

Student Work

5-1-2013

Achievement, engagement, and English language acquisition of fourth-grade ELL students following five years of instruction in an English as a Second Language program or instruction in a dual language program in the same urban elementary school

Rony E. Ortega
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>



Recommended Citation

Ortega, Rony E., "Achievement, engagement, and English language acquisition of fourth-grade ELL students following five years of instruction in an English as a Second Language program or instruction in a dual language program in the same urban elementary school" (2013). *Student Work*. 3490.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/3490>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

Achievement, Engagement, and English Language Acquisition of
Fourth-Grade ELL Students Following Five Years of Instruction in an
English as a Second Language Program or Instruction in a
Dual Language Program in the Same Urban Elementary School

By

Rony E. Ortega

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Dr. Jeanne L. Surface

Omaha, Nebraska

May, 2013

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. John W. Hill

Dr. Kay A. Keiser

Dr. Sandra Rodriguez-Arroyo

UMI Number: 3558297

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3558297

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Abstract

ACHIEVEMENT, ENGAGEMENT, AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION OF
FOURTH-GRADE ELL STUDENTS FOLLOWING FIVE YEARS OF INSTRUCTION
IN EITHER AN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM
OR INSTRUCTION IN A DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM
IN THE SAME URBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Rony E. Ortega, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2013

Advisor: Dr. Jeanne L. Surface

The purpose of the study was to compare the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students from the same urban elementary school who received instruction in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program from kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students who received instruction in a Dual Language (DL) program from kindergarten through fourth-grade to determine the effectiveness of both programs that are aimed at helping English language learners (ELLs) acquire the English language. All Hispanic ELLs with the home and school correspondence language of Spanish were in attendance in the research urban district's elementary school kindergarten through fourth-grade and had the same bilingual principal. Third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scores compared to fourth-grade posttest ELDA scores of ELLs enrolled in the ESL program were in the direction of improved speaking ($p < .001$), reading ($p < .001$), writing ($p < .01$), and comprehension ($p < .01$) dependent t test scores. Null hypotheses were also rejected in the direction of improved listening ($p < .001$), reading ($p < .01$), writing ($p < .05$), and comprehension ($p < .01$) dependent t test scores for ELLs enrolled

in the DL program. However, null hypotheses were not rejected for fourth-grade posttest-posttest ELDA scores comparisons of ELLs enrolled in the ESL program compared to ELLs enrolled in the DL program except for speaking, where ELLs enrolled in the ESL program had a statistically significant ($p < .05$) improvement compared to ELLs enrolled in the DL program. Third-grade pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment reading (NeSA-R) scores compared to fourth-grade posttest NeSA-R scores of ELLs enrolled in the ESL program were in the direction of improved reading ($p < .01$) dependent t test score. Null hypothesis was also rejected in the direction of improved fourth-grade posttest reading ($p < .01$) dependent t test score for ELLs enrolled in the DL program. However, null hypothesis was not rejected for the posttest-posttest NeSA-R scores comparisons between ELLs enrolled in the ESL program compared to ELLs enrolled in the DL program. Third-grade pretest school days absent compared to fourth-grade posttest school days absent of ELLs enrolled in the ESL program were in the direction of fewer days absent but not statistically significant. Third-grade pretest school days absent compared to fourth-grade posttest school days absent for ELLs in the DL program were also in the direction of fewer school days absent but not statistically significant. However, posttest-posttest independent t test comparisons of school days absent were statistically significant ($p < .05$) for ELLs enrolled in the DL program who had statistically significantly fewer school days absent in the fourth-grade compared to ELLs in the ESL program. Finally, all ELLs noticeably benefited from five years participation in the research district's urban elementary school's ESL or DL program, made statistically comparable gains from third-grade to fourth-grade, and were equally prepared for participation in the next school year's fifth-grade academic instruction.

Acknowledgements

I embarked on my doctoral studies at the University of Nebraska at Omaha in the summer of 2010. A few years later, with gratitude, appreciation, and a sigh of relief, I check the doctorate degree off of my “bucket list.” Although this degree is a capstone of my formal education, clearly it is not the end of my learning and represents my life-long commitment to education. This degree is also a celebratory reminder of my resiliency, determination, and hard work. Several years ago, I made a conscious choice to defy the negative statistics that plague many people of my similar background and today I am truly blessed to have had the opportunity to earn four college degrees, including this doctorate. I hope that somewhere along this life journey, I am able to inspire others like me to do the same because education has profoundly impacted and changed my life.

These past few years have been rewarding, challenging, and a test of my priorities, which have always revolved around my family. I could not have achieved this level of education without the support of my beautiful wife and biggest fan, Cara. She was there many late nights to listen to my thoughts, proof my papers, and to remind me of my abilities and her faith in me. As doubt began to creep in and several times I thought about walking away, her persistence and belief in me helped push me through. My beautiful daughters have also been very supportive of me throughout my studies. Gabriela, Ariana, and Natalia were willing to spare some “daddy time” and were the first to excitedly greet me at the door after a long day. To my amazing wife and daughters I say, thank you, and I love you!

