"Some of us are learning Spanish and some of us are learning English": A comparison of second language programs in Texas

Lore Carrera-Carrillo

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds

Repository Citation
Carrera-Carrillo, Lore, "'Some of us are learning Spanish and some of us are learning English': A comparison of second language programs in Texas" (2003). UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations. 2533.
https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds/2533

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Scholarship@UNLV. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.
"SOME OF US ARE LEARNING SPANISH AND SOME OF US ARE LEARNING ENGLISH": A COMPARISON OF SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN TEXAS

by

Lore Carrera – Carrillo

Bachelor of Science
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1988

Master of Science
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1991

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Leadership
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2003
The Dissertation prepared by

Lore Carrera-Carrillo

Entitled

Some of us are Learning Spanish and Some of us are Learning English: A Comparison of Second Language Programs in Texas

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative
ABSTRACT

"Some of us are learning Spanish and some of us are learning English": A Comparison of Second Language Programs in Texas

by

Lore Carrera – Carrillo

Dr. James Crawford, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dual language education programs are gaining momentum throughout the United States as exemplary means of educating both language minority and language majority students. There is considerable evidence that learning through the native language has many advantages for language minority students. Specifically, it allows them to gain important content knowledge in their native language that will make the English they encounter more comprehensible as they enhance their overall cognitive and social development. Additionally, dual language education facilitates the development of both basic and advanced literacy in two languages for language majority students.

Research results demonstrate that dual language education programs can be very successful. However, in many cases dual language programs are initiated too quickly without the implementation of the key features identified in this study necessary for program success. This study addresses the practical
application of the key features found in dual language programs, and links them to the academic success of students participating in this type of program.
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CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW

Introduction

The United States has experienced a significant amount of immigration over many decades and particularly in the past twenty years. Although, the general U.S. population only grew at a rate of 17% from 1980 to 2000, the rate of growth among different ethnic groups living in the United States varied Tremendously. Hispanics are the fastest growing group and currently represent about 11.7% of the U.S. population. This population is expected to double to 24.3% by the year 2050. Much of the growth in Hispanic groups has resulted from recent immigration and this trend is expected to continue. An estimated 9.9 million of the total 45 million school-aged children, live in households in which languages other than English are spoken. Spanish is the language of two-thirds, or six million children, who speak a language other than English at home (Lindholm, 2000).

Background

This demographic shift has great educational significance. According to key findings from Our Nation on the Fault Line: Hispanic American Education presented at the President’s Advisory Commission on Educational excellence...
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for Hispanic Americans, September 1996, "educational attainment for most Hispanic Americans is in a state of crisis, the disparity in overall achievement between Hispanic Americans and other Americans is intolerable, students are segregated in schools that are "resource poor, and Hispanic American students drop out earlier and at unacceptably high rates."

In spite of the complexity of the problem of school failure for non-mainstream children, those concerned with its remediation have focused on attempting to change particular aspects of the institutional and instructional contexts, hoping that such changes will bring about increased school success. While aware of the structural factors that frame the problem, these researchers and practitioners represent the tension that Carnoy and Levin (1985) have described that exists between "the unequal hierarchies associated with the capitalist workplace" and "the democratic values and expectations associated with equality of access to citizen rights and opportunities" (Levin, 1985).

In comparison to theorists who have sought to explain the nature and circumstances of educational failure, practitioners and policy makers have focused on bringing about change in schools and in school outcomes. Programs that have endeavored to reverse educational outcomes for poor, disadvantaged, or at-risk children have tended to address single micro-level factors such as English language fluency as the cause for their failure. With few exceptions, programs aimed at at-risk children are designed to address key shortcomings or deficits in these students in order to help them succeed in the school environment. For this reason, compensatory programs have failed to meet the expectations of those policy makers and practitioners who sincerely hoped
compensating the key factors would bring about significant changes in total educational outcomes.

Politics of Bilingual Education

The education of Hispanics and other immigrants has often been as much politically based as educationally. Historically, bilingual education in the United States has gone through changes that indicate shifts in ideology, preference, and practice. In the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the United States linguistic diversity was often accepted and the presence of different languages was encouraged in both private and public schools. Specifically, the latter part of the nineteenth century demonstrated an openness to immigrant languages. German-English bilingual schools were opened in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Minnesota, North and South Dakota and Wisconsin. In cities such as Cincinnati, Baltimore, Denver, and San Francisco dual language education was present (Crawford, 1995).

In the first two decades of the twentieth century a change in the attitude toward bilingual education occurred in the United States. This change in attitude was related to a fear of new foreigners, and a desire for the assimilation of immigrants. Competence in the English language was associated with loyalty to the United States.

In 1906 the Nationality Act was passed and required immigrants to speak English to become naturalized Americans. In 1917 the United States entered the First World War spread Anti-German sentiments and as a consequence the German language was portrayed as a threat to the unity of America. Linguistic
diversity was replaced by linguistic intolerance. In 1919 the Americanization Department of the United States Bureau of Education recommended all states conduct government business in the English language and instruction in elementary schools be in English (Baker, 2001).

The English only philosophy changed in 1923 when the US Supreme Court found in *Meyer vs. Nebraska* that proficiency in a foreign language was not injurious to the health, morals and understanding of the ordinary child, however this ruling did not support bilingualism or bilingual education. In 1957, the Russians launched Sputnik into space and as a result the quality of U.S. education was questioned and a new consciousness arose about the need for foreign language instruction. In 1958, the National Defense and Education Act was passed, promoting foreign language learning in elementary, high schools, and universities. In 1964 the Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of color, race, or national origin, and led to the establishment of the Office of Civil Rights. The results of this Act served to increase tolerance of ethnic languages at the federal, state and local level.

In 1963 Cuban exiles established a dual language school in Dade County in South Florida known as the Coral Way Elementary School. The exiles were educated middle-class Cubans who felt the need to maintain their mother tongue. In 1967, Texas Senator, Ralph Yarborough, introduced the Bilingual Education Act amendment to the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This Act indicated that bilingual education programs were to be seen as an integral part of federal education policy. Subsequently, federal funds were authorized for the education of speakers of languages other than English (Baker, 2001).
Legislation Impacting Bilingual Education

A landmark case that profoundly affected the growth of bilingual education was Lau vs. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786 (1974). In 1970, this case was brought by Chinese public school students against the San Francisco Unified School District. The main issue focused around the question of whether or not non-English speaking students received an equal educational opportunity when instructed in a language they could not understand. In 1974, the Supreme Court ruled that “Chinese-speaking minority students receive fewer benefits than English-speaking majority students from the school system that denies them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the educational program—all earmarks of discrimination banned by the regulations” (414 U.S. at 568). In essence the Chinese students were entitled to receive whatever special assistance was necessary to allow them to succeed in the school program. This Supreme Court decision did not mandate any particular program of bilingual education so school district administrators were left to decide which programs were more suitable for their situation.

After the Lau vs. Nichols decision the Office of Civil Rights began visiting school districts with large numbers of language minority students and discovered most districts were failing in their attempts to set up effective educational approaches. In response to this finding, the U.S. Commissioner of Education Terrel Bell announced the Lau Remedies on August 11, 1975. These remedies were established guidelines that assisted districts in the identification and evaluation of students with limited English proficiency, set standards by which
particular programs were to be selected appropriately, and determined professional standards that teachers should meet.

In 1978 the United States Congress reauthorized Transitional Bilingual Education under the Bilingual Education Act allowing the native language to be used only to the extent necessary for a child to achieve competence in the English language. The 1984 and 1988 amendments allowed increasing percentages of funds available to be allocated to programs where a student's first language was not used.

In 1985, Secretary of Education William Bennett suggested there was no evidence that children from language minorities had benefited from the Bilingual Education Act (Baker, 2001). Twenty five percent of the funds from this Act were redistributed for English monolingual, alternative instructional programs.

In 1994, the 103rd Congress undertook a major reform of education through the legislation known as Goals 2000; Educate America Act. This Act stated that limited English proficient students should be expected to achieve high academic standards. This legislation aimed to provide children an enriched educational program improving instructional strategies and making the curriculum more challenging. The reauthorization of Title VII in 1994 continued federal support for bilingual education programs. However, Title VII appropriations came under attack by politicians and the US Press. Title VII appropriations were reduced 38% between 1994 and 1996 leading to cuts in bilingual programs, teacher training and reducing the budgets for research, evaluation and support of bilingual education in the United States. In 1998 the “Unz initiative” known as
Proposition 227 passed in California and sought to impose severe restrictions on native-language instruction for English learners.

**History of Bilingual Education**

The history of bilingual education in the United States has been of constant change based on a constant movement of ideas, ideology and impetus. Throughout history there have been periods when bilingual education has been criticized, forbidden, and rejected, then there have been periods where bilingual education has been seen as positive and necessary.

An ongoing difficulty faced by decision-makers in school districts has been to reach an agreement on whether bilingual education programs, English as a second language programs or English Immersion programs provide the greatest linguistic and academic benefit to limited English proficient students.

**Bilingual Education**

Bilingual education is a type of school program in the United States for language minority students who do not speak or have a limited proficiency in English when they start schooling. The students' primary language is used for curriculum instruction for a number of years. This approach aims to promote the students' mastery of academic material while they are learning English as a second language. These programs are intended to facilitate language minority students' transition to instruction in English only. Bilingual programs aim for full proficiency in oral and written English (Lindholm, 2000).
English as a Second Language

English as a second language (ESL) instruction is designed to promote the acquisition of a second language. ESL teachers use instructional materials, learning tools and classroom techniques from academic content areas as the vehicle for developing second language, content, cognitive, and study skills (Lindholm, 2000). The primary objective of ESL instruction is to promote language learning.

English Immersion

English immersion programs can refer to regular programs for native English speaking students where English is the only language of instruction. These programs may or may not include special provisions for English language learners. They aim for proficiency in oral and written English and full academic achievement; they do not aim to maintain or develop language minority students’ primary language or culture (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000).

Research Studies

Many studies of the effectiveness of bilingual vs. ESL programs have focused on the short-term picture by examining differences between programs in the early grades, K-3. These studies have found little difference in effectiveness between programs.

In 1991, the U.S. Department of Education released the findings of an eight-year study entitled the Ramirez Report. This report documented the educational validity of strongly promoting bi-literacy as an effective means to
overall educational achievement for language minority students (Cummins, 1992). The researchers found that students who remained in bilingual programs during their elementary years demonstrated greater growth in English reading skills, mathematics and English language skills.

Thomas and Collier (1997) conducted a study that examined language minority students over a period of five years. Their study focused on the time needed for language minority students to reach and sustain on grade-level achievement in their second language as well as the type of program and instructional variables that strongly affect the long-term academic achievement of language minority students.

Thomas and Collier (1997) found that language minority students best acquire a second language when their first language is firmly established and a second language is best developed by language majority students through immersion in the language.

Dual language education is considered an additive language program that enables students to add a second language to their first and demonstrate higher levels of language proficiency, achievement, and self-concept. To a large degree dual language education is based on the research carried out over a multi-year period on one-way immersion programs implemented in Canada. These one-way programs, known as Canadian Immersion Programs (Genesee, 1984) educate language majority children primarily through French. From the research on these programs, we know that middle-class language majority students can be educated through a second language quite successfully.
Dual Language Programs

Dual language programs in the United States might be expected to
develop more fluent second-language skills in young language majority learners.
Proponents of dual language education have suggested that the presence of
native speakers of the target language who are available for peer interaction with
language-majority children can add to the many strengths of the original models
of immersion education (Linholm, 1992).

While some English speaking parents see dual language education as a
wonderful opportunity, there will not likely be a sufficient number of these parents
to create enough places for even ten percent of the language minority children in
the United States. Two additional problems must be faced if the growth of dual
language education is to be encouraged. Recruiting enough competent teachers
who are also native, or even near native, speakers of another language is
difficult, as in the case of recruiting competent teachers for bilingual programs.
The other difficulty is the resistance of regular classroom teachers to what they
perceive as a radically different and potentially threatening program that could
cause the loss of jobs for monolingual teachers (Porter, 1996).

Even with the aforementioned difficulties in 1999, 261 recognized dual
language programs existed in the United States. In 240 of these programs
Spanish was utilized as the target language (Lindholm, 2000). The concept of
dual language education builds directly on the body of research that has focused
on the benefits of primary language instruction for at-risk minority children. For
many advocates of such programs, dual language offers primary language
instruction for language minority children in programs that are highly prestigious
and in contexts where there is access to the majority language through same-age peers (Valdes, 1997).

According to Lindholm (2000) dual language education has the following four critical components:

1. The program involves instruction through two languages where the target language is used for a significant portion of the students' instructional day.
2. The program involves periods of instruction during which only one language is used.
3. Both native English speakers and native speakers of the target language are participants.
4. The students are integrated for most content instruction.

Dual language education is emerging as an educational program that not only benefits language minority students but also offers important benefits to language majority students as well. Schools offering dual language programs are being regarded as schools that are transforming education and implementing effective practices.

Key Features of Dual Language Programs

Based on a number of reviews that have been conducted concerning effective implementation for successful dual language education programs, Lindholm (2000) has identified the following seven key features that correlate closely with the effective school attributes:

1) Administrative support and leadership
2) Positive school environment
3) High quality instructional personnel
4) Pre-service/Inservice training
5) Instructional design of the program
6) Program configuration
7) Parental involvement

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study is based on both language acquisition theory and socio-cultural theory. Two-Way Immersion dual language programs are based on research findings concerning both first and second language acquisition. First, bilingual education research indicates that academic knowledge acquired through one language paves the way for the acquisition of related knowledge and skills in another language (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Second, research indicates English is best acquired by students with limited or no proficiency in English after their first language is firmly established. Specifically, strong oral and literacy skills developed in their first language provide a solid base for the acquisition of literacy and other academic language skills in English (Edelsky, 1982). Third, immersion programs for language majority students enable them to develop advanced levels of second language proficiency without compromising their academic achievement or first language development (Genessee, 1984).

Additionally, Two Way Immersion dual language programs grow out of sociocultural theory that maintains learning occurs through social interaction.
(Vygotsky, 1978). More specifically, the integration of native English speakers
and native speakers of another language facilitates second language acquisition,
because it promotes authentic, meaningful interaction among speakers of the two
languages (Genesee, 1987).

Meaningful interaction between teachers and language minority students
is critical. Faltis (1997) identifies a framework consisting of principles to ensure
teachers and students develop meaningful interactions. The first principle is
promoting two-way communication between teacher and students. When
teachers apply this principle they first recognize the knowledge the students bring
with them to the classroom. Teachers promoting two-way communication also
encourage interactive exchanges for all students regardless of their level of
English proficiency. These teachers find a way to incorporate the students’
experiences into classroom topics and discussions (Wink & Putney, 2000). The
second principle refers to social integration of minority language students in
classrooms where English is the dominant language. In order to achieve social
integration, both teachers and the language minority students need to explicitly
model and provide encouragement in order to support language minority
students’ social and academic learning (Wink & Putney, 2000). The third
principle defines language acquisition as a socially interactive process in which
students must have access to what is going on in a particular context and must
also be able to participate fully in ongoing classroom discourse (Wink & Putney,
2000).
Statement of the Problem

Researchers in the field of bilingual education have found additive models such as “two way dual language” programs (Cummins, 1992; Thomas and Collier, 1997) are more effective in developing first and second language achievement. However, the development and successful implementation of dual language programs require a thorough knowledge base regarding their implementation. Although, the research literature identifies key features of dual language programs they are often vague and ill defined. In many cases, well-intentioned practitioners initiate this type of program too quickly without the implementation of essential elements necessary for a comprehensive program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify and provide an in depth investigation of the key elements necessary for a comprehensive dual language program. Additionally, social interaction processes that lead to bi-literacy of majority/minority language students were examined in the context of dual language programs.

Research Questions

This study focused on the following questions:

1. What are the essential elements of a comprehensive dual language program and how are they being implemented?

2. What are the differences in social interaction opportunities in dual language, bilingual or Immersion programs?
3. If different social interaction opportunities exist in a single model what is the impact on emergent literacy skills?

4. How do social interaction processes during a dual language program lead to greater emergent literacy skills?

**Research Design and Methodology**

The design of this study was primarily qualitative with a mixed methods analysis within a two-phase approach. First, surveys from The Directory of Two Way dual language programs in the United States distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics were closely examined to determine what school practitioners identify as the most important factors in implementing dual language programs. The responses were categorized according to the seven key features (Linholm 2000) as identified in the literature review. A matrix was utilized to display this data. Second, a series of observational case studies were conducted in three second grade classrooms implementing a bilingual, a structured immersion, and a dual language program. The Faltis (1997) Joinfostering framework for teacher-student interactions was utilized for the purposes of data analysis. The extant literature was used to compare the responses from structured interviews, observations as documented in the researcher's field notes to confirm the existing findings.
Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as:

**Bilingual education** – A program in the United States for language minority students who do not speak English or are limited English proficient. The instruction in this program involves the use of the students’ primary language for some curriculum instruction. This approach aims to promote the students’ mastery of academic material while they are learning English as a second language (Linholm, 2000).

**Dual language education** – An educational program that emphasizes challenging standards in the core curriculum while enriching students’ development in both their first and second language. These programs aim for full proficiency in two languages, an understanding and appreciation of cultures associated with those languages, and high levels of achievement in all core academic domains (Linholm, 2000).

**English as a second language education** – A program designed to promote the acquisition of a second language without utilizing the students’ primary language during the instruction. While content may be the focus of the instruction, the primary objectives are to promote language learning (Linholm, 2000).

**Language majority students** – These students come from homes in which the family speaks English (Linholm, 2000).

**Language minority students** – These students come from homes in which the family speaks a language other than English (Linholm, 2000).
Limited-English proficient students – These students who do not possess sufficient English language proficiency to participate fully in mainstream education classes (Lindholm, 2000).

Assumptions

It was assumed that respondents to the questionnaire and interviews answered the questions honestly.

Limitations

The study was limited by the psychological well being of the respondents that may be influenced by external factors. The study was also limited to the number of teacher-student and student-peer interaction opportunities during the observed lessons.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to three schools offering dual language, bilingual, and English Immersion programs. One-second grade classroom was selected at each school site.

Significance of the Study

The findings in this study can assist school districts with the implementation of effective dual language education programs. Furthermore, best practices were examined carefully to determine the elements within each practice needed for the successful implementation of dual language programs on
a national level. Additionally, this study determined different social interaction opportunities existed within a dual language program, which lead to greater emergent literacy skills.

**Organization of the Study**

This study was organized into five chapters. The first chapter was an overview of the study. Chapter two contained a review of the literature pertaining to the historical and political aspects of bilingual education as well as research study findings that supported both language acquisition and socio-cultural theories which were the premise of dual language programs. The research design and methodology was described in the third chapter. Findings were specified in chapter four. Chapter five summarized findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The United States has a long tradition of multilingualism. Even prior to European contact, there were 500 to 1,000 indigenous languages or dialects spoken in the United States (Grosjean, 1982). From colonial times to the early 1900s, education in languages other than English was accepted and flourished in some ethnic communities.

In the 1960's, a new chapter in the culture wars was opened when Native Americans, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans joined in efforts to have public schools implement bilingual education programs. Those opposed to multicultural education quickly reacted to the bilingual education movement by arguing that the official language of the United States should be English. By the 1980's, the two major U.S. political parties were divided over bilingual education and during the 1980s and 1990s bilingual education became a major target of attack. In fact, a movement was started that opposed bilingual education and supported the adoption of English as the official language of the United States. The movement to make English the official language was led by an organization, U.S. English, founded in 1983 by a former United States senator (Spring, 1997).
Historical Perspectives

Historically, bilingualism has both been tolerated in the United States as well as restricted. Even though citizens have freedom of speech, the Constitution dictates no official language. The societal hegemonic forces have been very successful in promoting English without any official language policy (Crawford, 1995). Bilingual education under Title VII means: “The use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction” (Bilingual Education Act of 1967, Statutes-at-Large 81, cited in Santiago Santiago, 1978, p. 34). Originally the intent of Bilingual Education Act/Title VII was to design innovative program models, so that states and local school districts could eventually become responsible for continuing the implementation of these programs. Problems in initiating bilingual programs included a lack of certified teachers, identification and assessment tools, curricula, materials, and research. The programs according to Stein (1986) had to be created “out of thin air” (p. 33). Since the beginning, the federal government has remained a mainstay of the bilingual programs, significantly influencing their funding, design and implementation (Lemberger, 1997).

Cases Impacting Bilingual Education

One of the most important cases, Lau v. Nichols (1974), was a class action suit filed on behalf of 1,800 Chinese-American students, who attended San Francisco public schools where subjects were taught in English, a language the students could not understand. In 1974, the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the students were being discriminated against and not being provided
an equal educational opportunity. Judge William O. Douglas (1974, cited in Ovando & Collier, 1985) stated that "There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students the same facilities, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (p. 34). Although the Lau decision specifically endorsed no program model, it gave a strong push for equal educational opportunity for limited English-speaking students. According to Teitelbaum and Hiller (1979), "Lau raised the nation's consciousness of the need for bilingual education, encouraged additional federal legislation, energized federal enforcement efforts, ... aided the passage of laws mandating bilingual education, and spawned more lawsuits" (p. 21).

Following the Lau decision, Congress passed the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, which extended Lau to all public school districts, not just to those receiving federal financial assistance (Teitelbaum & Hiller, 1979). Lau was important in fostering the creation of bilingual programs. However, much resistance resulted from programs implemented as a result of court order or mandate. "Antipathy of school personnel to bilingual education may intensify with judicial involvement" (Teitelbaum & Hiller, 1979, pp. 21-22).

At the state level, prior to the 1960s, no state-mandated bilingual programs existed. In fact many states had laws mandating English-only instruction. According to Ambert and Melendez (1985), "In seven states teachers could face criminal penalties or revocation of teaching licenses if they conducted bilingual classes" (p. 38). Each state had developed its own legislation and policies to serve language minority children. For example, some states such as Texas and Massachusetts have mandates for transitional bilingual programs
(Crawford, 1995). State policies have also wavered according to the political climate. For example, since 1976, California with Assembly Bill (AB) 1329 (the Chacone-Mascone Bill) and later AB 507, had more prescriptive and supportive bilingual education legislation and policies, but in 1987, Governor Deukmejian allowed the legislation to expire (Powell, 1995).

