EXPLORING WHY SOME BILINGUAL STUDENTS HAVE LOW ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE WHILE OTHERS SUCCEED AFTER TRANSITIONING INTO ALL-ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS AT AN INNER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Alexander S. Rodriquez

May, 2011

EXPLORING WHY SOME BILINGUAL STUDENTS HAVE LOW ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE WHILE OTHERS SUCCEED AFTER TRANSITIONING INTO ALL-ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS AT AN INNER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Doctoral Thesis for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by

Alexander S. Rodriquez

Approved by Dissertation Committee:

_____
Dr. Name, Chairperson

_____
Dr. Name, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Name, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Name, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Robert K. Wimpelberg, Dean
College of Education

May, 2011

EXPLORING WHY SOME BILINGUAL STUDENTS HAVE LOW ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE WHILE OTHERS SUCCEED AFTER TRANSITIONING INTO ALL-ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS AT AN INNER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

An Abstract
of A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Alexander S. Rodriquez

May, 2011

Rodriquez, Alex, S. Exploring Why Some Bilingual Students Have Low Academic Performance While Others Succeed After Transitioning into All-English Instructional Settings at an Inner City Elementary School. Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Houston, May, 2011.

Abstract

The steady influx of English Language Learners (ELLs) into today's public school system has led to a myriad of issues concerning bilingual students' academic performance. Investigating academic performance disparities should examine the reasons why some bilingual students, who are academically successful while they are in a bilingual program, do not perform as well after transitioning into all-English instructional settings when the majority of their peers do.

Two research questions addressed the following: (1) determining reasons why students perform well academically while enrolled in bilingual programs but experience performance dips after transitioning into an all-English classroom, and (2) how elementary bilingual and/or ESL teachers' practices, attitudes, knowledge and beliefs regarding English Language Learners relate to their students' later success in all-English settings.

Data were collected through a mix-methods approach. Quantitative data were obtained through a 43-item Likert-scale survey instrument previously developed and validated, supplemented with qualitative, structured, open-ended interviews. The research questions were analyzed using statistical analyses of the survey data using SPSS 17.00 software and qualitative data analysis of the focus groups. Data analysis for survey items was conducted using three separate t-tests to examine differences between two groups of

teachers. Demographic variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Qualitative data was recorded, transcribed and analyzed into common and overarching themes.

Qualitative analysis results show that participants believe the main reasons why students have low academic achievement after transition is related to low proficiency in the area of English as a second language; lack of formal English as a second language instruction, especially in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension; inadequate implementation of the bilingual program model, and students' early exit. Finally, a previously validated survey instrument was used to explore constructs. The results show no statistically significant difference across teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs toward ELLs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

Chapter One

Introduction

Bilingual Programs, Teachers, and Students in Texas

In this era of high-stakes testing, combined with a movement toward school and teacher accountability, the diversity of our student population plays a significant role. As individuals from a variety of different nations continue to immigrate to the United States, it continues to be a nation of immigrants. In fact, the country is experiencing a significant demographic shift that will shortly result in immigrant families surpassing the numbers of the native population. Such changes, in many cases, contribute to increases in the number of English Language Learners (ELLs) where such children attend USA public schools on a daily basis. During the last twenty five years, the linguistic minority population in the United States has increased by 113% percent and is projected to continue growing (Fry, 2007). Furthermore, on April 2008, approximately half of California's student population existed within the spectrum of English proficiency from knowing the minimum basics skills in English to almost none at all (Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). In states such as Colorado, Nevada and Oregon, the population of English Language Learners has doubled within the last ten years (Jepsen, 2009). By 2009, in Texas, approximately sixteen percent of the student population is reported as Limited English Proficiency or LEP (Texas Education Agency, TEA, 2010), and such students attend some kind of bilingual or ESL education program. Although the reported number appears to be low, the U.S. Census Bureau indicates that, for the school year starting in August 2010, thirty five percent of Texas children age between 5 and 17 spoke a language other than English in their homes. By comparison, thirty-four percent children in New Mexico, and thirty-two percent of

children in Arizona also spoke a language other than English, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

The majority of students labeled as English Language Learners, ELL's or LEP students in Texas are of Latino origin (also referred to as Hispanic). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the Latino or Hispanic population is the fastest growing group in the U.S. According to these projections, Hispanics will be largest ethnic group by 2030. It is important to note that many of these Hispanics are considered immigrants. Thus, the subject of immigration, and those families immigrating into our communities and public schools is a daily reality. Schools must grapple with the task of balancing and implementing effective instructional programs *and* decisions of how to better serve such students. Despite its contentious nature at all levels of national, state and local governments, the most common educational program in addressing the education of LEP students is bilingual education (Rossell and Baker, 1996). Simply put, bilingual education is a type of instruction that uses one, two or more languages to produce learners who can fluently speak, read, write and communicate in the conventional language of instruction. The ultimate goal of any bilingual education program is for a student to learn a second language while developing his native tongue. Bilingual education is not only implemented in the United States but also in almost every country around the world in some shape or form (Cummins, 2000). Bilingual education programs have existed in Texas since Superintendent Harold Brantley supported and launched the first bilingual program in Laredo in 1964. Brantley's ideas spread throughout the state and were signed into law in 1973. The Texas Education Code (TEC) states that *"it is a policy of the State of Texas that every student identified as LEP be provided with the opportunity to*

participate in a bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) education program as requirement to each school district" (TEC Chapter 89, Subchapter BB). Furthermore, ELL students in Texas must be part of the accountability system; yet, once they are placed in an all-English instructional setting, ELLs tend to have consistently lower scores than students whose native language is English (Jepsen, 2009).

Despite the legal support the state of Texas offers, no clear agreement exists as to the effective, consistent implementation of Bilingual programs or their effects on student learning. Experts, both for and against their implementation, write on the controversy associated with such programs. A comprehensive review of the literature in Chapter Two will address this particular issue in further detail. One ongoing concern is that many teachers accept teaching assignments in grade levels where they expect students to be prepared not only academically to learn the new curriculum but also linguistically prepared in order to understand the instruction. The truth is that, in many cases, in the specific grade levels within some school contexts, learners may be academically prepared yet linguistically limited. Since the goal of these programs is to produce bilingual students, learners will spend most of their elementary years in a bilingual classroom, which often means classrooms where all instruction is provided in the students' native tongue (Rossell & Baker, 1996).

A well-documented body of research indicates that schools and teachers are not only affected by continuous reforms and changes in policies; in addition, they also understand, buffer, adjust and remake those policies and reforms to fit their particular context and situations (Palmer & Lynch, 2007). Teachers not only have to deal with the daily journey of conveying learning and strategies to their students but they also have to

solve numerous and ongoing contradictions. For instance, teachers must respond and counterbalance pressure, combine contradicting messages from multiple sources, and make sense of their classroom reality as a means to help themselves, their schools and their students to show academic progress (Jennings and Spillane, 1997). This reality frequently stifles instruction, which in turn affects academic accountability. When teachers in a bilingual classroom are faced with the dilemma of preparing students academically, or facing the risk of losing their jobs, and/or making sure their students develop the language skills in the second language.

What might be the best decision, and how should one effectively balance these different imperatives? The State of Texas does not have an enforcement mechanism for bilingual programs; instead, discretion is left to individual campuses or district administrators. Therefore, schools have individual autonomy in implementing bilingual education models and programs. In many districts and schools, teachers are strongly encouraged and paid to utilize the students' native language while teaching. In the majority of districts, students are transitioned into English in third grade, but schools have the choice of keeping students in a bilingual program until they show proficiency in English. For other districts, however, students are kept in bilingual programs until they reach fifth grade, which is the limit or cut-off transitional year. At this point, students are to be fluent in the language of instruction and proficient in all academic areas. Another critical factor underlying teachers' instructional choices is that of accountability. In Texas, students and teachers in grade three and above are faced with an annual state mandated assessment in a variety of subject areas. For instance, at the elementary level, third grade students must take reading and math; fourth grade students are administered

reading, writing and math; and fifth grade level students must take reading, math and science (TEA, 2009*a*). All tests are administered in the language of instruction and are used to rate the school within the Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and Districts. The results of these tests may bring serious consequences – including school takeover or closure – as set forth by the federally mandated *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* Law. While operating under the specter of NCLB, teachers must decide whether they should use their limited time to cover an almost unlimited curriculum (so students can perform well on the test) or prepare them for transition into an all-English environment. In other words, teachers' central dilemma rests on a decision regarding which elements of the instruction and assessment policies can be modified, customized, or blatantly ignored altogether (Palmer & Lynch, 2009). Not surprisingly, it only makes logical sense that schools typically adopt practices that address the aspects directly linked mandates that could possibly lead to their demise. The child, after all, will have more time the new school year to improve his English. In addition, teachers must focus their instruction in the language of the assessment, which is decided by the type of program the school and district accepts. The decisions regarding language of instruction and assessment are fundamental and critical for the ELLs own fate in their upcoming grade level.

The focus of this case study is to examine the consequences of transitioning students into an all- English instructional environment when they are not proficient in the target language that the bilingual program was initially supposed to develop. In many cases, these students have met the minimum test standards. This study delves into the reasons why some students regress in one year from highly performing - even being

characterized as Gifted and Talented – to being almost illiterate at the communication level the next, while others continue to succeed academically despite the new language of instruction.

Need for the study

The population of Texas is expected to grow four times as fast as that of the nation within the next twenty-five years (U.S. Census, 2000). For the year 2000, the US census Bureau indicated the Houston area showed that over forty-one percent of people aged five years or older spoke a language other than English (US Census, 2010). According to Nealy (2006), approximately one million of the four and a half million children in Texas' schools demonstrate Limited English Proficiency (LEP). As more and more families immigrate into the Houston area from their countries, or from immigrant unfriendly states, counties, and towns, entire inner city neighborhoods concentrate large populations of poor communities that communicate in a language other than English. Public schools also enroll high numbers of these populations. Once in the classroom, students are sheltered in their native language in the beginning, but they are later expected to perform regardless of their language abilities. What public elementary schools serving these communities are doing, and how they are implementing their practices to help such students learn and succeed academically and linguistically in the broader society, become critical given the demographic projections and the limited availability of resources. Prior research has focused on the benefits and models of bilingual programs, teachers' expectations and attitudes, as well as bilingual student achievement. Yet, very little research has focused on the reasons why students transitioning into English, and who were expected to develop their linguistic competence

in a second language (i.e., the English language) while in a bilingual program, have not achieved at similar levels after being placed in a full English instructional model. The teachers' knowledge, beliefs and attitudes toward the implementation of bilingual programs associated with ELL's academic and linguistic success in later all-English instruction are critical factors to examine as well. Few studies have used a quantitative and qualitative (Quan-Qual) research approach to explore these three constructs targeting elementary school students. Most importantly, no such research project has been conducted in a Houston area inner city that deals with a densely populated Hispanic community in an elementary school. This study will aggregate survey data with archival data in order to find the roots of ELL low academic and English language performance after they are transitioned from their native language to all-English instruction. This study will focus mainly in the elementary school due to the prevalence of bilingual education programs at this level. And, since Texas law requires students to be transitioned into all-English instructional programs after a certain period of time, they are more likely to go through this process during their higher-level elementary grades or just before they enter middle school.

Statement of the Problem

Despite its advantage from the rest of the country in serving bilingual and ELL students, the Houston area continues to experience significant growth in this subgroup of the student population. Interestingly, this population growth trend is now occurring in areas where bilingual and ELL services were not a part of schools' district operations a decade ago. This situation is exacerbated by increases in the so-called "achievement gap" and a steady increase in middle and high school drop outs; as well as the low graduation

rates among populations of students who needed but were not served by bilingual or ESL programs (Munoz & Hawes, 2006). These serious worries identify the need to examine the reasons behind students' academic and English-language failure after they are transitioned from bilingual to ESL, or full English instruction in upper elementary.

Purpose of the Study

The specific purpose of this study is to examine the origin and reasons why some bilingual students perform well academically when they are part of a bilingual program, yet experience frequent problems being successful academically and linguistically once they transition to an all-English classroom the following year. In addition, it is essential to explore teachers' attitudes towards bilingual programs, and the actual degree of implementation of such programs as a critical building block for students' future success in a second language classroom. More explicitly, this study addresses two general issues: (a) What are the reasons behind ELL's low performance after they transition from a bilingual to an all-English instructional program?; and, (b) how are the bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge, beliefs and attitudes towards bilingual programs and their required implementation related to students' mastery of the English language?

Research Questions

This study investigates the reasons why some bilingual students perform low academically after they are transitioned into an all-English setting, bilingual teachers' attitudes toward bilingual program implementation, and the degree to which the implementation of these programs is helping students master the English language. This research specifically explores the following lines of inquiry:

1. Are there any differences across elementary teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards the implementation of bilingual programs associated with students' academic and linguistic success in later all-English grades?
2. What are the reasons why some bilingual students who perform well academically during the time they are taught and tested in their native language tend to fail when they are transitioned into an all-English instructional environment?

Summary and Significance of the Study

Due to the continuous flow of ELL and bilingual students through the Texas public school system, and their expected growth within the next decade, this research is key to schools providing quality bilingual education programs and services. A plethora of concerns and issues endow this particular study with increased validation and salience – namely, the continuous expansion of accountability systems to include all students regardless of language ability. In addition, current research highlighting teacher effects upon student academic success, particularly when making grade level transitions, lends increased significance to such study.

This study will add to the existing body of research and analysis addressing the reasons why students do not perform well after they transition into all-English instruction from a bilingual program. The teachers' attitudes toward bilingual programs and how teaching practices in bilingual programs are hindering or advancing bilingual students' academic and English language achievement will also be explored.

Definition of Terms

Bilingual education: Instructional program whose goal is to develop literacy and academic skills in the students' native language with the expectation of helping the

learner develop proficiency in his or her first or native language as well as his or her ability to become competent in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and composition of the English language. The emphasis of bilingual education programs is the mastery of English language skills, mathematics, science and social studies, as building blocks of the academic expectations for all students to enable limited English proficient students to participate equitably in school (Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 89, Subchapter 89.1201, section (b), 2007).

English Language Learner (ELL): The term ELL refers to a student who is in the process of acquiring English and has a first language other than English. It is also referred to in the literature as limited English proficient (LEP), English as a second language (ESL), language minority students and culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) (Brisk, 1999).

ESL Programs: English program that serves students identified as students of limited English proficiency (LEP) by providing part or full time instruction solely in English. ESL programs do not include the use of students' native language but focus primarily on teaching students English as well as using it to develop academic knowledge in the content area subjects (Texas Education Code, TEC, 2008).

Limited English Proficiency (LEP): A category used by governmental agencies to associate learners whose native language is not English and who are in the process of acquiring English as their second language. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2002 refers to LEP students as anyone aged three to twenty-one years of age who is enrolled in public K-12 school and whose native and home language is one other than English.

Dual Language: A type of bilingual education program also known as Early Exit or Transitional that serves students identified as LEP in both English and Spanish and transfers students to only-English instruction (TEC, 2008)

Bilingual Teacher: A professional educator who has completed certification requirements established by the State Board of Education Certification (SBEC) to provide instruction to students whose native and home language is one other than English, with the goal of supporting their students' academic development in the first language while also expanding their communication and academic skills in English.

Value Added: A statistical measure used to calculate an approximate effect of educational inputs on student outcomes; more specifically, student achievement as determined by standardized tests. In the local context, value added measures assert to calculate and quantify a teacher's role in student achievement and learning (McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz & Hamilton, 2004).

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Introduction

As stated above, the focus of this research is to examine the origin of the reasons why some bilingual students perform so well academically when part of a bilingual program but have some many problems being successful, academically and linguistically,

once they transition to an all-English classroom at the next grade level. In addition, it is essential to explore teachers' attitudes towards bilingual programs and the actual degree of implementation of such programs as a building block of students' future success in a second language classroom. Thus, for the purpose of this study, the review of the literature was developed through structured criterion. Since this study focuses primarily on the reasons why bilingual students exiting bilingual programs tend to have lower academic achievement after they are transitioned into English-only classrooms, the literature review encompasses only research studies that identify the population as Bilingual, English Language Learners, Limited English Proficiency children from ethnic minorities [that speak primarily Spanish as a first language], and those who may or may not be immigrants or children of immigrants.

The specific literature analyzed in this review is drawn from empirical research, including both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Given the critical role of the school context in the learners' development of their ability to act and participate in a second language, the literature review focuses solely on research conducted in U.S. schools that addresses the specific areas/programs of concern here (i.e., bilingual program implementation, ELLs, LEP students, etc.). In addition, all of these studies have been published in English and address target student populations within K – 12 educational environments.

The information collected, as well as the data used for the review of the literature covers a forty-year span, yet other salient studies completed prior to that time span may be included. The literature sampled is extracted from peer-reviewed journals and other reports, including books, book chapters, dissertations and other studies. The journal

searches were conducted using several large data bases – namely, Academic Search Premier, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and PsychoInfo. Subsequently, the articles were sought using the following key terms: transitional bilingual, bilingual, ELLs and academic achievement, bilingual teachers, English as a second language, language acquisition, LEP, bilingual program, etc.

Manual and computer-based searches were also carried out in specific journals relevant to elementary bilingual and K -12 ESL Education (American Journal of Education, California Law Review, Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages, Inc. [TESOL], The Elementary School Journal, Reading Research Quartertly, The Clearinghouse, The Reading Teacher, International Journal of Bilingualism and Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk) in order to consult potential studies to include in the literature review. While some of these sources are in-depth, area-specific research, this review of the literature is best defined as inclusive. Therefore, the literature review points out, comprises and includes all relevant research conducted with a broad subject focus. However, this literature review is guided by the boundaries already defined within the frame of this research project.

The sources compiled provide a strong review of the literature. Some of the major issues addressed in the current research regarding bilingual education are related to the need for the existence of such programs. Long before the United States became a nation, language diversity has been one of its most prominent aspects (Crawford, 2004). American history has been heavily influenced by the interaction of many languages in the same territories throughout the country –

starting with Native American languages and then, later, with the languages of multiple groups who emigrated from various parts of the world. The latter populations brought their unique languages and cultures with them. Among the more than two hundred and fifty languages spoken in United States, some of the languages spoken include English, Italian, German, Dutch, Polish, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Russian, and Thai (Nieto, 2009). Bilingual education has typically been linked to immigration, perhaps because "immigration has been one of the authenticities in the history of the United States of America" (Nieto, 2009 p. 61). In fact, immigration is not simply a phenomenon of the past; rather, it is a living, dynamic force relevant to our current society (Nieto, 2009). According to Fix & Passel (2003) more immigrants came into the U.S. during the 1990s than at any other time in the history of this country. In addition, the population of ELLs grew by a staggering 52% during the same decade. Although once characterized as a nation of mainly European immigrants in the early twentieth century, the United States is now being transformed by a significant influx of mostly Latin-American new-comers. Today, Latinos make up the largest minority group and are expected to reach a monumental 25% of the U.S. population by the year 2050 (Suarez-Orozco & Paez, 2002).

Another important aspect of this drastic demographic shift is assimilation. Typically, the linguistic integration pattern or language shift of new immigrants has been evidenced as lasting approximately three generations. Consequently, it is unlikely that the grandchildren of today's émigrés will speak and communicate in the language of their predecessors (Schmidt, 2000). Historically, assimilation has not necessarily been a painless process that was completely embraced by all groups (Urban & Wagoner, 2003). This has resulted in some languages being more tolerated than others. For instance, while

European languages were endowed with higher social status, languages used by Native Americans, African Americans, and people arriving from territories south of the Mexican border were intentionally assigned a rustic, lower status (Wiley, 1999).

Two fundamental issues must be mentioned in regard to the topic of assimilation: (1) immigrant students experience feelings of frustration when forced to relinquish their native language. And, in many ways, this process can isolate them from their families, who may have less access to mainstream culture given their language (Brisk, 1998) with a sense of ambivalence toward the value of their own culture (Bartolome, 2008; McArty, 2000; Nieto, 1992); and (2) the silencing and persistent ignoring of immigrant students' linguistic and cultural realities has salient affects upon their academic success (Crawford, 2004). Furthermore, the suppression of immigrant students' experiences may, in fact, be directly linked to the current patterns of lower academic achievement and increased drop-out rates among these populations (Crawford, 2004).

Before the twentieth century, the U.S. actively imposed the use of English upon Native Americans by sending their children to boarding schools – also refer to as "residential schools" –where students were taught the "official language". In addition to nearly eradicating native languages as a whole, these efforts also created a sense of shame among native children's use of their cultural language (Crawford, 1998; McArty, 2002; Nieto, 2009). Another approaches used in the suppression of divers languages were delimiting state borders to benefit English speakers, and deferring statehood until a critical mass of English speaking settlers was achieved. Then, in 1906, the Nationality Act was approved in Texas and English became the only language to be imparted during

school instruction, requiring all immigrants to be fluent in English in order to be considered for a naturalization process (Perez, 2004; Nieto, 2009).

Schmidt (2001) asserts that the justification for designating the English as the predominant language was predicated on the grounds that it would help to define a national identity. In addition, those vying for such designation held the belief that bilingualism and low intelligence essentially same. In 1917, Congress passed the Burnett Act, which required all immigrants to pass a literacy test and limited immigration from Asian countries. Later, in 1926, President Theodore Roosevelt added to the anti-bilingual sentiment by declaring that there would only be room for the English language in the United States. Crawford (1998) insists that the zeitgeist of the early 20th century was guided by two primary intentions: (a) to deprive minorities from demanding their rights, and (b) to brand the U.S. as a white, Anglo-Saxon community. This situation remained unchanged until the 1960s. In the 1920s, in *Meyer v.* Nebraska, The Supreme Court ruled that the prohibition to teach in a foreign language violated the Fourteen Amendment. On the same token, in *Farrington v. Tokushige*, The Supreme Court invalidated a law prohibiting foreign language instruction without a permit in Hawaii, this time under the Fifth Amendment. Various other cases reaffirming the right to teach and be taught in a language other than English were judged in different parts of the country.