I am also very appreciative of my in-laws, Mr. and Mrs. Rex and Jolene Medley, for their support of my family. Many times they watched our daughters, picked them up from school, and cooked meals for our entire family so that I could focus on my studies.

The countless ways in which you supported my family will always be remembered, Rex and Jolene.

Thank you to Dr. Jeanne Surface, my dissertation chair, for her guidance, support, and expertise. I would also like to thank Dr. John Hill, a professor who I had for several courses and was instrumental in my study. Also, thank you to Dr. Kay Keiser and Dr. Sandra Rodriguez-Arroyo, two other members of my dissertation committee. Along with these committee members, I would also like to thank the other professors who helped me become a better scholar, consumer of research, and administrator, Dr. Karen Hayes, Dr. Peter Smith, and Dr. Gigi Brignoni. Thank you to Mrs. Barbara Mraz for her assistance with editing and also for being so kind during each of my many visits.

Thank you to Ms. Susan Aguilera-Robles, principal of Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School, for her support of my dissertation study. Also, thank you to the Omaha Public Schools (OPS) Research Committee for their approval, collecting, and sharing of the school data with me.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to Mrs. Susan Mayberger, Coordinator of ESL, Migrant and Refugee Education and to Ms. Katy Catlett, district supervisor of the OPS K-12 Dual Language program, for their support and leadership in the K-12 Dual Language program in OPS, and to Dr. Jim Ramirez, retired OPS administrator, a friend and mentor who was influential to my joining the OPS district. Thank you to friends and co-workers who took an interest in my studies and repeatedly asked, “Are you done yet?” To all of these family, professors, colleagues, mentors, and friends, I am thankful you traveled this journey with me.

Table of Contents

Abstract	<i>i</i>
Acknowledgements	<i>iii</i>
Table of Contents	<i>v</i>
List of Tables	<i>x</i>
Chapters	
1. Introduction	<i>1</i>
Demographic Changes	<i>3</i>
The Achievement Gap	<i>4</i>
Dropout Risk	<i>4</i>
Language of Instruction	<i>5</i>
Purpose of the Study	<i>6</i>
Research Questions	<i>6</i>
Importance of the Study	<i>15</i>
Assumptions of the Study	<i>16</i>
Delimitations of the Study	<i>17</i>
Limitations of the Study	<i>17</i>
Definition of Terms	<i>18</i>
Significance of the Study	<i>25</i>
Contribution to Research	<i>25</i>
Contribution to Practice	<i>26</i>
Contribution to Policy	<i>26</i>
Organization of the Study	<i>26</i>

2. Review of Literature	28
English Language Acquisition Programs	29
Monolingual Education Programs	30
Bilingual Education Programs	32
Second Language Acquisition Theories	36
Theories by Jim Cummins	37
Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP)	37
Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS)	39
Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)	40
The Interdependence hypothesis	41
The Threshold hypothesis	42
Social, Cultural, and Psychological Factors on Second Language Acquisition	43
Schumman's Acculturation Model	44
Mother Tongue	46
Language Connected to Ethnic Identity	46
Language Attitudes	47
Language Status	48
Bilingualism	48
Additive Bilingualism Model	50
Subtractive Bilingualism Model	51
Deficit Model	53
Critical Theories in Biliteracy	53

Meta-Linguistic Awareness	53
Cross-Linguistics Transfer	54
Conclusion	56
3. Methodology	58
Participants	58
Number of participants	58
Gender of participants	59
Age range of participants	59
Racial and ethnic origin of participants	59
Inclusion criteria of participants	59
Method of participation identification	60
Description of Procedures	60
Research design	60
Independent Variable Conditions	61
Description of English language acquisition program	62
Home language survey	62
English language acquisition programs for elementary students	63
Implementation of the English language acquisition programs	63
Dependent measures	66
Research Questions and Data Analysis	66
Research Question #1	66
Research Question #2	68
Research Question #3	70

Research Question #4	72
Research Question #5	73
Research Question #6	74
Research Question #7	75
Research Question #8	76
Research Question #9	77
Data Collection Procedures	78
Performance site	78
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects	
Approval Category	79
4. Results	80
Purpose of Study	80
Implementation of the Independent Variable	80
Description of the English language acquisition programs	81
Dependent Measures	81
Research Question #1	84
Research Question #2	86
Research Question #3	88
Research Question #4	91
Research Question #5	92
Research Question #6	93
Research Question #7	95
Research Question #8	96