Politics of Bilingual Education

Another example of the political nature of bilingual education policies can be seen with the New York City's Aspira Consent Decree that resulted from Aspira v. Board of Education of 1974 (Santiago Santiago, 1986). Aspira, a Hispanic advocacy group, brought a class-action suit on behalf of 180,000 Puerto Rican students whose language and learning needs were being neglected by the Board of Education. The Aspira Consent Decree, mandates transitional bilingual programs for the city's Spanish-speaking students. The decree established guidelines for identification of students, curriculum, and assessment, provisions for qualified teachers, and parent notification procedures. The original decree stated students could exit the program upon reaching the 21st percentile of the Language Assessment Battery, and English language proficiency test. This cut-off point was not decided on by psychometricians or language specialists; rather it was a compromise made in court between Judge Frankel and the New York City Board of Education (Santiago Santiago, 1978). In 1989, that cut-off score was raised to the 41st percentile after much struggle by bilingual educators and advocates who knew that such a low cut-off point (the 21st percentile) allowed
youngsters to exit the program without a firm enough language or second foundation (Lemberger, 1997).

Educating the Language Minority Population

The language minority population is increasing at six to seven percent per year (C.B. Stein, personal communication, July 19, 1996). The diversity has and will have a significant impact on the U.S. schools. The numbers of language minority youth, both English-speaking and non-English speaking are clearly on the rise. Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans are the fastest growing segments of the student population (U.S. Department of Education, "A Back to School Report," 1996). Schools need to be better equipped to handle the diversity through recruiting and training of teachers. The need for qualified bilingual education teachers is a high priority (Council for the Great City Schools, 1996).

The education of language minority children must be framed within a social, political, and economic framework that takes into consideration racism, cultural discontinuities between the home and the school, the attitudes of the majority towards minorities, social status, lowered teacher expectations, curricular tracking, social isolation, educational segregation which is related to segregation in society and discriminatory educational treatment (Ambert, 1991). If these factors are not considered language minority students find themselves forced into acculturation into the dominant society.

Research results indicate that acculturation affects language proficiency, academic achievement, social and emotional adjustment, self-concept, and
identity. Acculturation is not always positive. Surprising results have emerged from research studies that show the more acculturated some language minority adolescents are, the less well adjusted they are emotionally (Ambert, 1991). Otherwise, language minority students whose culture and language is validated tend to become well adjusted emotionally.

The research has explored successful programs, which include validating the children’s native language and culture by incorporating the linguistic and cultural elements of the home in the curriculum and encouraging parents to participate in the children’s learning process (Ambert, 1991).

Language Acquisition Theory

According to cognitive research and theory in language acquisition, the best way for students to learn English and gain access to the high level of proficiency needed for upper-intermediate and secondary instruction, is for them to attain initial mastery in their home language before addressing literacy in English (Krashen & Biber, 1988; Krashen 1996; Willig, 1985). The conceptual base developed through the medium of a child’s first language facilitates later learning in English so children with a home language other than English are able to attain similar access to education as their English-speaking peers (Krashen, 1996; Beykont, 1994). Additionally, long term research has also shown individuals who begin second language learning early are more likely than those who begin later to achieve native-like levels of proficiency in their second language, particularly if given exposure to the language in extracurricular settings.
Language acquisition research has documented the following findings:

1) Considerable language learning can occur naturally during non-language arts classes such as math or social studies which is similar to first language acquisition in which children communicate with each other about non-language related issues (Genesee, 1984).

2) The learner can progress according to his or her own rate and style, again in much the same way that first language learners do (Genesee, 1984).

3) Early immersion in a second language can facilitate a child’s second language learning by taking advantage of his or her special neurolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and cognitive capacities to learn language (Genesee 1984; Lambert, 1984).

4) Language input to the students is adjusted to their conceptual and linguistic level using many features to facilitate language comprehension and acquisition on the part of the students.

5) Concentrated exposure to language is important to promote language development.

6) The two languages are kept distinct and never mixed during instruction.

Empirical Evidence on Bilingual Education

In a classic study by Peal and Lambert (1962) they observed exposure to
two languages gave French-English bilinguals the advantage. Intellectually, their experiences with two languages seemed to result in mental flexibility, superiority in concept formation, and a more diversified set of mental abilities. In contrast, the monolinguals appeared to have more unitary cognitive structures that restricted their verbal problem solving ability. Furthermore, Cummins (1987) proposed the common underlying proficiency theory which states there is a common storage space and development of skills and knowledge in one language is not independent of the acquisition of information in a second language. Rather, developing knowledge and proficiency skills in one language facilitates learning in the second language. Thus acquiring the cognitive demanding tasks in context-reduced environments, typical of many school-related activities in one language, paves the way for the bilingual to perform similar tasks in the other language.

Studies of academic skills in a bilingual’s two languages typically show high relationships with correlations in the .60 to .80 range (Cummins, 1979). Therefore, a bilingual who performs well in math in one language is highly likely to perform well in math in a second language, even after only one or two years of schooling in the second language, once the student has the language proficiency skills for demonstrating that knowledge (Lindholm, 1992).

In an examination of the predictors of reading and math achievement in English, the best predictor of English math achievement was Spanish math achievement (r squared = .47), followed by English achievement (r squared change =.06). The result suggests math knowledge and skills learned in Spanish were transferred to English, but responses to math problems in English also
required academic language proficiency in English, as one would expect. The best predictor of English reading achievement was English language achievement (R2 = .65) followed by oral English proficiency (R2 change = .04). Thus, the best predictor was not Spanish reading achievement, but academic English language skills and oral English language skills (Lindholm, 1992). Spanish reading was correlated with English reading but it was not the best predictor. Spanish reading was also highly correlated with English language achievement. While English language achievement was the best predictor of English reading, an important correlate of English language achievement was Spanish reading achievement.

On the basis of these results, one would argue students developed high levels of English language achievement because of the Spanish academic language they possessed. The results show a clear evidence for transfer of content across languages. They demonstrate distinction between two types of language proficiency skills, academic and conversational, and they show the significance of both types of language skills in English reading. Furthermore, conversational skills are significantly less important in achievement, both reading and math, than academic language skills, despite their overall saliency in the process of transitioning language minority students into mainstream English only programs (Lindholm, 1992).

Researchers are also recommending use of alternative assessment methods, linking assessment to instruction, and there appears to be an emphasis on the prevention of referrals and pre referral interventions. However, there continue to be difficulties in the assessment of language minorities. These
include biases in the assessment process, service duplication, and an unchanging assessment process that continues to depend on "standard" batteries and the questionable technical adequacy of tests. In addition, very little has emerged in the assessment of low incident language groups and low incidence disabilities (Ambert, 1991).

Cognitive Advantages

Psychometric research conducted over the last three decades provides convincing evidence bilingualism has a positive effect on cognitive processing. It is now generally accepted, for example, bilinguals who have achieved a high level of proficiency and balance in their home language (L1) and second language (L2) outperform monolinguals on verbal and nonverbal measures of intelligence as well as demonstrate greater cognitive flexibility than their monolingual counterparts on tasks requiring complex problem-solving skills (Nanez, & Padilla, 1995).

Students who learn content in one language can demonstrate knowledge of content in the second language once they acquire the language skills to express the content knowledge. Students need to reach a certain level of native language proficiency to promote higher levels of second language development and bilingual proficiency. Once students have sufficiently developed both languages, they will benefit from the cognitive advantages that accumulate with bilingualism such as more creative thinking, greater mental flexibility, ability to think more abstractly, and superior concept formation.
Sociocultural Theory

The socio-cultural advantages to knowing more than one language are the development of a greater intercultural understanding and tolerance, as well as appreciation and respect of cultural differences (Cloud, Genesee & Hamayan, 2000). Language cannot be viewed in isolation from the sociocultural context of the classroom or the larger world. Vygotsky, (1986) stated that higher levels of cognition are both formed and expressed through language, which is developed in social processes (Wink & Putney, 2002). The very core of Vygotsky's theory was the influence of social processes on higher mental functions and the development of these cognitive capacities, which are social in origin and mediated by changing uses of language (Wertsch, 1985).

Vygotskian Principles of Teaching and Learning

In Vygotskian theory learning requires that the learner receive assistance through social interaction with significant others before individual meaning can take place, then the learner reconceptualizes the learning into a novel form of understanding and knowledge based upon prior and present experiences. The learner gains a new way of responding to and solving problems similar but not identical to those used by the teacher (Diaz, Neal, & Amaya-Williams, 1990). Vygotsky (1978) refers to this social process as moving from other-regulated to self-regulated learning. Other-regulated learning enables learners to converse and perform tasks that are beyond their individual capability at the time of their introduction. Self-regulation is when the learner is able to plan, guide, and monitor problem-solving activities similar to those performed jointly without adult
assistance. (Diaz, Neal, & Amaya-Williams, 1990). The teacher initially regulates the learning activity in order to create a level of intersubjectivity.

Vygotsky identifies the zone of proximal development as a social learning principle that is the difference between actual and potential levels of learning. This is the function of both the learner’s level of development and the nature of the instruction involved. The teacher is working within a student’s zone of proximal development when they can provide discourse assistance so that the learner participates in the lesson from the very beginning. As learners gain conceptual understanding through discourse and practice, the boundaries of the zone gradually expand into new areas of knowledge, in terms of both what can be done independently and what can be done with assistance (Faltis, 1997).

Social Context of Dual Language Education

A theoretical premise for dual language education is the social context of language education (Lindholm, 1992). The social context of language education programs, refer to the attitudes and policies that are held regarding the language education program and its participants, and can positively or negatively influence a program’s outcomes (Troike, 1978). If community, administration, and staff attitudes toward bilingualism and language minority students are favorable, then language education policies are more likely to result in high-quality programs and high levels of language and academic achievement among program participants (Willig, 1985). When attitudes are negative it is unlikely language education programs will be implemented unless they are mandatory, and then they will tend
to result in lower levels of academic achievement and language proficiency on the part of the program participants (Lindholm, 1992)).

As Linney and Seidman (1989) pointed out in their review of the literature on school and teacher effects on student outcomes, the quality of a child's school experience is important not only for academic and achievement outcomes, but for fostering self-esteem, self-confidence, and general psychological well-being (Lindholm, 1992). Social class and ethnic minority status have different effects on teachers, where lower class ethnic minority students have the lowest expectations, and middle-class white students the highest expectations (Dusek, 1985). Differential treatment by teachers lead to differential outcomes on the part of students (Brophy, 1986). Additionally, student to student interactions within the classroom setting also have an impact on student achievement.

Allport (1954) proposed four factors that are all core conditions for improving intergroup relations and maximizing the achievement of minority and majority students. They are:

1) equal status in the classroom among minority and majority students
2) students work interdependently on tasks with common objectives
3) students have the opportunity to interact with each other as individuals
4) contacts supported by teachers and other authority figures

Research demonstrates unequivocal support for cooperative learning in achievement ethnic relations, and self esteem (Slavin, 1983). When students work in ethnically mixed cooperative learning groups, they gain in cross-ethnic friendships. Most research shows positive effects of cooperative learning on achievement. Strong achievement gains have been found with minority and
typically low-achieving students, with little or no effect for white (non-Hispanic) and higher achieving students (Lindholm, 1992).

Dual language education is built on providing language learners with the most positive social context in which to develop bilingual competence. Linguistic minority and majority students benefit from an additive bilingual environment and develop in a social context in which both languages and cultures are equally valued and all students are treated equally. Additionally, dual language programs promote cross-cultural attitudes and psychosocial development, and higher levels of second language development and academic achievement (Lindholm, 1992).

Faltis Framework

Faltis (1997) identifies a framework consisting of principles to ensure teachers and students develop meaningful interactions. This framework is organized around the concept of jointfostering. Jointfostering is underway when classrooms are organized so that students of varying English-language abilities talk about, listen to, and work together individually on tasks that are interesting, relevant and intellectually challenging. Jointfostering is in motion when students have a say about topics, activities, and ways of turn-taking (Edelsky, 1991).

Two-Way Communication Principle

The first principle of the Faltis Framework is promoting two-way communication between teachers and students. Students need a variety of opportunities in the classroom for two-way communication (oral as well as
written) about content and readings that combines authentic language and
language uses with interesting topics. Furthermore, the topics at some point
should inevitably enable students to question and discuss critically issues that
surface in their lives (Faltis, 1997).

During this high incidence of two-way communication exchanges between
the teacher and the students, the teachers are constantly negotiating for meaning
with students. This type of communication results in the empowerment of
students to become generators of their own knowledge and understanding. A
joinfostering classroom should be a place where students are constantly thinking
and taking pleasure in using their intellect (Edelsky, 1991).

In order to facilitate meaningful interactions during two-way
communication exchanges, teachers must ensure that the physical environment
in their classrooms facilitates their students' social needs. A primary goal of
arranging a joinfostering classroom is to visualize and then create multiple
learning areas in places that are not necessarily bordered only by the corners of
the classroom and still maintain a functional whole-class environment (Faltis,
1997).

Social Contexts

Faltis (1997) identifies three major social contexts in joinfostering
classrooms that allow two-way communication to occur. They are teacher-led
whole-class teaching, teacher-led small group interaction and teacher-delegated
small-group work.
Whole-Class Context

In the teacher-led whole-class context, language is utilized as a motivator for students to gain their interest about topics as well as elicit and evaluate student exchanges, and regulate student behavior during the lessons. Taking notice of the language of content instruction requires an understanding of the kinds of language teachers use for content instruction, the kinds of knowledge structures that underlie content instruction, and the kinds of language students use to make sense of the content (Faltis, 1997).

In order for students to understand the language of content, teachers must provide multiple sources of context through the following three support systems. The first system is paraverbal support that has to do with the ways sounds are emphasized and utilized and with the manner in which teachers change the pace of their speech as they invite students to participate in the lessons. The second system is nonverbal support, which involves the utilization of gestures and facial expressions to illustrate meanings of concepts, notions, and actions. The third system is visual and sensory support, which encourages the use of visual aides for organizing and displaying content information.

In addition to providing extra-linguistic support during whole group lessons, teachers need to encourage students to participate verbally. Getting students to interact in whole-class settings requires multiple strategies for both soliciting talk and responding to what students say. Enright & McCloskey (1998) identified five basic techniques for asking students to talk in a whole-class setting. The first technique is identified as asking a question and calling on a student, which involves posing a question and then immediately calling on a
student by name, without the student having to bid for a turn at talking. The second technique is asking a question and students bid for the floor by raising their hand. The third technique is asking a question and allowing any student to answer, usually open-ended questions are asked and each student may have an individual response. The fourth technique is asking a question and the entire class responds chorally to a directive or request to recite words, phrases, or long stretches of language. The final technique is asking a question and students take turns responding to the same question one by one in a patterned sequence.

**Small Group Context**

In teacher-led small group instruction students must be guided to move through tasks and activities and assume total responsibility for carrying out the task on their own. When authority is delegated to students for their own learning in small groups, we need to make sure they know how to work in groups, and they have the social ability that promotes continuous interaction and collaboration, and they see themselves linked together positively as members of a group (Cazden, 1988).

Meaningful interactions between teachers and students in small group settings require scaffolding and dialogue strategies. Scaffolding refers to the visible and audible support that the teacher temporarily supplies to a learner making it possible for the learner to participate in problem-solving activities from the very beginning that otherwise might be too difficult (Cazden, 1988).

Resnick (1985) identifies dialogue as the result of students contributing to the conversation what they can and the teacher providing the rest of the
dialogue. The two ways students enter into a dialogue is by initiating the conversations themselves or by the teacher orienting them to a particular topic that they will pursue further. Joan Tough (1985) identifies five dialogue strategies. The first strategy is orienting the students to establish an interpersonal and contextual foundation from which the dialogue can unfold. The second strategy is enabling students to generate long and short exchanges by posing a variety of questions. For example, follow through questions assist a student's response to an open-ended question, focus questions direct a student's attention to a particular feature that might have been overlooked, and checking questions invite students to think again about what they have stated and clarify their meaning. Informing is identified as the third dialogue strategy, which is providing new content information to students and giving corrective language information. The fourth strategy is sustaining the students' interactions by having teachers encourage the students to continue talking and letting them know the teachers are interested in what they are saying. The final strategy is concluding which is a statement made by the teacher to the students so they become aware that the conversation is about to end.

In a joinfostering classroom students must be prepared for small group learning in order for it to be a beneficial experience for all students (Cohen, 1986).

**Social Integration Principle**

Faltis (1997) identifies the second principle of the framework as the social integration of minority language students in classrooms where English is the
dominant language. In joint fostering classrooms all students have rights of participation, which must be balanced in order for the successful integration of students. Au & Mason (1981) identified three dimensions as a balance of rights of participation. The first dimension is control of turn taking which involves the teacher allowing more than one student to speak contemporaneously, rather than limiting the floor to one student at a time. The second dimension is control of topic in which the teacher allows the students to dictate the topic to be studied, discussed, or written about, rather than insisting that they stay on a prescribed topic. Topics that are initiated by students rather than by the teacher are often of greater interest to students and are more likely to have genuine purposes because students can tie back to prior experiences (Enright, 1991). The third dimension is control of talk and writing audiences, which is when teachers allow students to talk among themselves and write to a variety of audiences, rather than insisting that they address their talk and written work only to the teacher. Within any social context of classroom learning, a balance of rights of participation occurs when neither the teacher, nor the students control more than two dimensions at any one time (Au & Mason, 1981).

Language Acquisition Principle

Faltis (1997) identifies the third principle as language acquisition which is defined as a socially interactive process in which students must have access to what is going on in a particular context and must be able to participate fully in ongoing classroom discourse (Wink & Putney, 2000). In linguistically diverse all-English classrooms, this responsibility is especially important because second
language learners can be left out of decisions about topic selection, interaction exchanges, and types of audiences. English learners need to hear and use English to talk about topics that interest them and to participate in academic discourses to develop high levels of social and academic proficiency in English (Saville-Troike, 1984).

What most all-English teachers do when faced with teaching to a mixed-language whole class is gear their language to the students who readily understand rather than consciously using language in ways that enable the greatest number of students to join in (Wong Fillmore, 1982). An unfortunate result of this tendency is that the second-language students participate considerably less than their native English-speaking counterparts because much of what the teacher says makes little sense to them (Schinke-Llano, 1983). Teachers who have second language learners in their classrooms must ensure that their students comprehend the concepts that are being taught. According to Krashen (1985), learners acquire language when they have repeated opportunities to understand new language.

**Parent Involvement Principle**

Faltis (1997) identifies the fourth principle as parent involvement. Jointfostering is complete when second-language parents begin to become involved at various levels in school and classroom activities, and when teachers, students, and parents critically address issues of how perspectives and identities are constructed, how knowledge is produced, and how dominance is maintained (Edelsky, 1991). Involving the community, especially non-English speaking
parents and other family members, in educational activities at home and in the school, is no simple matter. There are language barriers to consider in addition to various ways that adult caregivers in different cultures and communities view their role and the school’s role in educating their children (Delpit, 1998; Coelho, 1994). For many of these parents, school, not home, is the appropriate place for learning about content and basic skills.

In all likelihood, the reason that many parents of non-English speaking students are less involved in school-related activities than their English-speaking counterparts, has as much to do with the school’s unfamiliarity with non-English speaking communities as it does with these communities’ unfamiliarity with the schools (Faltis, 1997).

Parental involvement in the jointfostering framework necessarily moves out of the classroom and into the communities the schools’ serve. School staffs who believe in jointfostering, look for ways to advocate for actions they consider are clearly needed to improve education for all students and they know the parents also support. They also work with other teachers and parents who share the same view about the need for greater involvement of parents in the school and of the school in the community. Lastly, they rely on their personal stance to help students and their communities join in the education process at home as well as in school (Faltis, 1997).

Research Studies in Social Interaction

Furst and Amidon (1962) were among the first to conduct a nationwide study on the social interaction in American classrooms. They observed social
interaction in 160 first through sixth grade classrooms in low-socioeconomic urban, middle socio-economic urban, and suburban elementary schools. These researchers found that teachers did most of the talking in the classrooms they observed. Within whole-class instruction, the students talk was brief, and related to what the teacher had already presented. An interesting finding was that student talk declined as students progressed through the grade levels. Beginning in third grade, they found a marked increase in teacher talk and corresponding decrease in student-generated ideas. The nature of the teacher talk also changed at this grade level with a greater proportion now devoted to giving instructions (Faltis, 1997).

In 1990, Ramirez and Merino investigated the nature of classroom interactions in bilingual and English as a second language classrooms. They found that both the all-English and the bilingual classrooms are essentially one dimensional, teacher-controlled social and physical learning environments. Students have little to say in determining classroom content or in using authentic language to communicate ideas with the teacher or peers. Teachers rely on the whole class as the chief physical environment for teaching, virtually excluding the contexts of teacher-led small group teaching, and small group learning from their teaching repertoire. Thus neither the all-English nor the bilingual classrooms appear to accommodate socially or physically the language and/or educational needs of students in the process of acquiring English as a second language.
Researchers in the field of bilingual education have found more additive models such as late exit maintenance and "two-way dual language" or developmental programs (Cummins, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 1997) are more effective in developing first and second language academic achievement.

In 1991, the findings of the Ramirez Report indicated Latino students who received sustained primary language instruction throughout elementary school have better academic prospects than those who received most or all of their instruction through English (Cummins, 1992). The Ramirez Report emphasized the following three central psychoeducational principles, which underlie the emphasis for enrichment bilingual education programs:

1. The continued development of two languages enhances children's educational and cognitive development.

2. Literacy-related abilities are interdependent across languages such that knowledge and skills acquired in one language are potentially available in the other language.

3. Conversational abilities may be acquired fairly rapidly in a second language, upwards of five years are usually required for second language learners to attain grade norms in academically related aspects of the second language.