In 1954, as a direct result of *Brown v. Board of Education,* the Court opened the doors to desegregation and more equal educational opportunity. With the Civil Rights Act and its Title VII (an initiative to bring bilingual education into law) desegregation and equality became the face adopted by multiple community organizations fighting to achieve recognition for the vital language and cultural differences between their

communities and the white communities (Nieto, 2009). Subsequently, a growing number of linguistic minorities that could not access meaningful opportunities prompted Congress to authorize the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. This legislation did not force school districts to implement bilingual education programs, but it did encourage them to utilize pedagogical methods aimed at helping low income and non-English speaking children. The primary purpose of the Bilingual Education Act was to provide funding for districts that would create programs that instructed children in their native language in order to assist in their transition into mainstream English classrooms (Cordasco, 1976; Schmid 2001; DelValle, 2003). In 1974, The Act was amended to specify programs; to establish specific goals and requirements; to broaden programmatic eligibility; and to eliminate the low income requirement of the initial version (Crawford, 1989).

In the same year, the *Lau v. Nichols* ruling mandated that school districts and boards must fund the programs and accommodations needed by children who did not speak English. According to Nieto (2009), DelValle (2003), and Crawford (2001), although *Lau v. Nichols* promoted transitional bilingual education, it provided few pragmatic solutions. Almost ten years later, in *Castaneda v. Pickard*, three requirements were defined by the Fifth Circuit in order to implement programs aimed at helping language minority children overcome the language barrier. According to the established requirements, these program must be (a) based on reliable educational theory; (b) they must have sufficient staffing and resources; and (c) they must show evidence that students are in fact learning English. During the 1980s, the “back to basics” movement produced several reports that harshly criticized the effectiveness of bilingual education,

but such reports were later defeated because they had purposefully ignored variables that would otherwise had given advantages to bilingual education programs (Nieto, 2009).

Then later, in 1994, the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized with the goal of promoting multicultural understanding and developing bilingual skills. This goal gave bilingual education the potential to serve as engine that could boost the U.S. future potential (Crawford, 2004; Nieto, 2009). A direct consequence of this reauthorization was the creation of developmental bilingual programs included the Two-Way Bilingual program. This particular program aimed at serving mainstream and language minority students by providing them a chance to learn a second language while in school. In 1994, California voters also approved proposition 187, making it illegal for children of undocumented immigrants to be served by public schools. Fortunately, this proposition was later declared unconstitutional, but it helped to re-ignite the debate in regard to the need for bilingual education. Next, in 1996, a proposed law declaring English the official language of U.S. government agencies was approved in the House but failed to be passed in the Senate.

In 1997, California approved proposition 227, which ended bilingual education programs in public schools and replaced them with English-only instruction. The same measures were approved in Arizona in 2000 and Colorado in 2001 (Crawford, 2004). The fatal blow to Bilingual Education came with the ironically titled *No Child Left Behind Act*, also known as NCLB, which was authorized by congress and signed into law in 2002. NCLB was a reauthorization of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Even though NCLB did not directly prohibit bilingual education, it blatantly

omitted all reference to it while imposing a system of standardized testing that promoted English-only instruction (Crawford, 2004).

The Nature of Bilingual Programs

The National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) (2005) defines bilingual education as "approaches in the classroom that use the native languages of English Language Learners for Instruction." The main goals of bilingual instruction include teaching English, nurturing academic achievement, helping immigrants' acculturation to a new society, preserving the minority groups' cultural and linguistic heritage, enabling English speakers to learn a second language, and any combination of these goals.

The nature of bilingual education is and has been controversial since its inception. In fact, the goals of bilingual education have their root in multiple different interpretations. Crawford (2001) states that the goals and nature of bilingual education in the U.S. have always lacked clarity; in particular, he questions whether the program was created to provide minority students the language skills required to succeed in U.S. schools, or whether they aimed to develop bilingual skills useful within American society as a whole. As they are implemented, very few bilingual education programs in the U.S. have the goal of developing bilingualism. The great majority of bilingual programs attempt to incorporate students in order to support their transition into English-only instruction, as well as their integration into mainstream American culture (Crawford, 2001). The nature of bilingual education can be framed, in the terms coined by Ruiz (1984), within the conceptions of *language as a problem*, *language as right*, and *language as a resource.* In the first instance, bilingual education has been dealt with as an

issue requiring a treatment to achieve proficiency. In the second instance, the issue has been studied from the perspective of equality of educational opportunity. Finally, in the last instance, it has been dealt with by focusing on the potential of increasing human capital as a means of enhancing the wealth of the nation (Crawford, 2001).

According to Federal Government (2010) updates on ELLs, providing equal educational opportunity to students who might not be proficient in English has become a serious challenge within our educational system. Learners whose home language is one other than English, or who communicate in English with significant difficulty, require special services. Regardless of the controversial the nature of the topic may be, the law defines Bilingual Education as a relevant pathway to address the challenges associated with educating ELL students.

Bilingual education programs in Texas serve not only immigrant children, but also those born in the U.S. from immigrant parents. The Texas Education Agency, TEC (2009) defines bilingual education programs as described in the following chart:

Bilingual Education Programs in Texas

Figure 2.1

Bilingual Program Description in Texas

Program	Means and Goals			
	POPULATION	SETTING HOW and	WHAT	TRANSITION TIME
Dual language/Early Exit/Transitional (*Transitional Bilingual/Early Exit* definition in TEC §29.066.)	Serves students identified as students of limited English proficiency in both English and Spanish and transfers students to English-only instruction	Provides instruction in literacy and academic content areas through the medium of the student's first language, along with instruction in English oral and academic language development	Non-academic subjects such as art, music, and physical education also may be taught in English	The transition will occur not earlier than two or later than five years after the student enrolls in school
Dual language/Late Exit/Developmental (*Transitional Bilingual/Late Exit* definition in TEC §29.066.)	Serves students identified as students of limited English proficiency in both English and Spanish and transfers a student to English-only instruction.	Academic growth is accelerated through cognitively challenging academic work in the students' first language along with meaningful academic content taught through the students' second language, English.	The goal is to promote high levels of academic achievement and full academic language proficiency in the students' first language and English.	The transition will occur not earlier than six or later than seven years after the students enroll in school
Two-Way Immersion (*Dual Language Immersion/Two-Way* definition in TEC §29.066.)	A biliteracy program that integrates students' proficient in English and students identified as students of limited English proficiency in both English and Spanish and transfers a student identified as a student of limited English proficiency to English-only instruction.	Instruction is provided to both native English speakers and native speakers of another language in an instructional setting where language learning is integrated with content instruction	Academic subjects are taught to all students through both English and the other language	Transition will occur not earlier than six or later than seven years after the student enrolls in school
Dual Language (*Dual Language Immersion/One-Way* definition in TEC §29.066.)	A biliteracy program that serves only students identified as students of limited English proficiency in both English and Spanish and transfers a student to English-only instruction	In an instructional setting where language learning is integrated with content instruction	Academic subjects are taught to all students through both English and the other language	Transition will occur not earlier than six or later than seven years after the student enrolls in school

(Source: TEC §29.066 , TEA 2009)

Academic achievement and bilingual education. In his 2002 work, Brittain reports that ELLs coming to the U.S. had negative feelings about their own capabilities to learn English rapidly. Those learners were inclined to perceive English proficiency as one of the major obstacles they had – not only in their ability to communicate, but also in relation to their opportunities to forge social relations and feel included in society. They shared experiences that led them to perceive English as the official language of

legalization required to be accepted into the collective structure – both within and outside of the school realm. To counteract such feelings, most advocates of bilingual education defend the use of native language in (at least) early education with the ultimate objective of affording uninterrupted cognitive development. It is also generally accepted that the attainment of the national language – in our case American English – is essentially and evidently linked to content learning and to the educational process provided in any form of bilingual programming.

Cummins (2000) asserts that some form of bilingual education is implemented in virtually every country. Prior to this assertion, Cummins and Krashen (1981) proposed a framework whose main theoretical point underlined the ability to transfer skills and knowledge between anyone's native language, and any other additional language(s). Under the condition of "quality education in the primary language," Krashen (1996) describes how the knowledge acquired through one's first language serves in understanding the second language, particularly in regard to the comprehension and literacy of, in this case, English.

Cummins (1983) asserts that the role of the students' first language is fundamental and foundational in the acquisition of a second language. Cummins (1983) makes the case for allowing students to participate in bilingual programs for a longer period of time; participation being the key, since students' academic language can take as much as three times longer to develop as his or her communicative ability. This work also suggests that, through the combined interaction with English speaking peers, various sources of media, and school academic experiences, children may require an average of only a few years to master their communicative abilities. Further, Cummins's (1981)

essential claim is that the ability to communicate on a day-to-day basis is dramatically different from the ability to develop academic skills in a second language.

Krashen (1984) hypothesizes that people acquire a second language when they receive intelligible input and when their affective filters such as self-confidence, motivation and anxiety are low enough to allow the input in. These affective filters are related to the subconscious aspects of second language acquisition. More recently, Krashen (2010) cites two studies that found very small differences between students placed in bilingual education programs and those in mainstream education programs. The first study, led by Robert Slavin of Johns Hopkins University, compared ELL students in five different states within the same instructional program over a five-year period – with the exception that one group had been taught only Spanish in their Kindergarten year, steadily introducing English until the program was completely in English by grade three. As reported by Krashen (2010), Slavin and his team found only extremely small differences between the two groups on English tests administered in grades three and four. The second study, led by Chistopher Jensen of the University of Kentucky, examined students performance data from California. Namely, students who had participated in bilingual education scored comparably on English tests in grades four and five as those children who were in the regular education program all along. Genesee, Lindholm, Sanders & Christian (2005) concluded that there exists critical parallels between the development of the first- and second language. In fact, learners use a wide array of linguistic, meta-cognitive and experiential sources in learning their first language; as much as when they are acquiring their second language. Some of these sources also have connections to the language they are developing *and* their home

language. Much of the research illustrates that both the amount of time students participate in a bilingual program as well as the time they are assessed influences the results. Bilingual students assessed in grades K-3 tend to score lower, or below grade level, when compared to equivalent group peers (Cazabon, Lambert & Hall, 1993). In contrast, the majority of students evaluated in upper elementary, middle, and high school illustrated that bilingually educated students achieved comparably or better than their peers, especially after participating in two-way or late-exit bilingual programs (Ramirez, 1992).

In their review of multiple studies, Genesee *et al*. (2005) conclude that none of the literature indicated that students who were educated in a bilingual program were less successful when compared with students from other on-level groups. Furthermore, Genesee *et al*. (2005) reported a positive correlation between students' academic achievement and the length of time spent within bilingual programs. Reporting on their review of the research performed by Fernandez & Nielsen (1986); Lindholm-Leary (2001); Nielsen & Lerner (1986) and Rumberger & Larson (1998); Genesee et al. (2005) point out that bilingual ability and biliteracy are positively related to academic achievement both in English and in Spanish. For instance, when compared with monolingual Hispanic students, research reveals that bilingual Hispanic students maintain higher achievement scores, better GPA scores, and adhere to more rigorous learning expectations. Finally, significant positive correlations were found between Spanish reading and English reading, English reading and English math, and between Spanish reading and Spanish math. Therefore, these findings suggest the existence of an intricate,

yet symbiotic affinity between language, literacy, and the likelihood of academic attainment for bilingual learners (Genesee et al., 2005).

Bilingual program implementation. Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 89 (TEA, 2007) states that "…every student in the state who has a home language other than English and who is identified as limited English proficient shall be provided a full opportunity to participate in a bilingual education or English as a second language program…." The statute goes on to provide that school districts enrolling 20 or more LEP students must offer a bilingual education program in grades PK-5 or PK-6 when appropriate. The statute also establishes the requirement that properly trained certified teachers be available to teach groups of students in bilingual programs. The fundamental goal of bilingual programs in Texas is to enable bilingual students to become proficient in comprehending, listening, speaking and writing in English through the use of the students' primary language as well as English. It is an expectation that the programs will emphasize the mastery of the English language and academic achievement in the content area subjects of mathematics, science and social studies.

Despite the provisions of the law, it is not uncommon for districts and schools to have to make decisions related to ensuring that teachers are mindful of which language they are using, and the need for revisiting the primary goals of bilingual programs from time to time. Several studies have shown the consequences related to teachers' language choice in bilingual classrooms. For example, patterns of teacher language use in bilingual classrooms were first observed by Phillips (1975) and Schultz (1975). While listening to teacher-student conversations, Phillips (1975) found that – during Spanish language instruction to native English-speaking children, and English language instruction to

native Spanish-speaking learners – there was a major difference in the frequency with which teachers switched from the language of instruction into students' native language. In the first case (i.e., while dealing with native English speakers) the Spanish teacher switched to English 104 times. Yet, while instructing Spanish-speaking students, the English teacher switched to Spanish only 2 times (Cazdem, 1978). In a similar study, Schultz (1975) recorded classroom talk and concluded that English was taught seventy percent of the time, thus indicating its presumed status as the more important language. He also observed that even during Spanish language arts, teachers would revert to English when it was time to give directions or reprimand someone (Schultz, 1975). Thus, Spanish was only used to teach the language itself.

Shultz (1975) suggests that the language used by teachers sent the message that English was, somehow, perceived as the predominant language. The observations described above suggest that a premeditated decision made by teachers as to what language to use or emphasize most often can convey a powerful message about the goals of the instructional program. Supporting the maintenance of students' first language as strongly as possible does not mean that teachers have the right to decide to reduce the amount of help students get to develop their second language (or the other way around). Furthermore, supporting students' second language acquisition does not imply walking away from using their first language as a means to increase proficiency in the second language (Cazdem, 1978). Given that children construe meaning and arrange schema contextually, language proficiency is directly related to the learner's frequency of language use during instruction.

The design of bilingual programs varies in scope, sequence, and implementation. And, in terms of students' use of their native language, a common thread runs through every program: the development students' oral proficiency and literacy. Hakuta, Butler & Witt (2000), Linholm-Leary (2001), and Thomas & Collier (2002) all agree that students' oral proficiency requires time to evolve, typically ranging from three to five years to reach advanced oral English proficiency. Beginning-to-middle level progress is described as relatively quiet, while middle-to-upper level proficiency seems to take longer (Genesee, 2005). Students' use of English during and outside of the instructional environment is positively associated with higher English proficiency, but such associations also depend greatly on the type of language interaction, and with whom one interacts. Hence, salient contextual interactions increase the likelihood that students will master the intricate aspects of their native language, such as phonological awareness, emergent literacy and sound-letter recognition.

The Bilingual Teacher and the Bilingual Program

Over the last ten years, U.S. public school systems have experienced a rapid rise in the number of students not adequately proficient in English. More importantly, these students are not granted equal opportunities to completely access and be successful with academic content in all of their courses. There is also a tendency for ELLs to come from poorer backgrounds, from less educated families, perform below average in standardized assessments and drop out of their high schools at higher rates than the rest of the population (Ballantyne, Sanderman & Levy, 2008). And, regardless of their specific linguistic background or language ability, teachers throughout the country are constantly

brought to the realization that serving these children presents a tremendously difficult challenge.

According the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA, 2007), the amount of ELLs in U.S. schools has grown by a staggering 57% during the last decade. In addition, almost 60% of ELLs qualify for free or reduced lunch. For ELL children in elementary school, approximately half had parents who had not completed high school and nearly a quarter of their parents had not been educated beyond grade nine. In Texas alone, almost eight hundred thousand children are in ESL or bilingual programs. In Harris County, Texas there are approximately one hundred and eighty thousand children being served in ESL or a bilingual program (approximately 22% of the State population). In Texas, ELLs receive instruction in a variety of settings including mainstream classrooms, English as second language classes, English immersion, and bilingual education programs. Furthermore, instructing ELLs requires teachers with skills in multiple curricular and instructional strategies. Texas is one of the few states that provide bilingual education programs, and which requires specific courses and separate certification for teachers who want to serve in bilingual education programs.

According to the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) (TEA, 2007), school districts are obligated to take the proper steps to appropriately assign certified bilingual teachers in order to staff the required program, or request emergency or special permits as allowed by the statute. TEA (2007) also provides special salary awards for teachers assigned to bilingual education programs, and the agency encourages districts to compensate teachers for their participation in continuing education programs that seek to enhance teachers' skills or qualifications in bilingual education. Bilingual education programs are clearly

defined with respect to amount of instructional time devoted to each language and how long the program should be presented (Genesee *et al*. 2008).

Beyond the legal requirements and provisions, bilingual teachers in bilingual programs that advance the academic success of ELLs require a clear understanding of all the constructs and second language acquisition in addition to the purposes and underlying principles for the model which they are assigned with implementing (Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Most fundamentally, teachers in bilingual programs need to have an understanding of the differential role of literacy and oral language in supporting ELL's academic achievement. Such understanding becomes increasingly relevant as these students transition from one grade level to the next, and as core subject areas delve into more theoretical, intricate, and language-dependent realms. When it comes to the bilingual program *per se*, Texas legislation provides for each school district that has such a program as to provide ELLs the opportunity to be enrolled in the mandatory program at her or his grade level. The legislation also called for teaching, pacing, and resources to be modified so ELLs in bilingual programs were provided the opportunity to master all fundamental knowledge and skills. In addition, bilingual education programs in Texas must be full-time programs of instruction in which students' home language, as well as English, is used in instructional and learning processes according students' individual levels of proficiency. The law also mandates that the State's adopted curriculum and materials should be utilized in all programs using Spanish and English instruction. Finally, the law defines the need for all bilingual education programs to address the affective, linguistic, and cognitive aspects of all ELL's education (TAC, 2007).

Teacher beliefs and attitudes about bilingual/English language learners. As summarized throughout this chapter, the number of students for whom English is an additional language continues to increase in U.S. public schools. Teachers are entrusted with shaping the academic success among this particular population of students. In a large study implemented in Texas, it was found that teachers with standard certification were truly more successful in preparing their students academically than teachers who did not have a standard certification or those who had substandard certification. This study also concluded that, in regard to teachers' preparation, certification does matter because it demonstrates the basic understanding of the knowledge required to address the learning needs of the students (Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin & Vasquez Heilig, 2005).

As reported by Ballantyne, Sanderman & Levy (2008), however, professional development opportunities for practicing certified teachers are very limited at state and district levels. In fact, the research shows that while nearly 80% of those teachers took part in curriculum related trainings, only 26% had staff development related to ELLs. Other studies have highlighted the importance of teachers' attitudes and feelings. Such studies indicate that a large number of teachers are unprepared and uncomfortable with their lack of understanding in this particular area. According to a 2001 survey, only 27% of the teachers surveyed felt well prepared to address the needs of ELLs, while 12% reported they felt they were not prepared at all (U.S Department of Education, NCES, 2001). As cited Ballantyne *et al*. (2008), on a different survey, Alexander, Heaviside & Harris (1999) found that, from a sample of 1200 teachers, 57% expressed the need for more information about how to work effectively with ELLs. In a different study, in which a group of 279 teachers worked at a district with a very small group of enrolled ELLs,

81% of the teachers believed they did not have sufficient preparation to teach ELLs effectively, and approximately half of the teachers wanted to gain more knowledge of instructional strategies in order to teach ELLs (Reeves, 2006).

Tatto (1996) explains that teachers' beliefs may influence teaching practices; namely, their instructional practices become stable and resist change. In his study, he evaluated the influence of teacher preparation programs as a critical factor in shaping values and beliefs in relation to teaching students from diverse backgrounds. The goal of the study was to indentify whether teachers were expected to adopt and develop novel perspectives in regard to students from diverse populations. One of the salient findings of this study was that teacher educators held that there must be some form of differential treatment. When asked whether students should be taught in English, the participants (consisting of regular teaching faculty to student teachers) revealed a wide spectrum of beliefs, which demonstrated there was no clear consensus between the groups. In a different item, Tatto (1996) expected to discover whether or not the faculty expected graduates to belief that instruction should be tailored to students' needs. The study concluded that graduates did, in fact, hold such beliefs, but when asked about which standards to be used to assess diverse students, faculty input showed a great extent of ambiguity and lack of general agreement.

Karabenick & Clemens Noda (2004) surveyed 729 teachers in multiple settings, and some of the items in their instrument addressed teachers' beliefs about ELLs. In addition, the items regarding beliefs about ELLs were correlated with items regarding attitudes toward ELLs. The conclusions of the study indicated that in the area of beliefs about second language acquisition and its relationship between literacy and academic

skills, 80% of the teachers reported it was possible to be proficient in more than one language; however, 52% of participants believed that one's native language impedes the acquisition of a second language, and 23% were not sure about their beliefs. Among the same conclusions, 66% reported that being fluent in one's first language assists literacy in the second language; furthermore, 42% of the respondents pointed to the fact that developing literacy in one's first language aids ELLs' overall academic performance in school. Twenty-two percent of the teachers reported that those students nearing English fluency do not have difficulties performing in the content areas; yet, 34% of teachers were not sure. In regard to beliefs about support for ELLs, 46% of the teachers believed ELLs did not represent a problem to their building or staff. Conversely, however, 30% of respondents thought that ELLs were perceived less than favorably by the staff. When asked about the parents of ELLs, 42% of the teachers reported that parents should learn English, as opposed to maintaining their native language. In addition, almost 60% of the respondents deemed parents of ELLs not as non-ELL parents. Further, when asked about the time and attention that they provide to their students individually, 66% of teachers believed that ELLs take more time and dedication when compared with other student populations. In relation to teachers' attitudes towards ELLs, 70% of the respondents claimed that they would receive and welcome ELLs into their classrooms; but, when asked if they would like to have ELLs in their classrooms, only 43% agreed with the statement, and most were uncertain or had an unfavorable attitude toward ELL in their classrooms.

