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ABSTRACT

A WASHINGTON STATE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' GUIDE TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION

By

María G. García-Bautista

JULY 2010

The purpose of this project was to create an elementary teacher’s manual which explained the history and laws of bilingual education, first and second language development theories and approaches, bilingual education models and what research says about the various models. Proponents of English only/ Sheltered Instruction programs argue that immigrants and their descendents should assimilate to the customs and cultural norms of the United States as expeditiously as possible. Those same proponents believe that acquiring English is a prerequisite for success in education. Without a doubt English language proficiency can lead to immeasurable success.

In this manual Two-Way Dual Language Immersion, ESL pull-out/push-in, Content Based ESL, English immersion, and Early and Late Exit Bilingual programs were analyzed along with the research for each model. The intent was to identify which of these programs best close the achievement gap for English language learners as is mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 so that educators and administrator can make pedagogically sound policy decisions. Research supporting the positive effects of bilingual education is promising.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Manual

Bilingual Education

The purpose of this project was to create an elementary teacher’s manual which explained the history and laws of bilingual education, first and second language development theories, bilingual education models and what researcher have learned about various models. Proponents of English only/ Sheltered Instruction programs argue that immigrants and descendents of immigrants to the United States should assimilate to the customs and cultural norms of the nation as expeditiously as possible. Those same proponents believe that acquiring English is a prerequisite for acculturation and that it will lead to success in education. Without a doubt English language proficiency can lead to immeasurable success. The question is which bilingual educational programs best meet the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs), Two-Way Immersion, or ESL? Content Based ESL or Late Exit programs? Which of these program designs close the achievement gap as is mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001? Which programs will provide students the skills and knowledge needed to succeed in a global economy? What are the consequences when programs fail to meet the needs of ELLs?

Several instructional models exist throughout the nation. These programs were designed to meet the needs of limited English proficient student. They include:

- Two-Way Bilingual Education (Dual Language, Two-Way Immersion Programs)
- Late-Exit Bilingual Education (Transitional Bilingual Education)
Early-Exit Bilingual Education (Transitional Bilingual Education)
Content Based English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) (Sheltered Immersion)
English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) Pull-Out/ Push-In

Statement of the Problem

The classrooms of 2010 in Washington State are not what they were in the 1980s. According to the U. S. Census Bureau, in 1980 the Hispanic population (can be any race Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican) of Washington state was 120,016. By the year 2000 that demographic group grew to 441,509 and reached 613,929 in 2008 (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2008). The Asian/Pacific Island population was 445,530 in 2006 and reached 470,361 in 2008 (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2008). It is projected that by 2030, the Asian/Pacific population will reach 825,234 and the Hispanic population will reach 1,099,540 (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2008). In 2000 the Black population was 35,818, by 2010 it reached 40,454, and is expected to climb to 61,363 by 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Meanwhile, it is expected that the white population will remain near 1,305,299 from 2006 to 2020. Any number of foreign languages are spoken among these groups including Russian, German, Chinese, Mandarin, Spanish, Vietnamese, Japanese and others. As the demographic makeup of the state changes, so will the educational needs of these new Washingtonians. Educators must be prepared to meet the sociocultural, linguistic and academic needs of the children who enter Washington’s public classrooms.
Rationale

Washington’s changing demographics created a high demand for bilingual bi-literate educators who are trained in effective and appropriate strategies to meet the needs of the changing population. Although, numerous teachers enter the general education classroom not all graduates, or veteran educators are trained in bilingual education. Many of these teachers have limited time and resources to invest in the study of the most relevant laws, theories, and pedagogically sound practices to meet the varying linguistic, social, and academic needs of the diverse population. Yet educators are expected to serve these students on a daily basis. There is a real need for educator texts where practitioners can gain quick answers to legal questions, text which will explain language development theories, language acquisition approaches followed in education, bilingual education models and reliable research. Educators and administrators alike must make informed decisions based on reliable theories and effective research to ensure that pedagogically sound practices are implemented. This manual will provide educators the information and research needed to address these issues.

Project Methodologies

A study of bilingual education history, laws, first and second language development and approaches, and bilingual education models and research was conducted. A manual was created out of this study with a strong focus on explaining bilingual education history and laws which states and local school districts are mandated to follow. Native and second language acquisition theories and approaches were discussed due to their importance in creating strong linguistic foundations for English language learners. The
Prism Model was presented so that educators could comprehend the significance of ensuring a meaningful education for English language learners (ELLs) by meeting their sociocultural, linguistic, academic and cognitive processes needs. Bilingual education models and research were evaluated to assist educator in analyzing the effectiveness and efficacy of the various programs which may be implemented in their schools.

Definition of Terms

**Additive Bilingualism** promotes bilingualism and biliteracy by maintaining the primary language through reading and writing in the student's primary language while adding the secondary language in content areas such as music, physical education, art, drama, social studies, library and media use. The use of both languages is seen as an asset. This kind of bilingualism is a centerpiece of dual language programs (Peregoy and Boyle, 2001).

**Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills** (BICS) are basic language skills needed to interact on a personal level. BICS is sometimes referred to as playground language skills (Cummins, 1980).

**Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency Skills** (CALPS) are sophisticated language skills needed for academic learning in content areas such as mathematics, science, social studies reading and language arts where students are required to use advanced language to analyze, evaluate, and synthesis cognitively challenging concepts (Cummins, 1980).

**Content-Based ESL (Sheltered Instruction in English)** Content Based ESL models use instructional materials and learning tasks from academic content areas
such as mathematics, science and language arts to develop English language skills as well as content. English development is both the goal and the method of instruction under his model (Malagon and DeLeeuw, 2006).

**Early-Exit Bilingual Education** (Transitional Bilingual Education)

Early-Exit Bilingual models are like Late-Exit models except that they are designed to transition ELLs from their native language to English in the first three-year period of the primary grades. This model relies on instruction of core content in the students’ native language throughout the model. The degree to which the teacher utilizes the students’ native language is related to the students’ English proficiency. The more English proficient the student is the more it is used (Malagon and DeLeeuw, 2006).

**English-as-a-Second-Language Pull-Out/Push-In** (mainly used at the Elementary Level) English language learners in pull-out models are “pulled” out of their mainstream classrooms for approximately 30-45 minutes several times a week. In this model, a teacher or paraprofessional provides students with assistance in either English language development or in academic contents. When this assistance is offered in the mainstream classroom, the model is called “Push-In” (Malagon and DeLeeuw, 2006).

**Immersion**

Under this model students are immersed in the mainstream classroom where no native language support is provided. The intent of the model is to have students learn English as quickly as possible. The rational is that if students are immersed.
in English they will rapidly develop the language skills necessary for success in complex content subjects (McCold and Malagon, 2009).

**Late-Exit Bilingual Education** (Transitional Bilingual Education)

Late-Exit Bilingual models are designed for ELLs exclusively. This is a transitional model designed to move ELLs from their native language (i.e. Vietnamese) to English over the first five to six years (therefore late) of their elementary school grades. This model relies on instruction of core content in the students’ native language throughout the model. This model promotes high levels of academic achievement in all curricular areas and full academic language proficiency in the students’ first and second languages. Late exit from the program is always determined by a student’s annual assessment of language proficiency, (Malagon and DeLeeuw, 2005-2006).

**Subtractive Bilingualism** promotes the use of and literacy in the secondary language and away from the primary language which is the main goal of the ESL Pull-out/Push-in model (Peregoy and Boyle, 2001).

**Two-Way Bilingual (Dual Language)**

A two-way bilingual program uses two languages to teach students the core curriculum (commonly used at the elementary level). The goals of this model are to produce high academic achievement, to educate bilingual bi-literate students, and to promote cross-cultural sensitivity. Students are as equally integrated as possible. A 50% representation of each language group is not required, but it is highly recommended. The model requires a consistent
language population at the K-5 level for its implementation to be feasible over the long-term (6-8 years) (Malagon and DeLeeuw, 2006).

The Remainder of the Study

Chapter II of the project was a literature review of bilingual education issues. It included a historical perspective of bilingual education nearly two hundred years ago, to the loss of support for German instruction during WWI, and the efforts to create bilingual programs during the Civil Rights era. Bilingual education laws were also included under the historical section, as well as, Washington State’s bilingual education laws. This literature review explained native and second language acquisition theories and approaches. The Collier’s Prism Model was explained because of its importance in addressing the sociocultural, linguistic, academic and cognitive processes which if provided could ensure that students receive a meaningful education. Chapter two included a brief explanation of the various bilingual education models and the research behind each model.

Chapter III of this project explained the procedures followed to create the teacher’s manual, how the research was collected and the rational behind the manual’s creation.

Chapter IV of this project is the Washington State Elementary Teachers’ Guide to Bilingual Education.

Chapter V concluded the project with a summary of the teacher’s manual created in chapter IV. The summary explained the procedures used and the rational for its creation. The researcher provided the conclusions deduced from the literature and research review, and recommendations for educators were provided.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The Issue at Hand

A Historical Perspective

The current influx of immigrants makes it appear as if bilingual education is a recent phenomenon. For many Americans the thought of educating immigrants in foreign languages is a sacrilegious act, an affront the American way of life. In these peoples’ minds, yesterday’s immigrants arrived in this country with a fervent desire to assimilate, to rapidly learn their adopted nation’s, customs, traditions and language. They believe school is the natural setting for weaning minority students from their native tongue (Crawford, 1999).

Many Americans commonly believe that immigrants of the past quickly assimilated and learned English; therefore, newcomers must forgo their native language to become true Americans. While there is no doubt that some immigrants assimilated quickly the reality is that many struggled for generations (Crawford). First generation immigrants of the past did not lose their native tongues upon arrival on America’s shores. Their, “immigrant children were the first to reach English fluency, their grandchildren the first to finish high school, and their great-grandchildren the first to grow up in the middle class” (Crawford, 999, p.20) Prior to the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s’ racial minorities had greater challenges in melting into the American mainstream regardless of their English language dominance.

[Type text]
Crawford (1999) explains that in 1664, at least eighteen languages were spoken on Manhattan Island, not including Native languages. Though English was wide spread through the colonies in the seventeenth century German, French, Swedish, Irish, and Welsh were also commonly heard as the American Revolution broke out (Crawford). Bilingualism was common among European colonists, new arrivals strived to preserve their heritage as schools were established; their language loyalty ran strong (Crawford). German schools were common in Philadelphia in the late seventeenth century. However, in the 1750s Benjamin Franklin tried to put an end to German language schools.

Franklin’s concerns over bilingualism could be taken out of today’s newspapers. Citing the increased use of German in public settings, he argued that translators would soon be necessary in the Assembly, to tell one half of our legislation what the other half say; In short unless that stream of their importation could be turned from this to other colonies...(Germans) will soon outnumber us, that all the advantages we have will not in My Opinion be able to preserve our language, and even our Government will become precarious (Crawford, 1999, p.22).

Franklin was soon voted out of the colonial assembly by German language supporters. Franklin’s views were not common among the nation’s founders. They placed greater importance on political liberty and peoples’ choice “than on linguistic homogeneity” (Crawford, p.22) and took ‘a policy to not have a policy’ on language (Crawford, p.22), thus allowing the continuity of bilingualism throughout the colonies.

According to Lessow-Hurley (2005) and Crawford (1999), support and opposition for bilingual education in the United States has historically swung to the left or right depending on world tensions and sense of nationalism. Many times these feelings are associated with language mastery by the ruling class. People with anti-immigrant
sentiments are offended when they hear others speak in foreign tongues. The polemic debate over bilingualism is not new nor will it cease easily.

Leesow-Hurley explained that dual language education was available throughout the country during the nineteenth century in various languages including German, Danish, Swedish, Polish, Norwegian, Italian, Czech, French, and Spanish. Lessow-Hurley goes on to say that the Cherokee established and ran over 21 academic facilities where students learned the Cherokee alphabet created by Sequoyah.

However, with the onset of WWI, a sense of isolationism and nationalism was sparked which resulted in anti-German rhetoric. As a result, German language instruction was shunned and dual language programs around the country ended. After that point, English language was associated with American loyalty, and bilingual education practically disappeared from the nation’s schools.

Lessow-Hurley stated that the English only sentiment changed during WWII when there was an increased need for bilingual and biliterate servicemen who could decipher coded messages sent by enemy militaries. After returning from the warfront, bilingual servicemen brought with them a heightened sense of pride in their heritage and their ability to function in linguistically diverse settings. Their pride empowered them and other minorities during the Civil Rights movement to promote the use and formal instruction of bilingualism.

History and the Law

The struggle for equitable education in American schools began nearly 200 years ago. In the late 18th century, southern states banned the education of enslaved men, women,
and children. In 1787, Northern states like Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio created some of the first segregated schools because Anglo citizens refused to send their children to schools with African American students (Spring, 2007). In 1849, Benjamin Roberts sued the City of Boston for denying his 5-year old daughter entry into five “white” schools that were closer to her home. The Court ruled in favor of the city, stating that Boston had provided “equal” schools for children of color. In 1877, the Massachusetts governor signed a law that banned segregation of children based on their race or religion (Spring, 2007). However, in the 1890s many white people believed that even one drop of blood from a colored ancestor made a person inferior. Long before Rosa Parks, “Homer Plessy, who was one-eighth black and seven-eights white” (Spring, 2007, p.55) was incarcerated for refusing to sit in the “colored” section of a train. Unfortunately, for people of color, in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled against Plessy stating that “segregation did not create a label of inferiority” and it legalized segregation (Spring, 2007, p.55). In 1954, the separate but equal doctrine was overturned by the Supreme Court in Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka. The Court stated that, “In the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate education facilities are inherently unequal…. Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy v. Ferguson this finding is amply supported by modern authority” (Spring, 2007, p.115). While many states followed the Supreme Court verdict some southern states were slow to comply (Pullman and Van Patten, 2007). The fight for equality continued as local and state governments resisted desegregation laws. The Civil Rights
Act of 1964 outlawed discrimination based on gender, color, ethnicity, religion or economic status in any agency or organization that received federal funding.

However, the Civil Rights Act did not specifically mandate bilingual education services for language minority students. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 mandated that school districts which received federal funds must create and implement educational programs for limited English students. Nonetheless, school districts across the nation continued to offer little or no language support to English language learners.

*Lau v. Nichols* of 1974

On December 21, 1974 in *Lau v. Nichols*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of 1,800 Chinese American students from San Francisco, who argued that they did not receive the instructional help that they were entitled to under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Lessow-Hurley, 2005). Justice William O Douglas wrote:

There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. Basic skills are at the very core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that before a child can effectively participate in the educational program he must already have acquired those basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful (Lessow-Hurley, 2005, p. 131).

After that decisive ruling, states were obligated to create education programs that would meet the needs of language minority students across the nation. Subsequently the *Lau Remedies* were created to guide states in their efforts to design and assess programs that would meet the needs of non-English and limited-English students. According to the Office of Civil Rights, public school districts which received federal funds were
obligated to identify the student’s primary or home language. If the student’s primary language was other than English, district were obligated to create and implement programs that would ensure the “effective participation” of limited-English students in the district’s educational program (Developing ELL Programs: Guidance Documents, 1985).

*Lau Remedies* Appendix B defines the programs as follows: Bilingual/Bicultural Programs in which students could utilize their native language and culture while they were introduced to English and the American culture; English as a Second Language (ESL Push-out /Pull-in models) programs designed to teach English to the students; High Intensive Language Training (HILT), a total immersion program designed to teach English; Multilingual/ Multicultural Program, similar to the Bilingual/Bicultural program except that students were taught in more than their primary and secondary language, with the intent to have students function in more than two languages and cultures; Transitional Bilingual Education Programs (TBE), where students were taught in their native language and culture. Once the students reached a certain level of proficiency they were no longer instructed in their primary language.

The *Lau Remedies* required districts to provide instructional personnel who were familiar with the student’s cultural background and language. Where staffing was not adequate to implement program requirements, districts were to provide staff training. This inservice was to include training objectives, instructional methods to reach the objectives, methods for teacher selection in need of training, names of instructional consultants and the location of the inservice, training content, training evaluation and
criteria as well as a proposed timetable (Lau Remedies Appendix B, 1985). Congress also established the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974:

No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin by... (f) the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede participation by its students in its instructional programs (Lessow-Hurly, 2005, section 1703(f) of EEOA).