Together, these principles suggest reinforcing children's conceptual base in their first language throughout elementary school and beyond will provide a foundation for long-term growth in English academic skills (Cummins, 1992).
Thomas and Collier (1997) examined the various types of school services being provided to language minority students in five large urban and suburban school districts in various regions of the United States. Over 700,000 language minority student records were examined and interpreted in this research. Statistical data was utilized to demonstrate the length of time it would take non-English proficient students to reach the 50th NCE on a standardized English Reading subtest administered in English with instruction in the student's primary language or without instruction in the student's primary language. The research also looked at achievement in NCEs on standardized tests in English reading compared across six program models. Language minority students who had been receiving instruction in the bilingual program models scored higher than students receiving instruction in English as second language program models. Specifically, students in the Two Way Bilingual dual language education programs scored the highest percentiles on the standardized tests (Thomas and Collier, 1997).

As a result of this study, researchers identified the following four key predictors of academic success:

1. Cognitively complex on-grade-level academic instruction through students' first language for as long as possible (at least through grades 5 or 6).
2. Cognitively complex on grade-level instruction through the second language (English) for part of the school day, in each succeeding grade throughout students' schooling.
3. Use of current approaches to teaching the academic curriculum.
4. Changes in the socioculture context of schooling by implementing additive bilingual programs.

**Dual Language Programs**

Although 75% of two-way dual language programs have been in Spanish-English, other two-way programs have been conducted in Russian, Arabic, French, Hmong, Korean, Chinese and Portuguese (C.B. Stein, personal communication, July 19, 1996).

Currently, prompted by the need to prepare our children to navigate in an increasingly global society, schools that are willing can invest planning time in learning and funding programs that can produce bilingual children in all of our communities. These programs are based upon the French immersion models in Canada and are usually referred to as “two way” or “dual language” programs (Baker, 1995). In the United States, during the early 1960s with the influx of privileged Cuban refugees, a “two way” program at the Coral Way Elementary School in Dade County, Florida was implemented experimentally. The goal of this privately funded program was full bilingualism for its Spanish-speaking Cuban and mainstream English-speaking children. Program success was due to its well-trained teachers, its private funding from the Ford Foundation, and its enriching additive bilingual focus. Additive bilingualism aims to add (rather than subtract) a second language to a child’s first language resources (Lambert, 1984 cited in Ovando and Collier, 1985). It is also a form of enrichment in which “children can add one or more foreign languages to their accumulating skills and...
profit immensely from the experience-cognitively, socially, educationally, and even economically" (Lambert, 1984, p.19). The Coral Way model set the stage for other bilingual dual language education programs to be considered.

With the premise of dual language instruction, the view of a bilingual child with a locally relevant language shifts from a "compensatory and deficit model" to a "gifted and talented" orientation. In many schools, this means minority language speakers are now finding validation, excitement, and enthusiasm about their presence in classrooms. Differences between individuals become celebrated rather than melted down. However, bilingual educators must continually keep the highest standard in clear sight (Montague, 1997).

**Implementation of Dual Language Programs**

Some teachers in dual language programs deliver instruction in one language according to the day of the week some split the time of the instructional day up according to hours. It is generally agreed among bilingual educators that keeping the language model pure is essential for teachers in dual language programs. Some bilingual teachers pair with English speaking teachers to create a dual language program for both groups of children involved (Montague, 1997).

In some cases, the concept of dual language has been adapted to quickly in schools. Instead of being phased in grade by grade (Lindholm, 1992), it is initiated at several levels or in multiple classrooms simultaneously. This places undue pressure on the English-speaking children to adapt quickly to language learning during a school year when formal, standardized testing begins to dictate instruction in several states (Morse, 1999). Phasing in two-way programs,
perhaps as a school within a school, at one grade per year lays the groundwork for success. If a child begins a dual language program in kindergarten, he/she would have more chance at success than the one who begins at an intermediate grade where instruction is more highly complex and context reduced, such as reading for meaning from a textbook (Montague, 1997).

In concert with current research directions, literacy development in language minority children has explored the social context of written language and the home and community influences on literacy development. Literacy is perceived as an activity that must engage and be meaningful to the learner. Therefore, to be successful, reading instruction should be modified to capitalize children’s cognitive, linguistic, and cultural resources and utilize the cognitive resources of the children’s households. Collaborative approaches among teachers have proved successful in the literacy development of language minority children in both the native language and English (Ambert, 1991).

Instead of having a balanced population of minority and majority language speakers represented, some dual language teachers may find they are addressing a majority language group with perhaps only one to ten percent of minority speakers who may have developed minimal English skills. This places incredible linguistic responsibility on the teacher and deprives the student of peers who serve as language models, ultimately affecting the quality of the program (Montague, 1997). International research over the history of bilingual education indicates children are efficient language learners and their language abilities develop best in environments where the language is necessary for communication and basic functioning (Krashen, 1996).
The value of materials in each of the languages represented in oral instruction should be clear if we wish bilingualism for our children to include biliterate capabilities (Montague, 1997). The students must be provided with quality and accessible materials in both languages to ensure bilingualism and biliteracy.

Goals of Dual Language Programs

According to Lindholm (1992) the following are three major goals of two-way bilingual dual language education programs reflect on the value of bilingualism:

1) students develop high levels of proficiency in two languages
2) students will demonstrate normal to superior academic performance measured in both languages
3) students will show high levels of psychosocial competence and positive cross-cultural attitudes

Implications of Dual Language Programs

According to Linholm (1992) there are three critical implications in dual language education programs:

1) Bilingual development may facilitate cognitive functioning if the duo language development is sustained over a long period of time so that the child attains a high level of proficiency in two languages.
2) High levels of language proficiency require the development of both communicative and academic language skills in both languages.
3) Skills and knowledge learned in one language are accessible in another language as soon as the student possesses sufficient proficiency to exhibit the knowledge.

Along with the three critical educational implications, Linholm (2000) identified seven key features necessary for the successful implementation of dual language programs.

**Administrative Support and Leadership**

It is very important for dual language programs to be implemented in schools that have administrative support and instructional leadership. Specifically, the school district and the local board of education must support the program by providing an equitable allocation of resources. Also, the principal needs to assure the dual language education program is integrated within the total school and all teachers and school staff understand the program.

The leadership in a dual language school may come from an assistant principal, program coordinator or resource teacher. This individual will need to have extensive knowledge of the language education model being implemented at the school. Specifically, knowledge about second language development, bilingual and immersion education theory and research, instructional methodologies, effective classroom practices, and the belief that the selected language education model can work if implemented correctly.
Positive School Environment

A positive school environment is also necessary for an effective program. The environment allows the promotion of positive interactions between teachers and students and between language minority and language majority students. The students are provided the opportunity to acquire a second language at no cost to their home language and culture.

High Quality Instructional Personnel

Another key feature is high quality instructional personnel who possess the knowledge of content, curriculum, instructional strategies, and classroom management skills needed in a dual language education program. Teachers must also have native or native-like ability in either or both of the languages in which they are instructing. Pre-service and in-service trainings for dual language program teachers need to be conducted on the dual language education model, bilingual and immersion research and theory, second language development, instructional strategies in second language development, multicultural and educational equity training, and in cooperative learning.

Instructional Design of the Program

The instructional design of the program will promote achievement, biliteracy and bilingualism. The academic curriculum is based on high standards of achievement that enables both language minority and language majority students to acquire high-level language skills in both languages. Instruction for
students in the program must last for at least six years so that they may reach academic proficiency in both languages.

The instruction should be delivered through highly contextualized language and gestures, comprehension and confirmation checks. The instructional activities provided should be both structured and unstructured involving oral production skills. The language arts curriculum specifies the linguistic structures that should be mastered and how these structures should be incorporated into the academic content.

**Program Configuration**

Lessons need to be delivered in one language at a time with a minimum of 50% target language instruction to promote high levels of the non-English language proficiency among language majority students and to promote academic achievement among language minority students. A minimum of 10% English instruction initially is important to promote English language development for the non-native speakers of English. The most desirable ratio is 50% English speakers and 50% target language speakers to insure there are enough language models of each language to promote interactions between the two groups of students. There should be no more than two speakers of one language to one speaker of the other language.

**Teacher Training**

Possibly the most important aspect of any program is teacher training in bilingual education. Stepping up to the challenge of maintaining a high standard
for any program might require a certain commitment from dual language teachers
to attain bilingual and/or English as a Second Language certification (Montague,
1997). The emphasis of teacher training today is directed toward action research
wherein universities and schools form partnerships and conduct research in
areas of need. The results of this research will not only assist in the
development of appropriate teacher training programs but will also inform
educators and assist them in making appropriate educational decisions for
language minority children (Ambert, 1991). For example, teachers in dual
language programs are finding if they refrain from eliciting responses too long,
English speakers will not attempt use of their second language. The pressure for
acquisition and production is not as strong since English can be used to
negotiate in most other areas of life outside of the classroom (Montague, 1997).

Parental Involvement

Parental involvement and collaboration with the school is critical. Parents
need training about the model, including the educational equity that balances
meeting the educational needs of both groups of students. They should also be
provided training in how to promote language proficiency and academic
achievement.

Summary

In summary, bilingual education in the United States has had a history of
uncertainty and change based largely on political factors. Currently, the political
climate centers around the business community who is concerned that American
school children are still behind in academic achievement and in diversity awareness. As the United States moves towards a global economy that includes job markets requiring multilingual and multicultural competencies for all students, the instructional practices in United States schools will have to meet these competencies. The goals of dual language programs parallel the competencies valued by the business communities. The growth of dual language programs has been considerable as emerging results of studies of these types of programs point to their effectiveness in educating language minority students, and in developing second language skills in English speaking students.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the implementation of the essential elements of a comprehensive dual language program as compared to student and teacher interactions in a structured English immersion and transitional bilingual classroom. The design of the study was primarily qualitative with a mixed methods analysis within a two-phase approach. First, surveys from the Directory of Two Way dual language programs in the United States distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics were closely examined to determine what school practitioners identified as the most important factors in implementing dual language programs. The responses were categorized according to the seven key features (Linholm, 2000) as identified in the literature.

In the second phase, a series of illustrative case studies were examined for this study to focus on the teaching and learning that occurred in each of the three English language learner classrooms. A case study design allows for the examination of social interactions that occur in a classroom setting as a bounded entity. Rather than focusing on the individual, past, or on culture, sociological case studies attend to the constructs of society and socialization in studying educational phenomena (Merriam, 1998). Observations focused on determining
language minority and language majority student-peer social interactions as well as teacher-student interactions in the classroom environment during the designated reading and integrated language arts instructional time. Three-second grade classrooms were selected and treated as individual case studies. Each classroom had a different instructional program: dual language; bilingual; and English structured immersion. Four observations were conducted in each of the classrooms over a two-month period, and focused on determining if different social interaction opportunities existed based on the instructional program. Each observation was between forty and forty-five minutes long depending on the lesson being conducted. The observations centered on teacher-student interactions and on student-peer interactions. The Faltis Jointfostering Framework (1997) was the primary source utilized to analyze the data documented in the field notes. Other terms, concepts, and categories for the identification of student-peer interactions were also reflected from the data. Different social interaction skills were identified and logged to demonstrate patterns of interactions and relationships between them. In addition the impact of those social interaction skills were examined through the Language Assessment Scales oral language proficiency test and reading grade level assessment data. Ten of the twelve observations were conducted during reading and language arts lessons and two of the observations were conducted during integrated language arts and science lessons. The study was limited by the number of opportunities observed during each lesson for teacher-student interactions and student-peer interactions.
Additionally, the classroom teachers were interviewed to gain further insight on student progress in relationship to emergent literacy skills based on students' language proficiency. The extant literature was used to compare responses from the structured interviews, and observations as documented in the field notes to confirm the existing findings.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify and provide an in depth investigation of the key elements necessary for a comprehensive dual language program. Additionally, social interaction processes that lead to bi-literacy of majority/minority students were examined in the context of dual language programs.

**Research Questions**

This study focused on the following questions:

1. What are the essential elements of a comprehensive dual language program and how are they being implemented?
2. What are the differences in social interaction opportunities in dual language, bilingual, or Immersion programs?
3. If different social interaction opportunities exist in a single model what is the impact on emergent literacy skills?
4. How do social interaction processes during a dual language program lead to greater emergent literacy skills?
Data and Data Sources

Dual language program information regarding the most important factors necessary for successful program implementation was acquired from the Directory of Two Way dual language programs survey distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics. A close examination of the surveys determined the practical application of the key features identified in the literature (Lindholm, 2000). For the sociological case studies, data was gathered through non-participant observations, supplemented with formal and informal interviews, and a review of the observed students' scores in reading, and oral English and Spanish proficiency levels as measured by the Language Assessment Scale test.

The following tables display the data collection, data analysis, and importance for each of the research questions.

TABLE 1  Phase One; Research Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the essential elements of a dual language program?</td>
<td>Lindholm (2000) literature review</td>
<td>Placed survey responses into 7 key categories</td>
<td>Rank order of key features in the literature review was different than order according to survey respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAL survey responses</td>
<td>Developed a matrix (Appendix A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the essential elements being implemented</td>
<td>Field notes taken during lesson observations and interviews</td>
<td>Field notes data placed in categories according to key features</td>
<td>Data collected provided insight to the practical application of the essential elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the differences in social interaction opportunities in dual language, bilingual, or immersion programs?</td>
<td>Field notes taken during classroom observations</td>
<td>Faltis Framework from literature review for teacher-student interactions (Tables 1-16)</td>
<td>Data revealed there are different teacher-student, student-peer interaction opportunities in the varied instructional model classrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact on emergent literature skills?</td>
<td>Grade level reading achievement data – AR and guide reading level</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of grade level reading achievement data and oral language proficiency data across program models (Tables 19-26)</td>
<td>Literacy skills are impacted according to the instructional model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the essential elements being implemented?</td>
<td>Field notes taken during lesson observations and interviews</td>
<td>Field notes data placed in categories according to key features</td>
<td>Data collected provided insight to the practical application of the essential elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 Phase Two; Research Question Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do social interaction processes in a dual language program lead to greater emergent literature skills?</td>
<td>Field notes taken during classroom observations</td>
<td>The number of opportunities for teacher-student interactions</td>
<td>Dual language program structure offers students social interaction opportunities that lead to greater emergent literature skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The type and language used for student-peer interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection of Subjects**

The schools included in this study were identified by Dr. Elena Izquierdo, Professor of Bilingual Teacher Education Programs at the University of Texas, El Paso and have been recognized by their school districts as having high student achievement scores on the state-wide Texas Assessment of Academic Skills. The participants in this study included administrators, teachers, and students. The administrators at each selected school site identified their highest-ranking second grade teacher as determined by student achievement data.

**Participants**

The participants across all programs were second grade students. In both the structured English immersion and bilingual classrooms these students were either recently arrived immigrants or first generation Hispanics. The student's native language was Spanish. In the dual language program the Spanish dominant students were also recently arrived immigrants or first generation...
### TABLE 4  Phase Two; Research Question Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do social interaction processes in a dual language program lead to greater</td>
<td>Field notes taken during classroom</td>
<td>The number of opportunities for teacher-student</td>
<td>Dual language program structure offers students social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergent literature skills?</td>
<td>observations</td>
<td>interactions</td>
<td>opportunities that lead to greater emergent literature skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The type and language used for student-peer interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Selection of Subjects

The schools included in this study were identified by Dr. Elena Izquierdo, Professor of Bilingual Teacher Education Programs at the University of Texas, El Paso and have been recognized by their school districts as having high student achievement scores on the state-wide Texas Assessment of Academic Skills.

The participants in this study included administrators, teachers, and students. The administrators at each selected school site identified their highest-ranking second grade teacher as determined by student achievement data.

### Participants

The participants across all programs were second grade students. In both the structured English immersion and bilingual classrooms these students were either recently arrived immigrants or first generation Hispanics. The student's native language was Spanish. In the dual language program the Spanish dominant students were also recently arrived immigrants or first generation
Hispanics. The English dominant students were second generation Hispanics who spoke only English at home.

The following table displays student demographic data across the structured English immersion, bilingual and dual language programs.

**TABLE 5** Demographics; 2nd Grade Students Across Observed Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structured English Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Education</th>
<th>Dual Language Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Male students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Female Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of English Dominant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Spanish Dominant</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Recent Immigrants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of First Generation Hispanics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Second Generation Hispanics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teachers in the observed programs were interviewed and observed delivering classroom instruction. During the interview teachers were questioned about their educational experience. The structured English immersion teacher had seven years of experience in this type of program. The bilingual teacher had twelve years of experience, four years in this type of program. The dual language program teachers had ten and nine years, respectively. This was their second year teaching in this type of program.

**Research Procedures**

**Phase One**

During the first phase of the study, seventy-eight surveys from the Directory of Two Way dual language programs in the United States distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) were examined to determine what school practitioners identify as the most important factors in implementing dual language programs. The responses were categorized according to the following seven key features (Linholm, 2000) identified in the literature review:

1) Administrative Support and Leadership
2) Positive School Environment
3) High Quality Instructional Personnel
4) Pre-Service/Inservice Training
5) Instructional Design of the Program
6) Program Configuration
7) Parental Involvement
A matrix was utilized to display this data (See Appendix A). Additionally, the information on this matrix was used to formulate questions asked of the administrator and the observed teacher at the dual language program school site which determined how the key features identified in the literature and the most important factors identified by the Center for Applied Linguistics survey respondents were being implemented at their particular school site (See Appendix B).

To carry out the key features, an instructional design framework was used to show how the key features were manifested in the classroom. According to the Faltis Johnfostering Framework (1997), the following principles are crucial for the successful implementation of a dual language program:

1. Two Way Communication
2. Social Integration
3. Language Acquisition
4. Parent Involvement

The parent involvement principle as identified by the Faltis Johnfostering Principle (1997) was beyond the scope of this study.

**Phase Two**

During the sociological case studies in the second phase a mixed design was employed. Field notes were utilized to collect data during the non-participant observations. Field notes were coded according to the Faltis
Framework. In addition, interviews were conducted to validate the interpretation of the observations.

Teacher-Student Interactions

The following teacher-student interaction categories as identified in the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) were used to analyze the data collected for the following teacher-student interactions; two-way communicative exchanges, dialogue strategies, the balance of rights of participation, and the facilitation of second language acquisition. The physical space provided in the classroom environment was not analyzed in this study.

Two-Way Communication Exchanges

Data analysis focused on the following five basic teacher-student interaction techniques identified by Enright & McCloskey (1998):

1) Ask a question – call on a student
2) Ask a question – students bid for the floor
3) Ask a question – any student can answer
4) Ask a question – the entire class responds
5) Ask a question – students take turns responding

Dialogue Strategies

Additionally, data analysis from classroom observations as documented in the researcher’s field notes during teacher-student interactions targeted the following five dialogue strategies as identified by Joan Tough (1985):

1) Orienting the students to establish an interpersonal and contextual foundation from which the dialogue can unfold.
2) Enabling students to generate long and short exchanges by posing a variety of questions.

3) Informing by providing new content information to students and giving corrective language information.

4) Sustaining the students' interactions by encouraging the students to continue talking.

5) Concluding the interaction with a statement that allows the learner to know the conversation is about to end.

**Balance of Rights of Participation**

Data analysis of the observed teacher-student interactions focused on determining if the teachers promoted student-generated talk and topics and if they were encouraged to be in control of their own learning. The following three dimensions identified as a balance of rights of participation by Au & Mason (1981), were utilized as categories:

1) Control of turn taking which involves allowing more than one student to speak at a time

2) Control of topic which allows students to dictate the topic to be studied, discussed or written about

3) Control of talk which allows students to talk among themselves and write to a variety of audiences
Facilitation of Second Language Acquisition

Data analysis also focused on determining if teachers facilitated second language acquisition along with content learning by providing extra-linguistic support. The following supports were identified as categories:

1) Paraverbal support which has to do with the way sounds are emphasized and utilized
2) Non-verbal support which involves the utilization of gestures and facial expressions
3) Visual and sensory support which encourages the use of visual aides

The data analysis for each teacher-student interaction technique was examined from the information collected from the classroom observations as documented in the researcher's field notes. Additionally, the data was displayed on a table according to the categories identified for each technique in the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997). The numbers listed on each table were drawn from the total number of opportunities observed during classroom instruction, per type of teacher-interaction and per type of classroom program model.

Student-Peer Interactions

Terms, concepts, and categories for student-peer interactions were developed from the field notes taken during the observations. Developing a coding system involves several steps: You must search through your data for regularities and patterns as well as for topics your data cover, and then you write down words and phrases to represent these topics and patterns (Bogden & Biklen, 1998). The data were organized into the following categories, student-
peer social interactions in English, student-peer social interactions in Spanish, student-peer academic interactions in English, student-peer academic interactions in Spanish.

Additionally, structured interviews were held with the classroom teachers to gain further insight on student progress in relationship to emergent literacy skills based on students' language proficiency (See Appendix C). Documents examined included Accelerated Reader computer generated tests, and running records, which determined students guided reading grade level scores (See Appendix D). Also, students oral English proficiency levels were examined based on the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) test (See Appendix E).

Data extracted from the researcher's field notes were also examined to determine how social interaction processes in dual language programs lead to greater emergent literacy skills.

The extant literature was utilized to compare the responses from the structured interviews, observations, and document analysis to confirm existing findings.

Summary

The methods used for this study followed primarily a qualitative design with a mixed methods analysis within a two-phase approach. During the first phase seventy-eight surveys distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics were examined to determine the practical application of the key features identified in the literature review by Lindholm (2000). During the second phase
the researcher conducted four non-participant observations in structured immersion, bilingual, and dual language program classrooms, using the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) as an analytical tool for comparison. The observed classroom teachers were interviewed as well as the dual language program administrator.

Additionally, comparative analysis on grade level student reading achievement data in the structured immersion and dual language program classrooms was conducted as well as analysis of student's oral language proficiency data across three program models.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study examines language acquisition programs utilizing the key features as identified by Lindholm (2000) and the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997), for examining the data across cases. Data is explored throughout this chapter by research question. Research question number one deals with examining survey data. Research question number two addresses the utilization of the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) to analyze the different types of teacher-student interactions across the three observed program models. Research question number three involves conducting comparative analysis of grade level reading achievement data and oral language proficiency data across program models. Research question number four involves examining the types of teacher-student and student-peer interactions in the dual language program classroom that lead to greater emergent literacy skills.