Research Question #9 97

5. Conclusion and Discussion 99

Research Question #1 Conclusion 99

Research Question #2 Conclusion 101

Research Question #3 Conclusion 104

Research Question #4 Conclusion 106

Research Question #5 Conclusion 106

Research Question #6 Conclusion 107

Research Question #7 Conclusion 107

Research Question #8 Conclusion 108

Research Question #9 Conclusion 108

Discussion 109

Implications for practice 116

Implications for policy 121

Implications for further research 123

References 126

List of Tables

Tables

- Table 1. Demographic Information of Individual Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program 82
- Table 2. Demographic Information of Individual Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program 83
- Table 3. Third-Grade Pretest English Language Development Assessment Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program 85
- Table 4. Third-Grade Pretest English Language Development Assessment Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program 87
- Table 5. Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program 90
- Table 6. Third-Grade Pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program 91
- Table 7. Third-Grade Pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program 92

- Table 8. Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School’s English as a Second Language Program Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School’s Dual Language Program 94
- Table 9. Third-Grade Pretest School Days Absent Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School’s English as a Second Language Program 95
- Table 10. Third-Grade Pretest School Days Absent Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School’s Dual Language Program 96
- Table 11. Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School’s English as a Second Language Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School’s Dual Language Program 98

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Today school districts across the United States are dealing with an unexpectedly fast-growing culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse student population (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Fry, 2007, 2008; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, Christian, 2005; Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011; Thomas & Collier, 2001; Wright, 2010) creating enormous challenges to meeting federal legislation accountability mandates designed initially to meet the needs of students within a static majority cultural context.

The passage of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) required schools across the U.S. to disaggregate student data and show growth for all students and subgroups, including English language learners (ELLs). NCLB (2001) requires 100% of students, including ELLs, within a school to reach the same state standards in reading and mathematics by 2014. Despite these rigorous federal mandates, most schools in the U.S. are under educating ELLs (Abedi & Dietel, 2004; Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Fry, 2007, 2008). What is more, 26 states have submitted official requests to be excluded from NCLB requirements (U.S. Department of Education, 2012) because of their inability to meet such standards.

Thirty-nine years ago the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), held that schools must take affirmative steps to provide a “meaningful” education to ELLs so that they are participating equally in schools. Thirty-two years ago, in *Castañeda v. Pickard*, 648 F. 2d 989 (1981), it specified that ELL programs be based on sound educational theory, be implemented effectively and evaluated. However, today

ELLs continue to significantly lag behind their native English peers regardless of grade or subject (Abedi & Dietel, 2004; Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Fry, 2007, 2008) and are more likely to drop out and not graduate from high school (Fleming, 2003; Rumberger, 2006; Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011). The alarming academic data on ELLs reveals that not all school districts are providing a “meaningful” education to ELLs and many have yet to implement programs based on research and sound educational theory. Some districts may not even be equipped or prepared to educate this culturally and linguistically diverse population of students (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Cummins, 1982; Flynn & Hill, 2005; Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011); which is significantly different from previous groups of immigrants who had their origins in Europe (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). More troubling, the education for ELLs remains separate and unequal (Crawford, 1997), and as a result, the fastest-growing group of students is also one of the lowest achieving. The lack of a quality education continues to perpetuate ELLs’ “poor immigrant” status (Fleming, 2003, p. 326). The large academic gaps between ELLs and native English speakers signal a need for more effective pedagogies and improved teacher preparation so that schools can more effectively address the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011).

However, the education of ELLs is important for reasons aside from the rigorous federal NCLB (2001) mandates. A quality education not only provides hope and power but also serves as the equalizing force between the advantaged and disadvantaged. Likewise, a quality education is the foundation for a successful life and without it one cannot be expected to succeed in life (Fleming, 2003). Socioeconomic success in life is

affected by academic achievement whereby high test scores have been linked to higher college going rates, higher college completion rates, and higher wages (Fry, 2007).

Demographic Changes

Students whose native language is other than English are the fastest-growing demographic group in the U.S. (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Fry, 2007, 2008; Genesee et al., 2005; Passel & Cohn, 2008; Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011; Thomas & Collier, 2001; Wright, 2010). According to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) (2011), the growth of ELLs in the U.S. exploded and increased by 51.01% from 1998 to 2008. To put this percentage into perspective, in 1998, the U.S. enrolled 3,540,673 ELLs and by 2008, the U.S. would enroll 5,346,673 ELLs of its 49,487,174 PK -12 students (NCELA, 2011). That is, over five million students with a native language of other than English are learning English in U.S. schools today, accounting for more than 10% of the PK-12 student population. Furthermore, 20 states saw their ELL population at least double from 1995-2008 (Maxwell, 2009). The state of Nebraska saw an increase of 171.7% in ELLs from 1997 to 2007. In 1997, Nebraska had 7,396 ELLs in its schools and by 2007 had accumulated 20,095 (NCELA, 2010). The Omaha Public Schools (OPS) District, which is the largest school district in Nebraska, saw an increase of 157% in ELL students from 1999 to 2009 (NCELA, 2011). What is more, the ELL population is projected to continue to be the fastest growing (Fry, 2008) due to the fact that the majority of children born in the U.S. from 2005 to 2050 will be from immigrant parents (Passel & Cohn, 2008). Due to these changing student demographics, schools are now faced with educating culturally,

linguistically, and academically diverse learners (Crawford, 1997; Flynn & Hill, 2005; Rehg & Waack, 2009; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011).