*Castañeda v. Pickard* of 1981

As with desegregation, bilingual education proponents faced opposition across the country. In *Castañeda v. Pickard* of 1981 the Fifth Court of Appeals ruled in favor of Mr. Castañeda. Mr. Castañeda, the plaintiff, argued that the Raymond Independent School in Texas (RISD) segregated his children, used inappropriate grouping strategies that were “ethically and racially discriminating” (1981, p.1), and failed to provide an educational program that would allow his children to overcome the educational barriers caused by their limited English proficiency. As a result of the Castañeda ruling, school districts were obligated to establish pedagogically sound and rational programs to guarantee that limited English students would have a quality educational experience. Districts in that region were to design a system to evaluate their program’s efficacy. They were also to provide qualified personnel to implement the educational program, hire new staff, train current staff as well as provide sufficient materials and resources to implement the program (Kerper Mora, 2005, Lessow-Hurly, 2005).

These acts of congress and court cases made it clear that states and local districts were obligated to provide English language learners with the instructional services they deserved and needed to succeed when exposed to challenging cognitively academic content.
Proposition 227

In 1997, Proposition 227 was submitted to California State voters by Ron Unz and Gloria Matta Tuchman (Krashen, 1997), in order to put an end to bilingual education in that state. Bilingual and multicultural education supporters joined the ranks with teachers and parents to counter the controversial initiative. None the less, Proposition 227 passed and nearly ended bilingual education in California. According to the official voters guide, prepared by the Attorney General, Proposition 227 required that all classroom instruction be conducted in English with the premise that English immersion methods were viewed as superior to bilingual methods of instruction. The English immersion requirement could only be waived if parents could prove that their children knew English, or if the children had special needs, or if the children would learn English faster through alternative education. Proposition 227 stated that if the children were not fluent in English they could be placed in a short-term (one year) intensive sheltered immersion program. Under Prop 227, $50 million were allocated per year for ten years to organizations that pledged to provide English tutoring to children in their community. Prop 227 also permitted parents and guardians to sue districts in order to achieve enforcement of the law (California Voter’s Guide, 1997). As a result of this English only mandate, Arizona soon followed California’s lead and ended its compliance with Title VII in 2000 (Crawford, 2002), ending years of support for bilingual education in that state as well.
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

In 2001, after years of attacks by English only proponents like Unz, Matta Tuchman, Cultural Conservatives, the Republican Party, as well as limited support form OCR and Democrats in Congress, Title VII ended with the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Title III) under G. W. Bush's “school reform” which passed with sweeping bipartisan support (Crawford, 2002, p. 1). Section G of Title III indicated that individual states had two options for serving Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Option one was to keep Title VII intact with little or no increased funding. Option two would replace Title VII with a formula grant system “to support instructional programs, accountability mechanisms that stressed rapid acquisition of English” (ESEA Implementation Guide, p. G1). NCLB required state and local agencies to design and submit detailed plans for accountability, which meant that students would be tested and ranked according to their test results. NCLB mandated yearly English proficiency testing and achievement testing in English for students that had enrolled in U.S. schools for at least three years (only limited English proficient students who had been enrolled in U.S. schools less than three years were to be exempt). Title III required local districts to inform parents about English learner programs. It replaced funding that supported native language instruction at the elementary level with a Foreign Language Incentive Program that would award funds to support foreign language instruction at the secondary level. Title III changed the federal Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) to the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited-English-Proficient Students (ESEA Implementation Guide, p.
Gl-G3) there wise know as OELA. Undoubtedly Title III had sweeping ramifications on local and state agencies.

Bilingual Education in Washington State

Washington Sates continued to offer bilingual education services, though with limited funding. In order to comply with Title III, the Lau Remedies and EEOA, Washington Administrative Code (WAC) required public school districts which receive federal funds to “provide each eligible student a transitional bilingual instructional program, or if the use of two languages is not feasible as provided under the WAC 392-160-040, an alternative instructional program” (WAC 392-160-010, p. 1) is to be provided. This “alternative instructional program” clause allowed districts to implement English immersion programs. The WAC indicates that districts “shall provide training for administrators, teachers, and other related staff on bilingual program models and/or district alternative instructional program, appropriate use of instructional strategies and assessment results, and curriculum and instructional materials for use with culturally and linguistically divers students” (WAC 392-160-010, p. 1).

Districts have ten days to identify student eligibility, to provide a home language survey, and administer the Washington Language Proficiency Placement Test (WLPT). Then annual reassessment of all students is required using the WLPT, as well as an academic assessment. The assessment must include, but is not limited to, the administration of a standards based test in reading, writing, listening and speaking in English (WAC 392-160-015). This part of the WAC is not in alignment with Title III, which mandated that yearly English proficiency testing and achievement testing in
English for students that had enrolled in U.S. schools for at least three years would take place, and that only limited English proficient students who had been enrolled in U.S. schools less than three years were to be exempt (ESEA Implementation Guide, p. G1-G3).

Washington State law indicates that limited English students are not required to participate in a transitional bilingual program if the parents/guardians so choose (WAC 392-160-15, p.3). Collier and Thomas (2004) advise that parents who opt out of bilingual education for their children be fully informed of the research that supports bilingual services. Washington’s law also indicates that students will receive services for no more than three consecutive years provided that eligible students have not yet met exit criteria as indicated by the WLPT. If students do not meet exiting criteria, then they are entitled to receive continued instruction in an approved bilingual or alternative program (WAC 392-160-035, p. 9). Once students meet or exceed the English language standards as measured by the WLPT, students will not be eligible for funding in the transitional bilingual instructional program (TBIP) (WAC 392-160-035, p. 10).

As a result of the No Child Left Behind Act, many states and local districts across the nation selected option two of Title III and scrambled to implement instructional programs which would place ELLs on a fast track to English proficiency to meet program exiting criteria (exiting form bilingual services). However, in an effort to get students to acquire English skills, many district’s administrators lost sight of the fact that English language learners need to develop high order cognitive academic language which is essential in comprehending content rich instruction in math, science, social studies and advanced
literary text (Collier, 1995). ELL students who met exiting criteria, under the Transitional Bilingual Program, were prematurely placed in general education classes without language support. When a higher level of cognitive academic language was required, the bilingual students began to falter (Collier and Thomas, 2004) because the general education teachers were not well versed in effective and appropriate instructional strategies for ELLs.

Language Development

How do humans develop language skills? Is language acquired or learned? Is there an optimal time period to learn language? Fortunately, linguists and researchers have contributed greatly to the understanding of language development.

As explained by Costantino (1999), Lenneberg proposed that children had a “critical period” from the ages of two to twelve to acquire language naturally. Lenneberg believed that this was accomplished through exposure to meaningful language in a natural setting. It was thought that during this critical period child had a certain level of brain plasticity, the ability of differing regions of the brain to adopt or take over functions of damaged parts (Berk, 1996) which allowed them to replicate nativelike speech, given the fact that the children were healthy and had no physical or neurological impairments. It is believed that after this “critical period” second language learners can learn a second language, although they may not produce “nativelike accents” (Brown, 1994, p. 53).

Today it is widely accepted that “as the brain matures specific functions are assigned-or ‘lateralized’ to the left” (Brown, 1994, p. 53) or right hemispheres of the brain. According to Brown, linguistic, analytical and other functions appear to be controlled by
the left hemisphere, while emotional and social needs appear to be controlled by the right hemisphere. For example, stroke survivors manifest speech impairments as a result of damage to the left hemisphere. Accident victims of right hemisphere trauma do not appear to manifest the same speech impairments (Brown, 1994). Lateralization and brain plasticity seem to explain why language can be relocated in the right hemisphere after traumatic injuries to the left hemisphere occur.

How does lateralization affect second language learners? According to Brown, there appears to be great right hemisphere involvement in second language learning when second languages are acquired after puberty. Brown explains that complex language processing (linguistic analysis) may occur in the right hemisphere when second languages are learned after puberty. In contrast, first and second language acquisition develop in the left hemisphere during early childhood adding support to the critical period hypothesis (Brown, 1994).

Another issue related to native like speech for second language learners is muscle use. Brown states that significant muscle dexterity is required to produce native like speech. According to Brown, the production of human speech sounds requires the use of various muscles in the throat, larynx, mouth, lips, tongue, nasal cavity and other muscles. This usually occurs by age five. It must be noted that some sounds may take longer to control, /r/ and /l/ for example.

Educators should understand that speaking with an accent does not imply that a second or third language learner did not master the language. Native like speech doesn’t equal eloquence or the ability to explain complex ideas (i.e. medical, mathematical,
economic, scientific, or technological), those arise from superior cognitive capabilities of which many older bilingual and multilingual individuals are capable (Brown, 1994). Developmentally mature students possess greater learning capacity. Brown argued that they have superior analytic abilities and refined pragmatic skills which younger students have not yet mastered. Older learners have prior linguistic and cultural experiences which they can tap into, upon receiving input, to gain meaning. They also have greater knowledge of their first language which they can draw upon to gain comprehension (Saville-Troike, 2006, Richard-Amato, 1996).

McLaughlin (1992) argued that not all researchers were in agreement with the critical period hypothesis. McLaughlin credited the differences in children’s second language acquisition to psychological and social factors, as opposed to exclusively biological ones. Behaviorists, on the other hand, believed in stimuli reinforcement.

Behaviorists viewed children as blank slates (*tabula rosa*) to be filled with information and shaped by their environment with stimuli reinforcement. They thought that language was a human behavior which developed as a result of stimuli. B. F. Skinner coined the term *Operant conditioning*. Operant conditioning can be explained as conditioning in which a living being (a child) responds, without seemingly visible stimuli, yet that response is reinforced by positive response from another person (Brown, 1994). Skinner believed that behavior could be manipulated with consequences that were either pleasant or unpleasant. Pleasant (positive) consequences could maintain and increase a behavior, while negative consequences or lack of reinforcement diminished a
behavior (Brown, 1994). “Skinner’s *Verbal Behavior* describes language as a system of verbal *operants*, classes of responses, and his understanding of the role of conditioning led the whole new era of language teaching...for several decades” (Brown, 1994, p. 78). Behaviorists believed that a child who received reinforcement for response would continue to develop language because he or she was conditioned to do so (Brown, 1994).

**Universal Grammar**

In contrast to Skinner, Chomsky (1965) believed language could not be analyzed in simple terms of stimuli and responses. His theory of “Universal Grammar” proposed that all children around the world had an innate ability to acquire language in relatively short periods of time regardless of the complexity of the languages. Chomsky thought that this predisposition to acquire language allowed children to deduce meaning, to reason abstractly and to think creatively. Universal Grammar is based on the idea that there are general principals common to all languages, and that through interaction within the group, children could acquire and master the use of these principles. These include phonology (sound systems), morphology (word structures), lexicon (vocabulary), syntax (grammar) and discourse (the ability to communicate with others) (Saville-Troike, 2006). Chomsky thought of language learning as a natural process. He felt that children acquire language in social settings because of their need to interact and communicate naturally and spontaneously with meaningful purpose in their social environment (Costantino, 1999).
According to Chomsky, people are universally equipped with a language acquisition device (LAD) (Brown, 1994). This device is associated with all universal languages. LAD is activated when people are exposed to natural languages. Depending on the language to which the child is exposed, LAD selects and makes meaning of the syntactical structure of the language. Children will develop their understanding of words, phrases and an infinite numbers of sentences that are appropriate to their language through exposure to the language grammar system. As their syntax and lexicon develop, so will their linguistic competence (Richard-Amato, 1996) in their tongue. LAD consists of four innate linguistic properties.

First, the ability to distinguish speech sounds form other sounds in the environment such as vehicles, animals and other random noises. Second, the ability to organize linguistic events into various classes which can later be refined. Third, knowledge that only a certain kind of linguistic system is possible and that other kinds are not. Fourth, the ability to engage in constant evaluation of the developing linguistic system so as to construct the simplest possible system out of the linguistic data that are encountered (Brown, p. 25).

Vygotsky proposed the Sociocultural Theory. Vygotsky believed that language plays a central role in cognitive development. According to Vygotsky, learning develops out of social communication with peers and adults. These people help the less skilled child master challenging tasks and language structures within the zone of proximal development (ZPD). ZPD is a range of tasks and skills that a child cannot perform independently, but can accomplish with assistance from more knowledgeable individuals (Berk, 1996). Therefore, a healthy active child who interacts with capable adults
(educators) and peers will develop an understanding of the underlying principles of their native tongue.

Second Language Development Approaches

According to Saville-Troike (2006), linguists also influenced the understanding of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Linguists believe that all languages share the following characteristics. First, languages are systematic. Second, languages are symbolic; alphabetic principals with letter-sound correspondence, and object names, descriptions, and sentence structures have culturally agreed upon meanings. Third, languages are social. They require interaction between people in natural and meaningful settings (Saville-Troike, 2006). What were some early approaches to second language development?

U.S. Time Line for Second Language Instruction

In 1939, Charles Fries of the University of Michigan applied the principles of structured linguistics to teach language through grammar with specific attention paid to pronunciation, and intense oral drilling of basic sentence structure. In 1943 the U.S. entered WWII as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor. The Army Specialized Training Program (ASPT) was established in response to the need for bilingual servicemen who were linguistically proficient in the languages of their allies and enemies alike (German, Italian, French, Chinese, Japanese, Malay and others) (Brown, 1994). In 1950, the U.S. State Department commissioned the American Council of Learned Societies to design English teaching textbooks for foreigners. These promoted the use of pronunciation, morphology, grammar, drills and exercises. In 1957, the Russian Satellite Sputnik was
launched forcing the U.S. government to accept the need to teach foreign languages in order to keep up with scientific advances outside the U.S. In 1959, the National Defense Education Act established funding for foreign language instruction in the U.S. (Richards and Rogers, 2004)

Audiolingual Method

The Audiolingual Method (ALM) evolved out of the Army Method of foreign language instruction. ALM was known for its oral and aural approach to structured language instruction which focused on aural training. Language was viewed as a system of structurally related elements for encoding, phonology, morphology, word and sentence structures.

ALM adhered to the Behaviorist stimuli response principles because successful responses in the second language were immediately reinforced. Thus, in a classic behaviorist second language classroom, a foreign language learner closely listened to teacher dialogues, practiced grammatical patterns, and engaged in morpheme and syntax studies with their teacher and peers. Under this method, foreign language learners were engaged in closely controlled practice of dialog drills for repetition and memorization with carefully designed schedules of reinforcement (Brown, 1994). Correct pronunciation and articulation were stressed. Once learners memorized the practice dialogues, grammatical patterns were selected for further study and practice. Learners were expected to practice skilled techniques to give correct responses. Learners had no control over content, pace or their learning styles. They were not encouraged to take risks and were expected to listen, imitate accurately and respond to prompts. The ALM was a
teacher dominated model. Teachers modeled the language, controlled the direction and pace of the lesson. They monitored and corrected students immediately. Teachers kept pupils busy with drills and tasks centered on phonology, morphology, and syntax (Richards and Rogers, 2004). Language skills materials were taught in order. First, there was a focus on listening training. Next, students were encouraged to speak articulately. Then, reading of graphic print, either hieroglyphic or alphabetic. Finally, students learned to write graphic speech symbols. The long term goal of the ALM model was to show native language proficiency and knowledge of second language. ALM was criticized for its failure to teach “long-term communicative proficiency” (Brown, 1994, p. 71). Though this approach lost popularity in the 1960’s, it is still used across the Untied States (Richards & Rogers, 2004).

Other early approaches to Second Language Acquisition include Robert Lado’s Contrastive Analysis (CA), and Error Analysis (EA). In CA, learners compared and contrasted their first and second languages to find similarities and differences in phonology, morphology and syntax. This approach fell in disuse because lexicon and discourse were given little emphasis, thus preventing any real mastery of the second language. In EA, focus was placed on the learner’s innate ability to construct language as opposed to stimulus reinforcement. Through this approach, the speaker needed to know the underlying rules of the language rather than rote memorization of unrelated concepts or skills. Under EA, the learner’s language production was seen as a “target for analysis,” thus a compilation of samples of learner language, identification, description, explanation, and evaluation of errors were created. Saville-Troike (2006) argues that EA
had its shortcomings because there was ambiguity of classification in the errors: What were the causes for the errors? There was lack of positive data: What could the learner do to correct the errors? The potential for language avoidance was also suspected: Linguists did not know if students avoided using language structures that were different or too difficult. In an era of data-guided instruction, one could argue that EA gave instructors insight into the learners’ progress and proficiency as well as their instructional needs (Costantino, 1999).