Research Question #1

What are the essential elements of a comprehensive dual language program and how are they being implemented?
Lindholm (2000) identified the following key features for dual language program implementation:

1. Administrative Support and Leadership
2. Positive School Environment
3. High Quality Instructional Personnel
4. Pre-Service/Inservice Training
5. Instructional Design of the Program
6. Program Configuration
7. Parent Involvement

Seventy-eight surveys distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics to 50/50 dual language program school personnel identify the practical application of the above named key features. Based on the survey responses, following is a rank order list of the key features determined by the number of responses categorized under each key feature. The key features that received the same number of responses were given equal value and placed in alphabetical order:

1. a. Instructional Design of the Program
   b. Program Configuration
2. a. High Quality Instructional Personnel
   b. Parent Involvement
3. a. Positive School Environment
4. a. Administrative Support and Leadership
   b. Pre-Service/Inservice Training
The following section identifies the key features in rank order according to the surveys distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The practical application and implementation for each key feature based on the information documented in the surveys and collected from the dual language program interviews are included in the narrative for each key feature.

**Instructional Design of the Program**

The surveys indicated a 50/50 program needed to be research based in order to be implemented successfully. Currently in fulfillment of the requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, the Office of Educational Research is conducting studies on the best instructional practices for English language learners. This research information along with this study’s findings will be valuable in ensuring the successful implementation of dual language programs.

In most dual language programs, teachers are teamed for instruction; therefore they must be allocated sufficient planning time. The teachers utilize the planning time to ensure they are teaching skills, concepts, and objectives in both languages. One of the teachers is the designated English-speaking teacher and the other is the designated teacher of the second language the program is offered in.

The instruction needs to be content based with a strong literature component so that both language and content are acquired. The lessons focus on language and concept attainment; therefore the instruction is linguistically sensitive and child-centered. The use of cooperative groups is important because all students serve as first language models for the second language
learners. The students attending the program must display a willingness to learn two languages.

During a discussion with the dual language program teacher she stated there were differences between her current employment in language as compared to her prior experience in a bilingual classroom. She stated, "The administration, teachers, and parents hold higher expectations for students who attend the dual language program than for students who do not attend this type of program". These higher expectations made the instructional design of the lessons focus on challenging students to attain higher level concepts rather than delivering lessons to reinforce concepts previously learned.

Program Configuration

The surveys indicated all involved in the program must have a common vision of bilingualism. This vision places a value not only on language proficiency but knowledge of literacy in two languages. Through this common vision the program needs to be integrated into the district program and looked upon as a viable option for language minority students.

A significant number of native English speaking students and native speakers of a second language is necessary in order to ensure students have peer role models for the acquisition of their second language. This balance of students allows for them to serve as peer role models for each other. All of the students participating in the program are second language learners and first language role models.
A strength of this particular program under study is that the participating students have been together since kindergarten; therefore the teachers do not need to spend the first month of the beginning of the instructional year teaching classroom routines and procedures. The students move into the next grade level trained in classroom routines from the previous year. Another aspect of the cohort feature is that familiarity with other students provides a sense of security about using a second language. During an interview with the dual language program teacher she stated, “The children motivate each other to learn because they have been with each other since kindergarten they do not have inhibitions about acquiring their second language”.

Along with instructional procedures and peer support equivalent materials in both languages must be available to students. Often it is difficult to find materials in another language suited for English speakers acquiring a second language. Teachers tend to spend time revising the non-English materials to meet their students’ needs.

High Quality Instructional Personnel

The surveys indicated schools need to hire qualified staff. The non-English speaking teacher must be a fluent speaker of the language he/she is teaching in. Both program teachers should have training in language acquisition strategies as both teachers are teaching students in a second language. Additionally, the teachers need to be dedicated and committed to the program. Successful implementation of a dual language program requires teacher
collaboration and hard work. It becomes very helpful for the teachers to be given support from other resource teachers in the school building.

During an interview with the dual language program school administrator, he mentioned, "I encourage the teachers to select their own team partners, and have them submit a letter of interest for teaching in the program". As a final selection process he would interview the teachers as a team to determine if they were going to be successful working together as partners.

Parent Involvement

The surveys indicated parents need to be given the choice of having their children participate in the program. Their involvement is key to the success of the program. The school can encourage parent involvement by offering educational sessions. For example, sessions on second language acquisition, literacy attainment, and social interaction opportunities could be offered as parent workshops at the school site. It is through this education that parents gain interest and support for the program.

A school should establish strong links to business partners to ensure community involvement. The business field is acknowledging the importance of having bilingual employees. Other partnerships could be established with universities to aid in the implementation of successful programs.

During interviews with the dual language program site administrator and teacher, they both expressed the importance of parent involvement. Specifically, the administrator stated, "I meet with parents at the beginning of every school year to recruit new students into the program and to share data on student
progress within the program". During this meeting, he also emphasizes their commitment to their children and to the program if they decide to enroll their children in the program.

The teacher stated the dual language program classrooms had higher parent involvement. "Parents ensure students complete their homework assignments, listen to their children read, or read to their children, and participate in school projects." She also stated, "This year the class had a hundred percent participation in the science fair".

**Positive School Environment**

The surveys indicated teachers need to display an enthusiasm for the program and share a common philosophy that all children can learn regardless of language. The staff at the school site must be united in support of the program. If this unity does not exist among the staff it will be more difficult to obtain buy-in from the parents and from the community at large. For this reason ongoing communication between the teachers, parents, administrators, and students is critical for the success of the program.

The site administrator for the dual language program mentioned during an interview with the researcher, "Besides meeting with the parents on a yearly basis, I also meet with all of his new staff to ensure they have a complete understanding of the dual language program even if they are not assigned to teach in this type of program".

The dual language teacher stated during her interview with the researcher the importance of being integrated into school. Additionally, she commented that
the dual language program teachers were aligned both horizontally and vertically. Specifically, they met with their grade level on a weekly basis for horizontal alignment and with the other dual language program staff for vertical alignment.

**Administrative Support and Leadership**

The surveys indicated it is very important for the district and board to support the program. They need to have bought into the benefits students will gain from being bilingual and bi-literate. The site administrator must also be in support of the program and demonstrate building level commitment for the program.

Grant financial support can be very beneficial to a dual language program. The funding is utilized to provide staff development training, purchase materials, and hiring instructional classroom assistant.

The site administrator interviewed by the researcher stated, "It is very important for administrators to meet with the dual language teachers to plan and set goals for the program". He also stated the importance of providing funding for teachers to attend both local and national trainings.

**Pre-Service/Inservice Training**

The surveys indicated the dual language program teachers must be provided with a comprehensive professional development program. This training needs to address strategies needed in order to ensure a successful program. For example, training in classroom management is essential because there are
two teachers assigned to the program who are responsible for a greater number of students.

The dual language program teacher interviewed by the researcher stated, "I am currently attending a training on balanced literacy and am finding students are making progress in their reading skills because of the guided reading instruction". She also mentioned she had attended a gifted and talented training which showed her how to make the curriculum more challenging for students.

**Summary**

According to Lindholm (2000) seven key features were identified as essential for the successful implementation of a dual language program. Of the seven key features only four were found to relate directly to the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997), addressed in the following section in response to question two.

The Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) identifies the following four elements common to both the framework and the key features of a dual language program:

1. Positive School Environment
2. Instructional Design of the Program
3. Program Configuration
4. Parental Involvement
Research Question # 2

What are the differences in social interaction opportunities in dual language, bilingual, and structured English immersion programs?

Each case study displays a composite picture of the schools in which the researcher observed as documented in the ethnographic field notes. The Faltis Jointfostering Framework (1997) was utilized to analyze teacher-student interactions. Student-peer interaction data emerged from the field notes.

The following section outlines each case study's analysis separately. The researcher begins with a short vignette for each individual case study then moves into the analysis according to the Faltis Jointfostering Framework (1997) by offering examples for each of the identified teacher-student interaction techniques as documented in the field notes. The data analysis was reported in number of incidents drawn from the total number of opportunities observed during classroom interactions, per type of teacher interaction, and per type of classroom program model. Four forty to forty-five minute observations were conducted in each of the observed classrooms. Ten out of the twelve observations were in the reading and language arts curricular areas. Two out of the twelve observations were integrated language arts science lessons. Eight of the lessons were whole group lessons and four were small group lessons. The study was limited to the number and type of teacher-student and student-peer interaction opportunities within the lesson time frame.

The next section of the response to question two offers a comparison of the teacher student interaction techniques across all three models. The last section in response to question two, identifies and compares student-social
interaction patterns across all three program models. The schools and their data are presented in the following order; structured immersion, bilingual, and dual language.

Alameda Elementary School (Structured Immersion)

The Alameda Elementary School was situated in an older school building in a rural neighborhood. As I drove up I noticed a kitchen worker and asked her for the location of the school office. She directed me to a building located between two buildings. I approached the school office, which was situated on the left hand side of a narrow hallway. The school office was quite small and there was limited space from the front counter to the back wall. An older lady stood up out of her chair and asked, “May I help you?” I responded “Yes, I am here to conduct an observation in Mrs. Lopez’s classroom, she is expecting me.” The site administrator walked out of her office and the older lady looked at the administrator and stated, “She is here to observe Mrs. Lopez. The administrator reached out her hand and welcomed me to the school. She stated she needed to get to an assembly and she would escort me to Mrs. Lopez’s room. We walked out of that building and approached another building where we turned left and walked into Mrs. Lopez’s classroom. The site administrator introduced me to Mrs. Lopez and stated she hoped I enjoyed my visit then went off to the assembly.

Mrs. Lopez greeted me and we sat around a kidney shaped table and talked. She was very willing to share information. She stated she had nineteen students all of whom had been attending school since kindergarten except for
two new arrivals from Mexico. She went on to state that all of her students were English language learners and were either new immigrants born outside of the United States or first generation Mexican-American and spoke Spanish at home. She explained the Structured English Immersion program did have a Spanish language component throughout the grade levels based on students’ English fluency. For example, non-English speaking students receive one hundred twenty minutes a day of Spanish instruction, students with limited English proficiency receive ninety minutes a day of Spanish instruction and students with more fluent English speaking proficiency receive sixty minutes a day of Spanish instruction. She stated most of her students were still receiving one hundred twenty minutes a day of Spanish instruction. She also explained the students sat heterogeneously according to language proficiency. Mrs. Lopez excused herself to go pick up her students from lunch recess.

The classroom was small and the student desks were situated in three groups of five desks and one group of four desks. Towards a corner of the room there was a big classroom library section with both English and Spanish language books. The books were placed inside baskets that were labeled according to the language the books were written in. At the opposite corner a carpet lay on the floor with a teacher’s chair positioned in front of the carpet. Bulletin boards displayed colorful posters and charts written in both languages. These displays included the months of the year, days of the week, money, poems, rules for centers and writing workshop, and word walls.

Mrs. Lopez was fluent in both English and in Spanish and had been teaching in this type of setting for seven years. Her classroom environment
supported the teaching/learning process. Specifically, materials were easily accessible to students throughout the classroom. Her interactions with students were friendly and she demonstrated a caring and respectful attitude towards the children. For example, when the students asked her if they could write about Abraham Lincoln in Spanish instead of in English, she responded they need to practice writing in English, but she would help them spell words they wanted to write. She monitored student behavior throughout her lessons and had a classroom management system in place. Specifically, during a shared reading lesson, a student who was not listening attentively was sent to move his clip from green light to yellow light. The student came back to the group and corrected his behavior.

Teacher – Student Interaction Techniques

Following is an analysis of the four types of teacher-student interaction techniques as identified in the Joinfostering Faltis Framework (1997), and as observed in the structured immersion classroom. A total of four reading language art lessons were observed; two lessons were conducted in English and two lessons were conducted in Spanish.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Two Way communication exchanges between the teacher and the students in the structured immersion classroom.
### TABLE 6  Structured Immersion; Two Way Communication Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Way Communication Exchange</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Call on a student (Teacher Controlled)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Students bid for the floor (Teacher Controlled)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Any student can answer (Student Controlled)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Entire class responds (Student Controlled)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Students take turns responding (Student Controlled)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ask a Question, Call on a Student

This exchange was utilized minimally during the lesson observations. Specifically, it was observed during a whole group reading lesson in which the teacher called on students randomly to define the four different types of story starters she had written on chart paper. For example a student responded, "The setting is a story starter and a setting is where a story takes place." Another student answered, "Feelings is a story starter also and it means that you start writing about how a character feels."

Ask a Question, Students Bid for the Floor

This exchange was utilized twice as much as the calling on a student type of exchange. For example, the teacher asked students to define the words she had written on chart paper. Students raised their hands and she called on them. A student who was called on responded "Something important is something that you have to do." The teacher then gave the students an example of what the student had just stated. She said, "If I tell you to bring a paper back signed with your parent's signature because it is important, this means you must do it."

Ask a Question, Any Student Can Answer

This exchange was the most utilized during the observations. Specifically, during a shared reading lesson, the teacher read a book about Abraham Lincoln's life. She would stop reading and ask students comprehension questions. Students would call out answers to her questions. For example, the teacher asked, "Who were the slaves that Abraham Lincoln freed?" A student called out, "They were the people who did not have any money or food." The teacher continued by stating that slaves were not paid for their work. During this
same lesson the teacher also asked “How were the winters in Kentucky different from the winters in El Paso?” A student called out, “It does not snow in El Paso.”

**Ask a Question, The Entire Class Responds**

This exchange was observed in twenty opportunities during lesson delivery. During a shared reading lesson in Spanish, the teacher asked the students “What language was this story *The Little Engine That Could* written in first?” The students responded in unison, “English.” The teacher read the story then stopped and asked students “What else is the little train carrying besides toys for the children over the mountain?” The students answered in unison, “food.”

**Ask a Question, Students Take Turns Responding**

This exchange had the least number of opportunities observed during classroom instruction. The teacher had students define vocabulary words she had written on chart paper. She told the students, “We are going to figure out the meaning for these words because they will be in the story *Arthur Writes Stories* that I will read to you a little later.” One of the words on the chart paper was library. When the teacher asked a student to define library he stated “libreria.” The teacher told the class they could use the Spanish language to help them define words. She continued by stating “The library is a place where we ….., then students took turns responding by stating, “There are books; there are computers; we take AR (Accelerated Reader) tests; and we can do homework”.

Overall, forty-five total opportunities for two-way communication exchanges were observed in the structured immersion classroom. The students demonstrated a greater control of the communication exchanges by calling out
responses and responding as an entire class to the questions posed by the teacher.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Balance of Rights of Participation between the teacher and the students in the structured immersion classroom.

TABLE 7 Structured Immersion; Balance of Rights of Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Participation</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of right of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of Turn Taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of opportunities per type of classroom</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control of Turn Taking

The student control of turn taking was observed in twice the amount of opportunities than teacher control of the turn taking. The students called out answers simultaneously to questions posed by the teacher. For example, during a shared reading lesson on The Little Engine That Could, the students called out
they thought the little blue train would help the little train that had been left stranded get over the mountain to deliver the toys and food to the children who lived on the other side of the mountain.

Control of Topic

This right of participation was observed minimally during lesson observations. Specifically, students were observed revising, correcting, holding a conference with the teacher, and publishing stories they had written. The students were able to select their own topics for the stories they were writing. During the student-teacher conferences, the teacher asked students to identify the type of story starter they had written in their stories. All of the students during this observation period wrote their stories in Spanish. Below is a sample of a story written in Spanish by a student that has been translated into English:

Once upon a time there was a wolf who wanted to eat a boy named Raymond Vasquez. Raymond was very scared and wanted to kill the wolf. The wolf brought Raymond a girl named Maria so he would not kill him. Raymond and Maria fell in love and married. One day the wolf was hidden in the woods as Raymond and Maria went walking by. The wolf cut Raymond and Maria's heads off. Now they live happily ever after in heaven.

Control of Talk

This right of participation was utilized in two opportunities during the observations. Specifically, this was observed during independent writing time. During English independent writing time, students were asked to write a story about Abraham Lincoln recalling facts they had listened to when the teacher had
read them the story. Students helped each other recall facts and with the spelling of words. During Spanish writing time, students were observed editing each others stories, and talking to each other about the design on their story covers.

Overall, forty-eight opportunities for the balance of rights of participation were observed in the structured immersion classroom. Specifically, the students had twice as much control of the turn taking than the teacher had control of the turn taking during classroom instruction.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Dialogue Strategies between the teacher and the students in the structured immersion classroom. The enabling questions dialogue strategy was subdivided by higher order level thinking questions and lower order thinking questions. Lower order level thinking questions were identified as basic recall of facts and details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue Strategies</th>
<th>Total number of opportunities per type of strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orienting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Questions</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Higher order</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lower order</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The enabling questions dialogue strategy was subdivided into higher order and lower order categories, and reported in number per type of enabling question observed. The higher and lower level categories were not counted in as part of the total # of opportunities per type of classroom.*

**Orienting**

The teacher was observed orienting students to establish interpersonal and contextual foundations to help initiate dialogue with her students in six opportunities. During a shared reading lesson conducted in English on Abraham
Lincoln, the teacher established a contextual foundation by reminding students of the story in Spanish she had previously read about Abraham Lincoln. She told the students to recall the facts and details they had already discussed about Abraham Lincoln in Spanish. During this same lesson, she established an interpersonal connection by asking how the winters in Kentucky were different from the winters in El Paso. During another shared reading lesson in which the teacher read the story, Arthur Writes Stories she asked the following two questions to have students establish an interpersonal connection, “Are you like Arthur who does his homework as soon as he gets home from school or do you play first?” and “Do you fight with your little brother or sister like Arthur fights with D.W?”

Enabling

This strategy was observed the most in the structured immersion classroom. The teacher posed eight higher order level thinking questions and twenty-three knowledge level questions, which enabled students to generate short and long responses. For example, as Mrs. Lopez read Abraham Lincoln’s biography she asked the students the following questions, “Where did Lincoln’s family move to? What season is this picture depicting and how do you know? What did Abraham Lincoln like to do? Who were the slaves? Where did Abraham Lincoln work? Did all people like slavery?”.

Informing

The teacher was observed providing new content information in four opportunities during her instruction. For example, students were engaged in a language arts lesson when she told them “I notice you are having some
confusion when starting your stories. Who can name the four different types of story starters?” Students respond then she continues by stating “Very good for remembering but now I am going to give you examples of each story starter so you can decide which type you will use when you write your stories.” She proceeded by giving them examples.

Sustaining

The teacher utilized this strategy to a greater extent than the others, except for the enabling strategy. For example as she read the story The Little Engine That Could, she sustained student interactions by asking the students to predict if they thought the next train going by the little train would help it get over the mountain to deliver the toys and food to the children who lived on the other side of the mountain.

Concluding

This strategy had the least number of opportunities documented during the observations. During whole group reading instruction the teacher concluded the lesson on Abraham Lincoln by closing the book and asking students “Should we be thankful for people like Abraham Lincoln?”

Overall, sixty-four opportunities for dialogue strategies were observed in the structured immersion classroom. Specifically, dialogue strategies had the greatest number of observed opportunities in this type of classroom.

The following table displays the number of opportunities for Extra-Linguistic support provided to students by the structured immersion classroom teacher.
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TABLE 9  Structured Immersion; Extra-Linguistic Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extra Linguistic Supports</th>
<th>Total number of opportunities per type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraverbal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Sensory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paraverbal Support**

The teacher was observed providing a limited number of opportunities for paraverbal support during the lesson observations. Specifically, she provided this type of support when students independently wrote stories in English about Abraham Lincoln. The students asked her to spell words they were writing in their stories. As she wrote the words on the board she also focused in on the pronunciation of the words.

**Nonverbal Support**

The teacher was not observed providing nonverbal support during her instruction.

**Visual and Sensory Support**

The teacher was observed providing students visual support in four opportunities during classroom instruction. Specifically, during shared reading lessons, the teacher showed students pictures from the stories she was reading which provided them with visual support as she read.
Overall, five extra linguistic support opportunities were observed in the structured immersion classroom. The teacher utilized visual supports three times as much as she utilized paraverbal supports.

**Structured English Immersion Program**

Mrs. Lopez in the structured English immersion program displayed a teacher-facilitated style of teaching. For example, during an observed writers workshop lesson she assisted the students with editing, revising, and publishing of student’s created stories. She met with each of her students’ individually and asked them to read her their stories. As the students read, she would stop and ask them how they could expand on their stories. For example, she stated to a student who had written a story about a mean wolf who wanted to eat a little boy “Why does the wolf want to eat the little boy”? The student responded, “He wants to eat Raymond because he is very hungry”.

She posed a similar number of questions as the teachers in the dual language classroom, but asked a greater number of lower level questions. For example she asked students after a shared reading lesson on Abraham Lincoln “What was Abraham Lincoln’s favorite thing to do”? A student called out “read”. As she posed these types of questions students were observed calling out answers simultaneously. Therefore, the students had a greater number of opportunities for taking control of the turn taking. The teacher control of the turn taking was calling students who raised their hands to answer questions.

Mrs. Lopez provided a limited number of extra linguistic supports to her students during lesson delivery. This may be due to the structure of an
immersion program, which is based on immersing students in their second language.

The students participating in this program were all Spanish dominant students who were either recently arrived immigrants or first generation Hispanics as reported by Mrs. Lopez during an interview with the researcher. The students had similar entry level English proficiency scores as the students in the dual language program. Even though these students were receiving two thirds of their instruction in English they made little gains in the acquisition of English after one year of instruction in this type of model. The researcher asked Mrs. Lopez why she thought the students had made limited gains in English language acquisition. She stated “The students are embarrassed by their pronunciation of the English language, in fact the other students at the school refer to them as the Spanish speaking students”. She then added that these pronunciation inhibitions did not allow the students to progress further in their acquisition of English.