The Achievement Gap

The achievement gap between the ELLs and the rest of the nation has grown parallel with the growth of the ELL population (Fleming, 2003) and continues to widen at the higher grades (Fry, 2007, 2008). By the end of high school, the achievement gap between an average native English speaker and an ELL is about 1.2 national standard deviations (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Regardless of grade or subject, ELLs trail far behind their native English peers (Fry, 2007, 2008). To close the achievement gap, ELLs must make larger gains annually to catch up and keep up with their native English peers who continue to make gains annually. Collier and Thomas (2009) pointed out that an average native English speaker will make a ten-month gain yearly and will continue to do so while in school. Therefore, ELLs must make more than a ten-month gain per year if they are to close the achievement gap.

Dropout risk. Disaggregated data on dropout rates collected by the U.S. Department of Education annually reveals that certain demographic groups have a greater risk factor for dropping out of high school. Two risk factors commonly associated with dropouts are minority status and students living in a culture of poverty (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Poverty is linked with a number of social ills that affect students' readiness to learn, including substandard housing, violence, crime, substance abuse, and mobility (Crawford, 1997). ELLs often live in a culture of poverty and are concentrated in large, segregated, and underperforming urban schools; which commonly are characterized as having higher dropout rates (Crawford, 1997; Fry, 2007, 2008; Wright,

2010). Also, ELLs tend to be educated in schools with the least experienced teachers and the fewest resources (Wright, 2010). Sheng, Sheng, and Anderson (2011) added that English proficiency, socioeconomic status, and cultural differences are also predictors of school failure and dropping out of school. ELLs, who frequently share all of these attributes and predictors, are clearly an “at-risk” group of students and are more than twice as likely to drop out from school as their native English-speaking peers (Fleming, 2003; Rumberger, 2006; Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011)

Language of instruction. There is considerable debate among educators, policy makers and researchers on how to best ensure the academic success of ELLs (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Crawford, 1997; Crawford & Krashen, 2007; Cummins, 1988). One key factor in this debate, that is often political, is the language of instruction in schools (Barnett, S., Yarosz, D., Thomas, J., Jung, K., & Blanco, D., 2007; Crawford & Krashen, 2007; Cummins, 1988; Reyes, 2011) because politics and pedagogy are difficult to separate emotionally. Language is more than just a set of words (Ovando, 1990) and time and again stirs up feelings on civil rights, immigration policy, race, and cultural identity (Crawford, 1997; Lessow-Hurley, 2000). Language is also referred to as the verbal expression of culture or “the vehicle through which we convey our experience and culture” (Lessow-Hurley, 2000, p. 26); so it goes without saying that at a minimum, language is intimately interconnected to culture. Within the schools, language serves a critical role as the medium of instruction by which teachers help students make meaning (Crawford, 1997). As such, language and cognitive development are inseparable (Collier & Thomas, 2009) and teachers of ELLs must be cognizant and intentional about language usage when teaching. For example, many schools are studying second language

acquisition (SLA) theory and research to provide them with an answer to instructional practices and pedagogy that will better meet the academic needs of ELLs (Gomez, 2006). This renewed interest in SLA and best practice models for ELLs has led many schools to focus on Bilingual Education by offering Dual Language (DL) programs (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Cummins, 2000; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005; Gomez, 2006). As of December 5, 2012, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) listed 422 two-way DL programs in 31 states, a significant increase from the 294 programs in 24 states in 2004. Even so the CAL listing of DL programs is by no means complete because the schools offering these programs self-report (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012). DL programs generally aim to create bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural students by instructing students in two languages.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to compare the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students from the same urban elementary school who received instruction in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program from kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students who received instruction in a Dual Language (DL) program from kindergarten through fourth-grade to determine the effectiveness of both programs that are aimed at helping English language learners (ELLs) acquire the English language.

Research Questions

Research question one analyzed the third-grade English Language Development Assessment scores compared to the fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores of students who participated in English as a Second Language

program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #1. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening, (b) Speaking, (c) Reading, (d) Writing measures, and (e) Comprehension?

Sub-Question 1a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening?

Sub-Question 1b. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (b) Speaking?

Sub-Question 1c. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language

Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (c) Reading?