Interlanguage

As summarized by Saville-Troike, Selinker (1972) introduced the idea of Interlanguage (IL) to differentiate between the intermediate states of the learners’ language as they moved from their first language to the second language. IL was viewed as a third language system which differed from native language, and second language. IL was seen as systematic in that it’s governed by the learner’s internal grammar. It was thought to be dynamic because the internal system of rules changed continually as learners’ IL progressed. It was variable, which meant that contextual differences produced different language patterns. IL was a reduced system both in form and function. Form refers to less complex grammar structures. Reduced function refers to the diminished need to communicate in IL (Saville-Troike, 2006). Selinker also introduced the concept of second language fossilization which can occur when IL ceases to develop before learners reach native competency in L2. Today it is believed that fossilization is more likely to occur in older language learners than younger ones because of cultural
identity and communication needs (Saville-Troike). Fossilization may add some relevance to the "critical period" and brain plasticity theories.

**The Natural Approach**

The Natural Approach was popularized in the 1980's. It draws on Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. Terrell and Krashen (1983) promoted a "natural" method to language instruction which focused on meaning and vocabulary expansion instead of systematic grammar teaching. Its designers believed that it matched the natural "principles found in successful second language acquisition" (Richards & Rogers, 2004). Under the Natural Approach, an emphasis was placed on language input rather than practiced drills, or teacher monologues. Individual students' comfort levels (affective filter), extensive language exposure, and student preparedness were stressed before language production was required. They believed that students who were just introduced to the second language were expected to demonstrate an extended silent period. During that time teachers were to allow children to listen and observe without forcing them to speak in the second language (Hill & Flynn, 2006).

As summarized by Richards and Rogers (2004), the Natural Approach is based on Krashen's Language Acquisition Theory and was composed of five hypotheses. These include the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, the Monitor Hypothesis, the Natural Order Hypothesis, the Input Hypothesis and the Affective Filter Hypothesis.

The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis is the belief that there is a difference between learning a language and language acquisition. According to Krashen, acquiring a language is subconscious and natural and involves the language acquisition device
(LAD), whereas learning a second language requires a conscious effort and occurs with formal instruction in an organized setting. In the Natural Order Hypothesis, language rules are acquired in a predictable natural order. For example, children will learn to name objects and people, then they may learn actions that people and animals perform, followed by descriptions of people, places and objects. The Input Hypothesis requires sufficient and contextual comprehensible input. Comprehensible input is information that is conveyed in a manner that ensures that students comprehend the information. For example, some students may understand a retell by physically acting out a story sequence, while other students could benefit from the use of a graphic organizer to help them sequence the text. According to Krashen, students can successfully acquire language and content comprehension if exposed to comprehensible input with the use of graphic organizers, realia, videos, and manipulatives: The emphasis is to facilitate comprehension by any means. Under the Affective Filter Hypothesis, Krashen proposed that learning occurs best when students are engaged in low stress environments (the affective filter is lowered). This makes students more receptive to comprehensible input. Learning is diminished when the filter is raised by stress or anxiety. In the Monitor Hypothesis, learned language serves as a monitor to make corrections or changes to prior language production. (Richards & Rogers, 2004).

Five Stages of Second Language Acquisition

As explained by Hill and Flynn (2006), Krashen and Terrell first proposed five stages of second language acquisition in their 1983 book, The Natural Approach. In the preproduction stage, zero to six months, students are new to the language and are not able
to produce the language yet. In the early production stage, six months to a year, students can produce one or two word phrases. Though they have limited comprehension they understand more than they can speak. In the speech emergence stage, one to three years, students’ comprehension improves, yet they still need language support, and use of visual aids to help them process information. Students in this stage speak in simple sentences, although grammar and production errors are still common. Students enter the Intermediate Fluency stage, three to five years, they have great comprehension and make few grammatical errors. At the Advanced Fluency Stage, five to seven years, the students demonstrate near-native levels of speech comparable to that of their native speaking peers. They use the second language to express a wide range of ideas. It must be noted that the time needed for students to go through these stages can vary from student to student depending on various factors, which include but are not limited to, prior education, native language literacy and vocabulary development, self confidence and motivation (Hill & Flynn, 2006).

Washington State Language Proficiency Standards

Washington State’s Office of Superintendent of Public instruction (OSPI) analyzed the five stages of second language acquisition and created a set of language proficiency standards and instructional guides which ELLs are expected to meet in order to succeed in the general education classroom. These are beginning, advanced beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional. The levels of proficiency must be demonstrated in listening/speaking, reading and writing (Malagon & Chacon, 2009) and are embedded in the English language development (ELD) standards which are aligned to the grade
level expectations (GLEs). For example, in listening and speaking a beginning student might have a very limited understanding of the English language.

Students will need to learn to distinguish and produce English phonemes (sounds), uses simple words, gestures, and actions. They will need to imitate verbalizations of others to communicate basic survival needs such as, “may I drink water”, “where the restroom”, “is when is lunch” and so on. Students will respond to simple directions and will use gestures and phrases to participate in class discussions and activities. Advanced beginning students will use words and/or phrases, uses social greetings, participate in social discussions on familiar topics and in academic discussions, develop correct word order in phrases and will begin to use content-related vocabulary. Intermediate students may use simple sentences with some inconsistent use of syntax, tense, plurals, and subject/verb agreement. These students tell stores, use information to explain ideas with a little more confidence, participate in social and academic discussions, and begin to use content-related vocabulary. Advanced student uses descriptive sentences with common grammatical forms which may have some errors, participate in academic and social discussions using appropriate methods of speech to differing audiences, tell a stories, inform, explain, entertain, and begin to use word patterns to determine the meaning of new words. Transitional students have met criteria to exit Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) and are believed to be ready to study in the general education classroom without language support. These students speak clearly and comprehensibly using Standard English grammatical forms with random errors. Student at this level apply content-related vocabulary in a variety of contexts and situations presented in the classroom such as science and technology and give oral presentations following grade level appropriate criteria (Washington State K-2 Listening and Speaking Language Proficiency Standards OSPI).

The Threshold Hypothesis

In 1979, Cummins theorized that bilingualism is cognitively and academically beneficial to students. Cummins proposed the Threshold Hypothesis which assumed that children must reach a minimum level (threshold) of competence in the primary and secondary languages to “reap” the maximum benefits of bilingualism. He believed that for bilingualism to be fully beneficial, children must reach a “threshold” to avoid cognitive and academic developmental deficits. Cummins argued that to profit from the
rewards of bilingualism, children must be enrolled in an additive bilingual program (L1 + L2) instead of a subtractive program (L2 - L1), because the additive approach supports higher cognitive development since children are taught grade level concepts and skills instead of remedial concepts, or a watered down curriculum.

BICS and CALP

Cummins (1980) introduced a framework to distinguish between two levels of linguistic proficiency. The first level is termed Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). These are language skills needed to interact on a personal or social level. The person relies on nonlinguistic input such as gestures, intonation and other contextual clues to comprehend information received. BICS is sometimes referred to as playground language or casual language (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001). The second linguistic level is termed Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). CALP are sophisticated language skills needed for academic learning in content areas such as mathematics, science, social studies, reading and language arts, where ELL students are required to have greater listening skills and higher vocabulary which will enable them to analyze, evaluate and synthesize cognitively and linguistically challenging concepts (Cummins, 1980).

An understanding of BICS and CALP is significant for educators and policy makers. A person who does not comprehend the distinction between these two levels of proficiency may erroneously believe that children who communicate with their peers out on the playground or in nonacademic settings will have the ability to meet the challenges and rigors of content rich classrooms (mathematics, science, technology). Cummins
argues that students who are functioning at the BICS level are not prepared for the
demands of cognitively higher and linguistically rigorous concepts of the English
academic classroom, however, given the opportunity to use their native language they
could function quite successfully. This is particularly important in middle school and
high school classrooms where academic concepts are linguistically and cognitively
challenging, even for native English speakers and where CALP will be developed more
extensively.

The Prism Model

Collier (1995) makes a compelling argument that many school districts struggle to
provide a “meaningful education” (as mandated by Lau v Nichols) for second language
learners because many policy makers, educators, and community members believe that
second language learners must focus on English language skills at the expense of
sociocultural, cognitive and academic content. As noted above, some district leaders
think that if ELLs can speak English they will be able to function successfully in English
only classrooms. Collier, like Cummins, proposes the opposite. Collier designed a
conceptual model for language acquisition, for both native and second language learners.
It is often referred to as the Prism Model which is formed by four interdependent and
complex components. These are sociocultural, linguistic, academic and cognitive
processes.

The sociocultural process focuses on the child’s self-esteem, social patterns, social
expectations, relationships, culture and language status at home, the classroom and in the
community. Collier (1995) indicates that this component is at the heart of successful
second language acquisition in an academic setting because if ELL do not feel comfortable, welcomed, or valued, then the likelihood of their success will diminish. Irujo (2005) explained that promoting native language use in the classroom to activate prior knowledge and access content comprehension is critical to student learning, but more profound than that, encouraging native language use affirms students’ identities and conveys the message that their language and culture are important. Cummins (2007) argued that educators could promote strong literacy development in L2 by encouraging students’ prior knowledge in L1 in order to help them transfer pre-existing knowledge to L2. Language and culture are inseparable. Through language, societies convey their histories, ideas, values, norms and religious ideals with songs, chants, stories, poems and written text. Educators must comprehend that “culture forms a prism through which members of a group see the world… and a group’s culture is reflected by the group’s language” (Bowman, 1990, p.1). Indeed “it is hard to argue that we are teaching the whole child when school policy dictates that students leave their language and culture at the schoolhouse door” (Cummins et. al, 2005, p.38). Instead, Cummins (1991) argues, educators should know that students enter schools with prior education, linguistic, and personal experiences which are a foundation to their future achievements, and educators are advised to tap into that foundation as opposed to stifling it. Prohibiting or promoting the use of a group’s language can contribute to, or disempower academic and social success (Irujo, 2005).

A clear understanding of the complex sociocultural needs of ELLs is critical for general education teachers who may be a student’s first experience with the U.S. culture.
Cummins (2007) explained that teaching is about “human relationships” and proposed that educators’ pedagogy acknowledge and build upon the students’ cultural and linguistic knowledge. Based on the educator’s understanding of second language acquisition and personal beliefs, he or she may convey a message of intolerance and superiority as opposed to tolerance and cultural plurality. Allowing and promoting ELLs access to their language and culture can ensure strong family ties, a sense of community and academic success (McGarner & Saenz, 2009). Indeed, a clear understanding of students’ sociocultural needs can allow educators to develop pedagogically sound curriculum and practices to ensure the linguistic, cultural, and academic success for all students.

Language development is another component of Collier’s model. It refers to the child’s innate ability to acquire language orally and in written form in both the primary and secondary languages. To ensure success in the second language (L2), a child’s first language (L1) must be highly developed orally, cognitively, academically, and in written form (see Universal Grammar). The third component of the model is academic development which stresses the child’s knowledge and conceptual understanding of mathematics, writing, science, language arts, and social studies. Collier proposed that to ensure cognitive and academic success in L2, a child’s L1 must be fully developed in both oral and written form at least through the elementary years. Collier, in agreement with Cummins, stated that academic knowledge and skills will transfer from L1 to L2. Cognitive development, the fourth component, encourages higher order thinking through evaluation, synthesis and analysis in problem solving, discovery and cooperative learning.
of cognitively challenging concepts and processes. Collier (1995, p.3) indicates that these higher order skills must not be neglected if educators are to ensure “deep academic proficiency in second language” acquisition. In other words, the emphasis must not be limited to English language acquisition exclusively, rather on meaningful education which encompasses sociocultural, linguistic, academic and cognitive processes.

Bilingual Education Models and Research

Thirty-five years after Lau v. Nichols, educators and policy makers continue to debate over which language programs best close the achievement gap for ELL students as was mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Bilingual education supporters and opponents have held contentious and long lasting debates over the efficacy of which programs best meet the needs of ELLs. Many misinformed parents and well-meaning educators placed non-English speakers in English-only classrooms so that they could “quickly” gain second language skills without comprehending the true ramifications of these decisions.

For a period of time many, but not all, English language learners benefited from legal rights which mandated that states create educational programs which would meet their learning needs. Many states created bilingual programs, however, in the early 1960’s, 70’s and 80’s bilingual education was in its infancy. There was no clear understanding of effective and appropriate strategies to meet ELL student needs. States across the nation were left at their discretion to create and implement bilingual and/or “alternative” programs which would serve language minority students. Luckily, linguists and
researchers were busy studying language development and analyzing the results of the various bilingual models.

Over the decades, numerous bilingual educational programs were created around the country in an attempt to meet the needs of English language learners. Bilingual programs are those that use two languages for instruction, the students' primary language and English.

*ESL Pull-Out/Push-In Models*

One of the first programs created was the ESL model. ESL programs were developed to provide English language development (ELD) students focused English instruction. The primary goal of this model is to develop student’s English language proficiency as rapidly as possible (Costantino, 1999). In the pull-out/push-in model, children were pulled from the general education classroom and taken to a resource room with a teacher or paraprofessional who could speak the child’s language. In many cases, the limited English proficient (LEP) students worked in small groups with other English language learners on similar skills such as English grammar, vocabulary and communications skills as opposed to academic content (Costantino, 1999). According to Malagon and Deleeuw (2006), the pull-out/push-in approach is selected by some Washington state school districts in order to maximize supplemental instruction to ELLs with limited support staff. When implementing this model, educators and administrators should take into account that students will be pulled out of class during core subject instruction. It is advised that ESL trained teachers provide language instruction, that there must be ongoing communication between the general education classroom teacher and the ESL
teacher, and that ELD students ought to be grouped by beginning, intermediate, advanced or transitional levels (Malagon & Deleeuw, 2006).

In a sixteen year longitudinal analysis of educational services provided for language minority students, Thomas and Collier (2001) found that ESL content students ranged between the 31st and 40th NCE (normal curve equivalent) with a median of the 34th NCE (23rd percentile) when they graduated. Costantino (1999) argued that students who were placed in mainstream classrooms and were then pulled-out for ESL instruction were deprived of full access to cognitively rich content instruction until they reach high levels of English-language proficiency. ESL pull-out students also run the risk of being labeled intellectually inferior. Many of their monolingual English classmates view ESL pull-out students as special education students, a label which carries a negative stigma. As a result of the deprivation of content instruction in the ESL pull-out model, ELLs fall behind their English-speaking peers. To promote a sense of belonging and success, Cummins (1991) proposed, that ELLs should be engaged in cognitively and linguistically rich environments where they have continuous opportunities to interact with their English speaking peers in grade level content. In this way ELL will be able to keep pace with their peers instead of playing catch up. According to Malagon and Deleeuw in 2005-2006, 36% of the ELLs in Washington State were served under the least effective ESL pull-out, model compared to the 2% served in Dual language programs.

**Dual Language Models**

Dual Language programs use native language instruction along with English to provide content-based instruction in the general education classroom. For example,
participating students might use English and Mandarin or English and Spanish. The goal of this model is to educate bilingual bi-literate students from diverse backgrounds who can function at higher cognitive levels of instruction. Students receive content instruction in both languages to help them develop linguistic and academic proficiency in both languages. In the Two-Way bilingual (Dual Language) model, children from two language groups (English and another language) receive content instruction in both languages. In One-Way bilingual (Dual Language) programs, students from one language group receive content instruction in both languages to develop linguistic and academic proficiency in both languages. Under this model it is common to have participants who are bilingual and native speakers of the other language of instruction. Under both of these models students learn to interact, communicate and cooperate with each other to learn the content and language skills. The dual language model allows educators to focus on designing and implementing high quality content and language instruction without translation since he/she only provides instruction in the target language. For example, science might be taught in Spanish where reading will be taught in English.