The non-English proficient students participating in the structured immersion classroom received one hundred and twenty minutes of native language instruction. The limited English proficient students received ninety minutes of native language instruction. The fluent English language proficient students received sixty minutes of native language instruction. Mrs. Lopez stated “Most of the students in this classroom are still receiving one hundred and twenty minutes of native language instruction, the other second grade teachers are also concerned that students are still non-English proficient even thought they have been attending this type of program since Kindergarten”.
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The students received literacy instruction in both the Spanish and English languages. During a shared reading lesson on Abraham Lincoln, the teacher assigned students to write facts about Abraham Lincoln in story format in the English language. The students pleaded with the teacher to allow them to write in Spanish. The teacher responded "You need to practice writing in English".

The students in the classroom were sitting in teams, which facilitated student-peer interactions but no formal cooperative learning structures were noted. Students were observed interacting for both social and academic purposes only in the Spanish language.

Cesar Chavez Elementary School (Bilingual)

The Cesar Chavez elementary school was situated in a large Hispanic populated neighborhood with older sized homes and trailers. The school building had been noticeably renovated. The hallways were wide with indoor and outdoor classrooms. Upon my arrival, I reported to the school office. I found it to be rather small, but as I looked around office materials and supplies were organized and neatly kept. The middle-aged woman sitting behind the counter stood up from her chair, greeted me with a smile and stated, "Welcome to Cesar Chavez Elementary School. How can I help you?" I introduced myself and told her I had contacted the principal and was scheduled to observe in a second grade classroom. She told me to wait a minute while she found the principal. She picked up a radio, called the principal's name and in Spanish told him I had arrived. He came quickly, greeted me with a handshake, and stated that I was about to observe the best bilingual teacher at the school site. He then asked the
middle-aged woman to escort me to the science lab, where Mr. Padilla had taken his class. She escorted me to the lab where I introduced myself to Mr. Padilla. He welcomed me to the school and introduced me to the students. He told them I was visiting their classroom because I had heard they were the best students at the school. The students welcomed me by stating in Spanish "Good afternoon Mrs. Carrillo." I responded to their greeting and thanked them for allowing me to observe in their classroom. I then proceeded to the back of the room where I took a seat and began taking field notes.

Mr. Padilla was short, stalky, and a little bald. He spoke with great intonation and displayed an energetic disposition. For example, he began the lesson conducted in the science lab by stating with excitement, "Today we are going to make ice cream and during the lesson you will learn why ice cream freezes." The students responded with a cheer. Throughout my observations of him, he consistently utilized academic vocabulary when delivering instruction. During a whole group reading lesson he asked the students to identify the similes and metaphors in the story. His style of teaching was teacher-directed instruction. He would pose questions then after a student's response he would ask follow up questions to sustain student interactions. For example, he asked a student where the accent mark went on the Spanish word "leon." After a student responded he asked the class where they could look to determine if the student had answered correctly. It was evident Mr. Padilla held high expectations for all of his students and throughout my observations he challenged them to gain knowledge. During an integrated language arts/science observation, he had students determine if an earthworm could survive after a week of being enclosed.
in a jar. After determining a response, he asked the students to justify their responses. Additionally, he met the needs of struggling students through small group interactions.

Mr. Padilla's classroom was inside the school building and had brick walls all around which were not conducive to bulletin board displays. The left hand side of the room housed older materials lying on steel rack bookshelves. Twenty computers were nicely aligned at the back of the room.

Nineteen-second grade students sat in three horizontal rows and faced the chalkboard. They kept their school texts and personal school items in their desks. During an interview with Mr. Padilla, he mentioned fifty percent of the students were newly arrived immigrants born outside of the United States and fifty percent were first generation Mexican-Americans.

Additionally, he shared that Spanish was his second language and he understood how language minority students acquired their second language. He also stated his philosophy about language acquisition had changed from being a supporter of English immersion to supporting the use of native language instruction for language minority students. He changed his philosophy because he was encouraged by the principal to teach in a bilingual classroom. From his experiences in the bilingual classroom he realized the importance of a native language foundation in order to ensure a transition into English.

Teacher Student Interaction Techniques

Following is an analysis of the four types of teacher-student interaction techniques as identified in the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) and
observed in the bilingual classroom. Tables 5-9 list the number of opportunities observed for each type of interaction technique. A total of four lessons were observed; two of the lessons observed were reading language arts lessons and two were integrated language arts science lessons. Three of the lessons were conducted in Spanish and one of the lessons was conducted in English.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Two-Way Communication Exchanges between the teacher and the students in the bilingual classroom.
TABLE 10  Bilingual; Two Way Communication Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Way Communication Exchanges</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call on a student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teacher Controlled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students bid for the floor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teacher Controlled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any student can answer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire class responds</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students take turns responding</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Ask a Question, Call on a Student

This exchange was utilized minimally during the four observations conducted in the classroom. The teacher seldom called on students randomly to answer questions.

Ask a Question, Students Bid for the Floor

This exchange was also utilized to a limited extent during the instructional observations. Specifically, it was utilized to call on students who raised their hands to read a story during small group guided reading instruction.

Ask a Question, Any Student Can Answer

This exchange was utilized in seven opportunities in the classroom. For example, during an integrated science and language arts lesson which involved identifying and mixing the ingredients for making ice cream, the teacher was observed asking the students to recall what temperature was considered freezing. A student called out "thirty-two degrees." The students noticed the temperature inside the tubs with the ingredients for making ice cream were all between eight and ten degrees.

During a whole group reading lesson, the teacher asked students which letters made up diphthongs and what did they remember about the letters. A student called out "Vowels make up diphthongs and the second letter in a diphthong is always silent." The teacher followed up by writing examples of diphthongs on the board.

Ask a Question, the Entire Class Responds

This exchange had the greatest number of opportunities observed during lesson delivery. Specifically, during a whole group reading lesson, students were
observed answering comprehension questions about the story they had just read in unison. For example, the teacher asked the students "Class what do we call this phrase from the story on page fifty-six, the sky looked like a glass?" The students answered in unison "a simile." The teacher continued by stating "What do you mean by a simile?" The students answered in unison "A simile is when you compare two unlike objects." The teacher asked students to find other examples of similes in the story they were reading.

Ask a Question, Students Take Turns Responding

This exchange was not utilized during the four classroom observations as documented in the researcher's field notes.

Overall, twenty-nine total opportunities for two way communication exchanges were observed in the bilingual classroom. The most prominent exchange was the entire class responding after the teacher posed a question.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Balance of Rights of Participation between the teacher and the students in the bilingual classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Participation</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of right of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Turn Taking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Topic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Talk</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Controlled)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control of Turn Taking

The teacher had minimal control of the turn taking and the students had the most opportunities for control of the turn taking during classroom observations as documented in the researcher’s field notes. This was evident when anyone with an answer was allowed to respond, and when students responded in unison to questions posed by the teacher.

During an integrated language arts/science lesson, students were observed taking turns and sharing their thoughts in front of their classmates regarding whether they thought an earthworm inside a jar for one week was still alive. Students had different opinions, one student read from his notes “The worm is still alive because it has dirt and air and the jar has little holes on top.”
Another student read from her notes, "The worm is not alive because it does not have food and water."

**Control of Topic**

This right of participation for students was observed in two opportunities during lesson delivery. An example of sharing a topic control was demonstrated during an integrated language arts/science lesson when students read from their handwritten notes that had sequential directions for making ice cream. The teacher had students elaborate on these directions in written format. He told them it was their choice as to how they would elaborate the directions for making ice cream. Students took turns sharing what they had written.

**Control of Talk**

Utilizing small groups allowed for students to share control of talk. For example, during an integrated language arts/science lesson students sat in teams of four and were able to talk in their groups about the amount needed for each ingredient when making ice cream. The students had the measuring tools at their tables, and utilized these tools in their conversations.

Overall, thirty-three opportunities for the balance of rights of participation were observed in the bilingual classroom. Specifically, the students had control of the turn taking in this classroom.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Dialogue Strategies between the teacher and the students in the bilingual classroom.
TABLE 12  Bilingual; Dialogue Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue Strategies</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per dialogue strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Questions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Higher order</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lower order</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opportunities per type</strong></td>
<td><strong>of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>classroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The enabling questions dialogue strategy was subdivided into higher order and lower order categories, and reported in number per type of enabling question observed. The higher and lower level categories were not counted in as part of the total # of opportunities per type of classroom.

**Orienting**

This dialogue strategy was observed to have the least number of opportunities during lesson delivery. The teacher oriented his students to establish an interpersonal and contextual foundation from which the dialogue
could unfold. For example, students established a contextual foundation by
activating their prior knowledge and recalling information about freezing
temperatures. This knowledge allowed them to determine if the ice cream stored
in plastic bags was frozen by reading the temperature on the thermometer. The
students discovered the temperature was between eight and ten degrees
Fahrenheit; therefore determining that the ice cream was frozen. Another
example of establishing a contextual foundation was observed during a small
group English reading lesson when the teacher translated some comprehension
questions from English into Spanish to ensure student understanding of the
questions being asked.

Enabling

The teacher utilized this dialogue strategy almost twice as much as the
orienting and confirming dialogue strategies. The teacher enabled students to
generate long and short exchanges by posing a variety of questions.
Specifically, he posed more higher order thinking questions than knowledge level
enabling questions. For example, he asked the following higher order-thinking
question, "How does one determine where the accent marks are used in words
such as leon and melon."

Informing

This strategy was utilized to present new content information during
classroom instruction. Specifically, the teacher informed the students by
providing new content information and giving corrective language information.
For example, during a language arts/science lesson he explained how the rock
salt ingredient had gone inside the ice cubes and had made the liquid inside the
plastic bags freeze. He then had students place a thermometer inside the tubs where the bags were stored and had them read the temperature on the thermometer.

Additionally, during a language arts lesson, he showed students how words would be pronounced differently in Spanish if they did not have accent marks.

Sustaining

This dialogue strategy was observed to have the greatest number of opportunities as documented in the researcher's field notes. The teacher sustained student interactions by encouraging them to continue to talk. During a language arts/science lesson he sustained the interactions by:

- Directing the students to read their notes on making ice cream as he poured the ingredients
- Having students count forward and backwards by two's, three's and fives as they mixed the ingredients
- Allowing students to share how they had elaborated on the directions for making ice cream
- Generating a conversation with the students about the effect the rock salt had on the ice cubes
- Having students identify the temperature on the thermometers

Concluding

The teacher provided the least number of opportunities for this strategy during lesson delivery. For example, he concluded the interaction of a language arts/science lesson by asking the students to recall the effect the rock salt had on
the ice cubes, which were enclosed inside a tub. The students responded the rock salt kept the ice cubes frozen which made the temperature in the tubs drop significantly.

Overall, forty-six total opportunities for dialogue strategies were observed in the bilingual classroom. The teacher provided new content information and asked students enabling questions to generate exchanges, then he would sustain the dialogue by asking students follow up questions or giving them additional directions.

The following table displays the number of opportunities for Extra-Linguistic support provided to students by the bilingual classroom teacher.

TABLE 13 Bilingual; Extra-Linguistic Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extra Linguistic Supports</th>
<th>Total number of opportunities per type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraverbal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Sensory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paraverbal Support

The extra linguistic support was observed in three opportunities during lesson delivery. This support focused on the way sounds were emphasized and utilized. Specifically, the teacher had students echo read stories after him, which
allowed them to hear the correct pronunciation of words in Spanish. He also utilized this type of support when conducting small group English reading instruction. He had the students repeat after him as he read the story.

Nonverbal Support

This support involves the utilization of gestures and facial expressions. The teacher was very expressive with his face and was observed utilizing this type of support during classroom observations. For example, he would encourage the students who responded correctly by putting a big smile on his face and stating, "You are correct!"

Visual and Sensory Support

This type of support was evidenced the most during classroom observations. This support encourages the use of visual aides. The teacher provided sensory support by bringing in real objects for measuring the ingredients for making ice cream.

Overall, twelve opportunities for extra linguistic supports were observed in the bilingual classroom. The teacher during an interview with the researcher emphasized the importance of providing English language learners with paraverbal support to ensure they correctly pronounced sounds that were part of the English language but were not utilized in the Spanish language.

Bilingual Program

The bilingual teacher displayed a teacher-directed style during lesson observations. Specifically, he posed questions to generate short and long student exchanges. The students would offer responses more frequently as an
entire class. The students in this classroom dominated the control of the responses with very little teacher control of the responses. Mr. Padilla posed a greater number of higher order thinking questions than knowledge level questions and a substantially less number of questions than both the structured immersion and dual language program teachers.

The students attending the bilingual program were divided amongst recent arrived immigrants, first generation Hispanics and second generation Hispanics. They were all Spanish dominant students. Mr. Lopez commented during an interview with the researcher, “I used to believe in the English only approach but since I have been teaching in a bilingual program, I can see the benefit of students learning in their native language.” He then stated, “Once students have learned a concept in their native language they are ready to learn the concept in English”.

These students demonstrated a lower entry level on the English LAS proficiency test than the students in the structured immersion or dual language programs. Additionally, their English language proficiency gains after one year of instruction were also lower that the students participating in the structured immersion and dual language programs. During an interview with the researcher he stated “I conduct 70% of my instruction in Spanish and 30% in English”. As observed in the classroom Mr. Padilla used the English language mostly for social purposes. For example, he was observed stating in English, “It is time to go to lunch, put your reading books away”. Therefore, students were exposed to more social English language skills than academic language skills, which was reflected during student-peer interactions.
The students sat in horizontal rows in the classroom and faced the chalkboard during and the teacher during instruction. This classroom arrangement reflected Mr. Padilla’s teacher-directed teaching style, which displayed teacher-student interactions as the teacher posing questions and the students responding to these questions. Specifically, he posed questions to generate short and long student exchanges. The students were observed frequently offering responses as an entire class. Therefore, the students dominated the control of the responses by calling out rather than being called upon. Mr. Padilla posed a greater number of higher order thinking questions than knowledge level questions, but a substantially less number of questions than both the structured immersion and the dual language program teachers.

The bilingual teacher provided a greater number of linguistic supports for his students. Specifically, during an interview with the researcher, he noted the importance of providing para-verbal support. During a small group guided reading lesson he had the students echo read after him. This strategy helped students practice the correct pronunciation of English words. For example Mr. Padilla read “The duckling was looking for his mother”. The students repeated this statement after Mr. Padilla.

Reading instruction in this classroom was conducted from the McMillan McGraw Hill basal reader. This instruction specifically targeted grade level reading skills. For example, students were observed filling out a work sheet related to the story they had just read in their readers. The teacher identified 84% of the students reading between a 2.0 and a 2.5 reading level in Spanish. 16% of the students were reading between a 1.5 and a 2.0 reading level in
Spanish. He also stated that 42% of the students were being taught to read in English as well. When asked by the researcher during an interview about his literacy goal for his students he stated, "For the recent arrived immigrants, my goal is for them to teach them to read in Spanish and for them to understand and speak in English by the end of the school year. For the first generation students, I want them to read close to grade level in Spanish by the end of the year so they are ready to transition into English reading by next year. For my second generation students, I also want them to read close to grade level in both Spanish and in English".

The students sat in horizontal rows in the classroom and faced the chalkboard and the teacher during instruction. This classroom arrangement reflected Mr. Padilla’s teacher-directed teaching style.

Zapata Elementary School (Dual Language)

The Zapata Elementary School is situated in a neighborhood of brand new mid sized to large sized homes. The school building looks new and the school motto "Reaching a new standard of excellence is visible as you approach the building. Entering the school I noticed a wide hallway in front of me with student work displayed on the bulletin boards located on both sides of the hallway. To my right I found the school office, which was very spacious. An office staff member stood up out of her chair and greeted me with a smile. I introduced myself and asked her if the site administrator was available. She asked that I take a seat in one of the chairs located in front of the counter for a few minutes and wait for him to come out of a meeting. I took a seat and looked at some
brochures on how parents could help their children acquire literacy skills at home. The site administrator came out of a conference room and approached me. I stood up and shook his hand. He welcomed me to the school and stated the teachers were ready for me to observe in their classrooms.

The assistant principal walked into the office and the principal introduced her to me and asked if she would escort me to Mrs. Sanchez and Mrs. Fernandez's classroom. He then stated he hoped I had a great visit and left.

The assistant principal escorted me to the classrooms. As we walked in we noticed the teachers were not there, she stated she would go find them to let them know I had arrived. I took a seat, made myself comfortable and started taking field notes.

I noticed two classrooms were utilized for this second grade program. The classrooms were open with a partition in the middle. Thirty-five student desks were visible and situated in groups of six in one of the classrooms. The classroom with the desks had a bulletin board displaying a word wall with words written in both the English and Spanish languages. In this classroom there were also student work language arts displays, study posters for reading skills, word and sentence charts, two kidney shaped tables for guided reading instruction, and seven computers on tables at the back of the room. Near one of the kidney shaped tables was a leveled reading program that had not yet been unpackaged. The other classroom had student math and science work hanging from the ceiling as well as displayed on the bulletin boards in the classroom. There were tables instead of desks in the classroom.
Mrs. Sanchez and Mrs. Fernandez walked in and introduced themselves. They welcomed me to their classroom and stated the students were at library but would be back in about thirty minutes. We all took a seat around one of the kidney tables. During this time, they talked about the program configuration. For two weeks the students receive language arts instruction in English during the morning and math and science instruction in Spanish during the afternoon. During the following two weeks the students receive language arts instruction in Spanish and math and science instruction in English in the afternoon. One of the classrooms was utilized for language arts instruction and the second classroom was utilized for math and science instruction. They also shared that Mrs. Sanchez was responsible for the instruction in Spanish and Mrs. Fernandez was responsible for the instruction in English.

I asked if they utilized guided reading groups for small group instruction since I noticed they had leveled reading books. Mrs. Sanchez enthusiastically stated, "We have been attending balanced literacy training throughout this school year." They both stated they were excited about receiving new leveled reading books.

Mrs. Sanchez was a fluent Spanish speaker. Throughout her lessons she provoked student thinking through the use of questioning strategies. Specifically, half of the questions she asked during the observed lessons were higher order level questions. For example, at the conclusion of a shared reading lesson, she asked the students if their original prediction of the story she had just finished reading were correct and if they were different, how were they different. She maintained discipline in a non-threatening manner and was consistent in
ensuring classroom procedures were followed. Students sat in cooperative learning groups, which facilitated classroom management. She oriented the students to make interpersonal and contextual connections with the concepts she introduced during lesson delivery. She displayed her excitement about the literacy training and had incorporated the knowledge gained at the trainings when conducting small group guided reading lessons. For example, she was observed conducting a running record to determine an individual student's reading fluency.

Mrs. Sanchez was aware of her students' backgrounds and stated that the majority of them were bused in from a small town where they had no electricity in their homes. She mentioned all of the Spanish dominant students were recent Hispanic immigrants or first generation Mexican-American who spoke Spanish at home. The English dominant students were second-generation Mexican-American students who spoke English at home.

Mrs. Fernandez was very friendly and willing to share information with me. She was helpful to her team partner during the reading lessons conducted in Spanish. She utilized a lot of repetition during her instruction in order to ensure student understanding of concepts being taught. For example, during a language arts lesson, she had students give a variety of examples for antonyms in order to ensure the understanding of the concept. Additionally, she utilized academic Spanish vocabulary during her instruction and had lesson materials readily accessible for her students. During a language arts lesson, she was observed asking students, “What is the difference between an antonym and a synonym.” She also maintained discipline in a non-threatening manner and held student attention throughout her instruction. During an interview, Mrs. Fernandez
commented she had previously taught in a bilingual classroom and noticed a
difference in student attitudes and academic achievement. Specifically, she
stated the students in their classroom displayed a greater motivation to learn. I
questioned her why she felt they were more motivated than the students she had
previously taught. She responded, “These students are motivated because half
of their instruction is in a second language; therefore they are challenged on a
daily basis.”

Teacher Student Interaction Techniques

Following is an analysis of the four types of teacher-student interaction
techniques as identified by the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) as
observed in the dual language classroom. Tables 9-12 list the number of
opportunities observed for each type of interaction technique. Four reading
language arts lessons were observed; two of the lessons were conducted in
English and two were conducted in Spanish.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during
Two-Way Communication Exchanges between the teacher and the students in
the dual language classroom.
TABLE 14  Dual Language; Two Way Communication Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Way Communication Exchanges</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call on a student</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students bid for the floor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any student can answer</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire class responds</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students take turns responding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of opportunities per</strong></td>
<td><strong>type of classroom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ask a Question, Call on a Student

This exchange was frequently utilized during lesson observations. Specifically, it was evident during both whole group and small group instruction. The students were called on randomly after a question had been asked. For example, during a shared reading lesson the teacher called on a student randomly to answer the following analytical question, "What do you think the little girl and the grandmother are going to do to get their last ingredient which is the
chicken to make their soup?” A student who was called on randomly responded “They are going to trade the little dog the girl found for the chicken.”

During another whole group shared reading lesson a variety of students were called on randomly to state the title of the story, define words found in the story, and read words from the classroom word wall that began with the letter the teacher called out.

Also, during a small group guided reading lesson the teacher asked what combination of vowels were found in the word nuevo, then she randomly called on a student to answer. The student responded the word nuevo had the ue vowel combinations which are called dipthongs.

Ask a Question, Students bid for the floor

This exchange was observed in eight opportunities during lesson delivery. Specifically, it was prevalent during whole group instruction. An illustration of this exchange was observed during a whole language arts lesson on antonyms. The teacher called on students who were raising their hands to give examples of antonyms. Also, during a whole group shared reading lesson, students were observed raising their hands and being called on by the teacher to describe the cover of the book the teacher was about to read.

Ask a Question, Any student can Answer

This exchange was utilized in eleven opportunities and was observed during both whole group and small group instruction. An example of this exchange was during a language arts lesson was noted when students called out and defined antonyms as words with opposite meanings. Another student called out by stating the antonym for “up” was “down.” During a shared reading lesson,
the teacher asked, "How much is a dozen?" A student called out twelve. The teacher continued reading the story and asked what the little girl and the grandmother in the story could do to obtain bananas. A student called out, "They could sell the eggs to get the bananas. As the teacher continued reading, a student called out and stated there were two dogs kissing on the page the teacher was reading. The teacher redirected the student by asking, "What are the grandmother and the little girl doing on the page where the two dogs are kissing?"