Few research projects have focused on how teacher expectations might be implemented to impact students' academic success, particularly from the purview of

bilingual education (Johnson, 2000). Furthermore, teacher beliefs in relation to environmental aspects like school, district, state, and community politics in relation to the view of native language instruction, have not been systematically studied in bilingual education. Therefore, in a study entitled *Case Studies of Expectation Climate at Two Bilingual Education Schools*, Johnson (2000) specifically examined to separate constructs: (a) the effect of beliefs and practices of bilingual and monolingual teachers in relation to the academic success of ELLs, and (b) teachers attitudes towards bilingual / English language. The two schools selected from a sample of elementary schools in Texas with consideration to the following criteria, as per the Academic Excellence Indicator System Report (AEIS) (Texas Education Agency, 1993): (a) student population of at least 40% limited English proficient (LEP), (b) 65% low socioeconomic status, (c) 80% minority, and (d) the existence of a bilingual program in each school. In addition, the schools were selected from a representative sample of rural and urban settings in Texas. In the rural school, 25 of the 48 teachers participated in this study; in the urban school, 13 of the 18 teachers participated in the study. Both of the schools in the study had similar demographics with regard to student population (i.e., mainly Spanish-speaking students in elementary urban school settings from low income families).

One major difference between the schools, however, was that one was located in a small district and the other in a fairly large district. The environment and individual characteristics of each school were very different as well. One school (Levin Elementary) was located in a larger district, and the instructional staff developed their own curriculum guided by an accelerated educational model that followed the district curriculum. Levin also provided continuous first language instructional support to ELLs from kindergarten

through grade sixth. The other school (Valle del Sol) was located in the smaller district, provided their teachers with a curriculum based on essential educational skills, and was guided by a scope and sequence with limited native language support that did not go beyond the middle of their second grade. In contrast to the teachers at Valle del Sol, teachers at Levin showed a greater sense of ownership of the educational program, and a greater sense of shared common vision and philosophy for the implementation of the program. Using a 117 item instrument, the study sought to focus on the areas regarding teachers' perceptions for student achievement and perceived leadership support. Teachers' perceptions about ELL achievement produced two different instructional approaches. The study revealed that the curriculum at Valle del Sol had very little teacher input and was strict in skill-based scope and sequence. Conversely, Levin's curriculum was guided by district curriculum with teacher developed units; it had projects and choices for the students; and its teachers provided consistency in terms of language use and expectations, which was not the case at Valle del Sol. It is also important to note that teachers at Valle del Sol cited students' lack of motivation as a contributing factor to student failure, while teachers at the Levin School did not mention student motivation as a trait influencing student achievement.

The teachers at Valle del Sol also indicated that parental involvement was critical for their top performing students; yet, parental support was not stated as the determining force behind student achievement by teachers at the Levin School. When questions about teachers' ability to motivate ELLs to achieve, 34% of bilingual teachers and 17% of monolingual teachers said motivation depends on students' individual environment, while none at Levin agreed with the statement affirming that teachers cannot motivate students.

Teachers at Valle del Sol believed that lack of English proficiency was the cause of student failure, but teachers at Levin did not cite it as a defining factor. When analyzing teachers' input in relation to the value of the use of ELL's native language, the teachers at Levin were more inclined to implement bilingual programs that they perceived to be effective at increasing student achievement than the teachers at Valle del Sol. Instead, the latter group typically followed a bilingual program guided by school guidelines. Furthermore, at Valle del Sol, 39.5% of the bilingual teachers and 19.3% of the monolingual teachers in grades K-5 agreed that ELLs needed 50% or more instructional time in their native language through the second grade at most, and 0% thereafter. Yet, at Levin, 51% of bilingual teachers and 72.2% of non-bilingual teachers supported the use of ELL's native language consistently from grades K to 5. When valuing the use of ELL's native language during instruction, teachers at Levin provided ELLs with higher levels of Spanish than teachers from Valle del Sol. The teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of the bilingual program in their respective schools demonstrated that teachers at Levin ranked their programs on a higher scale than did teachers at Valle del Sol. The difference in rating between the two schools was a direct result of Levin teachers' perceptions of Spanish. Johnson (2000) concluded that teachers' beliefs and attitudes cannot be changed without a school-level transformation. Therefore, teachers' beliefs about ELLs are heavily influenced by whether or not the school culture itself has embraced the notion that ELLs *can*, in fact, achieve academically.

Penfield (1987) sought to uncover regular teachers' beliefs and assumptions in regard to ELL students and the instructors of these students. Using an open-ended questionnaire, this researched sought input from 179 teachers who had ELLs in their

classrooms but had no specific training to address their needs. Penfield sorted the teachers' responses into five broad categories: (a) programmatic setting and instruction, (b) training needs, (c) ELLs and their parents, (d) peer interaction, and (e) the role of the ESL teacher. For the first category, the results showed that over 60% of the respondents thought the regular classroom was better than a segregated one for ELLs. In addition, 21% showed a preference for the bilingual classroom, while 18% favored the ESL-only classroom. In relation to their training needs, participants indicated they lacked the capacity to deal with ELLs and their families. For the third category, ELLs and their parents, participants explained that ELLs were easy to discipline, but that the students tended to be passive and introverted. Next, regarding peer interaction, responses supported the view that ELLs tend to band together and isolate themselves from the regular group. Finally, when asked about the role of the ELL teacher, participants took five different roles: language/reading teachers, subject-matter teachers, interpreters, and consultants. Penfield's (1987) conclusion highlights the need for ESL and ELL teachers to be able to share instructional techniques to address academic achievement and language development with their peers.

Walker, Shafer, & Lams (2004) explored teachers' attitudes towards ELLs with a focus on content-area classrooms. 422 teachers from elementary and secondary schools participated in their survey. In addition, the researchers interviewed six ELL teachers in the Midwestern region of the United States. The study included teachers in three different schools located in white, homogeneous communities – one school with a minimal or zero number of ELLs, another one which began enrolling high numbers of ELLs very recently, and a third school serving a migrant community with an extensive story of

segregated ELL students. The survey sought to address five different dimensions: (a) teachers' attitudes about ELLs, (b) teachers' self-value in instructing ELLs, (c) ELL's influence on teachers' knowledge, (d) practice and views about learning English as a second language, (e) and perceptions about school openness to ELL programs/students. In regard to subject and teachers' perceptions of ELLs, the study showed that 18% of all participants reported that ELLs do well in school. A large majority of participants responded that ELLs perform poorly in school or provide no answer at all. In addition, seventy-seven percent reported no interest in serving ELLs; 87% responded they had no training in serving ELLs; and 51% said they would not want training regardless of its availability. Sixty-eight percent perceived that their school was open to ELLs. Regarding the effectiveness of education tailored specifically to ELLs, the study concluded that 15% of participants said students would learn better if they were banned from using their native language, and 46% responded neutrally. In reference to the type of learning community, the study showed that schools serving migrant students tend to have the most stereotypical and negative attitudes towards ELLs. Schools enrolling low numbers of ELLs had more positive views about ELLs but were less disposed to want them in their classrooms; and, finally, schools which have recently enrolled large numbers of ELLs were the most likely to want ELLs in their classrooms. Walker *et al*. (2004) discuss findings that point to how teachers with little or no experience in serving ELLs tend to have more positive attitudes toward them.

Shin and Krashen (1996) investigated teachers' perceptions of bilingual education by exploring the relationships between teachers' attitudes toward the underlining principles of bilingual education and student participation in bilingual programs. The

researchers' goal was to address two ideas: (a) teachers' understandings and attitudes toward the bilingual education theoretical construct and how their understanding or attitude related to the support of students participating in the bilingual program, and (b) determining the influential factors of teachers' attitudes toward bilingual education. Seven hundred and ninety-four elementary and secondary teachers participated in the study. The instrument used focused on the following contructs: (1) attitudes towards bilingual education, (2) percentage of Limited English Proficient students in the classroom (i.e., LEP or ELLs, for our case), (3) ESL training/credentials, (4) self-rating proficiency in another language, and (5) teaching experience in years. The study drew very important conclusions regarding teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward bilingual education – namely, 29% of the classrooms served from 20-40% ELLs and 21% of the classrooms instructed between 40% and 70% ELLs. Participants supported or agreed with the theoretical construct of bilingual education for the most part. In addition, 74% of the teachers agreed that literacy is transferred from the first to the second language, and 70% concurred that learning a subject matter in one's first language is helpful in understanding subject matter in English. However, only 50% to 60% of the respondents showed support for students who were placed in bilingual programs. The study also concluded that as more teachers served higher numbers of ELL, the more support they would express for the bilingual program *and* second language fluency. Shin & Krashen (1996) also underline the divergence between teachers' attitudes toward the bilingual education constructs and actual ELL participation in the program.

Garcia-Nevarez, Stafford & Arias (2005) assert that teachers' common views can both positively and negatively influence students in their classrooms. For instance,

teachers holding negative attitudes towards languages other than English may affect the children they serve in a negative manner.

The School Leader and the ELL Population

Leadership is another critical factor necessary for ensuring that ELLs are granted opportunities for educational success and achievement. Evidence from multiple bodies of research confirms that school leaders and teachers are the two most important factors in student success and improving student achievement, especially in relation to urban schools in high need areas. The school leader provides direction and exercises influence in shaping a school's individual circumstances in order for teachers to be most effective, and to provide students an educational environment conducive to high level of academic achievement. School leaders provide the stability required for schools to create and develop a strong instructional foundation (Seashore, Leithwood, Walstrom & Anderson, 2010).

According to Capps, Fix, Murray, Ox, Passel and Herwantoro (2005), California, Texas, New York, Florida and Illinois account for 68 percent of elementary school ELLs. This does not hide the reality that ELLs and their families are moving into states where immigrant populations have not been part of the traditional make up of the society. These shifts in demographics represent challenges, but they present various opportunities as well. One notable challenge is that teachers in regions experiencing a deluge of new ELLs may not be adequately equipped to serve speakers of other languages. Language is a fundamental function in teaching. When teaching fluent English speakers, teachers create stories, explanations, make connections and construct meaning just by opening their mouths (Flynn & Hill, 2005). Teachers of ELLs must think about language

strategically and carefully, and have to adjust their instructional arrangements, to address the needs of ELLs. Teachers must employ such practices with the purpose of making all students successful, but these practices are also mandated under state and federal laws to meet the learning needs of ELLs. Thus, such an auspicious environment offers school leaders the opportunity to adopt a welcoming attitude toward ELLs, and to establish meaningful two-way communication channels with families to support the programs that serve them. In addition, school leaders are under the obligation to train their school staff in the legal requirements established for serving ELLs, and to support them in their instructional efforts to implement such programs. Hence, leaders are obligated to provide school staff with professional development opportunities aimed at making ELLs' success a priority. Most importantly, school leaders must ensure ELLs are integrated into the core instructional program and expect that all ELLs achieve in the content areas. Finally, the school leader must make sure programs serving ELLs are monitored, evaluated, and adjusted as necessary to better help encure ELLs success, not only in acquiring English a second language but also in developing the academic proficiency that will help them progress academically throughout their lives (Flynn & Hill, 2005). Research shows that school leaders can fundamentally impact ELL achievement by influencing teachers motivation and supporting positive working conditions that can significantly alleviate some of the challenge associated with teaching ELLs (Seashore, Leithwood, Walstrom & Anderson, 2010).

Transitions and Transitional Issues

As mentioned, there are near one million students in Texas who are classified as ELLs. There are over a hundred different languages spoken in the homes of those

children, despite the fact that Spanish is the dominant language in the group. Every single one of those students have must complete an evaluation process before even being placed in a classroom. As the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) sets forth in Sub Chapter 89.1220, each school district (by local board policy) should establish and operate a language proficiency assessment committee, also known as LPAC committee, along with the procedures to select, appoint, and train the LPAC committee members.

The LPAC committee, as defined by the statute, is charged with the following responsibilities: (1) evaluate the language proficiency of each ELL in accordance with statutory guidelines, (2) appoint the level of academic achievement of each ELL (a process subject to parental approval), (3) decide the instructional placement of each ELL in the required programs, (4) assist ELLs' participation in other programs they may be eligible for under federal, state, and local legislation, and (5) classify students as English proficient under state guidelines and recommend their exit from the bilingual education or ESL program. In order for students to be exited from the bilingual program and transitioned into an all-English instructional setting, ELLs can be categorized as English proficient based upon three specific criteria: (1) ELL has met minimum standard on a Texas Education Agency-approved assessment designed to measure the degree to which the student has reached oral and written language proficiency and explicit language skills in English; (2) ELL has met the minimum performance standard on the standardized reading assessment instrument under the Texas Education Code, §39.023 Section(a), which as of 2010 is the TAKS reading assessment, *or* a TEA-approved English language arts assessment tool administered in English, *or* range among the 40th percentile or higher on both the English reading and the English language arts sections of

a TEA-approved, norm-referenced evaluation instrument for students enrolled in Grade 1 or 2; and (3) the ELL has met minimum standard on a TEA-approved criterion-referenced written test when available, and thorugh the results of a subjective teacher evaluation. Specifically, as of 2010, this assessment is known as the Texas Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS). Furthermore, in order to verify if an ELL who has been transitioned from a bilingual program into an all-English instructional setting, the LPAC committee should use the following criteria: (1) the ELL passes the English version of TAKS for her grade level, and (2) the ELL has passing grades in all subjects and courses taken (TEA, TEC, 2007). At the end of the 2003 school year, TAKS results for ELLs were dismal – namely, the passing rate for all tests taken by ELLs ranged from 50% at the fourth grade to 12% in the tenth grade. In fact, concern was such that the TEA 2007 – 2011 Strategic Plan included a provision creating an initiative to enhance support for ELL programs. The purpose of this initiative was to provide rigorous instructional programming for ELL students as well as training and other resources to assist teachers in gaining the expertise required to help ELLs become proficient and academically successful.

In another instance, the 2001 *No Child Left Behind* Act established standardized annual assessments of reading and mathematics for all students at specific grade levels (in schools receiving Title I and Title III funds), and purposely incorporates ELLs into the state accountability system. Although schools may choose to exempt ELLs from standardized testing in English for up to 3 years, they must evaluate English language proficiency annually with no exemption (Genesee, 2005).

Multiple meaningful studies have been carried out in support of bilingual programs based on the theory of interdependence, which states that skills acquired in the leaner's first language assist in the acquisition of–or transfer into–the second language (Baker, 2006; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Other research has concludes that ELLs who fall behind due to language barriers develop academic gaps that are often extremely hard to close (Tashakkori, Ochoa, & Kemper, 1999; Viadero, 2001).

Lopez & Tashakkori (2004) conducted a case study whose goal was to scrutinize the effects of language use, and language development process, in regard to the achievement gap in a predominately Hispanic elementary school with students from a variety of different socioeconomic status. This particular study followed eighty-seven ELL Kindergarteners classified as at-risk with a low level of English proficiency, and at-risk Kindergarten students that were English proficient. Both groups of ELLs were classified at-risk due to their low performance in comparison to other students within the same grade level. The low level at-risk, Spanish proficient ELLs were instructed in an English as a Second Language Program in which Spanish was used for at least 30% of the school day and English for at least 70% of the day. Those students classified as English proficient received instruction in English with a supplemental two and one-half hours of language arts in Spanish per week over a period of two years. During a two-year period the researchers separated the two participating at-risk groups to receive the treatments described. Students were administered pretests and posttests at the beginning of Kindergarten and first grade, and the curriculum content was the same for both groups with the exception of language use for language use. To ensure the proper measurement of students' literacy growth in Kindergarten and the first grade, two separate district-

based assessments were administered to determine the literacy goals and objectives associated to the districts' language arts curriculum. These test results identified major differences between the pretest scores of the two groups in kindergarten. However, at the end of the study, students' assessment scores upon conclusion of the first grade showed no major academic differences between groups. More importantly, the study revealed that at-risk ELLs who were enrolled in the English as a Second Language program reached satisfactory levels of academic achievement.

De la Garza and Medina (1985) examined the immediate impact of bilingual education when using native language instruction. During this study, researchers compared ELL students in a bilingual program to English proficient students in a monolingual program in a public school in Tucson, Arizona. The low English proficiency ELLs who participated in the bilingual program received 75% of the instructional time in Spanish in the first grade, 70% of the time in Spanish in the second grade, and 50% of the time in Spanish in the third grade. In addition, subject areas were alternately taught in English and Spanish (depending upon the students' level of English proficiency); however, the reading curriculum was taught entirely in Spanish. The English proficient students in the monolingual program received all-English instruction. Participating students were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT, 2000) at the end of the second grade. The results showed that the students who received all-English instruction performed slightly better than the ELL students who received native language instruction. At the end of the third grade, the students in this study were assessed using the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) in word recognition and decoding. In this test, the native language group scored higher that the monolingual by a difference of over

ten points. ELL students who received native language instruction outperformed the comparison group at a significant level.

In an effort to corroborate the benefits of native language instruction in bilingual programs, Saldate, Mishra, and Medina (1985) examined the long-term effects of this approach in order to establish the overall impact of native language instruction, even after students exited bilingual programs. In order to explore the permanent or long-term effects of bilingual education, a group of ELLs previously enrolled in a bilingual program was studied. This ELL group received instruction in their native language until grade six. From the seventh-grade through grade twelve this group of students was transitioned into monolingual programs, where they received all-English instruction. In addition, researchers tracked this group of students through grade twelve. The academic achievement of these students was then compared to that of students in monolingual classrooms at the same grade level who had received similar all-English instruction.

The results of standardized tests on both groups of students revealed that no significant differences existed between the two groups. In regard to long-term achievement on standardized assessments for students in the bilingual and monolingual programs this study showed the following: bilingual students scored a mean of 44.78% by their sixth-grade, while their monolingual peers scored a mean of 46.23%; eight-grade bilingual students scored a mean of 46.82%, while monolingual students scored a mean of 47.83%; bilingual students in grade twelve scored a mean of 49.57%, and monolingual students in the same grade scored a mean of 52.82%. The adjusted means for the reading comprehension assessments, when comparing bilingual vs. monolingual students, revealed the following for grades five and seven: Fifth-grade bilingual students scored

4.6%, and monolingual students scored 5.09%; seventh-grade bilingual students scored 21.36%, while monolingual students scored 23.82%. In addition, ELLs' performance on the Stanford 9 reading test (for students in a bilingual class as compared to students in English-only programs in Arizona) indicated that students in bilingual programs attained slightly higher means scores than English-only students in grades two through eleven. These explicit comparisons are as follows: two bilingual = 37.2%, monolingual = 37.0%; Grade three bilingual = 35.9%, monolingual = 32.3%; Grade four bilingual = 38.4%, monolingual = 33.8%; Grade five bilingual = 32.4%, monolingual = 31.6%; Grade six bilingual = 34.7%, monolingual = 34.3%; Grade seven bilingual = 33.4%, monolingual = 31.8%; Grade eight bilingual = 35.4%, monolingual = 32.6%; Grade nine bilingual = 33.4%, monolingual = 27.7%; Grade ten bilingual = 33.6%, monolingual = 25.5%; and Grade eleven bilingual = 33.4%, monolingual = 26.9%.

In summary, Lopez & Tashakkori; Krashen, Park, & Seldin, *and* Saldate *et al*., agreed that the use of the native language in bilingual programs facilitated the acquisition of a second language. And, these researchers contend that teachers' use of students' native language serves to facilitate academic progress. Lastly, the researchers concluded that students tested while in bilingual programs, or immediately after they exit the program, perform as well – or better than – their monolingual peers.

The transitional learner. The expectation today in Texas is that students entering the fifth-grade or, at the latest, middle school are proficient and ready to transition into all-English classes, or have already done so. However, the number of ELLs enrolled at the middle school level is extremely high when compared to the previous history of public education in the U.S. Furthermore, the current ELL high enrollment is closely

correlated with the extremely high dropout rates of Hispanic/Latino students from secondary schools, particularly at a time when secondary ELLs are required to attain even higher levels of education and develop solid academic proficiency in English (Rubinstein-Avila, 2003). Students who have been transitioned into an all-English instructional setting continue to be ELLs.

The fact that they are not being served in their native language does negate the issues around their education. Once transitioned, they become a vastly heterogeneous group – diversity being one of their most unique characteristics. Students in transitional all-English classes differ in their previous formal schooling experiences and programs, but also on levels of proficiency in their first language and English language. Furthermore, ELLs in transitional programs are often perceived as elements of particular groups rather than unique individuals (Rubinstein-Avila, 2003). The transitional ELL student is one who depends heavily on creating bonds with their teachers. Nieto (2000) states that the bond ELLs create with their teachers has a tremendous influence on their achievements. The importance of this bond is underlined by numerous studies that have documented how vulnerable ELLs can be, especially those with a Latino background. Latino students often endure inappropriate or poor instructional experiences, and often do not have access to challenging content or classrooms and schools with high expectations. In addition, schools lack the strategies and, at times, the willingness to involve parents in their children's schooling and education; thus, increasing the likelihood of student drop-out. Furthermore, Latino ELLs are evaluated based exclusively on standardized testing, which leads to narrowed instruction and curriculum based on preparing students to perform at minimum standard for these tests, many times at the expense the ELL's needs

(Bartolome & Balderrama, 2001; Crawford, 2004). In order to succeed academically, Latino ELLs require environments that provide them the bridges to connect their language, culture and experiences, and background knowledge to the curriculum being taught (Crawford, 2004; Cummins, 2000).

The fact that ELLs have been transitioned into an all-English instructional setting does not necessarily mean they have attained their highest level, that they have fully developed their proficiency in English, or that they are, subsequently, ready to achieve. According to Rubinstein-Avila (2003), ELLs who have transitioned are proficient in oral English and their ELL status is questioned by content area teachers. However, teachers are often unaware that many of these ELLs have been labeled as such since they entered early childhood or elementary grades because they have not been able to achieve above the 36th percentile on standardized tests. Many ELLs who have been transitioned into all-English classes struggle with reading. This skill is essential in acquiring content area knowledge, and many ELLs still spend tremendous amounts of energy decoding and have not yet developed the strategies required to draw basic meaning from a given reading passage. On the other hand, despite of their limited vocabulary development, some students demonstrate sophisticated reading comprehension skills. Others may decode and understand at grade level but are unable to activate their background knowledge in order to interrelate with and interpret texts, or connect with their individual meanings and circumstances. Citing Ivey's (1999) description of a struggling reader, Rubinstein-Avila (2003) asserts that struggling ELLs have yet to develop their ability to read "strategically and purposefully by the sixth grade" (p.291). But not all ELLs can be designated under this category. Despite these daunting statistics, it is important to note that thriving

schools, programs, and environments do exist. These are hopeful places where ELLs flourish, succeed, and have proven that they can achieve at the same or higher levels as students from other sub-groups.