Students enrolled in the 50-50 one way dual language model reached the “62nd NCE (72nd percentile) after four years of instruction” (Thomas & Collier, 2001, p.3). Fred Genesee et al. (2006) indicate that students who participate in Dual language programs score at, or greater than, state norms in content areas, had greater achievement levels in English reading and math than monolingual English learners, were more likely to close the achievement gap with native English students, had better over all grades, lower dropout rates, and were on track to graduate on time with greater success than ELL with
low primary language proficiency. Researchers have found this model to be the most effective academic and linguistic model for English language learners and native English speakers alike (Thomas & Collier, 2001). According to McCold and Malagon (2009) only 2.7% of Washington’s ELLs were served under this model during the 2008-2009 school year. Though this percentage increased from 2006, it is still a small percentage.

According to researchers Cummins (2007), Thomas and Collier (2001), Genesee (2006, 2009), Lindholm and Aclan (1991), Greene (1998), Linton (2007) and others, Dual Language programs have been documented to be the most promising for educating competent English language students and language majority students alike. They state that Dual Language programs not only close the achievement gap for second language learners, but these models lead to grade level and above grade level achievement for all participants. Students in these programs outperform monolingual students when enrolled in high quality enrichment programs that teach curriculum content through L1 and L2 (Collier & Thomas, 2004). Thomas and Collier (2001) found that the dual language programs and 90-10 enrichment are the only ones that close the achievement gap. In many cases students in these programs outperform their peers and are less likely to drop out of school.

As noted above, the two-way dual language program uses two languages to teach students the core curriculum. A foundational cornerstone of the Dual Language model is that classrooms have as close a balance of limited English students, bilingual students and language majority students work together as possible. Because instruction is delivered in both languages, there is no need to create remedial programs. Teachers in dual language
classrooms create cognitively challenging grade level interdisciplinary units with the core curriculum in order to help the ELLs make connections between various academic disciplines. Those teachers do not translate any concepts, but rather promote cooperative work among students so that they scaffold each other through cognitively challenging curriculum. The lessons are not repeated in the other language (Collier & Thomas, 2004) so students must negotiate meaning through comprehensible input, cooperative work, the use of multiple modalities, visual organizers (graphs, charts, tables, posters) interactive videos, content dictionaries and any means which will facilitate comprehension.

Content-based ESL/Sheltered Instruction Model

Content-based ESL/sheltered instruction models use instructional materials and learning tasks from academic content areas such as mathematics, science, social studies and language arts to develop English language skills as well as content knowledge. English development is both the goal and the method of instruction under his model. It is believed that by learning content through the target language the students gain language skills without the risk of falling behind academically (Herrera & Murry, 2005). In other words, students are immersed in language rich content which is relevant to their academic studies, as opposed to delaying their academic studies until they’ve developed high levels of language proficiency. This in turn motivates students to participate in class which increases their learning (Larson-Freeman, 2000). Because content concepts may be challenging, it is essential for educators to identify both content and language objectives to be mastered during all lessons and activities (Herrera & Murry). Under this model multiple subjects are taught through thematic units which require ESL teachers to
implement various teaching strategies and techniques to help students meet content and language specific objectives (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2004). According to Echevarria et al., content based ESL instruction was not enough to help all ELL achieve academically outside of the language supported environments thus forcing teachers to reevaluate effective strategies that would facilitate ELL learning in the general education classroom.

To help teachers develop the necessary skills to effectively teach ELL the following professional development classes are recommended. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD), and Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA).

In their sixteen year longitudinal analysis of educational services provided for language minority students, Thomas and Collier (2001) found that ESL content students ranged between the 31st and 40th NCE (normal curve equivalent) with a median of the 34th NCE (23rd percentile) when they graduated. Students enrolled in Content Based ESL programs, where no native language support was provided, showed serious deficits in reading and mathematics (Thomas & Colliers, 2001). In the 2008 to 2009 school year, 88.1% of Washington’s ELL was served under this model (McCold & Malagon, 2009). This is cause for concern and should send red flags to parents, teachers, administrators, and curriculum directors.

*Late-Exit Bilingual Models*

Late-Exit Bilingual programs are designed for English language learners (Malagon & Deleeuw, 2006). This model uses the students’ primary language for instruction, based
on their level of language proficiency, and for a longer period of time (five to six years) than Early-Exit programs. The goal is to develop academic proficiency in the students' native and second languages. At the onset, instruction is mainly in the students' native language, gradually increasing instruction in English so that by the time that students are exited, all instruction is in English. The amount of native language instruction is related to the students' English language proficiency. Generally speaking, more emphasis is placed on developing the students' first language as a bridge to English language development as opposed to developing the students' native language. That being said, native language literacy is used as a foundation for developing English literacy. This requires bilingual, bi-literate staff in using both languages for academic instruction (Malagon & Deleeuw, 2006). According to Thomas and Collier (2001) students in this model reached the 40th NCE (32nd percentile) by the end of fifth grade. McCold and Malagon (2009) found that in 2008-2009 3.8% of Washington’s second language learners were served under this model.

Early-Exit/Transitional Bilingual Model

The Early-Exit Bilingual program, also known as the Transitional Bilingual program, is similar to the Late-Exit bilingual model except that the transitional period typically occurs within a three to four year window. This model provides initial instruction in the student’s native language (kindergarten) which serves as a foundation for English literacy. Children are transitioned into English instruction once they demonstrate native language proficiency because literacy skills will transfer to the second language. The intent is to quickly transition the student into all English instruction in the mainstream
classroom. The goal of this model is to help students develop academic proficiency in English. Students may receive 50 percent instruction in English and 50 percent instruction in their native language. Thomas and Collier (2001) indicate that students who participated in this model reached the “47th NCE (45 percentile) by the end of 11th grade” (2001, p. 2-3). In 2008 to 2009, 3.7% of Washington’s second language learners were served under this model (McCold and Malagon, 2009).

**English Immersion Model**

The last method analyzed here is the English immersion model. Under this model students are immersed in English mainstream classrooms where no native language support is provided. Educators in these classrooms are not trained in, nor do they implement, effective and appropriate strategies which will help students gain comprehensible input to master content. ELL enrolled in immersion models “showed the largest decrease in reading and mathematics achievement by 5th grade when compared to students receiving bilingual services with the largest dropout rate coming from this group. By 11th grade those still enrolled in school had only achieved the 25th NCE (12th percentile)” (Thomas & Collier, 2001, p.2).

As noted above, bilingual education supporters and opponents hold ongoing battles over which programs are most effective for ELLs. According to a five-year analysis of Proposition 227, which almost eliminated bilingual education in California, and conducted by the American Institute for Research in collaboration with West Ed, it “conclusively and empirically” demonstrated that English immersion methods of instruction are not superior to bilingual instruction methods in closing the achievement
gap for ELL. "Very little evidence can be found to demonstrate the superiority of the English immersion model" (August & Shanahan, 2006, p. VII-2). These researchers indicate that all Californian students improved academically; however, they also indicate that the achievement gap between ELL and monolingual English speakers remained the same across all grades and subject areas. That is to say, the achievement gap between English language learners and native English speakers did not close (August & Shanahan, 2006, p. VII-2). These findings are significant. The premise for Proposition 227 was the alleged superiority of English immersion in closing the achievement gap. So what should educators do to close the achievement gap?

Research on Program Effectiveness

Greene (1998) conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the scholarly research on the effects of bilingual education. Greene argued that only randomized studies provide unbiased samples which offer helpful information on bilingual education. He stated that these randomized experiments clearly indicated that English language learners who were at least partially instructed in their native language would perform better on standardized English tests. He said that native language instruction was beneficial to second language learners.

In a study of 249 first through fourth grade students enrolled in Two Way (dual language) programs, researchers Lindholm and Aclan (1991), found that highly proficient bilingual students out performed medium and low-level proficient bilingual students in native and English reading and native and English mathematics. Lindholm and Aclan found that knowledge and skills learned in the student's native language transfer to the
second language. They indicate that when tested in their native language, students demonstrated greater achievement levels. They also state that as L2 language skills increased, students were better able to demonstrate their knowledge of skills in content areas. Lindholm and Aclan also argued that additive bilingual programs resulted in greater levels of language proficiency, academic achievement and second language learners’ positive self image, whereas subtractive programs yielded lower levels of language proficiency, academic achievement, and poor self concepts.

The Executive Summary of Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth found that native language literacy and oral language proficiency can be used to assist literacy skill development in English (August & Shanahan, 2006). Tapping into the student’s first language literacy skills can be beneficial to English language learners. Literacy knowledge in the student’s primary language is related to English literacy skills including word reading, reading comprehension, application of reading strategies, as well as spelling and writing proficiency (August & Shanahan). ELL can utilize higher order vocabulary skills developed in their primary language, such as knowledge of cognates, words which are spelled alike and have similar meanings in both L1 and L2, to comprehend English language vocabulary and content (August & Shanahan). August and Shanahan stated that students enrolled in bilingual programs which cultivated first language proficiency developed superior literacy skills in English than students who were instructed in English only programs both at the primary and secondary levels.
This is in agreement with Collier (2004), and Lindholm-Leary (2006) who argued that there was a strong correlation with sustained instruction through the English language learners’ first language and their educational success. Lindholm and Aclan (1991), in accordance with Cummins (1979), proposed that bilingual students must achieve a higher level of bilingual proficiency in order to benefit from long term cognitive growth and academic proficiency. Researchers advocate the use of native language instruction while ELL develop a firm understanding of cognitively challenging grade level skills and concepts which will then transfer to L2. This in turn will ensure that ELL keep pace with their monolingual English speaking peers, thus requiring that less time, energy and resources be needed to remediate students who would inevitably fall behind.

The Time Factor

How much time is required for English Language Learners to develop academic English language skills? According to Cummins (2007), ELLs can learn decoding and spelling skills as quickly as basic vocabulary and basic conversational skills (BICS). Cummins goes on to say that ELLs need continued bilingual support after they gain conversational English skills, and that removing this support precipitously may harm their academic development if they are not enrolled in a classroom which provides appropriate and effective strategies. ELL may need “five or more years” to make the same gains as their English speaking peers in academic English content (Cummins, 1994, p.56). Cummins (2002) also explained that monolingual English speaking students are not waiting for second language learners to catch up with them.
This concurs with Thomas and Collier (2001) who indicated that the more formal instruction received in the primary language the greater probability of academic success. In other words, the more primary language instruction received, the greater the second language achievement. When ELLs were immersed in English without native language support it takes them between “7-10 years or more to reach age and grade-level norms” (Collier 1995, p. 4) of their native English speaking peers. For ELLs to achieve a native-English level of proficiency, they must receive cognitively complex, on-grade-level instruction through the student’s home language for five or six years, which is much less than that needed under the English only remedial models (Thomas & Colliers, 2001).

The strongest predictor of second language learners’ success is the amount of formal primary language instruction at grade level (Thomas & Collier, 2001). It is urged that parents who refuse bilingual services should be “strongly counseled against this refusal” and informed of the negative ramifications of this decision (Thomas & Collier, 2001, p.7). Genesee (2009) suggested that parents should be encouraged to use the primary language in order to foster primary language development which will enhance second language acquisition. That is to say that full bilingual proficiency can serve not only as a bridge but as a foundation to academic achievement.

Conclusion

As the debate continues over which language programs close the achievement gap for language minority students, educators and policy makers must remember to put their political biases aside and analyze the research. Much has been learned about effective and appropriate practices for ELLs over the decades. A key to successful student
achievement depends on educators’ understanding that language learning is natural, that second language learners’ sociocultural needs must be met, and that language acquisition is a lifelong process (Collier, 1995). Educators must follow pedagogically sound practices which are supported by sound research.

Although the struggle for equitable and meaningful education in American schools began nearly 200 years ago, there are still students who do not benefit from the federal mandate that districts must create and implement educational programs which will ensure students’ meaningful and effective participation in the classroom. As OSPI and local school districts across Washington State evaluate the efficacy of their programs in order to make AYP, it is imperative that all educators and administrators involved in the decision making process use sound theories, effective research, as mandated by NCLB, and follow the law to design and evaluate effective and appropriate programs to meet the social, linguistic and academic needs of Washington’s diverse language minority students.

President Obama reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act otherwise known as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB), although with many unexpected changes. Under Obama’s New Blueprint, states may apply for formula grants. Upon receiving these grants, states are expected to develop and implement high-quality assessments aligned with college and career-ready standards in English language arts and mathematics that measure students’ academic achievement and growth (U.S. Department of Education A Blueprint for Reform, p.11). Districts that are awarded funds may select and implement instructional programs including dual-language, transitional bilingual
education, sheltered English immersion or other instructional programs. However, districts are required to identify staff training, English language learners, student eligibility, placement and duration of program, and services based on assessment. Districts must also evaluate program effectiveness and provide ELL achievement progress reports based on assessments. To ensure accountability, districts have three years to show student improved, or risk loss of fund flexibility (p.20). Districts are allowed to close low performing schools, to replace principals and staff, and enroll students in other high-performing schools in the district (p.12).

This guide provides districts policy makers and educators with the history and laws of bilingual education, first and second language development theories and approaches, bilingual education models, and research results for the various models. Based on the information provided, educators and administrator are advised to make pedagogically sound policy decisions to meet the needs of English language learner.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Manual Creation Procedures

A literature review of bilingual education issues was conducted. The review included a historical analysis of bilingual education history in the United States over the past 200 years. The historical evaluation was important because many general education teachers believe that bilingual education is a recent phenomenon, or that it's only the bilingual teachers' problem, when in fact all educators across Washington State are increasingly expected to provide the best quality of education for ELLs from around the world. Upon reading historical and legal texts it became apparent that bilingual education in German, Norwegian and Czech, to name a few, was available in the Unites States for two hundred years. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, *Lau v. Nichols* and the *Lau Remedies*, the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or NCLB as it is known, are explained because of their implications for ensuring that ELLs civil and legal rights are met in order to be in compliance with federal funding regulations. Washington State’s Bilingual Education laws were included to discuss English language learner’s rights as well as Washington school districts’ responsibilities in meeting ELL rights in accordance with NCLB, Title VII, and the Equal Education Opportunity Act.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 mandated that school districts implement research based education practices. Research based practices must be formed on pedagogically sound theories. Thus, it was imperative to study native and second
language development theories and approaches such as the Critical Period, Chomsky's Universal Grammar, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, Cummins' Threshold Hypothesis, language fossilization, and Krashen's Natural Approach to second language acquisition. These theories and approaches guided bilingual education throughout Washington State and the rest of the United States.

Virginia Collier's Prism Model was examined because of its importance in addressing the sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and cognitive processes in academically challenging, language rich classrooms, which if provided could ensure that students receive a quality education. An understanding of the Prism Model has wide reaching implications for parents, educators, and policy makers.

As the demographic population across Washington State and the nation continues to diversify, educators and policy makers alike must critically sift through the research. It is important to compare various bilingual education models in order to know what each model’s design was intended for and which models best meet the needs of English Language Learners.

Data Collection Procedures

To gather the information included in the manual the researcher read an extensive amount of Bilingual Education texts which included history, laws, effective practices, models and research. Articles were retrieved from research journals, the Center for Applied Linguistics, the American Institutes for Research and West Ed, the State Department of Education, the ERIC data base, and numerous online websites. Articles
selected were chosen based on the practices followed as these were conducted. Research papers were selected for their peer review status.

Thomas and Collier's research was selected because of its credibility with the U.S. Department of Education, Washington State's Office of Superintendents Report to Congress and the U. S. Department of Applied Linguistics.

The American Institute for Research in conjunction with West ED analyzed Proposition 227 and its affect on ELL in California. They found little evidence to support the superiority if English immersion methods of instruction compared to bilingual instruction methods in closing the achievement gap for ELLs. This was important research because of the number of students who were analyzed and the ramifications Proposition 227 had on bilingual education.

Genesee's (2006 & 2009) research was included because it explained that students who participate in Dual language programs score at, or greater than, state norms in content areas, had greater achievement levels in English reading and math than monolingual English learners, were more likely to close the achievement gap with native English students, had better over all grades, lower dropout rates, and were on track to graduate on time with greater success than ELL with low primary language proficiency.