**Ask A Question, the Entire Class Responds**

This exchange had the greatest number of opportunities observed as documented in the researcher's field notes. Specifically, during a language arts lesson the teacher wrote down words on the overhead projector and asked students to identify the antonym for each word. She continued the lesson by asking students what they needed to do to place the words she had written on the overhead in alphabetical order. The students responded in unison, "We need to look at the beginning letter of each word." She then had the students orally place the words in alphabetical order.

**Ask a Question, Students take turns Responding**

This exchange had the least number of opportunities noted during classroom instruction. For example, during a language arts lesson, the teacher asked students to identify the different types of sentences they had previously studied. Students took turns responding they had studied about interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentences. The students who responded also identified the punctuation marks that belonged to each type of sentence.
Overall, forty-seven total opportunities for two-way communication exchanges were observed in the dual language program. Specifically, twenty opportunities for teacher control of the communication exchanges were documented and twenty-seven opportunities for student control of the turn taking were also documented in the researcher’s field notes.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Balance of Rights of Participation between the teacher and the students in the dual language classroom.

**TABLE 15 Dual Language; Balance of Rights of Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Participation</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of Turn Taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Topic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Talk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control of Turn Taking

Both the teachers and the students had control of the turn taking in the dual language program classroom. Specifically, students were observed taking
turns to respond to the teacher's questions. For example, students were observed taking turns making predictions about their thoughts of what was going to happen in a story the teacher was going to read to them.

Control of Topic

This right of participation was observed twice as much as control of the talk. An example of sharing of topic control was evident during a shared reading lesson when students were asked to predict what was going to happen in the story. The students' predictions allowed for further classroom discussion of those predictions. For example, a student predicted that the little girl pictured on the front cover would go to the supermarket and find a dog. The teacher followed up by asking students "If this prediction is correct why do you think the little girl is going to the supermarket?" This question generated a variety of answers from the students. Students' responses included, "The little girl is going to buy fruits." "The little girl is going to buy vegetables." "The little girl is going to the store but does not have any money and will not buy anything."

Control of Talk

This right of participation had the least number of opportunities noted during lesson delivery. This right was observed during center activities that facilitated the opportunity for students to talk amongst themselves. For example, at the reading center students were observed with a paper and pencil tallying the number of times they had found words in books from the classroom library that started with the letter a. The students had puppets and interacted with each other utilizing the puppets, "Mr. Duck did you find any more words that start with a".
At the math center, students helped each other figure out addition problems with regrouping.

Overall, fifty-three opportunities were observed for the balance of rights of participation in the dual language classroom. Specifically, the teacher and the students shared the control of the turn taking in this classroom.

The following table displays the number of opportunities observed during Dialogue Strategies between the teacher and the students in the dual language classroom.
TABLE 16  Dual Language; Dialogue Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue Strategies</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per dialogue strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orienting</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Questions</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Higher order</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lower order</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The enabling questions dialogue strategy was subdivided into higher order and lower order categories, and reported in number per type of enabling question observed. The higher and lower level categories were not counted in as part of the total # of opportunities per type of classroom.

Orienting

This strategy was the second most evident strategy utilized by the teacher. During a shared reading lesson she read a story about a little girl and her grandmother who traded what they had taken to the store for other items. The teacher established an interpersonal connection with the students by asking...
“Do you think exchanging corn for carrots is fair?” The students responded, "Yes, because they are both foods."

During another shared reading lesson the teacher established a contextual foundation by asking the students to look at the word wall and identify words from the wall she had read in the story.

**Enabling**

This strategy was identified as having the greatest number of opportunities during classroom observations. The teacher generated long and short exchanges by posing a variety of questions. She asked both higher order level and knowledge level thinking questions. For example, during a language arts lesson the teacher asked the following questions: “What is the definition of an antonym?” and “What is the antonym for cloudy?"

During a shared reading lesson, the teacher read the story *The Big Red Apple Tree*. She asked students the following questions: “What is the title of the story?” “What is a capullo?” “What is a trinon?”

**Informing**

This dialogue strategy was observed in four opportunities during classroom instruction. For example, during a small group guided reading lesson, the teacher showed students words on flash cards. She identified the words and had students repeat after her, then she defined the words, and finally practiced the correct pronunciation of the words with the students.

**Sustaining**

This strategy was observed twice as less as the enabling strategy and twice as more as the informing and concluding strategies. During a language
arts lesson, the teacher had the students orally place words she had written on
the overhead in alphabetical order. A student raised her hand, was called on and
stated they had not placed the words correctly. The teacher asked the class to
inform the student who had stated the words were not in alphabetical order, how
they had determined the order they placed the words in. The students
responded they looked at the beginning letter of each word.

Concluding

This strategy was utilized in four opportunities during lesson delivery.
Specifically, the teacher after having read the story *Making Chicken Soup* asked
the students recall facts and details from the story in sequential order. She
concluded the lesson with the following question, “What important thing did the
little girl learn at the end of the story?” A student responded she had learned
how to trade evenly and was able to get all of the ingredients to make the soup.

Overall, sixty-two opportunities for dialogue strategies were observed in
the dual language classroom. Specifically, the utilization of enabling questions
was observed three times as much as the orienting and sustaining strategies and
eight times as much as the informing and concluding strategies.

The following table displays the number of opportunities for Extra-
Linguistic support provided to students by the dual language classroom teacher.
TABLE 17  Dual Language; Extra Linguistic Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extra Linguistic Supports</th>
<th>Total number of opportunities per type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraverbal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Sensory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paraverbal Support

This strategy was evident in four opportunities during the observations. The teacher emphasized sounds when during a small group guided reading lesson she dictated words for students to write on their white boards. Students sounded out the words as they wrote them. The teacher emphasized the correct pronunciation for each word.

Nonverbal Support

The teacher was observed utilizing this strategy in three opportunities during lesson delivery. For example, she used her body to describe the antonyms big and short during a lesson on the identification of antonyms. During a shared reading lesson, she held up her fingers as students recalled facts and details in sequential order from the story she had just read.

Visual and Sensory Support

This type of support was noted in four opportunities during lesson observations. For example, pictures from the stories read during shared reading
were shown to the students. The classroom had a word wall, which students utilized for visual support as they identified words from the stories they listened to that were a part of the word wall. The teacher utilized picture word flash cards during small group guided instruction to offer visual support for the words they were studying.

Overall, eleven opportunities for extra linguistic supports were observed in the dual language classroom. A similar number of opportunities for each support were noted in the bilingual classroom as well.

**Dual Language Program**

The teachers in this program displayed a teacher-facilitated style of teaching. For example, when they posed questions and a student would respond they did not determine if the student had answered correctly or not, instead they waited and other students elaborated on the previous student’s response or provided a different response. Specifically, the teachers utilized orienting dialogue strategies allowing students to establish a conceptual foundation to the concepts being taught. For example, during a language arts lesson, Mrs. Sanchez asked students to identify and give examples of the four different types of sentences they had previously studied. A student was observed responding “An interrogative sentence asks a question, like “Is it hot outside?” It was also noted that the teachers provided a greater number of higher order thinking level questions. For example, during a shared reading lesson, Mrs. Fernandez read a story about a grandmother and her granddaughter who went to the market with food items they were going to trade for other food items they needed to make
chicken soup. Mrs. Fernandez asked, “Do you think trading corn for carrots is a fair trade”? Students responded, “Yes because they are both foods”.

The Spanish dominant students attending the program were recent arrived immigrants or first generation Hispanics. The English dominant students were second generation Hispanics. During an interview Mrs. Sanchez stated, "Our Spanish dominant students are bused in from a rural area in which they do not have electricity in their homes. Our English dominant students live within the school zone".

The instruction in the classroom was conducted in English for 50% of the day and in Spanish for 50% of the day, alternating according to subjects every two weeks. The students sat in teams consisting of both English and Spanish dominant students. This allowed for student-peer interactions in both languages. Specifically, an English dominant student was observed speaking to a Spanish dominant student on her team in Spanish, then addressing an English dominant student also on her team in English.

The students in the dual language program made substantial gains in their English oral proficiency after one year of instruction when compared to the structured immersion and bilingual program students. This may be a result of entering kindergarten with fluent Spanish oral skills. According to language acquisition theory the best way for students to learn English is for them to attain initial mastery in their home language. (Krashen & Biber, 1998; Krashen 1996).

The Spanish dominant students demonstrated a two-month gain in grade level reading when compared to the structured immersion students. Even though they had just begun formalized reading instruction in English midyear. This may
also be directly related to a correlation between Spanish reading and English reading skills as documented in previous research studies identified in Lindholm, (1992). The English dominant students demonstrated a three-month grade level advancement in English reading skills and were only two months behind in grade level Spanish reading.

The dual language program was found to have a greater balance between teacher-student interactions and student-peer interactions. Specifically, both the teachers and the students shared the control for student responses during lesson delivery. For example, the teachers were observed calling on students randomly to respond to questions and students were observed calling out answers and responding as an entire class.

Students sat in teams in the dual language program classroom. The teams consisted of both Spanish dominant and English dominant students. This allowed for students to interact both socially and academically in English and in Spanish. Mrs. Sanchez during an interview with the researcher stated, “The students motivate and help each other to continue learning in their second language”.

**Student- Teacher Interaction Techniques**

The following section offers a comparison of the data analyzed across all three program models according to the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) for the four types of teacher-student interactions as documented in the researcher's field notes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Way Exchanges</th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Language</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Call on a student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Students bid for the floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Any student can answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Entire class respond</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Students take turns responding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of Opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 offers a comparison of two-way communication exchanges in which teachers negotiate for meaning with their students.

In the structured immersion classroom the most utilized two-way communication exchange was asking a question-any student can answer. This exchange was observed twice more often than in the bilingual classroom. It was documented in the field notes that during lessons taught in Spanish a greater number of students called out questions than during instruction conducted in English.

In the bilingual classroom the most prevalent communication exchange observed was the entire class responding after the teacher posed questions. This type of exchange was utilized more than in the structured immersion or in the dual language classrooms. Additionally, it was noted that students also called out answers in response to the teacher's questions. Students in this classroom seldom raised their hands or were called on randomly to answer questions. Therefore, the students exhibited a greater control of the communication exchanges.

According to the data in Table 18 the dual language program had a greater number of two way communication exchanges as documented in the researcher's field notes. Specifically, the most evident communication exchanges noted in the dual language program were asking a question and having the entire class respond and calling on students after the teacher had posed a question. This calling on students communication exchange ensured that students were listening attentively during instruction because they did not know when they would be called on to respond to the teachers' questions.
Overall, the dual language program classroom demonstrated more of a balance between teacher and student control of the communication exchanges than the structured immersion or the bilingual classrooms.

**TABLE 19  Balance of Rights of Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Participation</th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of right of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Talk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of opportunities per type of classroom</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 afforded a comparison of the Balance of Rights of Participation. Specifically, field notes of instructional observations were examined to determine if the teachers in the different types of programs promoted student-generated talk and topics and if they encouraged students to be in control of their own learning.

The structured immersion classroom had twice as much student control of the turn taking than teacher control of the turn taking. Additionally, the students were not given many opportunities to have control of the topic during lesson delivery. However, students were given the same number of opportunities to control the talk as students in the bilingual and dual language program classrooms.

The bilingual program had the least number of opportunities for the balance of rights of participation. Specifically, the students had almost all of the control of the turn taking during classroom instruction. However, the students had twice as less control of the topic than the students in the dual language classroom. This may be due to the teacher's direct style of teaching in which he controlled the content to be studied.

In the dual language program the teacher had control of turn-taking by calling on students randomly and calling on students who raised their hands. The data in Table 19 displays the students participating in the dual language program classroom also shared this turn taking with their teachers. The students also displayed greater control of the topic than the students in the structured immersion or in the bilingual classrooms.

Overall, the dual language program displayed a greater number of opportunities for the balance of rights of participation. Specifically, a balance
was noted between the teachers' rights of participation and the students' rights of participation.
### TABLE 20  Dialogue Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue Strategies</th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Language</th>
<th>Total # of opportunities per type of dialogue strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orienting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Higher order</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lower order</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The enabling questions dialogue strategy was subdivided into higher order and lower order categories, and reported in number per type of enabling question observed. The higher and lower level categories were not counted in as part of the total # of opportunities per type of classroom.
Table 20 displays a comparison of the dialogue strategies in which the students contributed to the conversation initiated by the teacher.

The structured immersion classroom teacher enabled students to generate long and short exchanges by posing a variety of questions. She posed almost the same amount of questions as the dual language program teachers, although most of the questions were at the knowledge level. The teacher also provided students similar opportunities for four out of the five dialogue strategies as the dual language teachers.

The bilingual classroom teacher informed his students by providing more new content information and corrective language than the dual language or the structured immersion teacher. He did this by utilizing a variety of instructional approaches to ensure the students gained an understanding of the new concepts he was introducing. Additionally, he posed a greater number of enabling higher order thinking questions than enabling knowledge level questions. He also sustained interactions with his students twice as much as the structured immersion and the dual language program teachers.

The teachers in the dual language program oriented the students to establish interpersonal connections and contextual foundations to encourage student interactions by offering twice the number of opportunities than the teachers in the other two types of programs. Also evidenced in the dual language program was the use of a greater number of higher order level thinking questions posed by the teachers. During an interview with the dual language program teachers they shared they had attended a training for gifted and talented
students and had acquired instructional strategies for making the curriculum more challenging.

Overall, the dual language program teachers displayed a greater percentage in the utilization of dialogue strategies. However, all of the program teachers provided the same number of opportunities for concluding their interactions with statements that allowed students to know the lessons were about to end.

TABLE 21 Extra Linguistic Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Language</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>Total number of opportunities per type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraverbal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Sensory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities per type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 exhibits a comparison of extra linguistic supports that help students build background knowledge in order to gain understanding of the concepts being taught.

The structured immersion teacher demonstrated the least amount of extra linguistic supports offered to her students. The greatest number of extra linguistic opportunities was noted as visual supports. Specifically, the teacher during the observed shared reading lessons provided the students pictures from the story for them to look at as she read.

The teacher in the bilingual program utilized these support systems to a greater extent than the other program teachers. Both he and the dual language teacher expressed the importance of providing students with paraverbal support throughout the content instruction. During an interview with him as documented in the field notes, he stated the students needed to be taught the sounds of the English language because they were different from the sounds found in the Spanish language.

The dual language program teachers provided a greater number of opportunities for paraverbal support. The dual language teachers during their interview stated the English dominant students helped the Spanish dominant students learn the correct pronunciation of words in the English language by serving as role models for the children.

Overall, the bilingual teacher provided the students with the greatest number of extra linguistic supports. However, during observations in all three programs the use of visual aids was documented in the field notes.
Student-Peer Social Interaction

Terms, concepts and categories for student-peer interactions were developed from the field notes during the observations. The data were organized into the following categories as displayed on Table 22; student-peer social and academic interactions in English; and student-peer social and academic interactions in Spanish.

TABLE 22 Student Socialization Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structured Immersion Program

Students in the structured immersion program were observed discussing with each other in Spanish for academic purposes what they would write about Abraham Lincoln in English. For example, a student stated to his team members “How do you spell the United States of America, I am going to write Abraham Lincoln was the President of the United States of America.

During another observation, in which students were writing their own stories they were observed socializing for both social and academic purposes in the Spanish language. Specifically, they showed each other how they had
designed the covers for their stories, and they helped each other edit and revise their stories.

**Bilingual Program**

Students in the bilingual program were observed utilizing both the English and Spanish language for social purposes when they were given time to eat the ice cream they had made during an integrated language arts/science lesson. For example, students stated, "This ice cream tastes good," and "Do you have more ice cream than me?"

During this same lesson the students were observed sharing ideas only in Spanish for academic purposes. Specifically, they elaborated on the directions for mixing the ingredients to make the ice cream. For example, a student stated, "I wrote we counted forward by two's and five's when we were mixing the ingredients to make ice cream."

During another language arts/science observation students socialized with their team partner in Spanish for academic purposes and shared their ideas about the worm being alive or not alive. For example, a student stated to his team partner, "I do not think the worm is alive because it has not eaten food for days, and it cannot breathe."

**Dual Language Program**

Students in the dual language program were observed utilizing both the English and Spanish languages for both social and academic interaction. Specifically, for social interaction an English dominant student was observed socializing with her team members according to the receiving students' language dominance. For example, she asked a Spanish dominant student in Spanish if
she could borrow her pencil. She told an English dominant student in English that the other student had lent her the pencil.

During center activities, students were observed interacting with each other for academic purposes. Specifically, the students at the Social Studies center were working on a Venn Diagram comparing President Thomas Jefferson with President Abraham Lincoln. The information about these Presidents was written in Spanish. A Spanish dominant student was paired with an English dominant student at this center. The Spanish dominant student was reading the information to the English dominant student. They wrote in the middle of the Venn Diagram in Spanish "They were both Presidents of the United States of America.

At the writing center, students helped each other copy sentences from the story, *The Big Red Apple Tree*, the teacher had read during a shared reading lesson. The sentence strips were written in Spanish. A student at this center stated to the researcher, "Some of us are learning English and some of us are learning Spanish."

Overall, the dual language program demonstrated a greater number of teacher-student interaction techniques and student-peer interactions during the classroom observations as documented in the researcher’s field notes.

Research Question #3
If different social interaction opportunities exist in a single model what is the impact on emergent literacy skills?
TABLE 23  Teacher Student Interaction Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Language</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>Total number of opportunities per type of interaction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Way Exchanges</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Rights of Participation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Strategies</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Linguistic Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of opportunities per type of classroom</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data cited in Table 23 revealed that the dual language program had the greatest number of teacher-student interactions noted in the field notes. Specifically, there were forty-eight more teacher-student interaction opportunities...
in the dual language program than in the bilingual and twenty more opportunities than in the structured immersion program.

Also documented in the field notes, students participating in the dual language program were the only students of the three program models researched who utilized both the English and Spanish languages for both social and academic interactions.

**Literacy Instruction**

The following section identifies the literacy instruction in each of the observed program models.

**Literacy in the Structured Immersion Classroom**

A balanced literacy approach was utilized in this classroom. Reading lessons observed focused on vocabulary building, listening comprehension, and on recalling facts and details from the stories the teacher shared with the students. Students were also observed during "Drop Everything And Read" time. They were allowed to take two books to their desks, a book written in English and a book written in Spanish. During this time students were focused on reading the stores they had selected. Students were observed selecting to read stories written in Spanish.

Additionally, the teacher utilized the Writers Workshop approach for reinforcement of writing skills. Students were observed revising, correcting, holding a conference with the teacher, publishing, and illustrating the cover for
their stories. This process stimulated students to think and write creatively. This process was observed being conducted in Spanish.

Students were also observed writing stories in English about Abraham Lincoln after the teacher had read President Lincoln's biography. During this observation several students asked the teacher if they could write their story in Spanish. The teacher stated they needed to practice writing in English. She assisted the students by writing words on the board the students stated they needed help spelling. Some of the words she wrote on the board were slaves, President, freed, Kentucky and married.

All of the observed classroom teacher offered the students both whole group and small group reading and writing instruction. In all three classrooms, students were observed engaged in instruction and actively participating in assigned tasks.

**Literacy in the Bilingual Classroom**

Students in the bilingual classroom had been taught literacy in their native language since Kindergarten. Students who had acquired near grade level or above Spanish reading were being transitioned into English reading. According to an interview with the classroom teacher and based on test scores from the adopted reading basal, 84% of his students were between 2.0 and 2.5 reading level in Spanish, and 16% were between a 1.5 and 2.0 reading level in Spanish. He also stated 42% of the students were being taught to read in English as well.

Reading instruction in the bilingual classroom was provided during both whole group and small group instruction. Reading lessons observed during
whole group instruction focused on reading comprehension and on the identification of reading skills. For example, students were observed working on a reading worksheet for the story they had read previously. The worksheet had questions, which asked the students to identify, What happened in the story?, and What did the main characters do? Below these two questions the worksheet had the following directions written on it: Identify the similes in the story, and Identify the metaphors in the story. The teacher helped the students answer these questions by directing them to the appropriate pages in their basal readers where they would find the similes and the metaphors.

During small group English reading instruction the teacher focused on vocabulary building skills and pronunciation. He was observed explaining to students the difference between the words "on" and "in" and used the words in sentences to ensure student understanding, "You are sitting in the chair," and "The book is on the desk."

Students were observed writing to answer questions on a worksheet, to copy cursive letter writing from the board, to elaborate on their own what had been dictated to them from the teacher, and to generate their own thoughts and ideas about the possibility of an earth worm being alive after one week of existence in a jar.

**Literacy in the Dual Language Classroom**

A balanced literacy approach was evident in this classroom. The teacher conducted shared reading lessons for the purpose of focusing on student listening comprehension. Specifically, she posed higher order thinking
questions to stimulate discussion about the story she was reading. For example, she asked students to orally sequence a story. Students were also observed looking for and defining vocabulary words from the classroom word wall that were a part of the story the teacher shared with them.

Small group instruction was used to reinforce reading strategies and skills. For example, students were observed writing on white marker boards and sounding out words with dipthongs. The teacher was also observed taking a running record to determine a student's reading fluency level, while three other students practiced reading a previously read leveled reader on their own.

Center activities were used to reinforce literacy skills. For example, students at the listening center heard the story the teacher had read to the class on tape. Students at the social studies center read about Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and had a Venn diagram they filled out after they finished reading. Students at the classroom library developed their speaking skills through the utilization of puppets as they read books.

Students were observed writing to answer questions on language arts skill level worksheets, to learn spelling words, to copy sentence strips from a story the teacher had shared, to write vocabulary words that they would encounter in their leveled readers, for comparisons of two like persons, and for creative writing purposes. Displayed in the hallway was the following student's writing inside of a construction paper heart:

One day I was kind to my friend Daniela. Daniela went to my house to play tag in the backyard with me and my sister. When I was it, I touched
Daniela then she fell down. Then I helped her get up and I said “I'm sorry.”

