman.pdf>