What comes after transition / English Language Learners' academic achievement in a second language: the possibilities. According to the U.S. Department of Education Federal update on ELL demographics (2010), in 2007, the Hispanic subgroup comprised the largest and fastest growing minority in schools. About seven million Hispanic elementary and secondary students spoke a language other than English at home. When compared with ELLs of South-American and other Central-American, Mexican and Cuban background, Dominican and Salvadoran students were the largest group who spoke a language other than English at home. Also, Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics or Latinos had the lowest percentages of students who spoke a language other than English at home. Furthermore, those ELLs from Mexico, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Central-American origins show higher rates of difficulty speaking English when compared with South-American, Puerto Rican, and other Hispanic or Latino ELLs who also had difficulty speaking English.

The transition from bilingual education programs to mainstream all-English instruction is often extremely traumatic both for ELLs and their teachers. Such transitions often produce a dip in students' academic achievement, especially if ELLs have yet to develop their English proficiency or if the transition is sudden (Gersten, 1996). The transition usually occurs in grades three, four or five, and typically follows a qualification process dictated by local or state policy. Most schools, however, end their bilingual programs at grades four and at times in grade three. These transitions are also

characterized by lower ELLs participation in instruction, reductions in academic performance, and negative effects in relation to their sense of cultural belonging. Students often struggle to understand teacher instructions and become frustrated at their own difficulty to express their thinking adequately in English. From the students' perspective, English may still be a strange second language. For the purposes of these study only students transitioning to all-English at grade five will be considered.

Despite the challenges, the statistics, and the clearly documented lack of teacher preparation for the education of ELLs, some studies have illustrate that ELLs can and will achieve academically within the appropriate conditions, and when essential support systems are in place. In a research project conducted by the Mauricio Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy at UMass Boston, researchers sought to inquire into schools where Latino students are succeeding academically as measured by standardized tests. Boston has the largest number of Latinos in Massachusetts. In 2003, Latinos had the highest poverty rate with a 27% of poor families; 17% of Latino males and 23% of Latinas live below the poverty line. Latinos are also the largest group working low-paying jobs and, in turn, the smallest group with high-paying professions. Two elementary schools, one middle school, and two high schools where Latinos have the highest academic achievement were chosen in Boston. The population of Latinos in these schools comprised 60% of students enrolled in the advanced and proficient categories of the state's assessment in English language arts and math; and only about 15% were failing both. Academic achievement for the Latino population in the district where the study was conducted shows that in the school year 2005, 63% of Latino students in grade 10 were failing or needed improvement, 22% achieved at the proficient

level and a meager 5% were advanced. ELLs in the district showed an 86% were in the Need Improvement, Warning/Failing category. ELLs represented 0% of the students scoring in the advanced level.

With the purpose of understanding how schools can create a counter narrative that overcomes the belief that being Latino is connected to academic failure, this study led to a variety of different conclusions. Importantly, the study found that schools where Latinos are successful academically have several common traits: (1) schools focus on the construction of paths to help Latino students see themselves as thriving future professionals supporting and contributing to their communities; (2) school climate is nurturing and openly affective; (3) schools take responsibility for the promotion of academic success by including all students in a culture of achievement that actively engages them; (4) schools have a positive and empathetic view of Latino families and students where families are seen as engaged in their children's education and recognize the linguistic and cultural challenges of immigrant families; (5) school culture and organization support learning by creating a sustained climate of support for educational and societal achievement, where school administration provides the necessary resources and support for teachers to be successful, and where collaboration is common thread; and (6) the school's mission, vision, organization, culture, climate, instruction, family and community relations display a high level of alignment (Reyes, Nieto & Diez, 2008).

At the classroom level, being sensitive to ELLs needs does not require feelings of pity on the part of teachers (Rubinstein-Avila, 2003). Instead, it demands the creation an environment of high expectations with the implementation of some instructional variation, such as slight adjustments in pacing and being consistently mindful of clearly

articulating while speaking. It also requires the abbreviation of difficult explanations when enunciating a problem or providing directions (Echavarria & Graves, 1998). In one case study, with an ELL who had been transitioned into all-English instruction, Rubinstein-Avila (2003) found that ELLs continue developing after being transitioned. First and foremost, ELLs might not have the highest achievement record, but they are greatly aware about their own learning and can be motivated to enlarge their knowledge base in English. Regardless of the individual intelligence levels, the academic language needed to demonstrate academic achievement also challenges ELLs. These students benefit from opportunities to be heard and receive enough attention from teachers through being placed in small content-area groups. In addition, ELLs benefit from being given instructional opportunities to have oral language interaction through class discussions or conversations with their peers. ELLs tend to do better when their progress and performance is communicated to them in a clear and consistent manner. ELLs often assume the intermediating role between their cultures (i.e., the new culture their parents have immigrated into and the culture associated with their 1st language) and the guiding linguistic mediator who addresses the needs of their families and their communication with the world that surrounds them. ELLs know very well they do not want to go through the same or similar experiences as their parents. Hence, they critically understand how important it will be to develop English proficiency and to be successful in school. ELLs learn a great deal when provided structured choices, multiple chances in multiple ways, and when they receive the *"authority"* to own their learning (Rubinstein-Avila, 2003, p. 298). ELLs are more likely to develop English proficiency at higher levels when they acquire the applicable strategies that can be reused as needed. Finally, the most crucial

aspect that appears to benefit ELLs' achievement is their relationship with teachers, instructional staff, and schools that they feel care for them and respect them. Lastly, such environments must also afford them the quality academic and educational tools needed to be successful both on standardized tests and in society as a whole.

Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

The specific purpose of this study is to examine the origin of the reasons why some bilingual students perform particularly well academically when part of a bilingual program, yet have so many problems being successful academically and linguistically once they are transitioned to an all-English classroom at the next grade level. Further, this study will examine the reasons other ELLs continue to demonstrate academic success after this transition. In addition, it is fundamental to explore teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards bilingual programs, and the actual degree of implementation of such programs as a building block of students' future success in a second language classroom. More explicitly, this study addresses two general issues: (a) what are the reasons behind ELLs' low performance after they transition from a bilingual to all-English instructional program, and (b) how are the bilingual and ESL teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards bilingual programs, and their required implementation, related to students' mastery of the English language?

Research Questions

This study investigates the reasons why some bilingual students perform well academically while they are part of a bilingual instructional program tend to fail after they are transitioned into an all-English setting while others continue to do well. Secondly, the study examines the bilingual and ESL teachers' attitudes and beliefs

toward those bilingual programs as they relate to their students' later success in an all-English classroom. This research specifically explores the following lines of inquiry:

1. Are there any differences across elementary teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards the implementation of *bi*-lingual programs associated with students' academic and linguistic success in later all-English grades?
2. What are the reasons why do bilingual students who perform well academically during the time they are taught and tested in their native language tend to fail when they are transitioned into an all English instructional environment?

Description of the Research Design

A mixed-methods approach will be used to collect and analyze data. This approach ensures a sense of equilibrium in regard to the views illustrated and data presented. A mixed-methods design combines qualitative and quantitative approaches by mixing them in a single study (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006). While quantitative research seeks to collect and analyze statistical data in order to clarify, forecast, or control issues of interest by controlling contextual factors and using enough participants to produce statistically meaningful data; conversely, qualitative research seeks to interpret and comprehend narrative and visual (i.e., non-numerical) data to gain understanding of specific issues of interest (Gay et al. 2006). The purpose of using mixed-methods is to maximize the potential of answering several questions from multiple perspectives. While quantitative data will help to clarify what the achievement trends and patterns are in the specific cases of students who are instructed in bilingual and later in all-English classes; the qualitative approach will assist me in gaining a better insight of how and why the respective programs are succeeding or failing in educating ELL's. This study utilizes

quantitative and qualitative research methods drawn from archival data obtained from the district's archives on previous cohorts of students at one elementary school, and by conducting an explanatory case study with data collected from bilingual and ESL teachers who have served or who are currently serving bilingual students transitioned into all-English classes.

The School Profile

The section below defines the population from which the sample was drawn. Specifically, the teacher and student population is described in order to establish context. The case study site is located in a large urban district in Texas. It was opened in the 2001-2002 school year as a relief Title I school for a densely populated inner city area whose population is drawn mainly from immigrant families. The school is housed in a two-story building organized consisting of pods. The school also holds fourty-four PK-5 rooms, three Special Ed rooms, one music room, one dance room, one culinary arts room, one art classroom, one gym, one parent center, one library, a teachers' lounge in each pod, one speech room, offices for school counselor and other supporting staff, two computer labs, and two science labs.

The school currently has a population of 953 enrolled students. As illustrated below in *Table 3.1*, the school's ethnicity percentages do not appear to reflect the district percentages.

Table 3.1

Racial/Ethnic Background and Total Enrollment by Percentage

Teacher Category	Case Study Site (N=953)	District (N=202,449)
African American	5.5%	29.2%
Hispanic	93.3%	59.3%
White	0.4%	8.3%
Native American	0.0%	0.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.7%	3.1%

Of the school's total population 95.2% (n=907) come from economically disadvantaged homes. According to the Texas Education Agency, "some common characteristics of economically disadvantaged children include low levels of parental education; inadequate housing with very few, if any resources; homes with extended or multiple families; parental unemployment or underemployment; poor access to health care; and insufficient support systems." (TEA, 2004, p.101). 82.2% of the school student population are classified as ELL (n=784), which differs from the district's rate of 27.4%. In addition, 94.1% of the total students (n=880) are considered at-risk as compared to district levels (66.2%). Also, the attendance rate for the previous school year was 97.5%, which was 2 points above the district average.

As of the 2008-2009 school year, the school population was distributed within the grade levels as follows: Pre-K (5.2%), Kindergarten (15.7%), first-grade (18.2%),

second-grade (16.4%), third-grade (16.9%), fourth-grade (15.3%), and fifth_grade (12.2%). During the 2009 year, 62% of students in grades 3 – 5 passed all standardized tests, and about 67% in the bilingual programs in the same grades performed at or above the minimum standard. Also, almost 13% of the students in grades 3 to 5 reached commended performance in all tests as reported by TEA (2010). The school is located in an area that experienced a great deal of development throughout the 1960s and 1970s. In particular, this development led to new apartment complexes built for individuals arriving from the Northeast and Midwest U.S. to work in the oil industry.

In the 1980s, as the oil industry and the economy began to decline, thousands of tenants left and these units were marketed to newly arriving immigrants and, subsequently, the area became a predominantly immigrant community. The sudden change in demographics forced the school district respond by building more schools to educate newly arriving students. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), 71.3% of the population was Hispanic or Latino by the year 2000, which explains the composition of the student body population. For instance, within this same zip code, the number of owner-occupied housing units was 1,065 in the same year; yet, renter-occupied units represented over sixteen thousand, and their average size family contained 3.57 members. Local sources estimate the population of the area as approximately sixty thousand (Rogers, 2005). In 1999, the mean income for a family living in the area was $23,686, and the per capita income was $12,305. Over three thousand families and over fifteen thousand individuals in the area lived below the poverty line. In terms of education, only slightly more than five thousand individuals held a bachelor’s degree or higher, while approximately thirty thousand (or about 60%) were foreign born, and over thirty

thousand individuals five year of age or older spoke a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Again, the level of English language proficiency in the area where the school is located is extremely high in comparison to state and the district averages. However, only approximately 27% of the district, and about 13% of the state population, is designated as ELL. Yet, the level of proficiency for the area in which this school is located is a staggering 70%. An ELL population has been commonplace since the school opened, especially in regard to those with a Hispanic or Latino background. In the year the school opened, TEA reported an 84.1% of Limited English Proficient students, and ten years later this average is 82.2%. It is also important to note that the school has implemented a bilingual program since its first year. Initially, approximately 80% of the school population was enrolled in a bilingual program but, eventually, more and more students where transitioned or enrolled into all-English ESL, regular, or transitional programs. Despite all of its programs, the school utilizes the district curriculum and instructional resources, which are aligned with the state mandated curriculum. Finally, for the 2008-2009 school year, enrollment at grade five was one-hundred and fourteen students, or 12.2% of the total school enrollment.

Sample Selection

At the time of the study, the school had a total enrollment of 951 students; however, for the purposes of this study, none of the current students' data will be used. The archival data sample will be drawn from the past six cohorts of fifth-graders who have moved to the middle school and who were in the bilingual program prior to being their fifth-grade. The sample will not include students who were in the fifth-grade the

previous year. In regard to teacher participation, all certified bilingual teachers who have implemented a bilingual program in the past, or who area now teaching in a bilingual program in the school, will be invited to participate. Their participation will take place on a volunteer basis and teachers will be asked to respond to a survey requesting completion an instrument inquiring about their attitudes and beliefs toward ELLs. The chart below describes the characteristics of the teachers at the research site as of the school year 2009-2010:

Table 3.2

Teachers by Certification Area and Ethnicity

Teacher Category	% of School Staff	Total
All Teachers	79.90%	56
Bilingual/ESL	75%	42
Regular/ESL	25%	14
Hispanic	66.10%	37
African American	8.90%	5
White	25%	14

Table 3.3

Teachers by Years of Experience

Teacher Category	% of School Staff	Total
Beginning	5.4%	3

1-5 Years	32.1%	18
6-10 Years	25%	14
11-20 Years	26.8%	15
20 Years of More	10.7%	6

For the purposes of this case study, the researcher analyzed the data gathered from participating teachers. With respect to gathering data in response to research question 2 (i.e., To what degree are instructional practices in that school helping students progress toward the mastery of the English language as quick as they need to be academically and linguistically successful in an all-English instructional program?), all teachers serving students who have already been transitioned into all-English instruction were invited to participate in a focus group. These sessions assisted the researcher in gaining greater understanding of the teachers' perceptions about whether or not the students they receive are indeed prepared to be successful in all-English classroom.

Description of the Instrument

Survey

In order to gather information from the selected sample population, a 42-item survey that merges both ordinal and nominal data will be used. Thirty-three survey items or statements directly address one of the research questions to be explored. The question at hand is as follows: Are there differences across elementary teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of bilingual programs associated with students' academic and linguistic success in later all-English grades? Teachers' attitudes will be measured in

concert with students' rate of progress toward second language proficiency and student academic achievement in their second language.

The 33 interval survey items calls for the sample population to indicate their level of agreement on the statements provided using a 5-point Likert scale. The Likert scale ranges from (1), for "strongly disagree," to (5), for "strongly agree." Therefore, a measurement of (3) represents "neither agree nor disagree" or "unsure" (Rea & Parker, 1997 and Sirkin, 2006).

The survey items to be used were obtained from instruments developed by Karabenick and Noda (2004) and Shin and Krashen (1996). However, the survey administered only included those items relevant to the constructs tested in this study. Karabenick and Clemens Noda's (2004) survey contained a total of 78 items encompassing 14 separate areas. For their study, Karabenick & Clemens Noda (2004) utilized the professional literature and a survey developing team with 150 person-years of experience within the field of education. This team consisted of staff from urban districts, including curriculum directors, principals from schools with high numbers of English language learners, and staff from the district research department. The researcher team's primary tasks included: (a) identifying the conceptual framework, (b) refining individual survey items and (c) piloting their final version for psychometric refinement. Consequently, the Karabenick and Clemens Noda (2004) survey items deemed best were from the areas that highly corresponded to the constructs to be measured. These items were attained from the following areas: (1) teacher attitudes towards ELLs, (2) beliefs about second language acquisition, (3) relationship between language literacy and academic skills, (4) bilingual education and bilingualism, 5) beliefs about building and

district support for ELLs, and (6) beliefs about ELL parents. Next, the Karabenick and Clemens Noda (2004) survey items selected were subsequently categorized into the three constructs as measured in this study. The following survey items (see Appendix D: Content-area Teacher Survey Version 1) were obtained from Karabenick and Clemens Noda's (2004) instrument: #1, #2, #3, #4, #6, #7, #8, #14, #18, #29 and #31.

In their 1996 study, Shin and Krashen sampled 794 K-12 teachers in several districts in California. Fifty-six percent of teachers were from the elementary level and forty-four percent were from secondary schools. Approximately 35% of the students in the districts studied were English language learners. The Shin and Krashen (1996) survey instrument contained a total of 14 items assessing two areas of teachers' attitudes: principles of bilingual education and student participation in a bilingual program. In turn, some of the items directly addressed the construct measured in this study (i.e., teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards ELLs and second language acquisition). As a result, the following survey items (see Appendix D: Content-area Teacher Survey and appendix A Focus Group questionnaire) were included from the Shin and Krashen (1996) instrument: #12, #20, #21, #25, #26, and #28. Items #22, #23, and #24, as found in both Karabenick and Clemens Noda (2004) and Shin and Krashen (1996) were also incorporated.

In order to ensure a comprehensive and exhaustive survey, several items were developed and used by Garcia (2010) following Samway & McKeon's (2007) book, titled *Myths and Realities: Best Practices for English Language Learners,* as a reference. Items developed are #5, #9, #10, #11, #13, #15, #16, #17, #19, #27, #30, and #32. Item #33 was based on item #11.

In order to calibrate the instrument to be used, Garcia (2010) organized and conducted a "focus group" later. This focus group consisted of five individuals who had extensive experience teaching ELLs, supporting teachers working with ELLs, as well as developing, implementing, and monitoring district-level bilingual and ESL programs.

Validity

Validity is defined as the degree to which an instrument measures what it intends to measure for a specific purpose and an explicit group (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006). Slavin (2007) points at validity as the level that indicates whether an instrument measures what it is designed to evaluate. In order to attain validity for the survey instrument at hand, Garcia (2010) used face validity, which relies on "internal logic of measure." Face validity was determined by gathering an expert panel that critically appraised the instrument. The expert panel consisted of several individuals with extensive experience working with ELLs in multiple capacities. The panel comprised a total of 77 years of experience with second language acquisition and bilingualism. The group evaluated the instrument to ensure that questions specifically measured the constructs being addressed. A few items, such as #23, were discussed at length and changed from the construct of "belief' to "knowledge." Similarly, item #9 was changed from "knowledge" to a "belief" construct. Since face validity was the method used to determine validity, and not an empirical measure, a measurable score could not be assigned.

Reliability

Reliability is the likelihood that a given scale is actually measuring what it is supposed to measure (Sirkin, 2006). In order to ascertain that the survey items adequately measure the constructs at hand (i.e., teachers' attitudes, and beliefs towards ELLs), a

factor analysis will be carried out and a Cronbach's Alpha calculated through a pilot study.

A Cronbach's Alpha, or Alpha, is a coefficient that describes how well a group of items or statements focus on a single idea or construct, also referred to as inter-item consistency reliability (Sirkin, 2006). Alpha assumes that there is only one construct being measured. This would mean that associations among survey inter-items that measure each separate construct were correlated. For example, item #1, measuring knowledge should have yielded a high correlation with another item that also measures knowledge - such as #2, #3, and #8. The Cronbach's Alpha method would then yield a reliability number or an Alpha Coefficient.

Data Analysis Procedures

The research questions in this study were analyzed using statistical analyses of the survey data using SPSS 17.00 software, and qualitative data analysis of the focus groups.

Data analysis for survey items was conducted using three separate t-tests to examine differences between two groups of teachers. Variables were defined as dependent or independent. The following research question were examined:

1. What type of differences exist across elementary teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of *bi*-lingual programs associated with ELLs academic and linguistic success in later all-English grades?

The dependent variables analyzed consisted of the following three constructs from the survey: (a) bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge about second language acquisition, (b) bilingual and ESL teachers' attitudes toward ELLs, and (c) bilingual and ESL teachers' beliefs regarding ELLs.

The independent, or the dichotomous grouping variable was teacher certification area (i.e., bilingual or ESL). More specifically items #1, #2, #3, #8, # 21, #22, #23, #24, #28 and #32 will measure bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge about second language acquisition. Items #4, #6, #12, #13, #19, #20, #25, #26, #29, #30 and #31 measure bilingual and ESL teachers attitudes regarding ELLs. Items #6, #7, #9, #10, #11, #14, #15, #16, #17, #18, #27 and #33 measure bilingual and ESL teachers beliefs regarding ELLs. Mean scale scores were created for each of the three constructs. These mean scale scores served as the three dependent variables in the statistical analysis. When more than one dependent variable exists, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) with a .05 confidence level is recommended to measure statistical significance level. However, some researchers use separate T-Tests for each of the dependent variables, and use a more stringent level of statistical significance (.01) by employing what is called known as a Bonferroni Adjustment (Girden, 1992). In this method, a 05. significance level is divided by the number of dependent variables (three in this study), which results in a more stringent .01 level.

Demographic Variables

Demographic variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics (counts and percentages). The following aspects were explored: Area of Certification (1=ESL, 2=Bilingual); languages spoken (1=English; 2=Other); participation in instructional program as a child (1=bilingual program, 2=ESL program, 3=regular program); subjects taught (1=Reading / language arts, 2=mathematics, 3=science, 4=social studies, 5=other); gender (1=female, 2=male); certification route (1=traditional, 2=ACP, 3=other); highest degree obtained (1=BA/BS, 2=Masters, 3=Doctorate); percentage of ELLs in his/her

class (1=0%-20%, 2=21%-40%, 3=41%-60%, 4=61%-80%, 5=81%-100%); years of teaching experience (1=0-3, 2=4-6, 3=7-9, 4=10-12, 5=13 and above); age (1=21-30, 2= 31-40, 3=41-50, 4=51-60, 5=60 and above).