Greene's (1998) meta-analysis evaluated scholarly research on the effects of bilingual education. Greene argued that only randomized studies provide unbiased samples which offer helpful information on bilingual education. He stated that these randomized experiments clearly indicate that English language learners who were at least partially
instructed in their native language performed better on standardized English tests. He concluded that native language instruction was beneficial to second language learners.

Lindholm and Aclan (1991), found that highly proficient bilingual students out performed medium and low-level proficient bilingual students in native and English reading and native and English mathematics. Lindholm and Aclan found that knowledge and skills learned in the student’s native language transferred to the second language. They indicated that when tested in their native language, students demonstrated greater achievement levels. These researchers also stated that as L2 language skills increased, students were better able to demonstrate their knowledge of skills in content areas.

Lindholm and Aclan argued that additive bilingual programs resulted in greater levels of language proficiency, academic achievement and second language learner’s positive self image, whereas subtractive programs yielded lower levels of language proficiency, academic achievement and poor self concepts.

The Executive Summary of Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth by August and Shanahan, 2006 found that native language literacy and oral language proficiency can be used to assist literary skill development in English. Tapping into the student’s first language literacy skills was beneficial to English language learners. August and Shanahan indicated that literacy knowledge in the student’s primary language was related to English literacy skills including word reading, reading comprehension, application of reading strategies, as well as spelling and writing proficiency. According to these researchers ELLs also utilized higher order vocabulary skills from their primary
language such as knowledge of cognates to comprehend the English language (cognates are words which are spelled alike and have similar meanings in both L1 and L2). August and Shanahan stated that students enrolled in bilingual programs which cultivated first language proficiency developed superior literacy skills in English than students who were instructed in English only programs both at the primary and secondary levels.

This was in agreement with Collier (2004), and Lindholm-Leary (2006) who argued that there was a strong correlation with sustained instruction through the English language learners’ first language and their educational success. Lindholm and Aclan (1991), in accordance with Cummins (1979), proposed that bilingual students must achieve a higher level of bilingual proficiency in order to benefit from long term cognitive growth and academic proficiency. Researchers advocated the use of native language instruction while ELLs develop a firm understanding of cognitively challenging grade level skills and concepts which would then transfer to L2. This in turn ensured that ELLs kept pace with their monolingual English speaking peers, thus requiring that less time, energy and resources be used to remediate students who would inevitably fall behind.

This research was significant because it supported the use of native language instruction in helping students close the achievement gap. As some districts step away from bilingual education programs they are advised to read reliable and empirical research which advises them against terminating bilingual education programs for ELL students. To the contrary districts are advised to implement well researched and designed bilingual programs.
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Introduction

The classrooms of 2010 in Washington State are not what they were in 1980. According to the U. S. Census Bureau, in 1980 the Hispanic population (can be any race Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican) of Washington state was 120,016. By the year 2000 that demographic group grew to 441,509 and reached 613,929 in 2008 (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2008). The Asian/Pacific Island population was 445,530 in 2006 and reached 470,361 in 2008 (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2008). It is projected that by 2030, the Asian/Pacific population will reach 825,234 and the Hispanic population will reach 1,099,540 (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2008). In 2000 the Black population was 35,818, by 2010 it reached 40,454, and is expected to climb to 61,363 by 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Meanwhile, it is expected that the white population will remain near 1,305,299 from 2006 to 2020. Various foreign languages are spoken among these groups including Russian, Ukrainian, Chinese, Mandarin, Spanish, Vietnamese, Japanese and others.

The fact is that many Washington schools do not have extensive experience teaching English language learners (ELL). With the influx of non English speakers schools are now expected to provide a quality education for students who are culturally and linguistically distinct from the educators, as well as different from the students many teachers were trained to teach. Educators must be prepared to meet the sociocultural and linguistic needs of the children who enter Washington’s public classrooms. As the demographic makeup of the state changes, so will the educational needs of the new Washingtonians. School districts and educators around the Washington State must
prepare to meet their needs. See Tables 1 for Washington State’s student demographic data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>27,363</td>
<td>27,131</td>
<td>26,312</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
<td>27.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>178,462</td>
<td>73,354</td>
<td>65,292</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>56,790</td>
<td>53,257</td>
<td>46,776</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>158,612</td>
<td>102,494</td>
<td>80,884</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>2,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>172,350</td>
<td>747,603</td>
<td>755,241</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64.80%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>77.50%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSPI Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Washington State Report Card

There is much to learn about English language learner’s needs and much more than can be covered in the scope of this guide. The intent of this guide is to explain the history and laws of bilingual education, first and second language development theories and approaches, bilingual education models and what research says about the various models. First let’s take a brief look at bilingual education history.

A Historical Perspective

The current influx of immigrants would make it appear as if bilingual education was a recent phenomenon. For many Americans the thought of educating immigrants in foreign languages is a sacrilegious act, an affront the American way of life. In these peoples’ minds, yesterday’s immigrants arrived in this country with a fervent desire to assimilate, to rapidly learn their adopted nation’s customs, traditions and language. Those same people believe that school is the natural setting for weaning students from
their native tongue (Crawford, 1999). The belief is that immigrants of the past quickly assimilated, and learned English, therefore newcomers must forgo their native language to become true Americans. While there is no doubt that some immigrants assimilated quickly the reality is that many struggled for generations (Crawford). According to Crawford (1999, p.20) first generation immigrants did not lose their native tongue upon arrival to America. Their, “immigrant children were the first to reach English fluency, their grandchildren the first to finish high school, and their great-grandchildren the first to grow up in the middle class.” Prior to the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s racial minorities had greater challenges in melting into the American mainstream regardless of their English language dominance.

According to Lessow-Hurley (2005) and Crawford (1999), support and opposition for bilingual education in the United States has historically swung to the left or right depending on world tensions and sense of nationalism. Many times these feelings are associated with language mastery by the ruling class. People with anti-immigrant sentiments are offended when they hear others speak in foreign tongues. Many opponents to bilingual education do not recall that many of their ancestors spoke other languages when they stepped on American land.

Crawford (1999) explained that in 1664, at least eighteen languages were spoken on Manhattan Island, not including Native languages. Though English was wide spread through the colonies in the seventeenth century German, French, Swedish, Irish, and Welsh were also commonly heard as the American Revolution broke out (Crawford). Bilingualism was common among European colonists, new arrivals strived to preserve
their heritage as schools were established; their language loyalty was strong (Crawford).

German schools were common in Philadelphia in the late seventeenth century. However, in the 1750s’ Benjamin Franklin tried to put an end to German language schools. Franklin expressed concerns about bilingualism that could be taken out of today’s newspapers. Citing the increased use of German in public settings, he argued that translators would soon be:

Necessary in the Assembly, to tell one half of our legislation what the other half say; In short unless that stream of their importation could be turned from this to other colonies...(Germans) will soon outnumber us, that all the advantages we have will not in My Opinion be able to preserve our language, and even our Government will become precarious (Crawford,1999, p.22).

Franklin was soon voted out of the colonial assembly. These views were not common among the nation’s founders. They placed greater premium on political liberty and peoples’ choice “than on linguistic homogeneity” (Crawford, p.22) and took ‘a policy to not have a policy’ on language (Crawford, p.22), thus allowing the continuity of bilingualism in the colonies.

Leesow-Hurley (2005) indicated that dual language education was widely available throughout the country during the nineteenth century in various languages including German, Danish, Swedish, Polish, Norwegian, Italian, Czech, French, and Spanish. Cherokee established and ran over 21 academic facilities where students learned the Cherokee alphabet created by Sequoyah (Lessow-Hurley).

However, with the onset of WWI, a sense of isolationism and nationalism was sparked which resulted in anti-German rhetoric. As a result, German language instruction was shunned and dual language programs around the country ended. After
that point, speaking English was associated with American loyalty, and support for bilingual education disappeared from the many of the nation’s schools.

Lessow-Hurley states that the English only sentiment changed during WWII when there was an increased need for bilingual and biliterate servicemen who could decipher coded messages sent by enemy militaries. After returning from the warfront, bilingual servicemen brought with them a heightened sense of pride in their heritage and their ability to function in linguistically diverse settings. Their pride empowered them and other minorities during the Civil Rights movement to promote the use and formal instruction of bilingualism. As is obvious, the polemic debate over bilingualism in American schools and communities is not new or easily terminated.

**History and the Law**

The struggle for equitable education in American schools began nearly 200 years ago. In the late 18 century, southern states banned the education of enslaved men, women and children. In 1787, Northern states like Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio created some of the first segregated schools because Anglo citizens refused to send their children to schools with African American students (Spring, 2007). In 1849, Benjamin Roberts sued the City of Boston for denying his 5-year old daughter entry into five “white” schools that were closer to her home. The Court ruled in favor of the city, stating that Boston had provided “equal” schools for children of color. In 1877, the Massachusetts governor signed a law that banned segregation of children based on their race or religion (Spring, 2007). However, in the 1890s many Caucasians believed that even one drop of blood from a colored ancestor made a person inferior. Long before Rosa Parks, “Homer
Plessy, who was one-eighth black and seven-eighths white" (Spring, 2007, p.55) was incarcerated for refusing to sit in the “colored” section of a train. Unfortunately, for people of color, in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled against Plessy stating that “segregation did not create a label of inferiority” (Spring, 2007, p.55) and it legalized segregation. In 1954, the separate but equal doctrine was overturned by the Supreme Court in Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka. The Court stated that, “In the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate education facilities are inherently unequal… What ever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy v. Ferguson this finding is amply supported by modern authority” (Spring, 2007, p.115). While many states followed the Supreme Court verdict some southern states were slow to comply (Pullman and Van Patten, 2007). The fight for equality continued as local and state governments resisted desegregation laws. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed discrimination based on gender, color, ethnicity, religion or economic status in any agency or organization that received federal funding.

However, the Civil Rights Act did not specifically mandate bilingual education services for language minority students. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 mandated that school districts which received federal funds must create and implement educational programs for limited English students. Nonetheless, school districts across the nation continued to offer little or no language support to English language learners.

Lau v. Nichols of 1974

On December 21, 1974 in Lau v. Nichols, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of 1,800 Chinese American students from San Francisco, who argued that they did not
receive the instructional help that they were entitled to under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Lessow-Hurley, 2005). Justice William O Douglas wrote:

There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. Basic skills are at the very core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that before a child can effectively participate in the educational program he must already have acquired those basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful (Lessow-Hurley, 2005, p. 131).

After that decisive ruling, states were obligated to create education programs that would meet the needs of language minority students across the nation. Subsequently the Lau Remedies were created to guide states in their efforts to design and assess programs that would meet the needs of non-English and limited-English students. According to the Office of Civil Rights, public school districts which received federal funds were obligated to identify the student’s primary or home language. If the student’s primary language was other than English, the district was obligated to create and implement programs that would ensure the “effective participation” of limited-English students in the district’s educational program (Developing ELL Programs: Guidance Documents, 1985).

Lau Remedies Appendix B defined the programs as follows: Bilingual/Bicultural Programs in which students could utilize their native language and culture while they were introduced to English and the American culture; English as a Second Language (ESL Push-out /Pull-in models) programs designed to teach English to the students; High Intensive Language Training (HILT), a total immersion program designed to teach
English; Multilingual/ Multicultural Program, similar to the Bilingual/Bicultural program except that students were taught in more than their primary and secondary language, with the intent to have students function in more than two languages and cultures; Transitional Bilingual Education Programs (TBE), where students were taught in their native language and culture. Once the students reached a certain level of proficiency, under TBE, they were no longer instructed in their primary language.

The Lau Remedies required districts to provide instructional personnel who were familiar with the student’s cultural background and language. Where staffing was not adequate to implement program requirements, districts were to provide staff training. This inservice was to include training objectives, instructional methods to reach the objectives, methods for teacher selection in need of training, names of instructional consultants and the location of the inservice, training content, training evaluation and criteria as well as a proposed timetable (Lau Remedies Appendix B, 1985). Congress also established the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974:

No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin by... (f) the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede participation by its students in its instructional programs (Lessow-Hurly, 2005, section 1703(f) of EEOA).

Castañeda v. Pickard of 1981

As with desegregation, bilingual education proponents faced opposition across the country. In Castañeda v. Pickard of 1981 the Fifth Court of Appeals ruled in favor of Mr. Castañeda. Mr.Castañeda, the plaintiff, argued that the Raymond Independent School in Texas (RISD) segregated his children, used inappropriate grouping strategies
that were “ethically and racially discriminating” (1981, p.1), and failed to provide an educational program that would allow his children to overcome the educational barriers caused by their limited English proficiency. As a result of the Castañeda ruling, school districts in that region were obligated to establish pedagogically sound and rational programs to guarantee that limited English students would have a quality educational experience. Districts were to design a system to evaluate their program’s efficacy. They were also to provide qualified personnel to implement the educational program, hire new staff, train current staff as well as provide sufficient materials and resources to implement the program (Kerper Mora, 2005, Lessow-Hurly, 2005).

These acts of congress and court cases made it clear that states and local districts were obligated to provide English language learners with the instructional services they deserved and needed to succeed when exposed to challenging cognitively academic content.

Proposition 227

In 1997, Proposition 227 was submitted to California State voters by Ron Unz and Gloria Matta Tuchman (Krashen, 1997), in order to put an end to bilingual education in that state. Bilingual and multicultural education supporters joined the ranks with teachers and parents to counter the controversial initiative. None the less, Proposition 227 passed and nearly ended bilingual education in California. According to the official voters guide, prepared by the Attorney General, Proposition 227 required that all classroom instruction be conducted in English with the premise that English immersion methods were viewed as superior to bilingual methods of instruction. The English immersion
requirement could only be waived if parents could prove that their children knew English, or if the children had special needs, or if the children would learn English faster through alternative education. Proposition 227 stated that if the children were not fluent in English they could be placed in a short-term (one year) intensive sheltered immersion program. Under Prop 227, $50 million were allocated per year for ten years to organizations that pledged to provide English tutoring to children in their community. Prop 227 also permitted parents and guardians to sue districts in order to achieve enforcement of the law (California Voter’s Guide, 1997). As a result of this English only mandate, Arizona soon followed California’s lead and ended its compliance with Title VII in 2000 (Crawford, 2002), ending years of support for bilingual education in that state as well.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

In 2001, after years of attacks by English-only proponents like Unz, Matta Tuchman, Cultural Conservatives, the Republican Party, as well as limited support form the Office of Civil Rights and Democrats in Congress, Title VII ended with the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Title III) under G. W. Bush’s “school reform” which passed with sweeping bipartisan support (Crawford, 2002, p. 1). Section G of Title III indicated that individual states had two options for serving Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Option one was to keep Title VII intact with little or no increased funding. Option two would replace Title VII with a formula grant system “to support instructional programs, accountability mechanisms that stressed rapid acquisition of English” (ESEA Implementation Guide, p. G1). NCLB required state and local agencies
to design and submit detailed plans for accountability, which meant that students would be tested and ranked according to their test results. NCLB mandated yearly English proficiency testing and achievement testing in English for students that had enrolled in U.S. schools for at least three years (only limited English proficient students who had been enrolled in U.S. schools less than three years were to be exempt). Title III required local districts to inform parents about English learner programs. It replaced funding that supported native language instruction at the elementary level with a Foreign Language Incentive Program that would award funds to support foreign language instruction for native English speakers at the secondary level. Title III changed the federal Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) to the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited-English-Proficient Students (ESEA Implementation Guide, p. G1-G3) otherwise know as OELA. Undoubtedly Title III had sweeping ramifications on local and state agencies.

Thirty-five years after *Lau v. Nichols*, educators and policy makers continue to debate which language programs close the achievement gap, as mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; English only immersion, content-based ESL, ESL pull-out, late exit, or dual language immersion. For a period of time, many, but not all, English language learners benefited from legal rights which mandated that states create educational programs that would meet their learning needs. Many states created bilingual programs; however, in the early 60's, 70's and 80's, bilingual education was in its infancy. There was no clear understanding of effective and appropriate strategies to meet
the needs of ELL students. States across the nation were left at their discretion to create and implement bilingual and/or “alternative” programs which would serve language minority students.