During an interview the teacher shared that language arts instruction always takes place in the morning and math and science instruction takes place in the afternoon. The language of instruction changes every two weeks. For example during the first two weeks in the month of February, language arts instruction was conducted in Spanish and math and science instruction was conducted in English. During the last two weeks in the month of February, language arts instruction was conducted in English and math and science instruction was conducted in Spanish.

Grade Level Reading Ability

The following section addresses students' grade level reading ability for students participating in the structured immersion program and in the dual language program. The levels are reported in the following manner; the first number represents the grade level the student is able to read at, and the second number represents the month within the grade level the student is reading at.

For the bilingual classroom, the teacher stated during an interview that 84% of his students were reading between a 2.0 and a 2.5 reading level in Spanish and 16% were between a 1.5 and a 2.5 reading level in Spanish. He also stated 42% of the students were being taught to read in English as well. He was unable to provide any concrete data the researcher could examine.
TABLE 24  Structured Immersion Reading Grade Level Ability;

Grade Level Grade Level Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data displayed on Table 24 were collected from the Accelerated Reader computer generated tests (See Appendix D). At the time the data were generated the students were in the eighth month of their second grade year. The scores for English reading are reflective of students who took the test independently without any support from the teacher.

As displayed in Table 24, the students in the Structured Immersion class were five months behind in Spanish reading and nine months behind in English reading.

During an interview with the structured immersion teacher and as documented in the field notes, she commented that 68% of her students had high native oral language skills and the balanced literacy strategies she incorporated into her instruction increased their reading levels. The other 32% of the students had limited skills in Spanish and came from homes in which the parents were illiterate in their native Spanish language; therefore making it difficult for the students to receive literacy reinforcement at home.
Table 25 displays grade level scores for the dual language program students based on teacher-administered individual guided reading assessments. At the time the data were collected the students were in the sixth month of their second grade school year.

As shown in Table 25 students were two months behind in Spanish reading and five months behind in English reading.

During an interview with the dual language teacher she stated they had started transitioning Spanish dominant students into English guided reading mid year. Additionally, she stated that Spanish speaking dominant students were about two guided reading levels behind in English reading, and English speaking dominant students were one level behind in Spanish reading.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Grade Level Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Grade Level Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The data cited in Table 26 indicated that English speaking dominant students in the dual language program classroom actually showed a three-month grade level advancement in English reading. In Spanish reading, English dominant students were only two months behind.

**TABLE 27 Dual Language Grade Level Scores; Spanish Speaking Dominant Students; 2.6 Grade Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Grade Level Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data cited in Table 27 revealed that Spanish speaking dominant students in the dual language program classroom were three months behind in Spanish reading and seven months behind in English reading.

Guided English reading instruction for the Spanish speaking dominant students had started in the classroom mid year, previously all guided reading instruction had been conducted only in the Spanish language.

Overall, students participating in the structured immersion program who were all Spanish dominant students were found to be reading two months behind the Spanish dominant students in the dual language program in both Spanish and in English.

The English dominant students in the dual language program were reading above grade level in their native language and only two months behind in their second language. The English dominant students were reading five months
ahead in their second language as compared to their Spanish dominant peers reading in their second language.

**Oral Proficiency Levels**

Lindholm (1992) refers to research studies, which suggest the best predictor of English reading achievement was English language achievement followed by oral English proficiency. Spanish reading was correlated with English reading but it was not the best predictor. The following two tables display entry level data and data after one year of instruction based on students' English language proficiency across all three-program models. The data is listed in percent of students identified in the following three categories, non-English proficient, limited English proficient, and fluent English proficient.
Students participating in the structured immersion and in the dual language program had very similar entry-level Language Assessment Scales (LAS) test proficiency designations. The bilingual program had 22% more students designated as non-English proficient students than the structured immersion and the dual language program.
TABLE 29 Differences between Entry Level LAS Scores and After One Year of Instruction LAS Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non English Proficient</th>
<th>Limited English Proficient</th>
<th>Fluent English Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>-0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Immersion</td>
<td>-0%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After one year of instruction students participating in the dual language program made substantial gains in English oral proficiency. Specifically, there were 44% less students classified as non-English proficient and 29% more students classified as limited English proficient. Also, there were 15% more students classified as fluent English proficient.

The following table displays data according to students' Spanish oral language proficiency level.

TABLE 30 Spanish Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non Spanish Proficient</th>
<th>Limited Spanish Proficient</th>
<th>Fluent Spanish Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The bilingual and the dual language percentages are reflective of entry-level Pre-Las scores. As criteria for entering into the dual language program students demonstrated Spanish fluent oral proficiency on the Pre-Las. Students in the structured immersion program are not administered Spanish assessments.

**Research Question #4**

How do social interaction processes during a dual language program lead to greater emergent literacy skills?

Faltis in the Joinfostering Framework (1997) describes the classroom as a place where students are constantly engaged in interactions with both their teachers and their peers for the purpose of taking pleasure in using their intellect by participating in thought-demanding lessons. Furthermore, he states there needs to be a balance between the teachers and the students control of these interactions.

The dual language program teachers generated a greater number of teacher-student interaction techniques. Specifically, in the area of two-way communication exchanges, the teachers and the students demonstrated a balanced control of these types of interactions. The dual language program teachers also provided students a greater number of opportunities for control of turn taking and topic control. Au & Mason (1981) state that within any social context of classroom learning, a balance of rights of participation occurs when neither the teacher, nor the students control more than two dimensions at any one time (See Appendix G).
Resnick (1985) identified dialogue as the result of students contributing to the conversation what they can and the teacher providing the rest of the dialogue. Two ways students enter into a dialogue is by initiating conversations themselves or by the teacher orienting them to a particular topic that they will pursue further. The dual language teachers provided students the greatest number of opportunities for dialogue. Specifically, they were observed orienting the students to establish interpersonal connections and contextual foundations. For example, during a shared reading lesson, students established a contextual foundation to a story by predicting what they thought would happen in the story before the teacher read the story to them. At the end of the story the teacher had the students determine if their original predictions had been correct.

Faltis (1997) identifies language being utilized by teachers as a motivator for students to gain their interest about topics as well as elicit and evaluate students exchanges, then regulate student behavior during the lessons. Taking notice of the language of content instruction requires an understanding of the kinds of language teachers use for content instruction, the kinds of knowledge structures that underlie content instruction, and the kinds of language students use to make sense of the content. The dual language teachers provided students with extra linguistic supports to ensure they understood the concepts being taught. During an interview with both teachers, they agreed that their students provided paraverbal support for their fellow peers in their language of dominance.
Student-Peer Social Interactions

In the observed dual language program classroom, students sat in cooperative groups heterogeneously based on language proficiency. This physical arrangement of student desks allowed for student interactions with their team members. The students socialized in both languages and interacted academically in both languages.

An English dominant student was observed socializing with her team members based on the receiving students language of dominance. During center activities conducted in Spanish, the Spanish dominant students helped the English dominant students and during center activities conducted in English, the English dominant students helped the Spanish dominant students. For example, a Spanish dominant student was observed reading a social studies worksheet with information about Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln in Spanish to an English dominant student.

In both the observed bilingual and structured immersion classrooms all of the students were English language learners. In both classrooms academic interactions in English among students were not observed. The only social interactions in English observed were in the bilingual classroom and they were limited.

Most of the social and academic interactions among the students took place in Spanish in both of these program types.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was three fold. First, it was to collect information regarding the essential elements in order to implement a successful dual language program. This was accomplished by examining seventy-eight surveys distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics to schools, which were implementing 50/50 dual language programs. The survey respondents listed the most important factors they thought were needed for the implementation of a dual language program. The researcher categorized the important factors listed on the surveys under each of the key features identified by Lindholm (2000) as critical for the implementation of dual language programs. The researcher correlated these findings with the interviews and classroom observations conducted at the dual language school.

Second, the researcher observed in three different types of program model classrooms situated in the state of Texas to determine if different social interaction opportunities existed within each program model. The Faltis (1997) Joinfostering Framework was utilized for the purposes of data analysis for teacher-student interactions. Information documented in the field notes was utilized for analysis of student-peer interactions.
the key features and their practical application as determined by the literature review, and the survey respondents.

Below is a description of the essential elements for a comprehensive 50/50 dual language program and their implementation based on the literature review, survey respondents, interviews and classroom observations recommended by the researcher:

**Instructional Design of the Program**

The instructional design of the program needs to be based on providing students a challenging curriculum with an emphasis on bi-literacy and bi-culturalism. The teachers in the dual language program attended training on differentiating curriculum for the gifted and talented students; therefore they delivered their instruction based on the strategies they acquired at this training.

The program teachers need to ensure that both the languages being used for instruction are given an equal value; therefore 50% of the instruction should be in English and 50% of the instruction in the non-English language. The dual language teacher mentioned the need to emphasize the non-English language.

Instructional lessons should focus on challenging students to attain higher-level concepts. For example, program teachers should be engaged in asking students a greater number of higher-order level thinking questions than lower-order questions. These higher-order level questions will engage students in thought provoking instruction. As evidenced during the classroom observations across all three programs, the teachers asked a greater amount of lower-order thinking questions than higher-level order; although the dual language teacher
Third, the researcher collected Language Assessment Scale English and Spanish oral language proficiency data and grade level reading assessment data.

The schools included in this study served a similar population of students. The observed students were mostly recent or first-generation Hispanic immigrants where Spanish was the language spoken in their households. The English dominant students in the dual language program were second-generation Hispanic students who spoke English in their households.

The limitations of the study were based on the number of opportunities observed during each lesson for the teacher-student interaction techniques and student-peer interactions.

Discussion of Results

Research Question #1

What are the essential elements of a comprehensive dual language program and how are they being implemented?

The order in which the literature presented the key features was different from a practical application aspect as recorded in the surveys examined and distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The interviews conducted with both the dual language program administrator and the teacher confirmed the data collected from the surveys. The interviewees offered similar responses for the key features and their practical application as determined by the literature review, and the survey respondents.
Throughout the lessons, teachers also need to emphasize their own use and students' use of academic language during interactions. According to Lindholm (2001), there are two reasons why students need stimulating language input. First, it will facilitate continued development of language structure and skills. Second, when students are instructed in their first language, the content of their lessons become more comprehensible when they are presented with similar content in the second language. As observed during language arts instruction in Spanish the teacher frequently utilized the academic Spanish vocabulary.

Language arts instruction that is integrated with the academic curriculum and is provided in both English and in the non-English language is another key component of the instructional design of a dual language program. It is important to utilize a language arts curriculum that specifies which linguistic structures should be mastered and how these linguistic structures need to be incorporated into the academic content (Lindholm, 2001).

**Program Configuration**

A 50/50 balance of English speakers to non-English speakers is the most desirable ratio of students to have in the program. This balance promotes social and academic interactions in both languages of instruction. If this balance is difficult to attain, then there should be no more than two speakers of one language to one speaker of the other language.

As noted in the researcher's field notes this balance of students allowed for both social and academic student interactions to occur in both languages.
High Quality Personnel

Teachers in dual language programs should be qualified by having the appropriate credentials, a strong knowledge of teaching integrated content, effective classroom management skills, and training in the language education model and in appropriate instructional strategies. They should also possess native-or native like proficiency in their assigned language of instruction. The observed Spanish-speaking teacher in the dual language program was both linguistically and academically fluent in Spanish.

Parent Involvement

The parents involved in the program must truly embrace the concepts of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and biculturalism. They need to be able to support their children as they are acquiring their second language. This support may take the form of displaying a positive attitude towards the second language their children are acquiring.

As expressed by both the dual language administrator and the teacher interviewed by the researcher, dual language programs tend to have higher parent involvement. This may be due to the fact that parents have a choice to select the program and the program is presented to them as an enrichment program.
Positive School Climate

It is essential for everyone in the school to have an understanding of the dual language program; this knowledge will develop support for the program among the staff, which will then facilitate parent and community support.

The administrator and the teachers in the dual language program stated they showcased the program and presented the program to the new staff and parents at the beginning of every school year. The teacher also mentioned that the program teachers were integrated into the school and were not looked upon as a separate entity. She met with her grade level colleagues on a weekly basis and then met with the other dual language teachers on a monthly basis.

Administrative Support and Leadership

Administrative support is key to the effective implementation of any program. As expressed by the dual language administrator during an interview with the researcher, the administrator must be willing to plan and set goals for the program along with the staff. They must also provide funding for resources and teacher training in order to ensure effective implementation of the program.

A supportive principal assures the language education program is integrated within the total school, that all teachers and staff understand the language education program, and an appropriate and equitable amount of financial and instructional resources is allocated to the program (Cortes, 1986: Troike, 1986).
Pre-Service/Inservice Training

The dual language program teachers need to be provided a comprehensive professional development program. The following is a list of necessary pre-service/inservice trainings:

1. dual language education model including bilingual and immersion research and theory
2. language acquisition theory
3. instructional strategies in language acquisition theory
4. multicultural and equity training
5. cooperative learning
6. differentiated instruction - gifted and talented training
7. integrating curriculum through language arts
8. constructivist approach to teaching

The elements in the Faltis Jointfostering Framework (1997) and the surveys distributed by the Center for Applied Linguistics demonstrated the practical application of the seven key features for the successful implementation of a dual language program identified by Lindholm (2000) in the literature review. The practical application of each key feature is necessary in order to ensure the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy are met within the context of a dual language program.
Research Question #2

What are the differences in social interaction opportunities in dual language, bilingual, and structured English immersion programs?

Teacher-Student Interactions

A review of the literature proposed a framework that consisted of principles to ensure meaningful teacher-student interactions organized around the concept of Joinfostering (Faltis, 1997). Specifically, teacher-student interactions within this framework focus on two-way communication exchanges (Enright & McCluskey, 1998), dialogue strategies (Tough, 1985), balance of rights of participation (Au & Mason, 1981), and the use of extra linguistic supports, which facilitate second language acquisition (Faltis, 1997).

The question for the researcher became to what extent were these meaningful interactions utilized during instruction within the three different program models. The answer to this question began to emerge during the analysis of the data. The researcher documented the similarities between the strategies used by the observed teachers and those outlined by Faltis (1997), in his framework for a jointfostering classroom.

Under the category of Two Way Communication Exchanges, the categories were subdivided into ask a question-call on a student, ask a question-students bid for the floor, ask a question-any student can answer, ask a question-the entire class responds, and ask a question-students take turns responding.

Faltis (1997) maintained that during a high incidence of two-way communication exchanges between the teachers and the students, the teachers
are constantly negotiating for meaning and students become generators of their own knowledge and understanding. Therefore, in language acquisition classrooms teachers need to be trained in providing students extra linguistic supports to ensure students understand the concepts being taught.

Across the three cases in this study, more two-way communication exchanges in the dual language program classroom were observed than in the bilingual classroom and the structured immersion classroom as noted in the researchers field notes. Specifically, there were greater incidences of the teacher calling on a student, and students taking turns to respond. The first technique of calling on a student is teacher controlled and the second technique of students taking turns to respond is student controlled; therefore a balance of teacher and student controlled exchanges were observed during the instruction in the dual language program classroom.

Faltis in the Joinfostering Framework (1997) acknowledges the need for a balance between teacher and students communication exchanges. This balance allows for both the teachers and the students to be the generators of information within the classroom setting.

**Balance of Rights of Participation**

Under the Balance of Rights of Participation teacher-student interaction technique, the categories were subdivided into control of turn taking, control of topic, and control of talk. The category control of turn taking was further divided into teacher control of the turn taking and student control of the turn taking.
Au and Mason (1981) identified control of turn taking as the teacher allowing more than one student to speak contemporaneously, rather than limiting the floor to one student at a time. Control of topic is when the students are allowed to dictate the topic to be studied, discussed or written about, rather than insisting that they stay on a prescribed topic. Control of talk is when teachers allow students to talk among themselves and to write for a variety of audiences, rather than insisting they address their talk and written work only to the teacher.

In the structured immersion class the turn taking was in the form of students calling out answers simultaneously to questions posed by the teacher.

In the bilingual classroom, due to the teacher's direct style of teaching, he would pose questions then students would respond. Therefore, the teacher kept the control over the topic being discussed and controlled most of the student talk as well.

In the dual language program classroom there were a greater number of student control of turn taking, and control of topic opportunities noted in the researcher's field notes than in the bilingual or the structured immersion classroom.

The teachers in the dual language program allowed for students to take control of turn taking by posing a question then allowing a student to answer and by not responding immediately to whether the student had answered correctly, instead she would wait, state "hmmm" and another student would offer an elaboration to the first student's answer or offer a completely different answer. For example during a shared reading lesson, students were asked to predict by looking at the cover of the story what they thought would happen in the story.
Students offered a variety of responses all based on the characters shown on the cover. This strategy of not responding to a student's answer immediately allowed for others to continue their thinking processes.

All three of the observed program models had the same number of opportunities for student control of the talk. Therefore, students were afforded similar opportunities for talking amongst themselves for academic purposes during both small group and whole group instruction. The differences were noted in the type of languages utilized during these interactions. Specifically, the bilingual and the structured immersion students utilized Spanish and the dual language students utilized both Spanish and English.

Au & Mason (1981) state that within any social context of classroom learning, a balance of rights of participation occurs when neither the teacher nor the students control more than two dimensions at one time. This indicates the importance of having students actively participating along with the teacher during classroom instruction.

**Dialogue Strategies**

Tough (1985) identified five dialogue strategies. The first strategy is orienting the student to establish an interpersonal and contextual foundation from which the dialogue can unfold. The second strategy is enabling students to generate long and short exchanges by posing a variety of questions. The third strategy is informing which is providing new content information to students and giving corrective language information. The fourth strategy is sustaining the students' interactions by having teachers encourage the students to continue
talking and letting them know the teachers are interested in what they are saying. The fifth and final strategy is concluding with a statement made by the teacher to the students so they become aware that a conversation is about to end.

The structured immersion teacher provided students with a greater number of opportunities in the dialogue strategy of enabling. She did pose a variety of questions to generate long and short exchanges, but her questions were mostly lower order questions especially during instruction in English.

The bilingual teacher provided students with a greater number of opportunities in the dialogue strategies of informing and sustaining. He displayed a teacher-directed instructional style of teaching. Therefore, he tended to be the provider of information during the lessons.

The dual language program teachers offered a greater number of opportunities for dialogue strategies during classroom instruction than the other program teachers. Specifically, they offered more opportunities in orienting, questioning using higher order level questions and in concluding strategies. For example, they were observed providing the students interpersonal and contextual foundations by establishing these types of connections at the beginning of their lessons to set the stage for learning.

The dual language program teachers also asked a greater number of higher order level thinking questions. Throughout their instruction they also demonstrated use of academic language. For example, instead of asking students to identify the opposite of tall, students were asked the following question; "What is the antonym of tall?"
Dialogue strategies allow conversations between teachers and students to unfold for the purposes of establishing interpersonal and contextual foundations, enabling students to generate long and short exchanges, informing by providing new content information, and sustaining student interactions. All of these types of strategies allow students to enhance their thinking abilities. Therefore, a classroom with greater opportunities for these types of strategies is a classroom in which the students are using higher order thinking skills during instruction.

**Extra Linguistic Support**

Faltis (1997) identified three types of language support systems that must be in place in order for students to understand the language of content. The first system was identified as paraverbal support which has to do with the way sounds are emphasized and utilized and with the manner in which teachers change the pace of their speech as they invite students to participate in the lessons. The second system was identified as nonverbal support, which involves the use of gestures and facial expressions to illustrate meanings of concepts, notions, and actions. The third system is visual and sensory support, which encourages the use of visual aides for organizing and displaying content information.

The structured immersion teacher only utilized these support systems to a minimal extent. In a structured immersion classroom the English instruction is conducted as it would be in a mainstream classroom; therefore resulting in the minimal use of extra linguistic supports.

The bilingual teacher demonstrated a use of extra linguistic support systems during his instruction. During the bilingual teacher’s interview with the
researcher he stated the need for his students to acquire correct Spanish and English language pronunciations. He focused on providing students with this type of support along with nonverbal and visual throughout the observed lessons.

The dual language teachers offered a greater number of paraverbal support throughout their lessons. The teachers during an interview with the researcher stated the students in the program also provided paraverbal support to their peers by serving as linguistic role models.

Overall, a greater number of teacher student interaction techniques were noted in the dual language program than in the bilingual or structured immersion program. Student-teacher interaction techniques as described by the Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) allow for the stimulation of student thinking and students become the generators of their own knowledge.

**Student-Peer Interactions**

According to Allport (1954) in the literature review, four factors that are all core conditions for improving student interactions and relationships and maximizing the achievement of minority and majority students are identified. The first factor is providing equal status in the classroom among language minority and language majority students. The second factor is to ensure students work interdependently on tasks with common objectives. The third factor is students are given the opportunity to interact socially within the classroom setting. The fourth and final factor is that the administration and the teachers are supportive in allowing language majority and language minority students to socialize.
More recently the research has noted that language majority and language minority students benefit from an additive bilingual environment and develop in a social context in which both languages and cultures are equally valued and all students are treated equally (Lindholm, 1992).

In the observed dual language program 50% of the instruction was conducted in English and 50% of the instruction was conducted in Spanish. As noted in the researchers field notes the students in the dual language program were the only students who utilized both the English and Spanish languages for social and academic interactions. Students in this program classroom spent a great deal of time working cooperatively in heterogeneous groups apart from the teacher, where opportunities for student-peer interactions were greater than in the observed structured immersion or bilingual classrooms. The advantage observed was that each group of students had dominant English speakers and dominant Spanish speakers; therefore both groups of students helped each other on assigned tasks and both languages were utilized for social and academic exchanges. This is the crucial element of successful implementation of a dual language program.

The students in the bilingual classroom utilized both social and academic Spanish during their interactions with their peers, but did not utilize academic English during any of the observed interactions.