Focus Groups

A focus group can be defined as group interviews where all interaction and discussion centers on a topic provided by the researcher. Focus groups are – as characterized by Krueger and Casey (2000) – a "carefully planned series of discussions designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment" (p. 5). The interactions of the groups are expected to generate insights that would otherwise be hard to obtain through individual interviews (Morgan, 1998; Umana-Taylor & Bamaca, 2004). These groups offer avenues for gathering in-depth information from members representing a target audience in an environment that encourages dialogue (Crocket, Heller, Merkel & Peterson, 1990). Focus groups generate information on participants' views, values, and attitudes that can then be utilized to identify solutions for both known and novel problems. Focus groups can also help to better understand the ways in which people experience programs from the perspective of their own world-view (Morgan, 1998). Focus groups depend on the existence of an open, trusting environment that seeks neither to persuade nor compel people's opinions (Grudens-Schuck, Lundy Allen, & Larson, 2004). Both Larson and Hegland (2003) and Mitra (1994) agree that focus groups lend insights on the language used by survey respondents; which, in turn, enhances the reliability and validity of survey responses. Hebbeler and Gerlach-Downie (2002) state that many of the questions regarding why some participants respond to survey questions in the manner they do can be clarified and

answered by utilizing focus groups. This process becomes particularly salient because researchers can add elements to the information gathered using a quantitative survey.

Fern (2001) contends that focus groups provide reliable data that can be used to determine some important inferences in regard to human behavior inherent in specified environments. For the purpose of this study, the specific environment is a single inner city elementary school. This particular researcher also used three focus groups. First, the researcher invited all bilingual and ESL teachers serving in the bilingual education program, those serving students who have been transitioned from the bilingual program into an all-English instructional classroom, and a group of administrators were invited to participate in each of the focus groups. A focus group invitation was an electronic invitation delivered to each potential participant (see Appendix B). This invitation outlined the purpose of the study, the approximate timeframe for the focus group, and other relevant information. Once participants were indentified, they then received a confirmation letter. Then, a focus group confirmation letter was sent to highlight the major components of the focus group process and meeting dates and times (see Appendix C). General demographic information was collected; however, no specific identifiers were included in the transcript in order to ensure anonymity in all areas other than teachers' area of certification and assignment level (i.e., Early childhood bilingual teacher A, B, etc.).

Focus Group Interview Questions

Morgan (1996) defends the idea that focus groups are "a research method devoted to data collection" (p. 130). The main purpose of the focus group interviews is to collect detailed information in a systematic fashion in order to facilitate the analysis of

participants' responses. The goal was to further examine teachers' views as to whether or not instructional practices in the bilingual program at this campus is preparing students to transition into all-English instructional programs effectively.

The focus group interview questions were developed by the researcher to examine staff perceptions about the possible reasons as to why some students continue to have higher academic achievement after they transition from the bilingual program into an only-English instructional setting. The researcher piloted the questions with the assistance of a group of experts from the following content areas to assess the questions' relevance: two campus administrators who have expertise in bilingual and transitional programs, the literacy coach and LPAC chair person, one ESL/transitional teacher and one bilingual teacher. All panel members were provided with informed consent forms (see Appendix E). And, the panel comprised of approximately 90 years of combined experience in the realm of bilingual and transitional programs serving English language learners. As a result, interview questions could be modified as needed to align their content with the survey's results. This formative approach of piloting the focus group questions enabled the researcher to assess the need to modify any questions and clarify the study's conceptual construct (Yin, 2003). The interview questions consist of three types: engagement, exploratory, and exit questions. Engagement questions served to introduce participants to the discussion and increase their comfort level.

The researcher also served as moderator for the focus groups, and the meetings were conducted in one of the teachers' lounges at the campus. The focus group interviews were scheduled to last approximately 60-90 minutes each, and a meal or snacks and drinks were provided to the participants. To promote eye contact and social

interaction among the group members, seating was arranged around a table. Each participant was asked to identify him or herself using their certification area and their teaching level.

In an attempt to include verbal and nonverbal responses, each focus group session was audio-taped with the purpose of transcribing responses later during the data analysis phase of the study. The ultimately goal here is to reach the most holistic, rich qualitative data collection process by including all modes of communication used by the participants.

Qualitative Data Analysis

According to Larson, Grudens-Schuck, and Lundy Allen (2004), focus groups provide researchers with more unexpected data than any other type of method since individuals are not limited by a fewer options. Focus groups derive data not only from discussion but also from various subjective phenomena, such as emotions, ironies, contradictions, and tensions. Conversations among focus group participants result in data best characterized as "talk." Data analysis based on focus group interaction also relies heavily upon explicit discourse as spoken by participants, from which the researcher will present patterns formed by words into themes or perspectives.

The audio recording of each focus group was replayed in its entirety a minimum of three times. Then, the researcher typed an abridged transcript in order to create a hard-copy version of the teachers' and administrators' responses in a Microsoft Word document. The researcher utilized transcript-based analysis to organize, and evaluate the focus group data. The researcher used the abridged focus group transcripts to initiate the analysis process. By utilizing this process the researcher identified emerging themes that

reflected bilingual, ESL, and administrators' responses or sources. The emergent themes will assist the researcher to explain the different reasons provided by ESL and bilingual teachers, as well as administrators, regarding the reasons why some students continue to be academically successful after they transition from bilingual programs into all-English instructional settings while other students do not. To obtain accurate and complete information from the participants in the focus groups, the researcher replayed each focus group audio-tape for the results section. Therefore, the statements included in the results section are expanded from the abridged transcripts.

Limitations

The purpose of this mixed-method research study is to explore the reasons as to why some students continue to be academically successful even after they are transitioned from a bilingual program into an all-English instructional setting, and why some students fail. Also, this study provided an in-depth examination of bilingual teachers', ESL teachers', and school administrators' beliefs and attitudes toward ELLs, particularly in relation to students' later academic success in an all-English instructional setting.

Firstly, it should be noted that the specific individual nature of the local community, the school, and educators working within the campus may limit the generalization of this study's findings, especially as one's scope widens. The study focuses on a relatively new inner-city school with a majority student population represented by one demographic group. More large-scale study will be needed to allow the generalization of this study's findings to other comparable schools with similar teaching staffs and student demographics.

Secondly, this study's survey research has some inherent limitations. For example, the participants are not able to elaborate on their responses on the survey – they were only able to respond to the Likert items.

Third, the use of focus groups does not represent major findings applicable to major populations. Focus groups produce conversations that border on intimacy (Larson, Grudens-Schuck, & Lundy Allen, 2004); therefore, the results do not produce reliable data beyond the local context of the problem being studied. Also, due to the fact that focus groups are social in nature, they are not a reliable technique to determine an individual's authentic point of view. Although the semi-public nature of focus groups shapes the data, it also renders it relevant to the local context only. As defined by Fern (2001), focus groups can lead to trustworthy data about human behavior, but they cannot be generalized and reliably confirmed repetitively in the same manner as other research techniques that lead to the development of theories.

Chapter Four

Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore reasons why some bilingual students perform low academically after they are transitioned into all-English settings while others continue to show high academic achievement. Secondly, the study examined differences across bilingual and ESL elementary teachers regarding ELLs, second language acquisition, and beliefs associated with students' academic achievement during their participation both while in bilingual programs and after transitioning into all-English instructional settings.

This chapter presents results using the following procedures, which were described in the previous chapter: analysis of qualitative data obtained through focus groups in an effort to answer research question one, and survey data analysis using three separate t-tests to examine research question two regarding differences between two groups of teachers. In addition, demographic variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics (counts and percentages) to further explain and reasonably respond to research question two.

Research question one of this study states:

What are the reasons why some bilingual students who perform well academically during the time they are taught and tested in their native language tend to fail when they are transitioned into an all-English instructional environment?

Focus Groups Data Analysis

As stated in the previous chapter, in order to attempt to answer research question one, structured, open-ended interviews or focus groups were employed with a selected group of participants. The initial objective here was to implement and group interview so the researcher might be able to elicit as many points of view as possible (Grudens-Schuck, *et al.*, 2004). At the same time, the goal was to collect detailed information and data in a systematic way in order to facilitate the analysis of the participants' responses. Another objective was to examine instructional bilingual and ESL staff views as they relate to research question one. In addition, the focus groups were utilized to examine whether participants' views could explain whether or not instructional practices in the bilingual program at this campus were preparing students to transition into all-English instructional programs effectively. A total of 28 teachers were invited to participate in the focus groups; 18 of which accepted and confirmed their participation. Three different focus groups were conducted with representation of ESL and bilingual teachers in each session. Before performing qualitative analysis, the researcher also typed an abridged transcript of the focus group session.

The resulting themes that emerged through the structured, open-ended interview protocol addressed the following:

1. Role of the bilingual program in students' second language proficiency at the research site.

a. *Describe the average linguistic ability of the students you receive at the beginning of the school as it related to your instruction.*

Two themes emerged here: preparation and cognitive ability**.** The first theme pointed to two separate patterns of understanding. On one hand, the role of the bilingual program is seen as the process that provides students with the foundational concepts required at each grade level. On the other, the participants perceive the bilingual program role as developing the required first- and second language proficiency that is fundamental in successfully participating in an all-English instructional program after transition. In support of this theory, Cummins (2001) states the following:

"When children continue to develop their abilities in two or more languages throughout their primary school years, they gain a deeper understanding of language and how to use it effectively. They have more practice in processing language, especially when they develop literacy in both, and they are able to compare and contrast the ways in which their two languages organize reality" (p. 17).

The One of the reasons to explain why some students tend to have low academic achievement is that only few of them display not only the basic communication skills but also the demanding academic proficiency related to learning the curriculum at the grade level they are starting. Furthermore, "cognitive ability" was regarded as more important than language ability when students first entered into a new grade level. Yet, although this ability is important, it is not the only asset ELLs will require and use after they are transitioned. Bilingual program models must also have a component that systematically integrates the curriculum and L2 in meaningful ways (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Next, emerging themes also addressed the following:

a. How would you describe the level of preparation of our bilingual students to successfully participate in an all-English instructional setting?

The overall theme here was *lack of preparation*. Teachers believed that the critical second language learning curve students must experience after transitioning will delay their academic achievement. As reported by the National Center for Educational Statistics (2001), the dropout rate for Hispanics was 64% a decade ago. One of the prevalent antecedents to high dropout rates is academic achievement (Lara-Alecio & Irby, 2010). Student groups that are completely separated or have limited exposure to grade-level classes in L2 are not familiar and cannot anticipate the intensity of the cognitive and academic work they will encounter in mainstream classes after transitioning (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

The two solid themes that emerged here were *vocabulary* and *comprehension.* Statements provided by participants mentioning the former theme were as follows: "Students can use everyday language just fine, when they do, but when it comes to academic subject area vocabulary their word knowledge is low," "students need to build up not only content but also vocabulary, they simply lack it," and " transition is a problem because students do not have the time to even develop academic vocabulary in their native language." Vocabulary instruction is vital to the development of new concepts and the comprehension of complex ideas; directly related to the acquisition of new knowledge; and related to the rooting of previously acquired content (Blachowicz, Fischer & Watts-Taffe, 2005). In regard to the latter theme, participants expressed the following concerns: "Bilingual programs are not helping students develop the necessary conceptual frameworks they will need to be academically successful in English," "students may have the cognitive ability, but they do not have a good conceptual foundation," and "students are not academically or linguistically ready for the next, more

demanding, grade level." Rosell and Baker (1996) question the educational effectiveness of bilingual programs and deny their value as an educational tool.

2. Student readiness for participation in a transitional all-English instructional setting

a. Do you think our current instructional practices prepare students to be proficient in both languages by the time they are exited from bilingual to all-English classes? Why or why not?

Two themes surfaced here: *variability* and *improvement*. The first theme was described as the different groups' readiness. Participants' responses revealed that recent arrivals seem to have better proficiency at transition time than students who have participated in the bilingual program for multiple years. In regards to improvement, the recurrent theme was that there had been a trend of producing better-prepared students over time. In other words, students seem to be more ready year after year, but the lack of readiness is still a critical reason why students seem to have lower academic achievement once they transition out of the bilingual program.

In addition, the themes extrapolated through the structured, open-ended interview protocol addressed:

b. Keeping in Mind the community we serve, when do you think students should be transitioned from the bilingual program into all-English?

Two concrete themes appeared here: *language maintenance* and *immersion.* An example of supporting language maintenance was reflected in the statement that, in their push for only English monolingualism, schools cannot forget that the most important aspect of learning is cognitive ability. Given that cognitive ability is better demonstrated in one's

first language; therefore, schools should make an extended effort to help bilingual students develop their native language first regardless of how long it takes before they are transitioned. In regard to *immersion,* one participant provided the following comments: "ELLs should be transitioned into all-English instruction the minute the walk in the door," "newcomers should be placed in an immersion class with string ESL support," "students spend so much time in the bilingual program that it may be the case that they are 'too proficient' in their native language, delaying their transition," and "non-Spanish speakers learn English a lot faster because they do not have any opt-outs."

c. *If it were in your power, what modifications would you make our current curriculum for the bilingual program to better support the ESL/regular program?*

One major that theme emerged was *formal English instruction.* Here the participants provided specific ideas in regard to the instruction of the structure, vocabulary, and use of the English language. In their view, participants preferred that students' curriculum in previous grades include the "mechanics of the English language," "early connection to literature in English," and the "structured teaching of writing, reading, speaking and listening in English." In another statement, one participant added, "We need to go back to basics, students need to learn the basics of English before they are transitioned."

d. *If it were in your power, what criteria would you use to transition bilingual students into an all-English instructional setting?* The theme that emerged here was the *inadequacy of current program model.*

With regard to the current bilingual and transitional program, participants said, "The current transitional program is not beneficial to students," and "[the] current model

does not have the required support at each grade level; and, even if students are not ready, the system moves them up to the next grade or transitions them in a 'sink or swim' situation." Participants also stated, "Bilingual students seem to have higher achievement because their instruction is actually monolingual," "as students go up in grade level, their proficiency in Spanish is higher as their English proficiency goes down," and "if we even complied with the minimum requirements of the bilingual model we follow, maybe our students would do better once they transition."

Here the participants provided statements that supported the previously discussed themes, such as *preparation, readiness,* and the *lack of formal English instruction.* In regard to *preparation,* a participant noted, "bilingual students' native levels do not match the demands made of them in English classes. Usually students are used to reading at high cognitive levels in Spanish and their motivation comes down when they have to come back to reading 'baby books.'" In reference to the theme of *readiness*, a participant said, "our bilingual program is not preparing students for transition, only to pass the tests in Spanish." Regarding *lack of formal English instruction,* a participant stated, "if the political pressure for an English only society was true in the classroom, maybe our students' English proficiency would not be so limited."

Survey Data T-Test Analysis Results

Research question two in this study specifically asks:

Are there any differences across elementary teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards the implementation of bilingual programs associated with students' academic and linguistic success in later all-English grades?

As proposed in chapter three in this study, in order to answer this research question, three separate t-tests were used to compare the means of two groups, and to examine the differences between two groups of teachers (one group of teachers with bilingual certification and the other with an ESL certification) that represented the independent variables. The three constructs measured representing the dependent variables were teachers' (a) knowledge about second language acquisition, (b) attitudes towards ELLs, and (c) their beliefs about ELLs. Sixty teachers were invited to complete an online survey, of which forty-two accepted to participate. Table 1 describes in detail the counts and percentages obtained from these respondents.

Table 4.1

Survey Questions Descriptive Statistics (N=42)

Question	1	2	3	4	5	*Mean*	*SD*
It is not possible to be equally proficient in more than one language.	28 (66.6%)	5 (11.9%)	6 (14.2%)	2 (4.7%)	2 (4.7%)	1.64	1.055
Learning in one's first language interferes with learning in a second language.	21 (50%)	15 (35.7%)	5 (11.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	1.69	.869
The use of the first language at home interferes with the speed and efficiency of second language acquisition.	15 (35.7%)	8 (19%)	11 (26.1%)	7 (16.6%)	1 (2.3%)	2.31	1.169
English language learners are (would be) a welcome addition to my class.	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.3%)	6 (14.2%)	33 (78.5%)	4.64	.850
All things considered I would rather not have English language learners in my classes.	35 (83.3%)	5 (11.9%)	2 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.21	.520
Learning a second language is an entirely different proposition from learning one's own native language.	7 (16.6%)	16 (38.1%)	4 (9.5%)	10 (23.8%)	5 (11.9%)	2.76	1.322
There is a critical age after which it becomes nearly impossible to completely master a second language.	10 (23.8%)	16 (38.1%)	8 (19%)	5 (11.9%)	3 (7.14%)	2.40	1.191
Nearly fluent ELLs have little difficulty with higher-order thinking in such language dependent academic subjects as literature and social studies.	3 (7.14%)	9 (21.4%)	10 (23.8%)	12 (28.5%)	7 (16.6%)	3.27	1.205

When teaching newcomers, it is best to hold off on reading and writing instruction until they have a good grasp of oral English.	20 (47.6%)	14 (33.3%)	2 (4.7%)	3 (7.14%)	2 (4.7%)	1.85	1.131
Teachers in English medium-classrooms should not allow students to use their native language, as this will retard their English language development.	15 (35.7%)	12 (28.5%)	8 (19%)	3 (7.14%)	3 (7.14%)	2.20	1.229
ELLs from Asian countries are better English language learners and more academically successful than students from Spanish-speaking backgrounds.	19 (45.2%)	5 (11.9%)	10 (23.8%)	6 (14.2%)	1 (2.3%)	2.15	1.236
If a student is not proficient in English, the ELL should be in a classroom learning his/her language (reading, writing, math, science, etc) as part of the curriculum.	8 (19%)	10 (23.8%)	8 (19%)	11 (26.1%)	4 (9.5%)	2.83	1.302
When English language learners speak their native language in English-medium classrooms, they are likely to be off-task.	10 (23.8%)	21 (50%)	7 (16.6%)	3 (7.14%)	0 (0.0%)	2.07	.848
All else equal, the more that LEP children are exposed to English; the more English they will learn.	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.14%)	10 (23.8%)	27 (64.2 %)	4.51	.840
ELLs only need about one year in which to learn enough English to be able to succeed academically therefore, ELLs need to be transitioned into all English classes as quickly as possible.	18 (42.8%)	11 (26.1%)	6 (14.2%)	6 (14.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2.00	1.095
ESL teachers must be able to speak a language other than English.	10 (23.8%)	9 (21.4%)	10 (23.8%)	7 (16.6%)	5 (11.9%)	2.71	1.346
ELLs learn English more quickly when they are placed exclusively with teachers who are native English speakers.	7 (16.6%)	10 (23.8%)	9 (21.4%)	6 (14.2%)	7 (16.6%)	3.00	1.414
Parents of ELLs do not seem to care about how their children are doing in school.	24 (57.1%)	7 (16.6%)	3 (7.14%)	5 (11.9%)	2 (4.7%)	1.88	1.269
It is impossible to involve parents of ELLs in school activities, as most of our teachers are monolingual English speakers.	26 (61.9%)	12 (28.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.14%)	0 (0.0%)	1.51	.840
ELLs not proficient in English should be in a classroom learning subject matter (e.g. reading, math, science, etc) in his/her first language.	9 (21.4%)	9 (21.4%)	9 (21.4%)	10 (23.8%)	4 (9.5%)	2.78	1.314
Learning subject matter in the first language helps ELLs learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in English.	2 (4.7%)	3 (7.14%)	10 (23.8%)	9 (21.4%)	17 (40.4%)	3.88	1.187
If ELLs develop literacy in the first language, it will facilitate the development of reading and writing in English.	2 (4.7%)	2 (4.7%)	5 (11.9%)	13 (30.9%)	19 (45.2%)	4.10	1.114

High levels of bilingualism can lead to practical and career related advantages.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	5 (11.9%)	35 (83.3%	4.83	.442
High levels of bilingualism can result in higher development of knowledge or mental skills, as well as academic achievement.	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (9.5%)	9 (21.4%)	27 (64.2%)	4.49	.870
It is good for ELLs to maintain their native culture, as well as American culture.	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	6 (14.2%)	33 (78.5%)	4.71	.750
The development of the native language helps develop a sense of biculturalism	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.3%)	4 (9.5%)	11 (26.1%)	24 (57.1%)	4.37	.942
If we focus on teaching the English language, learning in all areas will occur faster.	3 (7.14%)	9 (21.4%)	15 (35.7%)	10 (23.8%)	4 (9.5%)	3.07	1.081
If a student is not proficient in English, the student will do better in school if he/she learns to write in his/her fist language.	3 (7.14%)	7 (16.6%)	13 (30.9%)	12 (28.5%)	7 (16.6%)	3.27	1.141
I (would) prefer not to admit English language learners to my classes.	32 (76.1%)	8 (19%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.24	.489
Students must learn English as quickly as possible, even if it means the loss of the native language.	23 (54.7%)	8 (19%)	9 (21.4%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.71	.901
I (would) like to have English language learners in my classes.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (21.4%)	12 (28.5%)	20 (47.6%)	.427	.807
Concepts and skills learned in the native language transfer to English.	2 (4.7%)	1 (2.3%)	3 (7.14%)	13 (30.9%)	22 (52.3%)	4.27	1.049

Note. *1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=unsure, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.*

As mentioned above, in order to determine the existence of any differences across bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge, attitudes and beliefs towards ELLs, and the implementation of bilingual programs associated with students' academic and linguistic success in all-English instructional settings, the survey response data was analyzed using three separate t-tests. Mean scale scores were created for each of the three constructs: (a) knowledge, (b) beliefs and (c) attitudes; these mean scale scores served as the three dependent variables in the statistical analysis (using .05 as statistical significance level).

e results and data regarding these particular areas of concern are quite clear. reference to the first construct (i.e., bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge about second

language acquisition), no statistically significant difference exist between ESL and bilingual teachers. The results also indicated no statistically significant difference between ESL and bilingual teachers regarding the second construct (i.e., teachers' attitudes toward ELLs associated with ELLs participation in bilingual programs). Finally, in reference to the third construct, the results show that there is no statistically significant difference between ESL and bilingual teachers with regard to their beliefs toward ELLs' participation in bilingual programs and their later success in all-English instructional settings.