Sub-Question 1d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (d) Writing?

Sub-Question 1e. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (e) Comprehension?

Research question two analyzed the third-grade English Language Development Assessment scores compared to the fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores of students who participated in Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #2. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening, (b) Speaking, (c) Reading, (d) Writing measures, and (e) Comprehension?

Sub-Question 2a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening?

Sub-Question 2b. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (b) Speaking?

Sub-Question 2c. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (c) Reading?

Sub-Question 2d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (d) Writing?

Sub-Question 2d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development

Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (e) Comprehension?

Research question three analyzed the English Language Development Assessment scores of students who participated in the English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Post-Posttest-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #3. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade have congruent or different ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening, (b) Speaking, (c) Reading, (d) Writing measures, and (e) Comprehension?

Sub-Question 3a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening?

Sub-Question 3b. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research

elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (b) Speaking?

Sub-Question 3c. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (c) Reading?

Sub-Question 3d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (d) Writing?

Sub-Question 3d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (e) Comprehension?

Research question four analyzed the third-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to the fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score of students who participated in English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #4. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Sub-Question 4a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Research question five analyzed the third-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to the fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score of students who participated in Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #5. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Sub-Question 5a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading

score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Research question six analyzed the Nebraska State Accountability Reading scores of students who participated in the English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Post-Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #6. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade have congruent or different ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading scores?

Sub-Question 6a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Research question seven analyzed the third-grade total days absent from school compared to the fourth-grade total number of days absent from school of students who participated in English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #7. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Sub-Question 7a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total days absent from school?

Research question eight analyzed the third-grade total number of days absent from school compared to the fourth-grade total number of days absent from school of students who participated in Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #8. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Sub-Question 8a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest total number of days absent from

school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Research question nine analyzed the total number of days absent from school of students who participated in the English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Post-Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #9. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade have congruent or different ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Sub-Question 9a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade total number of days absent from school?

Importance of the Study

This study contributes to research, practice, and policy. The study is of significant interest to teachers, school district administrators, local and state Boards of Education, and all educational professionals and service providers who serve students who speak something other than English as a native language, and are interested in

learning the indicators for second language acquisition (SLA), academic achievement and engagement of ELLs in the hopes of raising school achievement while also preserving ELLs' native languages and ethnic identities in linguistically and culturally responsive schools.

Assumptions of the Study

This study has several strong features including two well-established English language acquisition programs aimed at helping ELLs. With about 7,000 students presently served, the kindergarten through 12th-grade ESL program is well established and fully supported by OPS. All ESL teachers have a Nebraska endorsement in teaching ESL. ESL teachers, paraprofessionals and bilingual liaisons that work with students in the ESL program receive yearly professional development through the district's Fall and Spring ESL/Refugee/Migrant conference as well ongoing coaching by ESL teacher trainers. ESL students receive no formal instruction in their native languages and most teachers are English monolinguals. Now in its 12th year since its inception, with almost over 1,500 students served, the kindergarten through 12th-grade DL program is also well established. The DL program is also fully supported by OPS, having expanded to one additional elementary school and one middle school in the 2012-13 school year, bringing the total schools served to five elementary, three middle, and one high school. Yearly, DL teachers, paraprofessionals, and bilingual liaisons that work with students in the DL program also receive professional development through the district's annual DL Institute as well through coaching by teacher trainers. DL students receive formal instruction in English 50% of the time and in Spanish 50% of the time. The majority of DL teachers are bilingual (Spanish/English) and many possess a bilingual education and an ESL

endorsement. All study participants completed their entire elementary education, kindergarten through fourth-grade, at Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School. Spring Lake Magnet School serves about 700 students in pre-kindergarten through fourth-grade. The school serves a diverse community representing a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. In 2001 Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School became a Math, Spanish, and Technology Center, boasts a Family Resource Center, strong parental involvement, and a bilingual principal that fully supports both the ESL and DL program.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to students entering Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School in kindergarten who had a native language of Spanish, received a score of 1, 2, or 3 on the oral Pre-LAS assessment, and who qualified for and were served in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language (ESL) or Dual Language (DL) English language acquisition programs from kindergarten through fourth-grade. Study findings were delimited to the students who completed their elementary education kindergarten through fourth-grade at Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School during the 2011-12 school-year. All students had the same bilingual elementary principal for the duration of the study.

Limitations of the Study

This study was confined to the students who qualified for the English as a Second Language (ESL) or Dual Language (DL) program in kindergarten with an oral Pre-LAS score of 1, 2, or 3. Study participants included ESL students ($n = 16$) who participated in the ESL program kindergarten through fourth-grade and DL students ($n = 18$) who

participated in the DL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade. The limited sample size may limit the utility and generalizability of the study results and findings.

Definition of Terms

Academic Language. Academic language is the formal language of school used for formal writing and found in books. Academic language is necessary for and related to academic achievement.