All of the students in the bilingual program were English language learners. Most of the instruction was conducted in Spanish, except for a small group reading lesson conducted in English where the teacher was observed using Spanish for clarification of concepts. The minimal amount of English
academic instruction provided to students in the bilingual classroom may be why students were not observed interacting academically in English. This is a major drawback of the bilingual classroom because if students are not exposed to academic English instruction they obviously will be limited in their academic English proficiency.

All of the students observed in the structured immersion classroom were English language learners. The teacher in the classroom during an interview with the researcher stated that most of her students were receiving one hundred twenty minutes of academic instruction in Spanish because they were still non-English proficient even though they had been attending this type of program since Kindergarten. The students received two hundred and sixty minutes of academic instruction in the English language. During all observations, the students interacted with each other in Spanish for both social and academic purposes. The researcher asked the teacher why they did not interact in English. She responded the students felt more comfortable interacting in their native language with each other because they were afraid other students in the classroom and in the school would make fun of their English pronunciation. During a math calendar activity observation, students chorally counted by tens and indeed had pronunciation errors. They stated, "seesty, seventy, eity."

Certainly, the fact that there were no English dominant students to serve as role models attributed to their pronunciation deficiency.

The question one must ask is "Why if these students are receiving two thirds of their instruction in English are they still interacting in Spanish?"
Obviously, structured immersion classroom instruction is not working well enough to make them linguistically and academically proficient in English.

In dual language programs minority children are no longer segregated from their English-speaking peers; therefore ending the linguistic isolation in which many minority children find themselves (Valdes, 1997). Students in the dual language program have been together since kindergarten. This allows them more opportunities to understanding each other. According to Vygotsky (1978) learners receive assistance through social interaction with significant others before individual meaning can take place.

**Research Question #3**

If different social interaction opportunities exist in a single model what is the impact on emergent literacy skills?

The dual language program had the greatest amount of teacher-student interactions. The students in the dual language program were the only students who were observed engaged in social and academic student-peer interactions in both English and in Spanish. Studies suggest that, when minority and majority students work independently on school tasks with common objectives, students’ expectations and attitudes toward each other become more positive and their academic achievement improves (Cohen, 1994).

**Literacy Skills Data**

The Spanish dominant students in the dual language program were ahead two months in both Spanish and English reading skills than the students in the
structured immersion program. During an interview with the dual language program teacher she stated they had just transitioned their Spanish dominant students to English guided reading instruction mid year.

The English dominant students showed the greatest progress in literacy skills in both their native and in their second language. Specifically, they demonstrated a three-month grade level advancement in English reading and near grade level reading in their second language.

Why would an English dominant student show the greatest amount of progress in a dual language program, when only half of the instruction is being provided in English? The answer to this question is simply students are being challenged by having to learn academic content in two languages. It is obvious the students are able to meet this challenge.

**English Oral Skills**

After only one year of instruction students participating in the dual language program made significant gains in English oral proficiency. Specifically, there were 44% less students classified as non-English proficient and 29% more students classified as limited English proficient. Also, there were 15% more students classified as fluent English proficient.

**Spanish Oral Skills**

The dual language program had a greater amount of their Spanish dominant students classified as fluent Spanish proficient as this was a criteria for student enrollment into the program. The structured immersion program had
69% Spanish proficient students and the bilingual program had 53% Spanish proficient students.

The Spanish dominant students in the dual language program had a greater oral language proficiency in their native language than the students in the structured immersion or bilingual program. This may be one reason for such a significant increase in the Spanish dominant students' English oral language proficiency after only one year of instruction in the dual language program.

The dual language program provided the Spanish dominant students who came with fluent oral Spanish skills the ability to begin their academic work in the language they spoke and understood. They developed what Cummins (1979) referred to as "cognitive academic proficiency" in their first language. This proficiency forms the basis for the acquisition of higher order academic skills in a second language as well.

As documented in the literature and according to cognitive research and theory in language acquisition, the best way for students to learn English and gain access to the high level of proficiency needed for upper-intermediate and secondary instruction, is for them to attain initial mastery in their home language before addressing literacy in English (Krashen & Biber, 1998; Krashen, 1996; Willig, 1985). The conceptual base developed through the medium of a child's first language facilitates later learning in English so children with a home language other than English are able to attain similar access to education as their English speaking peers (Krashen, 1996; Beykont, 1994).
Research Question #4

How do social interaction processes during a dual language program lead to greater emergent literacy skills?

In Vygotsky's (1978) view, learning is a "social occurrence that can be fostered when teaching is focused on the learner's zone of proximal development." Literacy develops best through social interaction and dialogue with others; therefore teachers need to support students' learning through collaborative means. Specifically, teachers shift from asking predetermined questions designed to ensure students arrive at the "right" meaning to facilitating conversations that encourage students' exploratory talk as they arrive at a deeper meaning (Gavelek & Raphael, 1996).

The teachers in the dual language program provided students a greater number of opportunities for teacher-student interaction techniques. These techniques were utilized to encourage collaborative dialogue and enhance student thinking. For example, during a shared reading lesson the teacher asked students if they thought exchanging corn for carrots was a fair trade.

Student interactions with other peers in a wide variety of settings are an essential part of students' language and literacy learning. In fact, classroom studies show the amount of breadth of students' reading is strongly related to social interaction as well as strategy teaching (Guthrie, Schafer, Wang, and Afflerbach, 1995).

In a dual language program language majority and language minority students are integrated for instruction and grouped heterogeneously according to language dominance. Both groups of students serve as first language role...
models and second language learners; this allows students opportunities for interaction in both languages of instruction.

In dual language program classrooms, cooperative learning management structures are utilized, which also allow students to interact both socially and academically in both languages of instruction. It is within these structures that students motivate each other to succeed by ensuring that all of their team members are engaged in the assigned task.

The students in the dual language program have also been together since kindergarten therefore eliminating any fears or inhibitions about their pronunciation of either language. In fact, during the interview with the dual language program teacher she commented that students help each other with the correct pronunciation. The teacher in the dual language program does not become the only role model for the students' second language as in the bilingual and structured immersion classrooms.

CONCLUSIONS

This study identified the following list of essential elements necessary for the successful implementation of a dual language program:

1. A challenging curriculum with a focus on bilingualism, bi-literacy and bi-culturalism.
2. Teachers in the program need to emphasize the non-English language.
3. Teachers need to utilize academic language during instruction.
4. Students must also be encouraged to use academic language during their interactions with the teacher and amongst themselves.

5. Students are provided with language arts instruction that is integrated with the academic curriculum and is delivered in both English and the non-English languages.

6. A 50/50 balance of English and non-English language speakers participating in the program is important.

7. Teachers need to have native or native-like fluency in the assigned language of instruction.

8. Parents who enroll their children in the program must truly embrace the concepts of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and bi-culturalism.

9. Everyone at the school must have an understanding of the dual language program education model.

10. The dual language program administrator must be willing to provide funding for resources and teacher training.

11. The dual language teachers need to have pre-service/inservice training in the areas of bilingual, immersion, and language acquisition theory, integrating the curriculum through language arts, and cooperative learning.

Five out of the eleven essential elements for the implementation of a comprehensive dual language program are specific to this type of program. Six elements can be incorporated into any other type of program model to ensure students are being afforded a successful educational experience.
This study also showed the importance of having both language minority
and language majority students integrated for classroom instruction to promote
both social and academic interactions in two languages. Additionally, students in
dual language programs are able to manipulate two language systems as
evidenced by their peer interactions as documented in the researchers field
notes.

The students in the dual language program have been together since
kindergarten; therefore they feel at ease with each other and do not display any
inhibitions about speaking in their second language. They also continuously
motivate each other and acknowledge the fact they are all first language role
models and second language learners.

Obviously, the future of these bilingual and bi-literate students will have
been broadened by the plain fact of having participated in a dual language
program.

So, therefore, if we have a program that provides students with the ability
to speak, read, and write in two languages, that promotes cooperative learning,
gives students high challenges that must be met, and creates in them a sense of
pride, then why do we continue to permeate programs in which children only
acquire linguistic and academic proficiency in one language?

As documented in the researchers field notes a student in the dual
language classroom felt the need to communicate the following statement to the
researcher, "Some of us are learning Spanish, and some of us are learning
English."
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study provides a preliminary analysis of the impact teacher-student and student-peer interactions have on emergent literacy skills. Further research can be conducted to expand this study's findings.

More research can be conducted on determining the impact of dual language programs on English dominant students' academic achievement to validate these studies findings that the English dominant students had greater literacy skills in both their native and in their second language than the Spanish dominant students.

Conduct further research in intermediate classrooms where dual language programs are being implemented successfully to determine both English dominant and Spanish dominant student levels of academic achievement.

Conduct a longitudinal study which tracks students from kindergarten through middle school to determine the impact of becoming bilingual and biliterate on student achievement.

Conduct research on the differences in student achievement of those that have been together since kindergarten and those that have been assigned to a different group of students every school year.
APPENDIX A

KEY FEATURES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Category 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature A</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature B</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td>Value 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature C</td>
<td>Value 7</td>
<td>Value 8</td>
<td>Value 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(repeat for each feature)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin. Support and Leadership</th>
<th>Positive School Environment</th>
<th>High Quality Instructional Personnel</th>
<th>Pre-Service/Inservice Training</th>
<th>Instructional Design of the Program</th>
<th>Program Configuration</th>
<th>Parent Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District and Board Support</td>
<td>Staff support</td>
<td>Qualified dedicated staff</td>
<td>Comprehensive Professional Development Program</td>
<td>Research based program</td>
<td>Common vision of bilingualism</td>
<td>Supportive involved community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>Communication between teachers, parents, adm., and students</td>
<td>Teacher ownership</td>
<td>Program staff meet on a regular basis to discuss issues and decision making</td>
<td>Planning Time</td>
<td>Integrated into the District program</td>
<td>Strong links to business partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support through grant funding</td>
<td>Teacher enthusiasm</td>
<td>Fluent speaking Spanish teachers</td>
<td>Visioning exercises involving staff input</td>
<td>Content based instruction</td>
<td>Students together since Kindergarten</td>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building level commitment</td>
<td>Philosophy all children can learn regardless of language</td>
<td>Dedicated and committed teachers</td>
<td>Study groups to discuss research</td>
<td>Students willingness to learn two languages</td>
<td>50/50 balance of students</td>
<td>Partnerships with Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff unity</td>
<td>Teacher collaboration and teamwork</td>
<td>Strong literature component</td>
<td>Peer models</td>
<td>Parent Interest and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource teacher support</td>
<td>A linguistically sensitive and child centered philosophy</td>
<td>Classroom Aides</td>
<td>Parent Choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Support and Leadership</td>
<td>Positive School Environment</td>
<td>High Quality Instructional Personnel</td>
<td>Pre-Service/Inservice Training</td>
<td>Instructional Design of the Program</td>
<td>Program Configuration.</td>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard work of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equivalent materials in both languages</td>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment of all teachers for language acquisition</td>
<td>Use of cooperative groups</td>
<td>Significant number of native English std.</td>
<td>Ongoing education of the public on program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>Motivated Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility in program design</td>
<td>Interaction of minority and majority language students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following interview questions related to the essential elements for a comprehensive dual language program were asked during an interview with the dual language program site administrator:

Questions for the Administrator

1. How do you display your support for the dual language program at your school?
2. How did you build community support for the dual language program? How do you maintain this support?
3. How do you integrate the dual language program into the total school to ensure your whole staff has buy-in into the program?
4. What pre-service/inservice trainings have you provided for your teachers? How often have you provided these trainings?
5. What criteria did you utilize to select the teachers for the dual language program?

The following is a list of questions that were asked during an interview with the dual language program teachers:

Questions for the Program Teacher

1. What is the instructional design of your dual language program?
2. What about the program configuration allows for student success in these types of programs?
3. How have the dual language program trainings impacted your teaching?

4. What instructional strategies must a teacher possess in order to have a successful dual language program?

5. Name support systems that need to be in place in order to implement a successful dual language program.

6. In what ways do you collaborate with other staff members?

7. How do you motivate your students to acquire their second language?

8. What social interaction opportunities do you provide for your students? What language do they utilize during these interactions?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following were interview questions posed to the observed structured immersion, bilingual and dual language program teachers to gain further insight on the observed students' literacy skills:

1. How do you monitor student progress in their literacy skills?

2. What impact do you believe student-peer interactions have on students' literacy skills?

3. Why did you decide to teach literacy in the students' native language first? (If this is not the case, then ask) Why did you decide to teach literacy simultaneously in both the students' native and second language?

4. Tell me in general terms the literacy progress of the following students in your classroom:
   - Language minority students high in oral skills in their native language
   - Language minority students low in oral skills in their native language
   - Language majority students high in oral skills in their native language
   - Language minority students low in oral skills in their native language

5. What is your literacy goal for your students in their second language?
APPENDIX D

TABLE 1
Structured Immersion Students Grade Level Reading Scores
Accelerated Reader Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This group of students' scores was tabulated on 4/02/03. At grade level performance would be 2.8.
TABLE 2

Dual Language Students Grade Level Guided Reading Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This group of students' scores was tabulated on 2/20/03. At grade level performance would be 2.6.*
APPENDIX E

TABLE 1

Structured Immersion Students English Oral Proficiency Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Level</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
<th>Level After 1 year of instruction</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student # 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Levels and Designations are based on Language Assessment Scale (LAS) English oral proficiency test.

Level 1 = Non-English Speaker
Level 2 = Limited English Speaker
Level 3 = Limited English Speaker
Level 4 = Fluent English Speaker
Level 5 = Fluent English Speaker
TABLE 2

Bilingual Students English Oral Proficiency Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Entry Level</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
<th>Level After 1 year of instruction</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student # 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Levels and Designations are based on Language Assessment Scale (LAS) English oral proficiency test.

Level 1 = Non-English Speaker  
Level 2 = Limited English Speaker  
Level 3 = Limited English Speaker  
Level 4 = Fluent English Speaker  
Level 5 = Fluent English Speaker
### TABLE 3

Dual Language Students English Oral Proficiency Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Entry Level</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
<th>After 1 year of instruction</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student # 25</th>
<th>Entry Level</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
<th>After 1 year of instruction</th>
<th>Fluency Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non – English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non – English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student # 27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Levels and Designations are based on Language Assessment Scale (LAS) English oral proficiency test.

Level 1 = Non- English Speaker
Level 2 = Limited English Speaker
Level 3 = Limited English Speaker
Level 4 = Fluent English Speaker
Level 5 = Fluent English Speaker
APPENDIX F

TWO WAY COMMUNICATION EXCHANGE FIELD NOTE OBSERVATION DATA

The following field note observation data related to Two Way Communication exchanges were noted as follows:

(o) ask a question – call on a student
(+) ask a question – students bid for the floor
(x) ask a question – any student can answer
(-) ask a question – entire class responds
(u) ask a question – students take turns responding

Bilingual - Integrated Language Arts/Science Lesson

(-) Students read the first direction chorally
(-) Students read their notes aloud
(-) Students counted aloud chorally by two’s, three’s, and fives forwards and backwards
(-) Students responded in unison they had counted forward and backwards by two’s, three’s and five’s as they mixed the ingredients
(-) Students counted chorally forward and backwards
(x) A student replied it was 32 degrees
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Dual Language model – Language Arts lesson

(+) Teacher called on students who were raising their hands to give examples of antonyms

(+) Teacher called on a student who was raising her hand and who responded sunny

(x) A student called out an answer and stated the antonym for up was down

(x) Several students called out and defined antonyms to mean opposite words

(x) A student called out the response alphabet.

(-) Students in unison responded they needed to look at the beginning letter in order to determine alphabetical order

(-) Students orally in unison placed words in alphabetical order

(x) A student described a jabali

(-) Students responded chorally in alphabetical order

(-) Students responded in unison they needed to write their names, write the date, write the time and read the directions

Dual Language model – Shared Reading lesson

(x) Student called out and he stated he thought the little girl was going to find a dog

(+ ) Students raised their hands, were called on and described the cover

(x) A student called out 12

(x) A student called out they could sell the eggs to get the bananas

(x) Students called out that 2 dogs were kissing on the page
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Students answered in unison about where the little girl had stopped first then next.

Students responded chorally no when asked if they thought exchanging corn for carrots was fair.

Student was called on randomly to answer the question of what she thought the little girl and the grandmother would do to get their last ingredient which was a pollo. Student responded incorrectly by stating gallo.

Teacher closed the book and stated if she should continue reading the story. Students enthusiastically responded “yes”.

A student called out and suggested they tell the dog to steal the chicken.

Teacher asked students what the little girl had exchanged her backpack for, students responded in unison she had received a trompo and colored pencils.

She asked students sitting in the back of the room what grandpa and the little girl were doing in the kitchen. Students in the back answered in unison.

Teacher asked students recall facts and details questions and students responded aloud by turn taking.

Dual Language – Shared Reading, Centers

Students were called on randomly to state the title of the story

Students then responded in unison to state the title of the story
(+) Student raised her hand and was called on, she answered correctly and the students clapped

(o) A student was called on randomly and stated a capullo was a flower

(o) Teacher called on a student randomly who then asked his neighbor for help

(o) Student was called on randomly to read the words on the word wall that started with the letter L.

(o) She then called on students randomly to read the words on the word wall that started with the letters E, S, and P

(+) Students who were raising their hands were called on to read the words on the word wall chorally.

Bilingual – Whole Group Reading

(-) Students read the last question in unison

(-) Teacher asked on which page would they find the answer to the last question. Students answered in unison.

(-) Students echo read the directions after the teacher

(x) A student called out that vowels make up diphthongs

(x) A student stated that one of the vowels in a diphthong is always silent

(-) Students echo read the directions

(x) Teacher asked students how many similes they had found, a student stated 6

(-) Students echo read a simile about the sky looking like a glass
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Students answered in unison that the word *leon* started with an *i*

A student called out and stated *melon* had an accent on the *o*.

Another student then stated *leon* also needed an accent mark.

Students in unison stated they needed to look in a dictionary to determine where the accent marks should go.

Teacher continued writing letters in cursive and students called out words that began with the letters the teacher was writing.

**Bilingual- Small Group Guided Instruction**

Students in the red group repeat read after the teacher.

Student responded after he raised his hand and was called on “The Ugly Duckling”.

Students responded in unison.

**Structured Immersion Model – Shared Reading, Independent Writing**

Students responded in unison that Abraham Lincoln was the 16th President.

A student called out that it did not snow very often in El Paso.

A student called out and responded to the teacher’s question by stating Indiana.

A student called out and responded to the teacher’s question by stating Fall.

Students answered in unison because of the colors of the leaves.
Teacher asked what Abraham Lincoln liked to do, a student called out read.

Students called out and told the teacher moon in the picture.

Teacher asked who were the slaves, a student called out those who do not have money or food.

Teacher asked students if Lincoln and his wife had any girls. The students answered in unison "no."

A student showed the teacher on the globe, the country of India, the teacher stated Abraham Lincoln had moved to Indiana.

Teacher asked students if people liked slaves. The students nodded their heads.

A student called out and asked the teacher if an actor in English is an actor in Spanish.

Dual Language model- Language Arts, Guided Reading

Teacher called on students who raised their hands.

Students called out examples of synonyms and antonyms for the words she called out.

Students took turns responding to the different types of sentences they had learned about Guided Reading Group.

Students took turns spelling words aloud.

Teacher asked what combination of vowels did a word have, a student was called on randomly who tried to remember dipthong.
Teacher asked what was the diphthong in the word nuevo. Student called out ue.

Students responded in unison that a question mark is used after a question has been posed.

Structured Immersion – Shared Reading

Students responded in unison that the story had first been written in English.

Students responded in unison that the train also carried food.

A student called out that the tires on the train were flat.

Another student called out the railroad tracks were broken.

Students responded in unison they thought the trains would help the little engine.

Students responded in unison two trains had passed the little engine.

Structured Immersion – Whole Group Reading Lesson

A student called out buenos comienzos.

A student answered personajes.

A student answered anamotepeya.

A student answered sentimientos.

Students called out examples of personajes.

A student answered anamotepeya is a way a word sounds.

A student was called on randomly to define escenario.

A student was called on randomly to define sentimientos.
Students identified the *personaaje* as a story startes

**Structured Immersion – Language Arts Lesson**

(x) A student called out important

(+) A student stated important is something you have to do

(+ ) A student stated decided meant you have a choice

(x) A student called out library was a *librería*

(u) Students took turns responding what could be found in libraries

(+ ) A student stated one could type

(+ ) A student stated if you have a boat and you put heavy things on it, it will sink

(x) A student called out the opposite of float was sink

(o) A students responded a planet was a *planeta*

(u) Students took turns responding to what were planets

(+ ) Student answered when you are proud you have a smile on your face

(x) Students called out whether they did their homework first or played

(-) Entire class responded Arthur’s little sister was D.W.

(-) Entire class responded planet Earth

(-) Entire class responded Arthur was worried about sharing his story with the class

(-) Entire class answered Arthur’s friend had liked the first story best
Paraverbal Support

- Teacher read the story *Chicken Soup with Rice* with intonation and would stop to have students predict what would happen next.
- Students wrote and sounded out the word “*abajo*”
- Students sounded out the dipthong in the word “*nuevo*”
- Teacher showed students word flashcards and pointed out the correct pronunciation for each word.

Nonverbal Support

- Teacher utilized gestures to show tall and short
- Teacher had students sequence the story by raising her fingers to depict what happened first, second, third etc...
- Teacher gestured a frown from one of the characters in the story she was reading about

Visual and Sensory Support

- Teacher utilized pictures in the story to generate understanding.
- Students referred to the classroom word wall for visual aid support.
- Teacher utilized word and picture word flashcards for visual support.
- Teacher showed students pictures from the big book entitled *The Big Red Apple Tree*. 
APPENDIX G

Elements of Faltis Joinfostering Framework (1997) in Three Types of Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Way Communication Exchanges</th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Language</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- call on a student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question – students bid for the floor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question – Any student can answer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question – Entire class responds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a question- Students take turns responding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance of Participation of Rights</th>
<th>Structured Immersion</th>
<th>Bilingual Language</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of Turn Taking</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Talk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extra Linguistic Supports</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraverbal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Sensory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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