In more detail, the following table illustrates the results of the analysis performed using three different t-tests:

Table 4.2

Results of the Three Independent t-tests

	n	*Mean*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p-value*
Knowledge						
Bilingual	29	2.8621	.40215			
ESL	12	2.9417	.41222			
				-.573	39	.570
Attitudes						
Bilingual	29	3.0376	.34233			
ESL	12	2.8788	.32277			
				1.373	39	.177
Beliefs						
Bilingual	29	2.6489	.52351			
ESL	12	2.4697	.53968			
				.989	39	.329

Note: None of the t-values are statistically significant.

Demographic Variables Analysis

In addition to the thirty-two content based items, the survey presented the participant with eleven questions aimed at exploring the demographic characteristics of the participants in relation to their assignment at the research site (see Table 3 below).

Out of the forty-two participants, 29 and 28 teachers respectively held a bilingual or ESL certification indicating that approximately 70% of the participants in the sample had obtained a bilingual or ESL certification. Regarding participation in a bilingual or ESL program as a child, 13 teachers (or approximately one third of the sample), indicated that they had participated in such a program while in school. In reference to the amount of professional development aimed at supporting the instruction to ELLs , about 10% of the respondents had less than ten hours of training, while 64% stated that they had attended over forty hours of training. Also, 19 of the teachers (46.3%) earned their certification through the traditional university route. More importantly, the very same number of teachers obtained certification through an alternative certification program. Of the forty-two respondents, 30 teachers (73%) instruct a class consisting of an ELL enrollment of 71% or higher.

The following table presents the descriptive statistics for the demographic variables included in the survey instrument:

Table 4.3

Participants Demographic Information (n=42)

Population Variables	%	Total
ESL Certification	70.7	29

Bilingual Certification	68.3	28
Speaks Another Language	78	32
Participated in Bilingual or ESL Program as Child	31.7	13
Teaching Assignment		
Reading/ELA	75.6	31
Mathematics	56.1	23
Science	63.4	26
Social Studies	73.2	30
Physical Education	7.3	3
Foreign Languages	14.6	6
Gender		
Female	70.7	29
Male	29.3	12
Certification Route		
Traditional University	46.3	19
District Alt. Cert.	43.9	18
Out of State Alt. Cert.	2.4	1
Region IV Certification	7.3	3
Highest Degree		
BA/BS	70.7	29
Masters	24.4	10
Doctorate	4.9	2
% of ELLs in Class		
0-20%	9.8	*4
21-40%	2.4	1
41-70%	14.6	6
Hours of Training		
0 Hours	2.4	1
1-10 Hours	9.8	4
11-20 Hours	7.3	3
21-30 Hours	9.8	4
31-40 Hours	7.3	3

41 and above	63.4	26
Experience in Years		
0-3 Years	24.4	10
4-6 Years	17.1	7
7-9 Years	9.8	4
10-12 Years	9.8	4
13 and above	39	16
Age		
21-30	22	9
31-40	19.5	8
41-50	39	16
51-60	19.5	8
60 and above	0	0

Note. ELL= English and Language Arts
*Hours of training specifically regarding ELLs.

Summary

This study explored differences across elementary teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes towards ELLs, and the implementation of bilingual programs associated with students' academic and linguistic success in later all-English grades. In addition, this research investigated the reasons why some bilingual students perform low academically after they are transitioned into all-English settings, especially while other ELLs continue to show high academic achievement. In order to examine the constructs addressed by research question 1, a series of focus groups was implemented.

The transcript-based analysis results show that participants believe the main reasons why students have low academic achievement after transition is related to low proficiency in the area of English as a second language. Participants also cite a lack of formal English as a second language instruction, especially in the areas of vocabulary and

comprehension. The final reasons cited were inadequate implementation of the bilingual program model, and students' early exit.

To examine the constructs related to bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge beliefs and attitudes, a previously validated survey instrument was used. The results show no statistically significant difference across ESL and bilingual teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs toward ELLs associated with their participation in bilingual programs and students' academic success in transitional instructional settings.

Chapter Five

Conclusions, Interpretations, and Implications

Introduction

The first purpose of this study was to explore the reasons why some bilingual students previously taught in bilingual programs (and whose academic achievement is high) tend to have low academic attainment after being transitioned into an all-English instructional setting while other students continue to thrive. Second, this study explored differences between elementary bilingual and ESL teachers regarding knowledge about second language acquisition, attitudes towards English language learners, and beliefs about ELLs associated with ELLs in bilingual programs later success in all English instructional settings. The following areas summarize the general, overarching research questions: Why do some students who show high academic achievement while they are part of a bilingual program tend to have low educational success after they transition into ESL, all-English instructional settings, *and* are there any significant differences across bilingual and ESL elementary teachers in regards to their knowledge about second language acquisition, their attitudes towards ELLs and their beliefs associated with ELLs' success in transitional programs.

In an attempt to answer the first question, the study adapted a structured, open-ended focus group protocol in order to collect detailed information and data in a systematic way. This method allowed the researcher to gather the participants' responses, views, and emerging themes in an efficient and controlled manner. To answer question two, the study utilized a survey instrument developed, piloted, and refined by Garcia (2010) to define the constructs and determine internal consistency.

Instrumentation Conclusions and Interpretations: Research Question One

Since individuals are not limited by fewer options, focus groups provide researchers with more unexpected data than any other type of research. Focus groups provide data not only from discussion but also from emotions, ironies, contradictions and tensions. Conversations among focus group participants result in data that are “talk” (Larson, Grudens-Schuck and Lundy Allen, 2004). Focus groups are considered naturalistic due to the fact that participants are allowed to say anything they prefer (Krueger and Casey, 2000). The focus group interview questions utilized for this study were developed by the researcher to examine the first research question; that is, staff perceptions about the possible reasons why some students’ academic attainment declines, while other students continue to have higher academic achievement after they transition from the bilingual program into an only-English instructional setting. The researcher piloted the questions with the following a group of content experts to assess the questions' relevance: two campus administrators with expertise in bilingual and transitional programs, one literacy coach and LPAC chair person, one ESL/transitional teacher, and one bilingual teacher. This panel collectively holds approximately 90 years of experience in working with bilingual and transitional programs that serve English language learners. As a result, interview questions were modified as needed in order to align their content with research question one. This formative approach of piloting the focus group questions enabled the researcher to assess the need to modify any questions and, ultimately, clarify the study's conceptual construct (Yin, 2003).

Analysis of focus group responses resulted into two fundamental conclusions around the themes, which points to instructional quality for reasons why students succeed or fail after they transition into all-English instructional settings. The first theme is related to the *role* of the bilingual program in students' second language proficiency. As a general educational community and public interest, there exists a great deal of controversy among policy makers, scholars, and the education community itself as to the appropriate role of the native language in the instruction of ELLs (Slavin and Cheung, 2005). Almost as a general consensus, teachers at the research site believe the bilingual program (i.e., the development and maintenance of students' native language) to be the process that provides ELLs with the ability to develop the foundational concepts required to be academically successful as they advance from one grade level to the next, and to maintain progress that allows students to acquire the linguistic proficiency required to function in a second language. This idea is aligned with research that has provided powerful proof in favor of bilingual programs' role in helping build strong cognitive skills that students immersed in a second language can (and will) transfer and utilize (August & Hakuta, 1998; Baker, 2006; Cummins, 2000; and Lopez & Tashakkori, 2003). The concept of transference hypothesizes that skills acquired in the native language may be transferred to the second language. In fact, this notion is critical to the education of ELLs. This previous line of thought is emphasized by the teacher participants' reiteration of the fact that *cognitive ability* related to literacy development – and solely language – is what determines student success. This assertion is supported by previous studies by Baker (2006), Calero-Breckheiner & Goetz (1993), and Lee & Shallert (1997), who

claimed that the concept of literacy development are facilitated by the native language via the transference of skills.

The participants almost unanimously counteracted the notion that bilingual programs play no role in educating ELLs by rejecting immersion upon "walking through the school door." Collier (1995), Cummins (2000), Hakuta (1998), Krashen (1996), Walqui (2001), and Willig (1985) also conducted other research studies that underline the same benefits of bilingual education as indicated by bilingual participants in the study's focus groups. These studies concluded that ELLs in well-designed bilingual programs acquire English at least as well as, or often better tha, ELLs in monolingual programs. This might explain why many students transitioning from bilingual to all-English instruction continue to have high academic achievement. Furthermore, participants cite evidence that the highest achieving students in transitional ESL or all-English classrooms are those who have participated in, and successfully exited, a bilingual program in previous years. Cummins (2001) insists: "Children who come to school with a solid foundation in their mother tongue develop stronger literacy abilities in the school language" (p.17). The use of students' native language for instruction facilitates their understanding of the content and also functions to allow students to demonstrate their skills and true literacy levels. From the point of view of participants with an ESL classroom assignment, this particular piece was critical given ELLs' language barriers; most importantly, their skills and abilities are not recognized and utilized in all-English classes. The conclusion arising out of this theme is that, participants argue, lack of proper and consistent implementation of the bilingual program is the central reason why students fail in all-English classrooms – not the use of students' native language in instruction. In

other words, current practices in carrying out the bilingual program fall short of developing all students' second language proficiency. Consequently, some students reach the transitional stage with a very strong foundation in their first language, but also with an underdeveloped proficiency in the second language. Another study impacted the views regarding educational programs for ELLs by addressing the adverse repercussions that ELLs face when placed in an all-English setting (Lopez & Tashakkori, 2003). The effect of sitting in a classroom where, due to formidable language barriers, the content is simply not comprehensible inevitably creates gaps in students' academic achievement. Sadly, such gaps continue to grow year after year while ELLs continue to struggle to acquire English language skills. For one reason or another, this may well be the case for ELLs who struggle to keep up with the academics once they are exited from the bilingual program at this study's research site. These academic gaps often reach as far as several years since research has proven that can take seven or more years for ELLs to acquire English skills that are appropriate and sufficient to be successful in an all-English academic setting (Cummins, 1984; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Students participating in a well-designed and implemented bilingual program will acquire English proficiency levels equal to or often higher than ELLs in monolingual programs. ELLs' progress in English proficiency and literacy development is either on, or near, appropriate grade level, and they show consistent, sustained advancement throughout the grades when placed in these environments (Thomas and Collier, 2002). A bilingual program that is well-implemented will unquestionably produce consistent, on grade level academic achievement, and it will help learners reach proficient performance in English that is on grade-level within a 4 – 7 year period (Thomas and Collier, 1997). This conclusion makes logical of sense in regard

to the urban school context in which this research was completed, especially since the majority of their students are placed in a bilingual program in Kindergarten and then transitioned into all-English instructional settings at the end of fourth-grade at the latest. Hence, students participate in a total of approximately five years of bilingual programming.

The second theme that emerged from the focus groups was that of bilingual students' *readiness* to transition to all-English instructional settings. In the context of the participants in this study, "*readiness"* refers to students' on-level proficiency in their second language (Cummins, 2003). Although participants recognize that second language proficiency varies from child to child, and from grade to grade, they also believe that a pattern of improvement in second language proficiency has emerged at the research site during the last few years. When asked what they believe causes some children to display low academic achievement after transitioning, there appeared to be a general consensus in reference to students' lack oral language proficiency and vocabulary. Genessee *et al.* (2005) affirm that as students' oral language proficiency increases so do their capacity to learn, acquire, and use that language with increased depth. In addition, Chesterfield, Chesterfield, Hayes-Latimer, & Chavez (1983) state that children with increased oral language proficiency are more prone to use English more often, and to use more sophisticated language learning strategies. Further supporting such claims, focus group participants point to students' low vocabulary development as an important, if not the *most* important, aspect of second language proficiency. Vocabulary development not only affects oral language proficiency, but it also has a strong impact on students' ability to take active part in the academic classroom routine. Participants show deep concern for

the fact that vocabulary instruction is critical to the improvement of comprehension as well as the development of the conceptual frameworks, particularly in mathematics, science, social studies and other academic areas (Blackhowicz, Fischer & Watts-Taffe, 2005). Furthermore, limited proficiency in English language vocabulary impacts the academic performance of ELLs in a minimum of three different ways: the interaction with other peers with whom they can learn; participation in academic activities for which they might already have knowledge in their first language; and comprehension as part of language arts or content area instruction (Blachowicz, Fischer & Watts-Taffe, 2005). In regard to interaction, ELLs transitioned into all-English instruction before they are proficient enough in the second language may often feel isolated and unable to participate in the daily classroom activities. Further, they may approach their isolation with silence or may become hesitant to take part in the learning (Hahn-Senta, 2010). Study participants did recognize that most (if not all) of the students in transitional ESL or all-English classrooms often display the social language proficiency, yet may lack the academic language skills related to the reading and comprehension, which are inherent to mathematics, science, and social studies (Cummins, 1994). Participants also point to the need for the implementation of "formal English instruction" in the bilingual program so that students can truly reach adequate proficiency by the time they are transitioned into all-English classrooms. The participants define "formal instruction" as instruction in English *grammar and mechanics*, and the structured teaching of listening, speaking, writing and reading in the second language. Although it may be tempting to formalize English language instruction for ELL children in terms of adult education, the literature on teaching English to ELLs in elementary grades, however, recommends embedded

instruction of the English language for ELLs through acting out, projects, research, conversations, the answering of engaging questions, integrated approaches, and activating prior knowledge (Blachowicz, Fischer & Watts-Taffe, 2005). In addition, thematic instruction in which the development of theoretical networks is a part of the lessons is particularly beneficial for ELLs (Blachowicz, Fischer & Watts-Taffe, 2005).

In summary, respondents believe that there are three critical reasons why some bilingual students have low academic performance, while others succeed after transitioning into all-English instructional settings. Specifically, these three reasons are best summarized as:

Lack of proper implementation of the bilingual programs, which justifies the need to implement programs centered upon developing students' first language proficiency at all costs.

The unfilled need for the formal instruction in relation the structure and mechanics of the English language, which is an issue related to student limited-vocabulary and limited-oral language proficiency.

The promotion and transition of students who are not proficient enough; hence, not sufficiently prepared for content area academic language in English.

Instrumentation, Conclusions and Interpretations: Research Question Two

The original survey instrument was developed, piloted, and refined by Garcia (2010) based upon original survey items created, validated, and used by Karabenick and Clemens-Noda (2004) and Shin and Krashen (1996). Garcia's (2010) survey instrument, which is also used for this study, identifies three constructs: Knowledge about second language acquisition, beliefs about ELLs, and attitudes towards ELLs. Garcia's (2010)

factor analysis identified two different constructs: (a) knowledge and beliefs about second language acquisition, and (b) attitudes toward second language acquisition and learners. Karabenick and Clemens-Noda (2004) only offer a definition for attitudes as being significant because of their effect on teachers' motivation to connect with their students, which provides students higher motivation and higher academic achievement. Similarly, Shin and Krashen (1996) do not define their construct operationally. Furthermore, there is no agreement in most of the educational field literature about the applicable concepts and definitions for *knowledge*, *attitudes* and *beliefs* or how the methodology to measure them and interpret their value, as well as the limits within which each one these constructs can be used and applied. (Pajares, 1992; McVicker, 2006; and Reeves, 2006).

With the volatility of such concepts in mind, the results of the 2009 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) TALIS report on teaching practices, beliefs, and attitudes shows that these three constructs are related the strategies teachers use to cope with various challenges. In his 1996 article, Bandura also affirms that one's beliefs play a determining role in what people do with the knowledge and skills they possess. Similarly, Horowitz (1994) holds that teachers' belief systems can be defined in line with her behaviors. Pajares (1992) agrees that these construct beliefs need to be contextualized in order to define the character of the isolated belief being studied. Consequently, in this study, the *beliefs about second language acquisition* construct is articulated only within the context of the urban school designated as the research site.

With regard to knowledge and beliefs, educational research literature asserts that it is very difficult to establish any differences between the two constructs. Pajares (1992)

points to the complexity of establishing where knowledge ends and beliefs surface as they relate to teacher practices and student outcomes. He goes on to distinguish knowledge as "epistemological belief" (Pajares, 1992, p. 316). For purposes of this study, knowledge is understood as an aspect of bilingual and ESL teachers' expertise, which relies on their experiences, meanings, concepts, propositions, and mental images within the area of second language acquisition. And, knowledge should play another important role in student learning – namely, it should be "grounded in disciplines and formulations related to school curriculum and the collective wisdom of the profession" (Carter, 1990, p. 306). For our purposes, teachers' knowledge has to do with what teachers know about classrooms, content area, curriculum, and the ways in which knowledge is structured (Carter, 1990).

Knowledge and Beliefs about Second Language Acquisition

In regard to bilingual and ESL elementary teachers' beliefs about second language acquisition, results indicate there were no statistically significant differences across bilingual and ESL teachers' knowledge about second language acquisition. Most participants (66%) believe that it is possible to become equally proficient in more than one language. However, about 3% also believe that the use of a first language at home interferes with learning a second language. Furthermore, approximately 87% did not believe this, and 12% were unsure. Therefore, even though most respondents held either ESL or bilingual certification, these numbers illustrate the fact that speaking the first language at home is a preexisting phenomenon that teachers have learned to accept. Fifty-percent of the teachers did not believe that learning in one's first language interferes with learning in a second language; yet, 3% did agree, and 47% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Sixty-two percent of the respondents agree that learning subject matter in the first language helps ELLs learn subject matter in the second language; conversely, 24% were uncertain, and 12% disagreed. Seventy-six percent of the teachers agree that if ELLs develop literacy in their first language it will facilitate the development of reading and writing in English, 12% disagreed, and 12% are unsure. Forty-five percent of the teachers agree that ELLs' English language fluency is strongly related to how well they can understand concepts in academic areas, 29% percent disagreed, and 24% were unsure. Despite of the fact that most teachers seem to know that ability in L1 does not impede ability in L2, teacher respondents clearly illustrate ambivalence that proficiency promotes school performance, and that linguistic performance is not indicative of comprehension. Results by Karabenick and Clemens-Noda (2004), Tatto (1996), and Walker *et al.* found similar ambivalences regarding responses to items measuring knowledge of second language acquisition. These findings may indicate that teachers' responses may come from their experience as ESL or bilingual teachers and not necessarily from their expertise in the body of knowledge about SLA. Teachers holding a bilingual or ESL certification are supposed to be familiar with the pedagogical content knowledge about how to serve ELLs. Carter (1990) agrees that, even with a certification on the disciplinary knowledge they have, many experienced teachers become more adept at utilizing practical knowledge as a response to contextual variables. It could be asserted that the participants' uncertainty is not due to lack of disciplinary knowledge, rather to teachers' need to adapt to specific contexts and the demands those contexts place on them. In regard to the bilingual program, an overwhelming 95% of the participants recognize that high levels of bilingualism have practical career-related advantages, and only 5%

disagreed. Additionally, 86% of respondents agree that higher levels of bilingualism can result in the development of greater knowledge and mental skills, 4% disagreed, and 10% neither agreed nor disagreed. The results point to the teachers' discernible understanding of the benefits of bilingualism, and their knowledge of the relationships between L1 and L2 in the mastery, in conjunction with their performance in regard to academic content. Participants' responses, however, highlight the imperative need to clarify the bilingual transitional model, which uses students' first language and English as instructional tools in all content areas. With particular focus on implementation, such models of instruction must ensure that all ELLs attain academic skills and achieve language competence at a level that ensures they can reasonably compete with the English monolingual students (Karabenick & Clemens-Noda, 2004).

In summary, teachers hold very strong and positive beliefs in the principles of the bilingual program; they understand that ability in the native language does not hinder ability in the second language; and they recognize that ELLs' linguistic performance is not an indicator of their ability to comprehend. In addition, teachers agree with the idea that bilingualism in general is beneficial to ELLs' short- and long-term learning. However, the model and implementation structure of the bilingual program requires further clarification and a systematic evaluation for improved effectiveness. The implications of these findings may be a sign of ELLs at the research site being emphatically exposed to behavioral interpersonal communication skills, and that the teaching methodologies do not address the use of students' L1 as a resource to develop students' academic cognitive skills.

Attitudes toward ELLs and Second Language Acquisition

In regard to elementary bilingual and ESL teachers *attitudes toward ELLs and second language acquisition* associated with ELLs' success in transitional all-English instructional settings, results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences across the two groups of teachers with respect to their attitudes toward elementary-level ELLs, SLA and ELLs' subsequent success in all-English instructional settings. Respondents clearly state that the role of students' L1 is critical to the development and acquisition of L2. On items designed to elicit attitudes toward ELLs, results point to several areas related to methodology, transitional issues, and issues related to students' use of L1 and maintenance of their home culture. In regard to the respondents' preferred methodologies for second language acquisition, and despite their almost unconditional support for the availability of a bilingual program, respondents showed a tendency toward an immersion approach. For example, 83% responded that the more ELLs are exposed to English, the more they will learn, while 3% disagreed, and 7% were unsure. Thirty-three percent agreed that focusing on teaching the English language would accelerate learning in all areas, 28% disagreed, and 36% were unsure. Respondents show a positive attitude toward students' usage of their L1, and a moderate support for the maintenance of their culture. For instance, 93% agreed that ELLs should maintain their culture as well as American culture, 3% disagreed, and 3% were not sure. Eighty-three percent showed support for developing a sense of biculturalism by maintaining ELLs' L1, 5% disagreed, and 10% were hesitant. Eight-eight percent of respondents disagreed to teachers' not allowing ELLs to use their L1 in the belief that it would delay their L2 proficiency development; additionally, 14% agreed, and 19% did

not know. This hidden support favoring immersion trends is aligned with the general societal tendency to send the message that, if ELLs want to be accepted by the culture they live in, they have to give up any adherence to their home culture and language (Cummins, 2001). At the same time, it represents evidence of respondents' development of two possible teaching orientations: (a) full support for the implementation of a bilingual program that leads students to the required proficiency in both their first and second language, and (b) support for the implementation of an instructional culture that supports the maintenance of ELLs first language by minimizing students' academic exposure to the second language. Grossman (1987) observed that different orientations to subject matter influenced how different teachers decide to present content in their classrooms.