As a result of the No Child Left Behind Act many states and local districts across the nation selected option two of Title III and scrambled to implement instructional programs which would place ELLs on a fast track to English proficiency to meet program exiting criteria (exiting form bilingual services). However, in an effort to get students to acquire English skills many districts administrators lost sight of the fact that English language learners need to develop high order cognitive academic language which is essential in comprehending content rich instruction in math, science, social studies and advance literary text (Collier, 1995). ELL students who met exiting criteria, under the Transitional Bilingual program, were prematurely placed in general education classes without language support. When a higher level of cognitive academic language was required the bilingual students began to falter (Collier and Thomas, 2004) because the general education teachers were not well versed in effective and appropriate instructional strategies for ELLs. Luckily, linguists and researchers were busy analyzing the results of the various bilingual models. But first let’s look at Washington State’s Policies for ELLs.

Bilingual Education in Washington State

Washington States continued to offer bilingual education services, though with limited funding. In order to comply with Title III, the Lau Remedies and EEOA, Washington Administrative Code (WAC) required public school districts which received federal funds to “provide each eligible student a transitional bilingual instructional program, or if
the use of two languages is not feasible as provided under the WAC 392-160-040, an alternative instructional program” (WAC 392-160-010, p. 1) is to be provided. This “alternative instructional program” clause allowed districts to implement English immersion programs. The WAC indicates that districts “shall provide training for administrators, teachers, and other related staff on bilingual program models and/or district alternative instructional program, appropriate use of instructional strategies and assessment results, and curriculum and instructional materials for use with culturally and linguistically divers students” (WAC 392-160-010, p. 1). See Figure 1 for Washington State enrollment by type of program for 2008 to 2009.

In Washington State, districts have ten days to identify student eligibility, to provide a home language survey, and administer the Washington Language Proficiency Placement Test (WLPT). Then annual reassessment of all students is required using the WLPT, as well as the Measure of Student Progress (MSP), and High Measure of Student Progress (HMSP) academic assessment. The assessment must include, but is not limited to, the administration of a standards based test in reading, writing, listening and speaking in English (WAC 392-160-015). This part of the WAC is not in alignment with Title III, which mandated that yearly English proficiency testing and achievement testing in English for students that had enrolled in U.S. schools for at least three years would take place, and that only limited English proficient students who had been enrolled in U.S. schools less than three years were to be exempt (ESEA Implementation Guide, p. G1-G3).
### Instructional Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Model</th>
<th>Count By Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Count By Student</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Based ESL/Sheltered Instruction</td>
<td>83,726</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>79,384</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Bilingual-Late Exit</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Bilingual-Early Exit</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Program</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Waiver</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Counts</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,021</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,131</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Washington State Enrollments by Type of Program School Year 2008-09 (McCold & Malagon, 2009, p.10).

Washington State law indicates that limited English students are not required to participate in a transitional bilingual program if the parents/guardians so choose (WAC 392-160-15, p.3). Collier and Thomas (2004) advise that parents who opt out of bilingual education for their children be fully informed of the research that supports bilingual services. Washington’s law also indicates that students will receive services for no more than three consecutive years provided that eligible students have not yet met exit criteria as indicated by the WLPT. If students do not meet exiting criteria, then they are entitled to receive continued instruction in an approved bilingual or alternative program (WAC 392-160-035, p. 9). Once students meet or exceed the English language standards as measured by the WLPT, students will not be eligible for funding in the transitional bilingual instructional program (TBIP) (WAC 392-160-035, p. 10).
**Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD)**

Project GLAD training provides research-based theory and practical, effective strategies for the development of academic language, literacy, academic achievement and cross-cultural skills of ELLs. Great emphasis is placed on understanding intercultural interdependence. Educators are encouraged to teach to the top and scaffold all the way up. Districts throughout Washington State have supported cohorts of teachers to complete GLAD training as well as investing in key trainers at the district level to offer ongoing GLAD training and support.

**Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)**

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol is both a valid and reliable, research-based observation instrument as well as a guide for planning instruction that focuses on both the academic and linguistic needs of ELLs. The model is built on the premise that teachers possessing these skills will be prepared to provide English language learners with a better learning environment. Critical features of high quality instruction for English language learners are embedded within the SIOP model such as building and activating prior knowledge, vocabulary development, English development, cognitive and academic development.

**Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)**

CALLA is a research-based instructional program that fosters the school achievement of students who are learning through the medium of a second language. This professional development program focuses on science and math.

The professional development programs described above are specifically designed to provide teachers with the instructional strategies most effective in educating ELLs. These programs are among the most commonly used in Washington State to provide English language development strategies to TBIP and mainstream staff.

---

Figure 2: Instructional Strategy Programs for Educators *(McCold & Malagon, 2009, p.10)*.

The WAC indicates that districts must provide training for administrators, teachers, and other staff on bilingual program models and/or the district alternative instructional program, appropriate use of instructional strategies and assessment results, and curriculum and instructional materials for use with culturally and linguistically diverse students *(WAC 392-160-010, p. 1)*. See figure 3 for instructional strategy programs which are offered across Washington State; though these are quite common they are not the only teacher training programs offered.
As a result of the No Child Left Behind Act, many states and local districts across the nation selected option two of Title III and scrambled to implement instructional programs which would place ELLs on a fast track to English proficiency to meet program exiting criteria (exiting from bilingual services). However, in an effort to get students to acquire English skills, many districts’ administrators lost sight of the fact that English language learners need to develop high order cognitive academic language which is essential in comprehending content rich instruction in math, science, social studies and advanced literary text (Collier, 1995). ELL students who met exiting criteria, under the Transitional Bilingual program, were prematurely placed in general education classes without language support. When a higher level of cognitive academic language was required the bilingual students began to falter (Collier and Thomas, 2004) because the general education teachers were not well versed in effective and appropriate instructional strategies for ELLs.

Language Development

How do humans develop language skills? Is language acquired or learned? Is there an optimal time period to learn language? Fortunately, linguists and researchers have contributed greatly to the understanding of language development.

As explained by Costantino (1999), Lenneberg proposed that children had a “critical period” from the ages of 2-12 to acquire language naturally. Lenneberg believed that this was accomplished through exposure to meaningful language in a natural setting. It was thought that during this critical period children had a certain level of brain plasticity, the ability of differing regions of the brain to adopt or take over functions of damaged parts
(Berk, 1996) which allowed them to replicate native-like speech, given the fact that the children were healthy and had no physical or neurological impairments. It is believed that after this “critical period” second language learners can learn a second language, although they may not speak with native accents (Costantino, 1999, Brown, 1994).

Today it is widely accepted that “as the brain matures specific functions are assigned-or ‘lateralized’- to the left” (Brown, 1994, p.53) or right hemispheres of the brain. According to Brown, linguistic, analytical and other functions appear to be controlled by the left hemisphere, while emotional and social needs appear to be controlled by the right hemisphere. For example, stroke survivors manifest speech impairments as a result of damage to the left hemisphere. Accident victims of right hemisphere trauma do not appear to manifest the same speech impairments (Brown, 1994). Lateralization and brain plasticity seem to explain why language can be relocated in the right hemisphere after traumatic injuries to the left hemisphere occurred.

How does lateralization affect second language learners? According to Brown, there appears to be great right hemisphere involvement in second language learning when second languages are acquired after puberty. Brown explains that complex language processing (linguistic analysis) may occur in the right hemisphere when second languages are learned after puberty. In contrast, first and second language acquisition develop in the left hemisphere during early childhood adding support to the critical period hypothesis (Brown, 1994).

Another issue related to native like speech for second language learners is muscle use. Brown states that significant muscle dexterity is required to produce native like speech.
According to Brown, the production of human speech sounds requires the use of various muscles in the throat, larynx, mouth, lips, tongue, nasal cavity and other muscles. This usually occurs by age five. It must be noted that some sounds may take longer to control, /r/ and /l/ for example.

Educators should understand that speaking with an accent does not imply that a second or third language learner did not master the language. Native like speech doesn’t equal eloquence or the ability to explain complex ideas (i.e. medical, mathematical, economic, scientific, or technological) those arise from superior cognitive capabilities of which many older bilingual and multilingual individuals are capable (Brown, 1994). Developmentally mature students possess greater learning capacity, Brown argued that they have superior analytic abilities and refined pragmatic skills which younger students have not yet mastered. Older learners have prior linguistic and cultural experiences which they can tap into, upon receiving input, to gain meaning. They also have greater knowledge of their first language which they can draw upon to gain comprehension (Saville-Troike, 2006, Richard-Amato, 1996)

McLaughlin (1992) argued that not all researchers were in agreement with the critical period hypothesis. McLaughlin credited the differences in children’s second language acquisition to psychological and social factors, as opposed to exclusively biological ones. Behaviorists, on the other hand, believed that stimuli reinforcement fostered language development.
Behaviorists viewed children as blank slates (*tabula rosa*) to be filled with information and shaped by their environment with stimuli reinforcement. They thought that language was a human behavior which developed as a result of stimuli. B. F. Skinner coined the term *Operant conditioning*. Operant conditioning can be explained as conditioning in which a living being (a child) responds, without seemingly visible stimuli, yet that response is reinforced by positive response from another person (Brown, 1994). Skinner believed that behavior could be manipulated with consequences that were either pleasant or unpleasant. Pleasant (positive) consequences could maintain and increase a behavior, while negative consequences or lack of reinforcement diminished a behavior (Brown, 1994). “Skinner’s *Verbal Behavior* described language as a system of verbal *operants*, classes of responses, and his understanding of the role of conditioning led the whole new era of language teaching...for several decades” (Brown, 1994, p. 78). Behaviorists believed that a child who received reinforcement for response would continue to develop language because he or she was conditioned to do so (Brown, 1994).

**Universal Grammar**

In contrast to Skinner, Chomsky (1965) believed language could not be analyzed in simple terms of stimuli and responses. His theory of “Universal Grammar” proposed that all children around the world had an innate ability to acquire language in relatively short periods of time regardless of the complexity of the languages. Chomsky thought that this predisposition to acquire language allowed children to deduce meaning, to reason abstractly and to think creatively. Universal Grammar is based on the idea that there are
general principals common to all languages, and through natural interaction within the
group children could acquire and master the use of these principles. These include
phonology (sound systems), morphology (word structures), lexicon (vocabulary), syntax
(grammar) and discourse (the ability to communicate with others) (Saville-Troike, 2006).
Chomsky thought of language learning as a natural process. He felt that children acquire
language in social settings because of their need to interact and communicate naturally
and spontaneously with meaningful purpose in their social environment (Costantino,
1999).

Language Acquisition Device

According to Chomsky, all people are universally equipped with a language
acquisition device (LAD) (Brown, 1994). This device is associated with all universal
languages. LAD is activated when people are exposed to natural languages. Depending
on the language to which the child is exposed, LAD selects and makes meaning of the
syntactical structure of the language. Children will develop their understanding of words,
phrases and an infinite numbers of sentences that are appropriate to their language
through exposure to the language grammar system. As their syntax and lexicon develop
so will their linguistic competence (Richard-Amato, 1996) in their tongue. As explained
by Brown, LAD consists of four innate linguistic properties.

First, the ability to distinguish speech sounds from other sounds in the
environment such as vehicles, animals and other random noises. Second, the
ability to organize linguistic events into various classes which can later be refined.
Third, knowledge that only a certain kind of linguistic system is possible and that
other kinds are not. Fourth, the ability to engage in constant evaluation of the
developing linguistic system so as to construct the simplest possible system out of
the linguistic data that are encountered (p. 25).
Vygotsky proposed the Sociocultural Theory. Vygotsky believed that language plays a central role in cognitive development. According to Vygotsky, learning develops out of social communication with peers and adults. These people help the less skilled child master challenging tasks and language structures within the zone of proximal development (ZPD). ZPD is a range of tasks and skills that a child cannot perform independently, but can accomplish with assistance from more knowledgeable individuals (Berk, 1996). Therefore, a healthy active child, between the age of 2-12, who interacts with capable adults, teachers, and peers, will develop an understanding of the underlying principles of their native language.

Second Language Development and Approaches

Linguists have also influenced the understanding of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (Saville-Troike, 2006). Linguists believe that all languages share the following characteristics. First, languages are systematic. Second, languages are symbolic; alphabetic principals with letter-sound correspondence, object names, descriptions, and sentence structures have culturally agreed upon meanings. Third, languages are social. They require interaction between people in natural and meaningful settings (Saville-Troike, 2006). What were some early approaches to second language development?

Early Approaches to Second Language Acquisition

Saville-Troike (2006) explained that early approaches to Second Language Acquisition included Robert Lado’s Contrastive Analysis (CA), and Error Analysis (EA). In CA, learners compared and contrasted their first and second languages to find similarities and differences in phonology, morphology and syntax. This approach fell in
disuse because lexicon and discourse were given little emphasis, thus preventing any real mastery of the second language. In EA, focus was placed on the learner’s innate ability to construct language as opposed to stimulus reinforcement. Through this approach, the speaker needed to know the underlying rules of the language rather than rote memorization of unrelated concepts or skills. Under EA, the learner’s language production was seen as a “target for analysis,” thus a compilation of samples of learner language, identification, description, explanation, and evaluation of errors were created. EA also had its shortcomings because there was ambiguity of classification in the errors: Teachers did not know the causes for the errors, there was lack of positive data/feedback for students, people did not know what learners could do to correct the errors, and linguists did not know if students avoided using language structures that were different, or too difficult in comparison to their native language (Saville-Troike, 2006). In an era of data-guided instruction, one could argue that EA gave instructors insight into the learners’ progress and proficiency as well as their instructional needs (Costantino, p.11). In the present, educators would be expected to analyze the data to create effective and appropriate interventions and curriculum to meet student’s linguistic needs. Neither of these approaches yielded positive results in facilitating successful second language acquisition and were abandoned by educators. However, the Audio-lingual Method showed more promise.

Audiolingual Method

The Audiolingual Method (ALM) evolved out of the Army Method of foreign language instruction. ALM was known for its oral and aural approach to structured
language instruction which focused on aural training. Language was viewed as a system of structurally related elements for encoding, phonology, morphology, word and sentence structures.

ALM adhered to the Behaviorist stimuli response principles because successful responses in the second language were immediately reinforced. Thus, in a classic behaviorist second language classroom, a foreign language learner closely listened to teacher dialogues, practiced grammatical patterns, and engaged in morpheme and syntax studies with their teacher and peers. Under this method, foreign language learners were engaged in closely controlled practice of dialog drills for repetition and memorization with carefully designed schedules of reinforcement (Brown, 1994). Correct pronunciation and articulation were stressed. Once learners memorized the practice dialogues, grammatical patterns were selected for further study and practice. Learners were expected to practice skilled techniques to give correct responses. Learners had no control over content, pace or their learning styles. They were not encouraged to take risks and were expected to listen, imitate accurately and respond to prompts. The ALM was a teacher dominated model. Teachers modeled the language, controlled the direction and pace of the lesson. They monitored and corrected students immediately. Teachers kept pupils busy with drills and tasks centered on phonology, morphology, and syntax (Richards and Rogers, 2004). Language skills materials were taught in order. First, there was a focus on listening training. Next, students were encouraged to speak articulately. Then, reading of graphic print, either hieroglyphic or alphabetic. Finally, students learned to write graphic speech symbols. The long term goal of the ALM model was to
show native language proficiency and knowledge of second language. ALM was criticized for its failure to teach “long-term communicative proficiency” (Brown, 1994, p. 71). Though this approach lost popularity in the 1960’s, it is still used across the Untied States (Richards & Rogers, 2004).