Acculturation. Acculturation is the process by which minority individuals adopt the culture of the dominant group while also maintaining their culture (Schumann, 1978).

Achievement Gap. Achievement gap refers to the disparity in academic performance, educational attainment, and standardized test scores between minority and majority students. Elimination of the achievement gap is one of the most discussed issues in education today.

Assimilation. Assimilation is the process by which minority individuals forgo their own culture and adopt the dominant culture (Schumann, 1978).

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). BICS refers to the day-to-day conversational language needed to interact socially with other people. BICS is usually developed within two years (Cummins, 1979).

Bilingual Education. Bilingual education is an umbrella term that includes various English language acquisition models which use two languages for instruction and learning.

Bilingualism. Bilingualism refers to using two languages for the purpose of communicating.

Code-Switching. Code-switching refers to a term used in linguistics in reference to the alternation between two or more languages in a single conversation or utterance (Garcia & Nanez, 2011).

Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). CALP refers to formal academic language essential to be successful in school. CALP is usually acquired in five to seven years (Cummins, 1979).

Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP). CUP refers to the skills and knowledge that are shared or common between two languages (Cummins, 1979).

Culture. Culture is how one lives life through traditions, customs, rituals, values, foods, etc.

Culture of poverty. Culture of poverty is a social theory that suggests the burdens of poverty are systemic and very difficult to overcome. Children raised in a culture of poverty have been socialized in ways that perpetuate poverty. The persistence of a culture of poverty results in a learned helplessness, powerlessness, and a feeling of inferiority (Payne, 2005).

Culture dissonance. Culture dissonance occurs when the family experiences dissonant acculturation resulting in: (a) a disruption to the familial ties, (b) a weakening parental authority, and (c) an increase in child non-compliance. The loss of the native language in children of immigrants is closely associated with producing culture dissonance (Crawford, 1997).

Culture Shock. Culture shock refers to the possible symptoms, such as fear, anxiety, or depression one may experience when entering a completely different culture than one is accustomed to (Schumann, 1978).

Dissonant acculturation. Dissonant acculturation occurs when the immigrant parent and child are on different trajectories for their English language acquisition and levels of cultural proficiency in their new home land. Frequently, the immigrant child becomes fluent in English and seeks to adopt more aspects of their culture whereas the parent is holding on to their native language and the norms and customs of their heritage culture (Crawford, 1997).

Engagement. Engagement is defined by the amount of time the student is present and actively involved in the school's academic and non-academic opportunities.

English as a Second Language. English as a Second Language (ESL) refers to various English language acquisition programs where monolingual teachers teach English to ELLs. Within these various monolingual programs, ELLs receive no support or instruction in their native language. ESL programs may include ESL pullout, ESL taught through academic content, and ESL resource center (Collier & Thomas, 2009). The goal of ESL instruction is to quickly increase English language proficiency so that ELLs no longer need ESL instruction. These programs are often seen as remedial and low priority in the scheduling of schools, making ELLs feel like second-class citizens within the school (Wright, 2010).

English Language Development Assessment (ELDA). English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) is a series of assessments developed to measure the annual progress in English by ELLs. The ELDA assessments are divided into separate tests for listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension and are also divided into different grade level categories, such as, kindergarten through second-grade teacher

inventories, and third-grade through fifth-grade, sixth-grade through eighth-grade, and ninth-grade through 12th-grade student assessments.

English Language Learners (ELLs). English language learners refer to students whose native language is other than English. These students are in the process of achieving proficiency in English and are not yet deemed proficient in English. ELLs are an extremely diverse group of students; vary widely by race, ethnicity, native language, educational attainment, proficiency and literacy in their native language, and proficiency in English. ELLs are also labeled as English Learners (EL), Limited English Proficient (LEP), or Language Minority Students (LMS) (Wright, 2010).

English language skills. English language skills commonly refer to domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These are the four primary English language skills and are assessed for new ELL students by school districts.

English language proficiency. English language proficiency refers to the competency a student has in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension. The level of English proficiency is closely associated with academic achievement and future socioeconomic success (Fry, 2007).

English immersion. English immersion is a technique that some consider a way to rapidly teach English to ELLs. Similar to the instruction of a foreign language, teachers primarily focus on teaching the language and the teaching of content takes a subordinate role.

Ethnic identity. Ethnic identity is the extent and degree to which an individual self-identifies with a particular ethnic group. Ethnic identity is associated with a feeling of belonging that can shape and define an individual's perceptions of self and others as

well as their feelings and behaviors. In short, ethnic identity helps answer the question “Who am I?” providing a sense of cultural belonging and meaning (Rehg & Waack, 2009).

Immersion. Immersion is a method in which teachers speak in the target language exclusively during instructional time. This model may be used in immersion programs or in traditional world language classes at any grade level (Crawford, 2004).