In regards to transition, ELLs are often portrayed as requiring additional classroom resources, attention, and time (Karabenick & Clemens-Noda, 2004). Survey data shows that respondents have a positive attitude toward L1 maintenance model implementation at the research site at the time. Such attitudes illustrate an additional sign of the prevalent ambivalence in regards to the sustainability of the bilingual program and the development of students' L2 proficiency. Seventy percent of teacher respondents agree that there is no need for ELLs to be transitioned as quickly as possible, 15% disagree, and 15% are not sure. This concealed support for immersion is also evident when thirty-six percent of the respondents judged that ELLs placed with English native speaking teachers will faster develop second language proficiency, while 40% disagreed, and 21% were uncertain. This substantiates research indicating that teachers who show great support for the principles of bilingual education may not support actual

participation by students in bilingual programs (Shin & Krashen, 1996). Additional studies have also documented that, despite their clear commitment to bilingual programs, teachers rarely start conversations with students about their transition into ESL or all-English instructional settings (Hahn-Seta, 2010). Following the same trend, ninety-three percent of the respondents said they would welcome ELLs into their classrooms, while 5% were in disagreement, and 2% were unsure. This was confirmed by a 95% respondent disagreement for not welcoming ELLs in their classroom, while 5% were not sure. Furthermore, 76% agree they would like to have ELLs in their classrooms, while 24% were hesitant. This corroborates previous research which indicates that teachers who have or have had ELLs in their classrooms are more inclined to receive them and have a positive attitude towards their needs. In their 2004 study, Karabenick and Clemens-Noda found that the strongest correlation with attitudes was whether or not a teacher currently had ELLs. Regarding the learning potential of ELLs, results indicate that 83% of the respondents' attitudes point to an agreement that, regardless of their proficiency levels, students should be exposed to the subject areas in English. 12% opposes this notion, while 5% are unsure. Regardless of whether they are positive or negative in nature, the pre-existing attitudes towards ELLs may make teachers seek or avoid addressing the needs of ELLs (Youngs & Youngs, 2001).

In conclusion, the data show general awareness about the principles of Second Language Acquisition bilingualism and biculturalism, positive beliefs about ELLs' potential, and favorable attitudes towards ELLs by the participants at the research site. However, the data also shows evidence for the existence of at least two different orientations in the methodologies to address the instructional needs of ELLs: (a)

adherence to the principles of bilingual education as a process for developing ELLs' linguistic and academic proficiency in L1 and L2, which it does, and (b) a focus on maintaining students' L1 with minimum exposure to L2 in the academic setting. This may explain why some students fully develop their academic proficiency level as well as their proficiency in the second language, which allows them to compete at the same level as the native speakers of English who have never been in a bilingual program.

Implications for Practice

Possibly, the genuine overall meaning captured in this research illustrates that the instructional staff at the research site understands and values the significance of multilingualism, and that they understand the critical a role it plays in the education of ELLs within their community. That being said, participants are aware of the existence of the reasons why some bilingual students are successfully transitioned into all-English instructional settings while others are not. Participants recognize that there may be an unseen expectation that the current model of the bilingual program being utilized does not make a significant impact on the education levels of all students. In other words, it has become common occurrence that some students do not successfully develop their second language proficiency; hence, they will show low academic achievement after they are transitioned.

In short, teachers understand the principles of bilingual programs, welcome ELLs in their classrooms, and yet they do not fully understand the specific purposes of their bilingual model, or foresee a systematic direction for its implementation. Nonetheless, the implications for deliberate practice are very encouraging. There is well-established

evidence that the educational success of ELLs is positively related to the continued instruction through L1 (Genesee, 2005). The bilingual and ESL instructional staffs at the research site appear to be very familiar with such evidence. The state of Texas requires that ELLs in elementary schools participating in bilingual programs be assigned to a certified bilingual or ESL teacher. The state of Texas also requires ELLs to fully participate and be successful in state accountability tests after only three years, which exacerbates the problem for ELLs who have not fully developed their literacy and proficiency in L1, much less in L2. Thomas and Collier (1997) concluded that students who received 5–6 years of on-grade-level instruction in both L1 and L2, and who were transitioned to all-English instruction, made larger progress than similar groups who received 2–3 years of schooling in both L1 and L2.

This and other research conclusions contradict the accountability limits established by the State of Texas (Cummins, 2001). Adding to an already difficult situation, the new Texas accountability system will begin using ELLs' progress as a measure to be included in assigning schools ratings, with the possibility of assigning a *low-performing* rating to a school based only on the percentage of students who either attain or fall short of the minimum requirements on the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment (TELPAS). This new procedure is particular troubling given that ELLs will be homogeneously lumped together with all other language groups; hence, schools may receive inadequate ratings regardless of the academic achievement levels in other subject areas. Thus, teachers are expected to develop students' L1 and L2 proficiency by the time students reach the third grade. It may seem fortuitous to use tests as quantifiable measures because they ensure that [bilingual] teachers are accountable not

only for ensuring students' L1 development and L2 proficiency. However, creating punitive measures for schools that fail to show their ELLs can perform in the State English language test. This in itself means that the decisions to fully develop L1 at the expense of L2 will no longer be an option. In the era of accountability, our research school will have to find the balance between support for full development of L1, and appropriate and due academic achievement for all students. The fundamental role of the school leader remains essential in providing program direction, clarification for the bilingual model, its implementation structure, and a systematic evaluation for its effectiveness. The implications of these findings may be used to break cycles of instruction in which ELLs are emphatically exposed to behavioral interpersonal communication skills and teaching methodologies that systematically address the use of students' L1 as a resource to develop students' academic skills, cognitive skills, and their English language proficiency. This is critical for ensuring that all students continue to thrive after they transitioned from bilingual/ESL into all-English instructional settings.

In regard to the constructs *knowledge, beliefs,* and *attitudes,* participants demonstrate responsiveness to the principles of Second Language Acquisition, bilingualism, and biculturalism. They also display positive beliefs about ELLs' education and indicate favorable attitudes towards ELLs needs. However, as demonstrated through participants' responses, the apparent existence of at least two different orientations in the methodologies addressing the instructional needs of ELLs are indicators of a gap between theory and practice regarding the education of ELLs. On one hand, there exists the adherence of some instructional staff to the principles of bilingual education as a process to develop some ELLs' linguistic and academic proficiency in L1 and L2. On the other,

teachers' focus on the maintenance of ELLs' L1 with a minimum exposure to L2 in the academic setting. The implications and consequences of this ambivalence require a number of remedies: an explanation of the bilingual program implementation standard, and the a clear direction in the instructional expectations regarding language and academic proficiency for those in charge of educating ELLs at the research site. It also implies the possibility of creating cohesive programmatic standards that unify practices and adhere to the requirement of the adopted bilingual and transitional programs. This possibility would ensure that more ELLs fully develop their academic and second language proficiency, but it would also guarantee that all ELLs continue to be successful after they transition into all-English instructional settings. Teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes do not exist in isolation. When successfully combined with cohesive standards of practice, these constructs become the gears that mesh instruction and learning, allow student learning to be significant, and encourage students to realize their potential. It is, after all, one of the purposes of public education.

Recommendations for Future Research

It is imperative to understand that this study was conducted with a very specific population of elementary teachers who instruct a similar group of ELLs at a very specific school site in a large urban district. The findings and conclusions, therefore, are unique to this group of teachers and students, and it may difficult to generalize to other sites and populations. In spite of this limitation, it is recommended that similar studies be conducted with larger groups of schools to find out whether different results are obtained. Another recommendation is to implement the instrument and focus groups with district and school leadership populations. Such an approach could be used to inquire into how

the constructs used for this study might be combined to examine input from a level above the classroom (i.e., how supervision and resource management practices related to the education of English language learners). In addition, this particular research student might help generate patterns in regards to bilingual and transitional programs and their effect on ELLs achievement.

In sum, it is recommended that future research explore the possible roles of the demographic variables, such as teachers' experience, age, and type of certification in relation to why some ELLs have low academic achievement after they are moved into transitional ESL all-English classrooms. In addition, the constructs of *knowledge* about second language acquisition, *beliefs* about English language learners, and *attitudes* towards ELLs should be explored further.

Summary

The use of bilingual programs in the education of ELLs is a mandated common practice in Texas elementary schools. The full implementations of such programs are the only guarantee that ELLs in Texas public schools can develop their first language and the proficiency in the English language required for them to succeed in all-English classrooms. Furthermore, the ultimately success of these mandated programs and students' overall success rests wholly on effective teacher practices. Those practices, when rooted in research that implies that teachers knowledge and beliefs about second language acquisition as well as the teachers attitudes towards ELLs play an important role in the ultimate learning ELLs go through.

The results of this study showed that despite teachers' best knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, and their agreement with the principles of bilingualism and biculturalism, the

implementation of bilingual programs does not always guarantee that ELLs will develop their L1 another with their on-grade-level proficiency in the second language. Results also suggest that there are programmatic implementation variations, adaptations, and modifications from teacher to teacher and classroom to classroom. Therefore, the results are not necessarily consistent for all students, which may partially explain why some ELLs develop strong L1 literacy and L2 proficiency while others do not. Consequently, not all students have a guarantee of success once they are exited from the bilingual program and placed in an all-English classroom.

Explicitly, Cummins (1979, 1981, 1996, 2001), Thomas and Collier (1997, 2002, 2004), Slavin and Cheung (2005), Hakuta and Butler (2000) highlight the need for providing consistent development of ELLs' native language, while at the same time providing instruction that centers around ELLs' development of on-grade-level second language proficiency. In fact, the Texas legislature has made this measure a mandate. Yet, the is an absence of systematic implementation measures and a cohesive instructional culture of bilingual-bicultural education for ELLs. These specific areas lack the delineation of common practices aimed at ELL proficiency, mastery, and performance. Lastly, program variability, implementation, adjustments and adaptations all threaten to defeat the purpose of the law in providing equitable opportunities of academic success for all ELLs.

In light of this study, if the professional staff and the leadership of a a public school is really in the business of serving all students and providing equitable opportunities of academic and societal success through programs stipulated by legislative decisions and acts, it is in the best interest of the administrators and those professionals

educating the children who attend such school to abide by the guidelines set forth for those programs. In the specific context of this work, any bilingual program, can only be effectively implemented if, at least, its implementation respects the essential difference between what is mandated, what is convenient and what is optional. L2 proficiency is not only the subject of some of the most rigorous and controversial research in the social science, it is not an option for our ELLs; it is the tool whose lack will continue to make our ELLs educationally handicapped.

References

Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self- Efficacy: The Exercise of control.* New York, NY: W.H. Freeman & Co.

Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64, 173-194.

Bartolome, L. & Balderrama, M. (2001). The need for educators with political and ideological clarity: Providing our children with the best. In M. Reyes & J. Alcon (Eds.) The Best for Our Children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students. NY, New York: Teachers College Press, 48-64.

Blachowicz, C.L.Z, Fischer, P.J. & Watts-Taffe, S. (2005). *Integrated Vocabulary Instruction: Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners in Grades K – 5*. Naperville , IL: Learning Point Associates.

Brisk, M.E. (1999). Quality bilingual education: Defining success. *Symposium of Language Policy. Israel, 1999.* Providence, RI. Education Alliance at Brown University.

Brittain, C. (2002). *Transnational messages: Experiences of Chinese and Mexican immigrants in American schools.* New York: LFB Scholarly.

Calderon, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. & Slavin, R. (1998). Effects of bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition on students making the transition from Spanish to English reading. *The Elementary School Journal, 99*(2), 153 – 165.

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J.S. & Herwantoro, s. (2005). *The new demography of American schools: Immigration and the No child Left Behind Act.* Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. *Participants in Teacher Education.* Phoenix, AZ: University of Arizona.

Cazabon, M., Nicoladis, E., & Lamber t, W. E. (1998). *Becoming bilingual in the Amigos two-way immersion program* (Research Rep. No. 3). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

Cazdem, C.B. (1979). Curriculum / language contexts for bilingual education In (Ed.) *Language Development in a Bilingual Setting.* California*:* National Multilingual Multicultural Material Development Center, 129 – 137.

Chesterfield, R., Chesterfield, K., Hayes-Latimer, K. & Chavez, R. (1983). The influence of teachers and peers on second language acquisition in bilingual preschool programs. *TESOL Quarterly,* 17*(3),* 401 – 419.

Civil Rights Project. (2009). Preserving Integration Options for Latino Children: A Manual for Educators, Civil Rights Leaders and the Community. Los Angeles, CA. UC MALDEF.

Cordasco, F. (1976). *Bilingual Schooling in the United States: A Sourcebook for Education Personnel*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Crawford, J. (1998). Anatomy of the English-Only Movement: Social and Ideological Sources of Language Restrictionism in the United States. In: Kibbee, D.A. (Ed.) 1998. *Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the University of Illinois*

at Urbana-Champaign, March 1996. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Crawford, J. (2001) *Bilingual education in the United States: Politics vs Pedagogy*, paper presented at I Jornadas Internacionales de Educación Plurilingüe, Ayuntamiento Victoria-Gasteiz, Pais Vasco, Spain, Nov. 2001. Retrieved on August 12, 2010 from: http://www.elladvocates.org/documents/RCN/vitoria.htm

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crockett, S. J., Heller, K. E., Merkel, J. M., & Peterson, J. (1990). Assessing beliefs of older rural Americans about nutrition education: Use of the focus group approach. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 90, 563-567.

Crowe, D. (2009). Poverty 101. Austin, TX. Center for Public Policy Priorities.

Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education? *Sprogforum*, 19.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In "Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework." Los Angeles: California State University; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (1983). Bilingualism and special education: Program and pedagogical issues. *Learning Disability Quarterly. 6(4), 373-386.*

Cummins, J. (2000). Bilingual education in the United States: Power, pedagogy and Possibility. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto.

Cummins, J. (2006). Basic interpersonal communicative skills and cognitive academic language proficiency. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto.

Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D., Gatlin, S., & Vasquez Heilig, J. (2005, April 5). *Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, teach for America, and teacher effectiveness.* Paper presented at the 2005 AERA Conference. Abstract retrieved September 21, 2010 from http://www.schoolredesign.net/binaries/(teachercert.pdf)

De la Garza, J. & Medina, M. (1985). Academic achievement as influenced by bilingual instruction for Spanish dominant Mexican-American children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences,* 7(3), 247-259.

Del Valle, S. (2003). *Language Rights and the Law in the United States: Finding Our Voices*. Clevedon, England: Multi lingual Matters.

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (1998). Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English-language learners with diverse abilities. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ernst, G. (1994). Beyond language: The many dimensions of an ESL program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 25*(3), 317-335.

Fern, E.F. (2001). *Advanced Focus Group Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fix, M. & Passel, J.S. (2003). U.S. Immigration: Trends and Implications for Schools. Presentation for the National As sociation for Bilingual Education, NCLB Implementation Institute. New Orleans, LA, January 2003. Retrieved on June 5, 2010 from: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410654_NABEPresentation.pdf

Flynn, K & Hill, J. (2005). English language learners: A Growing population. *Policy Brief.* Denver, CO: Mid Continent Research for Education and Learning.

Fry, R. (2007). The Role of Schools in the English Language Learners Achievement Gap. Pew Hispanic Center: Washington, D.C.

Garcia, K. (2010). Exploring relationships between knowledge, attitudes and beliefs toward English language learners among secondary teachers (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston, 2010). Ann Arbor MI: PROQUEST.

Garcia-Nevarez, A., Stafford, M. & Arias, B. (2005). Arizona Elementary Teachers' Attitudes Toward English Language Learners and the Use of Spanish in Classroom Instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal,(29)* 2, 295-317.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P.W. (2008). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. NJ, Upper Saddle River, Pearson.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W.,& Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 10* (4), 363-385.

Gersten, R. & Woodward, J. (1995). A longitudinal study of transitional and immersion bilingual education programs in one district. *The Elementary School Journal,* 95(3) 223-239.

Gersten, R. (1996). Literacy instruction for language minority students: The transition years. *The Elementary School Journal, 96*(3), 227 – 244.

Grossman, P. (1987). A tale of two teachers: the role of subject matter orientation in teaching. Paper presented at the Meeting of American Education Research Association in Washington D C.

Grudens-Schuck, N., Lundy Allen, B. & Larson, K. (2004). *Focus Group Fundamentals*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Extension. Retrieved on

September 23, 2010 from: http://www.extenison.iastate.edu/ Publications/PM1969B.pdf.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? Linguistic Minority Research Institute.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. FL026 180). Retrieved on September 7, 2010, from http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Docs/HowLong.pdf#search''Hakuta% 20How%20long% 20does% 20it%20take% 20English%20learners'.

Hebbeler, K. & Gerlach-Downie, S. (2002). Inside the Black Box of Home Visiting: A Qualitative Analysis of Why Intended Outcomes Were Not Achieved. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 17, 28-51.

Horowitz, R. (1994). Adolescent beliefs about oral and written language. In R. Garner & P. Alexander (Eds.), *Beliefs about text and instruction with text* (pp. 1-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ivey, G. (1999). Reflection on teaching struggling middle school readers. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy,* 42, 372-381.

Jepsen, C. (2009). Bilingual education and English proficiency. *Education, Finance and Policy, 5*(2), 200 -227.

Jennings, N. & Spillane, J. (1997). Aligned Instructional Policy and ambitious pedagogy: Exploring instructional reform from the classroom perspective. *Teachers College Record, 98*(3), 449-479.

Johnson, R. J. (2000). Case studies of expectation climate at two bilingual schools. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24(3),* 261.

Karabenick, S. & Clemens Noda, P. (2004). Professional development implications of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28* (1), 55-75.

Krashen, S.D. (1979). Language acquisition and language learning in the late entry bilingual education program, in: *Language Development in a Bilingual Setting.* California*:* National Multilingual Multicultural Material Development Center, 101 -120.

Krueger, R., and M.A. Casey, 2000. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lara-Alecio, R & Irby, B.J. (2010). *The Education in an Intercultural Society: Problems for Immigrant Hispanic/Latino Students*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.

Larson, K., and S. Hegland, 2003. *Iowa Family Child Care Providers' Survey: Final Report.* Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Extension CD-DIAL [on-line]. Retrieved on September 23, 2010 from : http: //www.extension.iastate.edu/cd-dial.

Legarreta, D. (1977). Language choice in bilingual classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 11*(1), 9 – 16.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Lopez, M. & Tashakkori, A. (2004). Effects of a Two-Way Bilingual Education Program on the Literacy Development of Students in Kindergarten and the First Grade. Journal *of Bilingual Education, 28 (1),* 19-34

Lutenbacher, M., W. Cooper, and K. Faccia, 2002. Planning Youth Violence Prevention Efforts: Decision making Across Community Sectors." *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 30, 346-354.

Martin, D., & Stuart-Smith, J. (1998). Exploring bilingual children's perceptions of being bilingual and bi-literate: Implications for educational provision. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 19(2), 237 -254.*

McCaffrey, D.F., Lockwood, J.R., Koretz, D.M. & Hamilton, L.S. (2004).*Evaluating Value Added Measures for Teachers' Accountability.* New York, NY: RAND.

McCarty, T.L. (2002). Between possibility and constraint: Indigenous language education, planning, and policy in the US. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Mertler, C.A. (2009). *Action Research: Teachers as Researchers in the Classroom*. CA, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Mitra, A. 1994. "Use of Focus Groups in the Design of Recreation Needs Assessment Questionnaires." *Evaluation and Program Planning 17*(2), 113-140.

Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*, 1–22.

Moran, R.F. (1987). Bilingual education as a status conflict. *California Law Review, 75*(1), 321-362.

Morgan, D. L. (1996). Focus groups. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22*, 129-152.

Morgan, D. L. (1998). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Munoz, C. & Hawes, D. (2006). The Best Schools for Latino Students in Texas 2002-2005. Texas Education Excellence Project. Austin, Texas.

Murphy, B. (1980). Second language reading and testing in bilingual education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *14*(2), 189 – 197.

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2007). *The Growing Numbers of Limited English Proficient Students*. Washington, DC. Retrieved June 10, 2010 from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/statedata/2005LEP/GrowingLEP_0506.pdf.

NCES, (2010). Status and Trends in the Education of Ethnic Minorities. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved on August, 6 2010 from: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010015/indicator2_8.asp

Nieto, D. (2009). A brief history of bilingual education in the U.S. *Perspective on Urban Education.* Spring 2002, 61-72.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education. In Fraser, J. (Ed.) (2000). *The School in the United States: A documentary History*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Neely, S. (2006). *Texas Strategic Plan for the Fiscal Years 2007 -2011 Period*. Austin, TX: TEA.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, (2009). *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environment: First Results from TALIS.* Paris, France: OECD.

Palmer, D. & Lynch, A, W. (2008). A bilingual education for a monolingual test? The pressure to prepare for TAKS and its influence on choices for language instruction in Texas elementary bilingual classrooms. *Language Policy. 7 , 217-235*

Penfield, J. (1987). ESL: The Regular classroom teacher's perspective. TESOL *Quarterly, (21)* 1, 21-39.

Perez, B. (2004). *Becoming Biliterate: A Study of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Phillips, J. M. 1975. Code-switching in bilingual classrooms, M.A. Thesis, California State University, Northridge.

Ramirez, J.D. (1986). Comparing structured English immersion and bilingual education: First-year results of a national study. *American journal of Education, 95*(1), 122-148.

Ramirez, J. D. (1992). Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education program for language-minority children (Executive Summary). *Bilingual Research Journal, 16*, 1–62.

Reeves, J.R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research,* 99(3), 131-142.

Reyes, E., Nieto, D. & Diez, V. (2008). If our students fail, we fail. If they succeed, we succeed. *Mauricio Gaston Institute, Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts*

Riddle, M. (2009). Bilingual education benefits all learners. *ASCD Express.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Reyes, I, & Azuara, P. (2008).Emergent biliteracy in young Mexican-American children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *43*(4), 374 – 398.