**Interlanguage**

As summarized by Saville-Troike (2006), Selinker introduced the idea of Interlanguage (IL) to differentiate between the intermediate states of the learners’ language as they moved from their first language to the second language. IL was viewed as a third language system which was unlike the native language or the second language. IL was seen as systematic in that it was governed by the learner’s internal grammar. It was thought to be dynamic because the internal system of rules changed continually as learners’ IL progressed. It was variable, which meant that contextual differences produced different language patterns. IL was a reduced system both in form and function. Form refers to less complex grammar structures. Reduced function refers to the diminished need to communicate in IL as second language dominance increased (Saville-Troike, 2006). Selinker also introduced the concept of second language fossilization which he believed occurred when IL ceased to develop before learners reached native competency in L2. Today it is believed that fossilization is more likely to occur in older language learners than younger ones because of cultural identity and communication needs (Saville-Troike). Fossilization may add some relevance to the “critical period” and brain plasticity theories.
The Natural Approach

The Natural Approach was popularized in the 1980's. It draws on Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. Terrell and Krashen (1983) promoted a "natural" method to language instruction which focused on meaning and vocabulary expansion instead of systematic grammar teaching. Its designers believed that it matched the natural "principles found in successful second language acquisition" (Richards and Rogers, 2004). Under the Natural Approach an emphasis was placed on language input rather than practiced drills, or pre-produced teacher monologues. Individual students' comfort levels (affective filter), extensive language exposure, and student preparedness were stressed before language production was required. They believed that second language learners went through a silent period. During that time teachers were to let children listen and observe without forcing them to speak in the second language (Hill & Flynn, 2006).

As summarized by Richards and Rogers (2004), the Natural Approach was based on Krashen's Language Acquisition Theory and was composed of five hypotheses. These include the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, the Monitor Hypothesis, the Natural Order Hypothesis, the Input Hypothesis and the Affective Filter Hypothesis.

The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis is the belief that there is a difference between learning a language and language acquisition. According to Krashen, acquiring a language is subconscious and natural and involves the language acquisition device (LAD), whereas learning a second language requires a conscious effort and occurs with formal instruction in an organized setting. In the Natural Order Hypothesis, language rules are acquired in a predictable natural order. For example, children will learn to name
objects and people, then they may learn actions that people and animals perform, followed by descriptions of people, places and objects. The Input Hypothesis requires sufficient and contextual comprehensible input. According to Krashen, students can successfully acquire language if exposed to comprehensible input with the use of graphic organizers, props, realia, videos or any means necessary to facilitate comprehension. Graphic organizers are diagrams, tables, and charts which help ELL comprehend the big idea/concepts. Realia are real life objects, props, or pictures of real life. Videos provide visual input of abstract and complex concepts such as protein synthesis, photosynthesis or mitochondrial DNA in science, of example. Manipulatives are physical objects, such as blocks, that students can use in order to make sense of concepts regardless of their linguistic proficiency. Under the Affective Filter Hypothesis, Krashen proposed that learning occurs best when students are engaged in low stress environments (the affective filter is lowered). This makes students more receptive to comprehensible input. Learning is diminished when the filter is raised by stress or anxiety. In the Monitor Hypothesis, learned language serves as a monitor to make corrections or changes to prior language production as new learning occurs or as language skills are refined (Richards & Rogers, 2004).

Five Stages of Second Language Acquisition

As explained by Hill and Flynn (2006), Krashen and Terrell first proposed five stages of second language acquisition in their 1983, book The Natural Approach. In the preproduction stage, zero to six months, students who are new to the language and are not yet able to produce the language. In the early production stage, six months to a year,
students can produce one or two word phrases. Though they have limited comprehension they understand more than they can express verbally. In the speech emergence stage, one to three years, students’ comprehension improves, yet they still need language support and visual aids to process information. Students in this stage speak in simple sentences, although grammar and production errors are still common. Students enter the Intermediate Fluency stage, three to five years, they have great comprehension and make few grammatical errors. At the Advanced Fluency Stage, five to seven years, students demonstrate near-native levels of speech comparable to that of their native speaking peers. They use the second language to express a wide range of ideas. It must be noted that the time needed for students to go through these stages can vary from student to student depending on various factors, which include but are not limited to, prior education, native language literacy and vocabulary development, self confidence and motivation (Hill & Flynn, 2006).

Threshold Hypothesis

Cummins (1979) theorized that bilingualism is cognitively and academically beneficial to students. Cummins proposed the Threshold Hypothesis which assumed that children must reach a minimum level (threshold) of competence in the primary and secondary languages to “reap” the maximum benefits of being able to speak two languages. He believed that for bilingualism to be fully beneficial, children must reach a “threshold” to avoid cognitive and academic developmental deficits. Cummins argued that to profit from the rewards of bilingualism, children must be enrolled in an additive bilingual program (L1 + L2) instead of a subtractive program (L2 - L1) because the
additive approach supports higher cognitive development since children are taught grade level concepts and skills instead of remedial concepts, or a watered down curriculum.

BICS and CALP

Cummins (1981) introduced a framework to distinguish between two levels of linguistic proficiency. The first level is termed Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). These are language skills needed to interact on a personal or social level. The person relies on nonlinguistic input such as gestures, intonation and other contextual clues to comprehend information received. BICS is sometimes referred to as playground language or casual language (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001). The second linguistic level is termed Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). CALP are sophisticated language skills needed for academic learning in content areas such as mathematics, science, social studies, reading and language arts, where students are required to have greater listening skills and higher vocabulary which will enable them to analyze, evaluate and synthesize cognitively and linguistically challenging concepts (Cummings, 1980).

An understanding of BICS and CALP is significant for educators and policy makers. A person who does not comprehend the distinction between these two levels of proficiency may erroneously believe that children who communicate with their peers on the playground or in nonacademic settings will have the ability to meet the challenges and rigors of content rich classrooms (mathematics, science, social studies, technology). Cummins argued that students who were functioning at the BICS level were not ready for the demands of cognitively higher and linguistically rigorous concepts of the English academic classroom, however, given the opportunity to use their native language they
could function quite successfully. This is particularly important in middle school and high school setting where academic and linguistic concepts are significantly more rigorous, for native and foreign language speakers alike, and where CALP will be developed extensively.

How can Washington State educators ensure that all English Language Learners receive a “meaningful education” which meets their social, academic and linguistic needs? District administrators, school board members, and educators must be well versed in language acquisition, bilingual education laws, effective instructional pedagogy and bilingual education research by leading experts.

The Prism Model

It is argued that many school districts struggle to provide a “meaningful education” (as mandated by Lau v Nichols) for second language learners because many policy makers, educators, and community members believe that second language learners must focus on English language skills at the expense of sociocultural, cognitive and academic content (Collier, 1995). As noted above, many district administrators and classroom educators think that if ELLs can speak English they will be able to function successfully in English only classrooms. Collier, like Cummins, proposes the opposite. Collier designed a conceptual model for language acquisition, for both native and second language learners. It is often referred to as the Prism Model which is formed by four interdependent and complex components. These are sociocultural, linguistic, academic and cognitive processes.
The sociocultural process focuses on the child’s self-esteem, social patterns, social expectations, relationships, culture and language status at home, the classroom and in the community. Collier (1995) indicates that this component is at the heart of successful second language acquisition in an academic setting because if ELLs do not feel comfortable, welcomed, or valued, then the likelihood of their success will diminish. Irujo (2005) explained that promoting native language use in the classroom to activate prior knowledge and access content comprehension was critical to student learning, but more profound than that, encouraging native language use affirmed students’ identities and conveyed the message that their language and culture were important. Cummins (2007) argues that educators can promote strong literacy development in L2 by encouraging students’ prior knowledge in L1 in order to help them transfer pre-existing knowledge to L2. Language and culture are inseparable. Through language, societies convey their histories, ideas, values, norms and religious ideals with songs, chants, stories, poems and written text. Educators must comprehend that “culture forms a prism through which members of a group see the world...and a group’s culture is reflected by the group’s language” (Bowman, 1990, p.1). Indeed “it is hard to argue that we are teaching the whole child when school policy dictates that students leave their language and culture at the schoolhouse door” (Cummins et al, 2005, p.38). Instead, Cummins (1991) argues, educators should know that students enter schools with prior education, linguistic, and personal experiences which are a foundation to their future achievements, and educators are advised to tap into that foundation as opposed to stifling it. Prohibiting
or promoting the use of a group’s language can contribute to, or disempower academic and social success (Irujo, 2005).

A clear understanding of the complex sociocultural needs of ELLs is critical for general education teachers who may be a student’s first experience with the U.S. culture. Cummins (2007) explained that teaching is about “human relationships” and asked if educators’ pedagogy acknowledges and builds upon the students’ cultural and linguistic knowledge. Based on the educator’s understanding of second language acquisition and personal beliefs, he or she may convey a message of intolerance and superiority as opposed to tolerance and cultural plurality. Allowing and promoting ELLs access to their language and culture can ensure strong family ties, a sense of community and academic success (McGamer & Saenz, 2009). Indeed, a clear understanding of students’ sociocultural needs can allow educators to develop pedagogically sound curriculum and practices to ensure the linguistic, cultural, and academic success for all students.

Language development is another component of Collier’s model. It refers to the child’s innate ability to acquire language orally and in written form in both the primary and secondary languages. To ensure success in the second language (L2), a child’s first language (L1) must be highly developed orally, cognitively, academically, and in written form (see Universal Grammar). The third component of the model is academic development which stresses the child’s knowledge and conceptual understanding of mathematics, writing, science, language arts, and social studies. Collier proposes that to ensure cognitive and academic success in L2, a child’s L1 must be fully developed in both oral and written form at least through the elementary years. Collier, in agreement
with Cummins, states that academic knowledge and skills will transfer from L1 to L2. Cognitive development, the fourth component, encourages higher order thinking through evaluation, synthesis and analysis in problem solving, discovery and cooperative learning of cognitively challenging concepts and processes. Higher order skills must not be neglected if educators are to ensure "deep academic proficiency in second language" (Collier, 1995, p.3) acquisition. In other words, the emphasis must not be limited to English language acquisition exclusively, rather on meaningful education which encompasses sociocultural, linguistic, academic and cognitive processes.

Bilingual Education Models and Research

Thirty-five years after Lau v. Nichols, educators and policy makers continue to debate over which language programs best close the achievement gap for ELL students as was mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Bilingual education supporters and opponents have held contentious and long lasting debates over the efficacy of which programs best meet the needs of ELL. Unfortunately, many misinformed parents and well-meaning educators placed non English speakers in English only classrooms so that they can “quickly” gain second language skills, without fully understanding effective practices, reliable research and the true ramifications of these decisions.

For a period of time many, but not all, English language learners benefited from legal rights which mandated that states create educational programs which would meet their learning needs. Many states created bilingual programs, however, in the early 1960’s, 70’s and 80’s bilingual education was in its infancy. There was no clear understanding of effective and appropriate strategies to meet ELL student needs. States across the nation
were left at their discretion to create and implement bilingual and/or “alternative” programs which would serve language minority students. Luckily, linguists and researchers were busy studying language development and analyzing the results of the various bilingual models.

Over the decades, numerous bilingual educational programs were created around the country in an attempt to meet the needs of English language learners. Bilingual programs are those that use two languages for instruction, the students’ primary language and English.

**ESL Pull-Out/Push-In Models**

One of the first programs was the ESL pull-out/push-in model where children were pulled from the general education classroom to work in a resource room with a bilingual teacher or paraprofessional. ESL programs were developed to provide English language development (ELD) students focused English instruction. The primary goal of this model was to develop student’s English language proficiency as rapidly as possible (Costantino, 1999). In the pull-out/push-in model, children were pulled from the general education classroom and taken to a resource room with a teacher or paraprofessional who could speak the child’s language. In many cases, the limited English proficient (LEP) students work in a small classroom with other English language learners who were working on similar remedial skills such as English grammar, vocabulary and communications skills as opposed to academic content (Costantino, 1999). According to Malagon and Deleeuw (2006), the pull-out/push-in approach is selected by some Washington state school districts in order to maximize supplemental instruction to ELLs with limited support staff. When implementing this model, educators and administrators
should take into account that students will be pulled out of class during core subject instruction. It is advised that ESL trained teachers provide language instruction, that there must be on-going communication between the general education classroom teacher and the ESL teacher, and that ELD students ought to be grouped by beginning, intermediate, advanced or transitional levels (Malagon & Deleeuw, 2006).

In a sixteen year longitudinal analysis of educational services provided for language minority students, Thomas and Collier (2001) found that ESL content students ranged between the 31st and 40th NCE (normal curve equivalent) with a median of the 34th NCE (23rd percentile) when they graduated. Costantino (1999) argues that students who are placed in mainstream classrooms and are then pulled-out for ESL instruction are deprived of full access to cognitively rich content instruction until they reach high levels of English-language proficiency. ESL pull-out students run the risk of being labeled intellectually inferior. Many of their monolingual English classmates view ESL pull-out students as special educations students, a label which carries a negative stigma. As a result of the deprivation of content instruction in the ESL pull-out model, ELLs fall behind their English-speaking peers. To promote a sense of belonging and success, Cummins (1991) proposed, that ELLs should be engaged in cognitively and linguistically rich environments where they have continuous opportunities to interact with their English speaking peers in grade level content. In this way ELL will be able to keep pace with their peers instead of playing catch up. According to Malagon and Deleeuw (2006), 36% of the ELL in Washington State was served under the ESL pull-out model in the 2005-06 school year compared to the 2% served in Dual language programs.
Dual Language Models

Dual Language programs use native language instruction along with English to provide content-based instruction in the general education classroom. For example, participating students might use English and Mandarin or English and Spanish. The goal of this model is to educate bilingual bi-literate students from diverse backgrounds who can function at higher cognitive levels of instruction. Students receive content instruction in both languages to help them develop linguistic and academic proficiency in both languages. In the Two-Way bilingual (Dual Language) model, children from two language groups (English and another language) receive content instruction in both languages. In One-Way bilingual (Dual Language) models, students from one language group receive content instruction in both languages to develop linguistic and academic proficiency in both languages. Under this model it is common to have participants who are bilingual and native speakers of the other language of instruction. Under both of these models students learn to interact, communicate and cooperate with each other to learn the content and language skills. The dual language model allows educators to focus on designing and implementing high quality content and language instruction without translation since he/she only provides instruction in the target language. For example, science might be taught in Spanish where reading will be taught in English.

Students enrolled in the 50-50 one way dual language model reached the “62nd NCE (72nd percentile) after four years of instruction” (Thomas & collier, 2001, p.3). Fred Genesee et al. (2006) indicate that students who participate in Dual language programs score at, or greater than, state norms in content areas, had greater achievement levels in
English reading and math than monolingual English learners, were more likely to close the achievement gap with native English students, had better overall grades, lower dropout rates, and were on track to graduate on time with greater success than ELL with low native language proficiency. Researchers have found this model to be the most effective academic and linguistic model for English language learners and native English speakers alike (Thomas & Collier, 2001). According to McCold and Malagon (2009) 2.7% of Washington’s English language learners were served under this model during the 2008-09 school year. Though this percentage increased from 2006, it is still a small percentage.

Dual Language programs have been documented to be the most promising for educating competent English language students and language majority students (Cummins 2007, Thomas and Collier 2001, Genesee 2006 and 2009, Lindholm and Aclan 1991, Greene 1998, Linton 2007). They state that Dual Language programs not only close the achievement gap for second language learners, but these models lead to grade level and above grade level achievement for all participants. Students in these programs outperform monolingual-English students when enrolled in high quality enrichment programs that teach curriculum content through L1 and L2 (Collier, 2004). Thomas and Collier (2001) found that the dual language programs and 90-10 enrichment are the only ones that close the achievement gap. In many cases students in these programs outperform their peers and are less likely to drop out of school. As noted above, the two-way dual language program uses two languages to teach students the core curriculum. A foundational cornerstone of the Dual Language model is that classrooms
have as close a balance of limited English students, bilingual students and language majority students work together as possible. Because instruction is delivered in both languages, there is no need to create remedial programs. Teachers in dual language classrooms create cognitively challenging grade level interdisciplinary units with the core curriculum in order to help the ELL make connections between various academic disciplines. Those teachers do not translate any concepts, but rather promote cooperative work among students so that they scaffold each other through cognitively challenging curriculum. The lessons are not repeated in the other language (Collier & Thomas, 2004) so students must negotiate meaning through comprehensible input, cooperative work, the use of multiple modalities, visual organizers (graphs, charts, tables, posters) interactive videos, content dictionaries and any means which will facilitate comprehension.