Language. Language, in Random House Webster’s Dictionary (1996), is defined as 1. A body of words and systems for their use common to a group of people or nation. 2. Communication using a system of vocal sounds or written symbols in conventional ways. 3. Any system of symbols or sounds, or gestures used for communication. 4. The vocabulary used by a particular group.

Language Minority Students. Language minority students refers to all students whose native language is something other than English and whom are learning English as a second language.

Language Status. Language status is the position or standing of a language against other languages.

Limited English Proficient (LEP). Limited English proficient is another term used by the U.S. Department of Education to include those students who have not yet achieved English language proficiency, and are eligible for programs supported by the U.S. Department Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

Majority language. Majority language refers to the language of a dominant group, in terms of numbers and/or power.

Meta-linguistic awareness. Meta-linguistic awareness (MA) is a term used to describe a construct to explain the interaction between language and written text, primarily in bilingual learners' literacy development (Bialystok, 1991, 2001).

Monolingualism. Monolingualism refers to the functioning in a single language.

Mother tongue. Mother tongue refers to the language one learns first, identifies with, and/or is identified by others as a native speaker of; sometimes also the language that one is most competent in or uses most.

Native speaker. Individual whose competence in a language almost always derives from the language being the mother tongue and first language learned.

Pedagogy. Pedagogy refers to instructional strategies correctly applied to the art and science of teaching.

Preservation. Preservation refers to the desire of a cultural group to resist and reject the dominant culture while preserving their culture (Schumann, 1978).

Prior Knowledge. Prior knowledge refers to what the student already knows or has experienced. Prior knowledge is relevant in acquiring new knowledge and the idea is that students learn and remember new information best when it is linked to relevant prior knowledge (Marzano, 2004).

Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Second Language Acquisition is the process by which one learns a second language. SLA can also incorporate how we learn subsequent languages after the second. SLA specifically refers to how the student learns the language, not how the language is taught. In short, SLA is the internal process by which the student learns a second language (Krashen, 1988).

Sheltered Instruction. Sheltered instruction is an instructional method for teaching English language learners comprehensible and rigorous content while simultaneously ensuring their English language development.

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model was developed to facilitate high quality instruction for English language learners (ELLs) in content area teaching. The SIOP Model is often viewed as an umbrella under which other best practices and programs developed for improving instruction for ELLs resides. It can also be viewed as a framework that can bring together a school's ELL instructional program by organizing methods and techniques to ensure that effective practices are implemented (Echevarria, J., Short, D, & Powers, K., 2006).

Social or conversational language. Social or conversational language is the informal, non-academic language needed to carry out everyday and informal conversations.

Socio-economic status (SES). Socio-economic status (SES) is a combination of income, educational attainment, occupation, and social status in the larger community. A higher SES has been linked to greater levels of academic achievement and access to resources (Fry, 2007) and vice versa, SES has been one of the best predictors of school failure and dropping out (Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011).

Submersion. Submersion is another term for “sink-or-swim,” where second language learners are provided no systematic support (Crawford, 2004).

Target Language. Target language refers to a language other than English that is used for instruction and learning.

World Language. World language is increasingly a common and preferred term for foreign language.

Significance of the Study

The study contributes to research, practice, and policy. The study is of significant interest to ELLs as they strive to acquire the English language and achieve academically while preserving their native language and ethnic identity. The study is also of significance because it supports and educates parents as they try to understand the role of the native language in learning a second language and how to best help their children acquire the English language to realize academic success. Finally, the study has significance for educators and school district officials as they consider implementing, expanding, or continuing programs and instructional practices designed for ELLs, and how these programs and practices affect these students' English language acquisition, academic achievement, and engagement.

Contribution to research. A review of professional literature suggests that more research is needed on the subject of English language acquisition (Crawford, 1997) and ELLs' achievement as it relates to English language acquisition, student engagement, and high school completion. Also, the results of this study may inform district central office, building principals, and teachers of the impact of instructional programs and practices, school culture, and language of instruction in schools on the English acquisition, achievement, and engagement of ELLs. Ultimately, the findings may indicate specific and reproducible factors for increasing student achievement of ELLs.

Contribution to practice. A school district with a significant population of ELLs may decide to maintain current English language acquisition programs and

practices, or consider implementing programs and practices described in this study by expanding or starting new programs that respect and preserve ELLs' native languages, ethnic identities, and promote additive bilingualism and increase student achievement. School districts can also be influenced to create culturally responsive schools that provide quality training to teachers to work with ELLs and to redefine their roles within the classroom and community so that these role definitions result in interactions that empower rather than disable students.