Rogers, S. (2005). Super neighborhood 27: A brief history of change. *Places*: Vol. 17: No. 2. 37 – 38.

Rogers, S. (2009). A new center on the periphery. *Cite*. Rice Design Alliance, (Northern Hemisphere). Fall 2009. 21.

Rossel, C.H. & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30 *(1)* 7-74.

Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2003). Facing reality: English language learners in middle school classes. *English Education in the Middle Grades.* 35*(2), 122-136.*

Saldate, M., Mishra, S., & Medina, M. (1985). Bilingual instruction and academic achievement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 72(1) 24-30.

Samway, K. & McKeon, D. (2007). *Myths and Realities: Best Practices for English Language Learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Seashore, K., Leithwood, K., Walstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). Learning from leadership project: Investigating the links to improved student learning. *Final Report of Research Findings.* New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Shin, F. & Krashen, S. (1996). Teacher attitudes toward the principles of bilingual education and toward students' participation in bilingual programs: Same or different? *Bilingual Research Journal, 20* (1), 45-53.

Shultz, J. 1975. Language use in bilingual classrooms. Paper presented at the Ninth Annual TESOL Convention, Los Angeles, March 4-9, 1975.

Sirkin, M. (2006). *Statistics for the Social Sciences.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Slavin, R. & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language for reading instruction for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research,* 75 (*2),* 247 – 284.

Slavin, R.E. (2007). *Educational Research in an Age of Accountability.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Solkov-Brecher, J. (1984). Improving bilingual education exit criteria and mainstreaming programs. *The Clearing House, 57*(8), 348 – 350.

Spolki, B. (1982). Sociolinguistics of literacy. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(2), 141 – 151.

State of Texas Legislature, (1977). *Texas Administrative Code*. Austin, TX: Texas Register.

Suárez-Orozco, M. & Páez, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Latinos. Remaking America*. Cambridge, MA and Berkeley, CA: David Rock efeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University and University of California Press.

Tashakkori, A., Ochoa, S. H. & Kemper, E. A. (1999). Pull and push factors in the educational attainment of Hispanics: Current realities and future directions. In A. Tashakkori, S. H. Ochoa, & E. A. Kemper (Eds.), *Education of Hispanics in the United States.* New York: AMS Press, Inc.

Tatto, M. (1996). Examining Values and Beliefs About Teaching Diverse Student: Understanding the Challenges for Teacher Education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis (18)* 2 , 155-180.

Texas Education Agency. (2008-2009*a*). *Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) State Report.* Retrieved on August 7, 2010, from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2009/state.html

Texas Education Agency. (2008-2009*b*). *Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) District Report.* Retrieved on August 7, 2010, from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/cgi/sas/broker

Texas Education Agency. (2009). LPAC Decision-Making Process for the Texas Assessment Program Austin, TX: U.S.

Texas Education Agency. (2010) Texas Administrative Code. Retrieved on September 5, 2010 from: http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/index.html

Texas Education Agency. (2010) Texas Administrative Code. Retrieved on September 5, 2010 from: http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter089/ch089bb.html

Townsend, D. (2009). Building academic vocabulary in after-school settings: Games for growth with middle school English language learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy,* 53*(3) 242-251*.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

Thomas, W. P & Collier, V., (1997). School effectiveness for language minority students. *NCBE Resource Collection Series.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Tong, F., Lara-Alecio, R., Irby, B., Mathes, P. & Kwok, O. (2008). Accelerating early academic oral English development in transitional bilingual and structured English immersion programs. *American Educational Research Journal.* 45*(4),*1011-1044.

Urban, W. & Wagoner, J. (2003). *American Education: A History*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Viadero, D. (2001). Learning gap linked to LEP instruction. *Education Week*, 20(32), 8.

Walker, A., Shafer, J., & lams, M. (2004). "Not in my classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the content-area classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2* (1), 130-160.

Wiley, T.G. (1999). Continuity and change in the function of language ideology in the United States. In Ricento, T (Ed.). *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Youngs, C. S. & Youngs, G. A., (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes towards ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35*(1),* 97-120.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods* (3rd Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A HISD APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
HATTIE MAE WHITE EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT CENTER
4400 WEST 18th STREET • HOUSTON, TEXAS 77092-8501

TERRY B. GRIER, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

Carla J. Stevens
Assistant Superintendent
Research and Accountability Department
Tel: 713-556-6700 • Fax: 713-556-6730

December 9, 2010

Alexander Rodriquez
1528 Prairie Grove
Houston, Texas 77077

Dear Mr. Rodriquez:

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) is pleased to approve the research study titled "Exploring Why Some Bilingual Students Have Low Academic Performance while Others Succeed After Transitioning into All-English Instructional Settings at an Inner City Elementary School." The study will investigate the reasons for bilingual students' success as well as teachers' attitudes toward bilingual programs. The research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of doctoral degree requirements at the University of Houston. The projected date of study completion is May 1, 2011.

Approval to conduct the study in HISD is contingent on your meeting the following conditions:

- The study population is bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers at Sylvan Rodriquez, Jr. Elementary School. The principal of the school supports this research project.
- Study participants will be asked to complete an online survey by February 2011 to determine how they perceive bilingual programs. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. In addition, participants will be asked to engage in a focus group to uncover instructional practices for helping students progress toward mastery of the English language.
- Written, informed consent must be secured of staff prior to participation in the study.
- The researcher is responsible for data collection. A fee may be assessed if the HISD Department of Research and Accountability assists in the data collection process.
- This study does not interfere with the District's instructional/testing program.
- The researcher must follow the guidelines of HISD and the University of Houston regarding the protection of human subjects and confidentiality of data. The HISD signed letter of agreement and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval letter must be submitted prior to initiating the study.
- While the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the university/organization is responsible for oversight of the study, the HISD Department of Research and Accountability will also monitor the study to ensure compliance to ethical conduct guidelines established by the Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) as well as the disclosure of student records outlined in Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).
- Data will only be reported in statistical summaries that preclude the identification of the district or any principal/school participating in the study.
- In order to eliminate potential risks to study participants, the reporting of proposed changes in research activities must be promptly submitted to the HISD Department of Research and Accountability for approval prior to implementing changes. Non compliance to this guideline could impact the approval of future research studies in HISD.
- The final report must be submitted to the HISD Department of Research and Accountability within 30 days of completion.

Any other changes or modifications to the current proposal must be submitted to the Department of Research and Accountability for approval. Should you need additional information or have any questions concerning the process, please call (713) 556–6700.

Sincerely,

Carla Stevens

CS: vh
cc: Chuck Morris Sam Sarabia Elena Martinez-Buley Jocelyn Mouton
Michele Pola

APPENDIX B BELIEFS, ATTITUDES, AND KNOWLEDGE SURVEY

1. It is not possible to be equally proficient in more than one language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

2. Learning in one's first language interferes with learning in a second language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

3. The use of the first language at home interferes with the speed and efficiency of second language acquisition.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

4. English language learners are (would be) a welcome addition to my class.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

5. All things considered, I would rather not have English language learners in my classes.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

6. Learning a second language is an entirely different proposition from learning one's own native language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

7. There is a critical age after which it becomes nearly impossible to completely master a second language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

8. Nearly fluent ELLs have little difficulty with higher-order thinking in such language dependent academic subjects as literature and social studies.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

9. When teaching newcomers, it is best to hold off on reading and writing instruction until they have a good grasp of oral English.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

10. Teachers in English medium-classrooms should not allow students to use their native language, as this will retard their English language development.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

11. ELLs from Asian countries are better English language learners and more academically successful than students from Spanish-speaking backgrounds.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

12. If a student is not proficient in English, the ELL should be in a classroom learning his/her language (reading, writing, math, science, etc) as part of the curriculum

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

13. When English language learners speak their native language in English-medium classrooms, they are likely to be off-task.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

14. All else equal, the more that LEP children are exposed to English; the more English they will learn.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

15. ELLs only need about one year in which to learn enough English to be able to succeed academically. Therefore, ELLs need to be transitioned into all English classes as quickly as possible.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

16. ESL teachers must be able to speak a language other than English.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

17. ELLs learn English more quickly when they are placed exclusively with teachers who are native English speakers.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

18. Parents of ELLs do not seem to care about how their children are doing in school.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

19. It is impossible to involve parents of ELLs in school activities, as most of our teachers are monolingual English speakers.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1

20. ELLs not proficient in English should be in a classroom learning subject matter (e.g. reading, math, science, etc) in his/her first language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

21. Learning subject matter in the first language helps ELLs learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in English.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

22. If ELLs develop literacy in the first language, it will facilitate the development ofreading and writing in English.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

23. High levels of bilingualism can lead to practical and career related advantages.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

24. High levels of bilingualism can result in higher development of knowledge or mental skills, as well as academic achievement.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

25. It is good for ELLs to maintain their native culture, as well as American culture.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

26. The development of the native language helps develop a sense of biculturalism

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

27. If we focus on teaching the English language, learning in all areas will occur faster

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

28. If a student is not proficient in English, the student will do better in school if he/she learns to write in his/her fist language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

29. I (would) prefer not to admit English language learners to my classes.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

30. Students must learn English as quickly as possible, even if it means the loss of the native language.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

31. I (would) like to have English language learners in my classes.
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

32. Concepts and skills learned in the native language transfer to English.
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1

33. Do you have a certification in ESL?
- Yes
- No

34. Do you have a bilingual certification?
- yes
- no

35. Do you speak another language other than English?
- Yes
- No

36. Did you participate in a Bilingual or ESL program as a child?
- Yes
- No

37. What subjects do you teach?
- Reading and/or Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Science
- Social Studies (History, geography, etc.)
- Physical Education
- Foreign Languages

38. Gender:
- Female
- Male

39. How did you obtain your certification?
- Traditional University Route
- District Alternative Certification
- Alternative Certification out of State
- Region IV Houston Certification

40. What is the highest degree obtained?
- B.A./B.S.
- Master's
- Doctorate

41. What is the percentage of LEP or ELLs in you class this year?

- 0-20%
- 21-40%
- 41-70%
- 71% and above

42. Approximately how many hours of training have you had in ESL and/or working with ELLs (include district level or other sources), please mark which one applies to you.

- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60

43. How many years have you taught?

- 0-3 yrs.
- 4-6 yrs.
- 7-9 yrs.
- 10-12yrs.
- 13 and above

44. What is your age?

- 0
- 1-10
- 11-20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41 and higher
- 60 and above

APPENDIX C FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

The interview questions were developed by the researcher to determine staff perceptions about how instructional practices at this campus are helping students progress toward the mastery of the English language.

The researcher piloted the questions with a group of two campus administrators with expertise in bilingual and transitional programs, the literacy coach and LPAC chair person, one ESL/transitional teacher and one bilingual teacher to assess the questions' relevance.

As a result, interview questions were modified as needed to align their content with the survey's results. This formative approach of piloting the focus group questions enabled the researcher to assess the need to modify any questions and clarify the study's conceptual construct (Yin, 2003).

The interview questions consist of three types: engagement, exploratory, and exit questions. Engagement questions served to introduce participants to the discussion and increase their comfort level. The three groups of teachers were presented with the same engagement questions:

1. Describe the teaching assignments you have had for the last three school years.

2. Describe the average L2 linguistic ability of the students you receive at the beginning of the school as it relates to your instruction.

Exploratory questions were used to gauge the participants' perceptions about students' ability to be successful in an all-English class.

3. Thinking about our instructional practices, the teaching that goes on in the bilingual program, how would you describe the level of preparation of our students to successfully participate in an all-English class?

4. Learning more English in the lower grades is always cited as one of the areas where the students who transition into all-English instruction need the most help, in your view what are the areas where students who are soon to be transitioned into all –English need the most help?

5 What specific teaching strategies do you use to address those areas at your grade level and in your own classroom? Why?

6. In your view and experience do you think our current instructional practices prepare students to be proficient enough in both languages by the time they are exited from bilingual to all English classes? Why? Or, why not?

7. From your experience in this school, do you believe students have better scores in Spanish or English? What do you think is the reason or reasons?

8. Keeping in mind the community this school serves, when do you think students should be transitioned from the bilingual program into all-English?

9. In your experience, should the teaching practices look different for the bilingual and the ESL/regular program?

10. What would be the one thing you would like your students to have gained from their previous teacher's instruction by the time they are transitioned from the bilingual program into one of your classes? (ESL teachers only)

11. If it were in your power, what modifications would you make to our current curriculum for the bilingual and ESL/regular program?

12. If it were in your power, what criteria would you use to transition students into an all-English class?

An exit question attempted to capture information not garnered during the engagement or exploratory phase:

13. Is there anything else you would like to share or propose concerning our practices to improve students' ability to succeed academically in the second language at our campus?

APPENDIX D SURVEY QUESTIONS FREQUENCY TABLES

Frequency Table

Quest1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	28	66.7	66.7	66.7
	2	5	11.9	11.9	78.6
	3	6	14.3	14.3	92.9
	4	2	4.8	4.8	97.6
	5	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	21	50.0	50.0	50.0
	2	15	35.7	35.7	85.7
	3	5	11.9	11.9	97.6
	5	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	15	35.7	35.7	35.7
	2	8	19.0	19.0	54.8
	3	11	26.2	26.2	81.0
	4	7	16.7	16.7	97.6
	5	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	2	1	2.4	2.4	4.8
	3	1	2.4	2.4	7.1
	4	6	14.3	14.3	21.4
	5	33	78.6	78.6	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	35	83.3	83.3	83.3
	2	5	11.9	11.9	95.2
	3	2	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	16.7	16.7	16.7
	2	16	38.1	38.1	54.8
	3	4	9.5	9.5	64.3
	4	10	23.8	23.8	88.1
	5	5	11.9	11.9	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	23.8	23.8	23.8
	2	16	38.1	38.1	61.9
	3	8	19.0	19.0	81.0
	4	5	11.9	11.9	92.9
	5	3	7.1	7.1	100.0

Quest7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	23.8	23.8	23.8
	2	16	38.1	38.1	61.9
	3	8	19.0	19.0	81.0
	4	5	11.9	11.9	92.9
	5	3	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Quest8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	7.1	7.3	7.3
	2	9	21.4	22.0	29.3
	3	10	23.8	24.4	53.7
	4	12	28.6	29.3	82.9
	5	7	16.7	17.1	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	20	47.6	48.8	48.8
	2	14	33.3	34.1	82.9
	3	2	4.8	4.9	87.8
	4	3	7.1	7.3	95.1
	5	2	4.8	4.9	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	15	35.7	36.6	36.6
	2	12	28.6	29.3	65.9
	3	8	19.0	19.5	85.4
	4	3	7.1	7.3	92.7
	5	3	7.1	7.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	19	45.2	46.3	46.3
	2	5	11.9	12.2	58.5
	3	10	23.8	24.4	82.9
	4	6	14.3	14.6	97.6
	5	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	8	19.0	19.5	19.5
	2	10	23.8	24.4	43.9
	3	8	19.0	19.5	63.4
	4	11	26.2	26.8	90.2
	5	4	9.5	9.8	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest13

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	23.8	24.4	24.4
	2	21	50.0	51.2	75.6
	3	7	16.7	17.1	92.7
	4	3	7.1	7.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest14

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	3	3	7.1	7.3	9.8
	4	10	23.8	24.4	34.1
	5	27	64.3	65.9	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest15

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	18	42.9	43.9	43.9
	2	11	26.2	26.8	70.7
	3	6	14.3	14.6	85.4
	4	6	14.3	14.6	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest16

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	23.8	24.4	24.4
	2	9	21.4	22.0	46.3

	3	10	23.8	24.4	70.7
	4	7	16.7	17.1	87.8
	5	5	11.9	12.2	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest17

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	16.7	17.1	17.1
	2	10	23.8	24.4	41.5
	3	9	21.4	22.0	63.4
	4	6	14.3	14.6	78.0
	5	9	21.4	22.0	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	24	57.1	58.5	58.5
	2	7	16.7	17.1	75.6
	3	3	7.1	7.3	82.9
	4	5	11.9	12.2	95.1
	5	2	4.8	4.9	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest19

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	26	61.9	63.4	63.4
	2	12	28.6	29.3	92.7

	4	3	7.1	7.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest20

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	9	21.4	22.0	22.0
	2	9	21.4	22.0	43.9
	3	9	21.4	22.0	65.9
	4	10	23.8	24.4	90.2
	5	4	9.5	9.8	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest21

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	4.8	4.9	4.9
	2	3	7.1	7.3	12.2
	3	10	23.8	24.4	36.6
	4	9	21.4	22.0	58.5
	5	17	40.5	41.5	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest22

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	4.8	4.9	4.9
	2	2	4.8	4.9	9.8
	3	5	11.9	12.2	22.0

	4	13	31.0	31.7	53.7
	5	19	45.2	46.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest23

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	4	5	11.9	12.2	14.6
	5	35	83.3	85.4	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest24

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	3	4	9.5	9.8	12.2
	4	9	21.4	22.0	34.1
	5	27	64.3	65.9	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest25

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	3	1	2.4	2.4	4.9
	4	6	14.3	14.6	19.5
	5	33	78.6	80.5	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		

Quest25

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	3	1	2.4	2.4	4.9
	4	6	14.3	14.6	19.5
	5	33	78.6	80.5	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest26

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	2	1	2.4	2.4	4.9
	3	4	9.5	9.8	14.6
	4	11	26.2	26.8	41.5
	5	24	57.1	58.5	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest27

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	7.1	7.3	7.3
	2	9	21.4	22.0	29.3
	3	15	35.7	36.6	65.9
	4	10	23.8	24.4	90.2
	5	4	9.5	9.8	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest28

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	7.1	7.3	7.3
	2	7	16.7	17.1	24.4
	3	13	31.0	31.7	56.1
	4	12	28.6	29.3	85.4
	5	6	14.3	14.6	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest29

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	32	76.2	78.0	78.0
	2	8	19.0	19.5	97.6
	3	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest30

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	23	54.8	56.1	56.1
	2	8	19.0	19.5	75.6
	3	9	21.4	22.0	97.6
	4	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Quest31

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	9	21.4	22.0	22.0
	4	12	28.6	29.3	51.2
	5	20	47.6	48.8	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Question32

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	4.8	4.9	4.9
	2	1	2.4	2.4	7.3
	3	3	7.1	7.3	14.6
	4	13	31.0	31.7	46.3
	5	22	52.4	53.7	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Frequency Table

ESL certification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29	69.0	70.7	70.7
	2	12	28.6	29.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Bilingual cert

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	28	66.7	68.3	68.3
	2	13	31.0	31.7	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher speaks other language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	32	76.2	78.0	78.0
	2	9	21.4	22.0	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Participated in Bilingual or ESL program as a child

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	31.0	31.7	31.7
	2	28	66.7	68.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher of Reading Language Arts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	31	73.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	11	26.2		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher of Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	23	54.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	19	45.2		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher of Science

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	26	61.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	16	38.1		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher of Social Studies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4	30	71.4	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	12	28.6		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher of PE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5	3	7.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	39	92.9		
Total		42	100.0		

Teacher of Foreign Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	6	6	14.3	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	36	85.7		
Total		42	100.0		

Gender:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29	69.0	70.7	70.7
	2	12	28.6	29.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		

Gender:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29	69.0	70.7	70.7
	2	12	28.6	29.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

How did you obtain your certification?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	19	45.2	46.3	46.3
	2	18	42.9	43.9	90.2
	3	1	2.4	2.4	92.7
	4	3	7.1	7.3	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

What is the highest degree obtained?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29	69.0	70.7	70.7
	2	10	23.8	24.4	95.1
	3	2	4.8	4.9	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

What is the percentage of LEP or ELLs in you class this year?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	9.5	9.8	9.8
	2	1	2.4	2.4	12.2
	3	6	14.3	14.6	26.8
	4	30	71.4	73.2	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		

What is the percentage of LEP or ELLs in you class this year?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	9.5	9.8	9.8
	2	1	2.4	2.4	12.2
	3	6	14.3	14.6	26.8
	4	30	71.4	73.2	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

Approximately how many hours of training have you had in ESL and/or working with ELLs (include district level or other sources), please mark which one applies to you.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	2.4	2.4	2.4
	2	4	9.5	9.8	12.2
	3	3	7.1	7.3	19.5
	4	4	9.5	9.8	29.3
	5	3	7.1	7.3	36.6
	6	26	61.9	63.4	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

How many years have you taught?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	23.8	24.4	24.4
	2	7	16.7	17.1	41.5
	3	4	9.5	9.8	51.2
	4	4	9.5	9.8	61.0
	5	16	38.1	39.0	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

What is your age?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	9	21.4	22.0	22.0
	2	8	19.0	19.5	41.5
	3	16	38.1	39.0	80.5
	4	8	19.0	19.5	100.0
	Total	41	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.4		
Total		42	100.0		

T-Test

Notes

Output Created		11-Mar-2011 16:03:04
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\lruban\Desktop\Alex Rodriguez fil2e.xls.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	42
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis in a list are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in that list
Syntax		T-TEST GROUPS=certESL(1 2) /MISSING=LISTWISE /VARIABLES=knowledge attitude beliefs /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.016
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.015

Group Statistics

certESL		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Knowledge dimension1	1	29	2.8621	.40215	.07468
	2	12	2.9417	.41222	.11900
attitude dimension1	1	29	3.0376	.34233	.06357
	2	12	2.8788	.32277	.09318
beliefs dimension1	1	29	2.6489	.52321	.09716
	2	12	2.4697	.53968	.15579

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed) p-value	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper
Knowledge	Equal variances assumed	.011	.917	-.573	39	.570	-.07960	.13902	-.36079	.20159
	Equal variances not assumed			-.567	20.143	.577	-.07960	.14049	-.37252	.21332

attitude	Equal variances assumed	.427	.518	1.373	39	.177	.15883	.11565	-.07509	.39275
	Equal variances not assumed			1.408	21.770	.173	.15883	.11280	-.07524	.39290
beliefs	Equal variances assumed	.186	.669	.989	39	.329	.17921	.18120	-.18731	.54572
	Equal variances not assumed			.976	20.030	.341	.17921	.18361	-.20375	.56216