**Content Based ESL/Sheltered Instruction Model**

Content Based ESL/sheltered instruction models use instructional materials and learning tasks from academic content areas such as mathematics, science, social studies and language arts to develop English language skills as well as content knowledge. English development is both the goal and the method of instruction under his model. It is believed that by learning content through the target language the students gain language skills without the risk of falling behind academically (Herrera & Murry, 2005). In other words, students are immersed in language rich content which is relevant to their academic studies, as opposed to delaying their academic studies until they’ve developed high levels of language proficiency. This in turn motivates students to participate in class which increases their learning (Larson-Freeman, 2000). Because content concepts may be challenging, it is essential for educators to identify both content and language objectives
to be mastered during all lessons and activities (Herrera & Murry). Under this model multiple subjects are taught through thematic units which require ESL teachers to implement various teaching strategies and techniques to help students meet content and language specific objectives (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2004). According to Echevarria et al., content based ESL instruction was not enough to help all ELL achieve academically outside of the language supported environments thus forcing teachers to reevaluate effective strategies that would facilitate ELL learning in the general education classroom.

In their sixteen year longitudinal analysis of educational services provided for language minority students, Thomas and Collier (2001) found that ESL content students ranged between the 31st and 40th NCE (normal curve equivalent) with a median of the 34th NCE (23rd percentile) when they graduated. Students enrolled in Content Based ESL programs, where no native language support was provided, showed serious deficits in reading and mathematics (Thomas & Collier, 2001). In 2008 to 2009 school year, 88.1% of Washington’s ELLs were served under this model (McCold & Malagon, 2009). This is a cause for concern and should send red flags to parents, teachers and administrators.

**Late-Exit Bilingual Models**

Late-Exit Bilingual programs are designed for English language learners (Malagon & Deleeuw, 2006). This model uses the students’ primary language for instruction, based on their level of language proficiency, and for a longer period of time (five to six years) than Early-Exit programs. The goal is to develop academic proficiency in the student’s native and second languages, and to slowly transition students into English language instruction. At the onset, instruction is mainly in the students’ native language, gradually
increasing instruction in English so that by the time students are exited all instruction is in English. The amount of native language instruction is related to the students’ English language proficiency. Generally speaking, more emphasis is placed on developing the students’ first language as a bridge to English language development as opposed to developing the students’ native language. That being said, native language literacy is used as a foundation for developing English literacy. This requires bilingual, bi-literate staff in using both languages for academic instruction (Malagon & Deleeuw, 2006).

According to Thomas and Collier (2001) students in this model reached the 40th NCE (32nd percentile) by the end of fifth grade. McCold and Malagon (2009) found that in 2008-2009 3.8% of Washington’s second language learners were served under this model.

*Early-Exit / Transitional Bilingual Model*

The Early-Exit Bilingual program, also known as the Transitional Bilingual program, is similar to the Late-Exit bilingual model except that the transitional period typically occurs within a three to four year window. This model provides initial instruction in the student’s native language (kindergarten) which serves as a foundation for English literacy. Children are transitioned into English instruction once they demonstrate native language proficiency because literacy skills will transfer to the second language. The intent is to quickly transition the student into all English instruction in the mainstream classroom. The goal of this model is to help students develop academic proficiency in English. Students may receive 50 percent instruction in English and 50 percent instruction in their native language. Thomas and Collier (2001) indicate that students
who participate in this model reach the "47th NCE (45 percentile) by the end of 11th grade" (2001, p. 2-3). In 2008 to 2009 3.7% of Washington's second language learners were served under this model (McCold and Malagon, 2009).

**English Immersion Model**

The last method analyzed here is the English immersion model. Under this model students are immersed in English mainstream classrooms where no native language support is provided. Educators in these classrooms are not trained in, nor do they implement, strategies which will help ELL gain comprehensible input to master content. ELL enrolled in immersion models "showed the largest decrease in reading and mathematics achievement by 5th grade when compared to students receiving bilingual services with the largest dropout rate coming from this group. By 11th grade those still in school had only achieved the 25th NCE (12th percentile)" (Thomas & Collier, 2001, p.2).

A note of caution, Content based ESL/Sheltered Instruction and Immersion are equivalent when teachers are not taught or do not implement effective and appropriate strategies for ELLs such as activating prior knowledge, building vocabulary, cooperative learning, the use of realia and manipulatives as well as visual organizers to facilitate comprehension of higher order cognitive concepts.

As noted above, bilingual education supporters and opponents hold ongoing debates over which programs are most effective for ELLs. According to a five-year analysis of Proposition 227, which almost eliminated bilingual education in California, and conducted by the American Institute for Research in collaboration with West Ed, it "conclusively and empirically" demonstrated that English immersion methods of instruction are not superior to bilingual instruction methods in closing the achievement
gap for ELLs. “Very little evidence can be found to demonstrate the superiority of the English immersion model” (August & Shanahan, 2006, p. VII-2). These researchers indicate that all Californian students improved academically; however, they also indicate that the achievement gap between ELLs and monolingual English speakers remained the same across all grades and subject areas. That is to say, the achievement gap between English language learners and native English speakers did not close (August & Shanahan, p. VII-2). These findings are significant since the premise for Proposition 227 was the alleged superiority of English immersion in closing the achievement gap. So what should educators do to close the achievement gap?

The Positive Affects of Bilingual Education

Greene (1998), conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the scholarly research on the effects of bilingual education. Greene argued that only randomized studies provide unbiased samples which offer helpful information on bilingual education. He stated that these randomized experiments clearly indicated that English language learners who were at least partially instructed in their native language performed better on standardized English tests. He says that native language instruction is beneficial to second language learners.

In a separate study of 249 first through fourth grade students enrolled in Two-Way (dual language) programs, researchers Lindholm and Aclan (1991), found those highly proficient bilingual students outperformed medium and low-level proficient bilingual students in native and English reading and native and English mathematics. Lindholm and Aclan found that knowledge and skills learned in the students’ native language transfer to the second language. They indicate that when tested in their native language,
students demonstrated greater achievement levels. They also stated that as L2 language skills increased, students were better able to demonstrate their knowledge of skills in content areas. Lindholm and Aclan also argued that additive bilingual programs resulted in greater levels of language proficiency, academic achievement and second language learners' positive self image, whereas subtractive programs yielded lower levels of language proficiency, academic achievement and poor self concepts.

The Executive Summary of Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth found that native language literacy and oral language proficiency can be used to assist literary skill development in English (August & Shanahan, 2006). Tapping into the student's first language literacy skills can be beneficial to English language learners. Literacy knowledge in the student's primary language is related to English literacy skills including word reading, reading comprehension, application of reading strategies, as well as spelling and writing proficiency (August & Shanahan). ELL can utilize higher order vocabulary skills developed in their primary language, such as knowledge of cognates, words which are spelled alike and have similar meanings in both L1 and L2, to comprehend English language vocabulary and content (August & Shanahan). August and Shanahan stated that students enrolled in bilingual programs which cultivate first language proficiency developed superior literacy skills in English than students who were instructed in English only programs both at the primary and secondary levels.

This is in agreement with Collier (2004), and Lindholm-Leary (2006) who argued that there was a strong correlation with sustained instruction through the English
language learners' first language and their educational success. Lindholm and Aclan (1991), in accordance with Cummins (1979), proposed that bilingual students must achieve a higher level of bilingual proficiency in order to benefit from long term cognitive growth and academic proficiency. Researchers advocate the use of native language instruction while ELL develop a firm understanding of cognitively challenging grade level skills and concepts which will then transfer to L2. This in turn will ensure that ELL keep pace with their monolingual English speaking peers, thus requiring that less time, energy and resources be needed to remediate students who would inevitably fall behind.

The Time Factor

How much time is required for English Language Learners to develop academic English language skills? According to Cummins (2007), ELLs can learn decoding and spelling skills as quickly as basic vocabulary and basic conversational skills (BICS). Cummins goes on to say that ELLs need continued bilingual support after they gain conversational English skills, and that removing this support precipitously may harm their academic development if they are not enrolled in a classroom which provides appropriate and effective strategies. ELL may need “five or more years” (Cummins, 1994, p.56) to make the same gains as their English speaking peers in academic English content. Cummins (2002) also explained that monolingual English speaking students are not waiting for second language learners to catch up with them.

This concurs with Thomas and Collier (2001) who indicate that the more formal instruction received in the primary language the greater probability of academic success.
In other words, the more primary language instruction received, the greater the second language achievement. When ELLs are immersed in English without native language support it takes them between “7-10 years or more to reach age and grade-level norms” (Collier 1995, p. 4) of their native English speaking peers. For ELLs to achieve a native-English level of proficiency, they must receive cognitively complex, on-grade-level instruction through the student’s home language for five or six, years which is much less than that needed under the English only remedial models (Thomas & Colliers, 2001).

The strongest predictor of second language learners’ success is the amount of formal primary language instruction at grade level (Thomas & Collier, 2001). It is suggested that parents who refuse bilingual services should be “strongly counseled against this refusal” (Thomas & Collier, 2001, p.7) and informed of the negative ramifications of this decision. Genesee (2009) suggests that parents should be encouraged to use the primary language in order to foster primary language development which will enhance second language acquisition. That is to say that full bilingual proficiency can serve not only as a bridge but as a foundation to academic achievement.

Conclusion

As the debate continues over which language programs close the achievement gap for language minority students, educators and policy makers must remember to put their political biases aside and look at the research. Much has been learned about effective and appropriate practices for ELLs over the decades. A key to successful student achievement depends on educators’ understanding that language learning is natural, that second language learners’ sociocultural needs must be met, and that language acquisition
is a lifelong process (Collier, 1995). Educators must follow pedagogically sound practices which are supported by sound research.

Although the struggle for equitable and meaningful education in American schools began nearly 200 years ago, there are still students who do not benefit from the federal mandate that districts must create and implement educational programs which will ensure students’ meaningful and effective participation in the classroom. As OSPI and local school districts across Washington State evaluate the efficacy of their programs in order to make AYP, it is imperative that all educators and administrators involved in the decision making process use sound theories, effective research, as is mandated by NCLB, and follow the law to design and evaluate effective and appropriate programs to meet the social, linguistic and academic needs of Washington’s diverse language minority students.

President Obama reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act otherwise known as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB), although with many unexpected changes. Under Obama’s New Blueprint, states may apply for formula grants. Upon receiving these grants, states are expected to develop and implement high-quality assessments aligned with college and career-ready standards in English language arts and mathematics that measure students’ academic achievement and growth (U.S. Department of Education A Blueprint for Reform, p.11). Districts that are awarded funds may select and implement instructional programs including dual-language, transitional bilingual education, sheltered English immersion or other instructional programs. However, districts are required to identify staff training, English language learners, student
eligibility, placement and duration of program, and services based on assessment. Districts must also evaluate program effectiveness and provide ELL achievement progress reports based on assessments. To ensure accountability, districts have three years to show student improved, or risk loss of fund flexibility (p.20). Districts are allowed to close low performing schools, to replace principals and staff, and enroll students in other high-performing schools in the district (p.12).

This guide provides districts policy makers and educators with the history and laws of bilingual education, first and second language development theories and approaches, bilingual education models, and research results for the various models. Based on the information provided, educators and administrator are advised to make pedagogically sound policy decisions to meet the needs of English language learner.
CHAPTER V

Summary

The purpose of this project was to create an elementary teacher’s manual which explained the history and laws of bilingual education, first and second language development theories and approaches, bilingual education models and research results for the various models. Washington’s changing demographics created a demand for bilingual biliterate educators who are trained in effective and appropriate strategies to meet the needs of the changing population. Although, numerous teachers enter the general education classroom not all graduates, or veteran educators are trained in bilingual education. Many of these teachers have limited time and resources to invest in the study of the most relevant laws, theories, and pedagogically sound practices to meet the varying linguistic, social, and academic needs of the diverse population. Washington State’s educators are expected to serve these students on a daily basis. There is a need for educator texts where practitioners can gain quick answers to legal questions, text which will explain language development theories, language acquisition approaches followed in education, bilingual education models and reliable research. Educators and administrators alike must make informed decisions based on reliable theories and effective research to ensure that pedagogically sound practices are implemented. The aim of the guide was to help educators and administrator make pedagogically sound policy decisions for English language learners.

The researcher analyzed which bilingual educational programs best meet the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). In this manual Two-Way Dual Language
Immersion, ESL pull-out/push-in, Content Based ESL, English immersion, and Early and Late Exit Bilingual programs were analyzed along with the research for each model. The intent was to identify which of these program designs best close the achievement gap for English Language Learners.

A literature review of bilingual education laws, language acquisition theories and, issues was conducted. The review included a historical analysis of bilingual education history in the United States over the past 200 years. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Lau v. Nichols and the Lau Remedies, the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or NCLB as it is known, were explained because of their implications for ensuring that English Language Learner’s civil and legal rights are met in order to be in compliance with federal funding regulations and to ensure that second language learners benefit from an equitable education. Washington State’s Bilingual Education laws were included to discuss English language learner’s rights as well as school districts’ responsibilities in meeting ELL rights in accordance with NCLB (Title III), Title VII, and the Equal Education Opportunity Act (EEOA).

Conclusion

Though support and opposition for bilingual education continue to be polemic, research supports the implementation of bilingual education programs that are based on sound practices and theories. Collier (1995) indicated that meeting student’s sociocultural needs was at the heart of successful second language acquisition in an academic setting because when ELL felt comfortable, welcomed, or valued, the likelihood of their success was increased. Collier’s sociocultural process focuses on the
child’s self-esteem, social patterns, social expectations, relationships, culture and language status at home, the classroom and in the community.

In order to follow pedagogically sound practices educators must accept that students enter schools with education, linguistic, and personal experiences which are a foundation to their future achievements. Educators and policy makers are advised to tap into that foundation as opposed to stifling it. Prohibiting or promoting the use of a group’s language can contribute to long term academic and social success. Encouraging native language use affirms students’ identities and conveys the message that their language and heritage are valued. Educators and policy makers must comprehend that language and culture are inseparable. Through language, societies convey their histories, ideas, values, norms and religious ideals with songs, chants, stories, poems, and written text. Students cannot be stripped of their heritage at the schoolhouse doors.

Cummins (2007) argued that educators can promote strong literacy development in L2 by encouraging students’ prior knowledge in L1 in order to help them transfer pre-existing knowledge to L2. Students should also be engaged in cognitively and linguistically rich environments where they have continuous opportunities to interact with their English speaking peers on grade level content as opposed to being pulled out of class to work on remedial, no contextualized skills or isolated grammar drills.

Both one-way and two-way dual language programs lead to grade level and above-grade-level achievement for ELLs and monolingual English speaking students alike. These were the only programs that fully closed the gap (Collier & Thomas, 2001). Students participating in these models outperformed students who participated in all other
models. English-only immersion, ESL pullout and Early-Exit programs deprived English language learners of full access to cognitively rich content instruction. As a result of this deprivation, ELLs fell behind their English-Speaking peers and were not able to close the achievement gap. Researchers found that ELL enrolled in English only immersion models “showed the largest decrease in reading and mathematics achievement... with the largest dropout rate coming from this group (Thomas & Collier, 2001, p.2), therefore educators are advised against using this model.

Recommendations

Contrary to popular belief that English immersion leads to English language learner success, research indicates that ELLs must fully develop both native and second language literacy skills and content knowledge in order to achieve high academic, linguistic, and cognitive proficiency, which can in turn ensure that they will close the achievement gap. To reach the highest levels of bilingual biliterate achievement students must be enrolled in long term programs that provide a positive sociocultural learning environment where native and second language development are encouraged, and where ELL students work cooperatively with their English speaking peers on academically challenging grade-level content.

Another critical component to ELL success is parental, staff, and administrative support for program implementation. Administrators must hire highly qualified ESL/bilingual endorsed educators, arrange ongoing staff development of effective and appropriate instructional strategies, advocate the purchase and implementation of cognitively challenging bilingual curriculum, and promote parental involvement in the
decision making processes that affect student progress. Educators must teach cognitively and linguistically challenging content using comprehensible input through the use of graphic organizers, props, realia, maps, videos, or any means necessary to facilitate comprehension. Educators are advised to create daily opportunities for all students, regardless of linguistic proficiency, to cooperate in natural and meaningful activities that allow students to make interdisciplinary connections. Educators and administrators must create a school climate where all cultures and languages share equal importance and are seen as assets to be nurtured.
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