Contribution to policy. The results of this study may offer insight in how district, school, and classroom policies and practices affect English language acquisition. If results show there is a statistically significant difference in English acquisition, achievement, and engagement scores of ELLs in the English as a Second Language (ESL) program compared to ELLs in the Dual Language (DL) program, the school district may choose to reconsider which of two programs to expand for native Spanish-speaking ELLs or if results show there is no difference in English acquisition, achievement, and engagement scores, the school district may choose to continue with and expand both the ESL and DL programs with some level of confidence that both programs are equally helping ELLs succeed.

Organization of the Study. The literature review relevant to this research study is presented in Chapter 2. This chapter reviews the professional literature related to ESL, Bilingual Education, and SLA theory, and social, cultural, and psychological factors that impact SLA. Chapter 3 describes the research design, methodology, independent variables, dependent variables, and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the data of the study. This includes a detailed synthesis of the participants, a comprehensive

list of the dependent variables, the dependent measures, and the data analysis used to statistically determine if the null hypothesis is rejected for each research question.

Chapter 4 reports the research results and findings, including data analysis, tables, and descriptive statistics. Chapter 5 provides conclusions and a discussion of the research findings.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

In this accountability era, school districts are feeling a sense of urgency to support successful outcomes for ELLs and the expected continued growth of ELLs will present enormous challenges for schools in meeting the mandates of NCLB (2001). Aside from the federal mandates to raise academic achievement in reading and math by 2014 (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001), the education of ELLs, like the education of all students, is important for reasons beyond these mandates. The educational attainment and socioeconomic success of ELLs is contingent upon their acquisition of the English language and overall academic achievement (Fry, 2007) while the cultural identity and participation of ELLs is dependent upon the retention of their native language (Rehg & Waack, 2009; Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010). Furthermore, a universal and basic educational principle that applies to all grade levels and subjects is that new learning should be based on prior knowledge. Best teaching practices almost always include the activation of prior knowledge as a strategy to engage the brain before new learning (Marzano, 2000, 2004; Sousa, 2006) because “learning is a cumulative process that builds on what has gone before, a foundation of concepts and skills acquired today will support intellectual growth in the future” (Crawford, 2004, p. 235). Although this principle is widely known and generally agreed upon by educators and researchers alike, in the practice of instructing ELLs it is frequently outshined by politics instead of pedagogy (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Crawford, 1997, 2004; Crawford & Krashen, 2007; Cummins, 1988, 2000; Duran, 1993; Lessow-Hurley, 2000; Ovando, 1990). Despite the fact that when the native language is used correctly in English language acquisition

programs, it is of tremendous benefit and can accelerate second language acquisition (SLA) (Cummins, 2000; Krashen, 1992), across many school districts ELLs are frequently assessed from a deficit perspective. They are then enrolled in monolingual English language acquisition programs such as English as a Second Language (ESL) programs or English immersion programs where the students' prior knowledge (language) is not "activated" or used in the learning of the second language (Thomas & Collier, 1998, 1999, 2003). A detailed review of the literature reveals a variety of factors present in effective practices for SLA and instruction of ELLs (Baker & Hornberger, 2001; Collier, 1992; Collier & Thomas, 2004, 2009; Crawford, 1997, 2004; Crawford & Krashen, 2007; Cummins, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1988, 2000; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005; Lessow-Hurley, 2000, 2009; Krashen, 1987, 1992, 2003; Ramirez, D., Yuen, S., Ramey, D., Pasta, D., & Billings, D., 1991; Wright, 2010).

English Language Acquisition Programs

Language development is a basic component of schooling and can take place in the context of many models and programs. ESL and Bilingual Education are umbrella terms that incorporate many different English language acquisition programs of instruction. For instance, monolingual programs, like ESL programs, generally have aimed at acculturation mainly toward the dominant English-speaking culture while Bilingual Education programs have aimed at biculturation through the preservation of the non-English-speaking culture as well as the acquisition of English (Duran, 1993). A common denominator within all ESL programs is the lack of support and instruction in the language minority students' native languages whereas a common denominator in

Bilingual Education programs is the provided support in and the use of the native language for instruction.

ESL programs are likely to be used in districts where the language minority student population is very diverse and represents many different native languages. These monolingual programs can accommodate students from different language backgrounds in the same class since ESL teachers are not required to be proficient in the native language of their students nor provide native language support (Rennie, 1993). On the other hand, Bilingual Education programs are likely to be used where a significant language minority student population shares the same native language (Rennie, 1993) and can include majority language students too (Duran, 1993). Ultimately, school principals are instrumental in the selection and development of their school's English language acquisition program and must understand the many factors that may impact their options in choosing among these English language acquisition programs. The demographic profile of the ELL student, size and linguistic heterogeneity of the ELLs, the mission and vision of the school and community, the number of bilingual teachers, and the political climate and legislation of the area all can impact the selection (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). However, the success of any English language acquisition program lays not in the name but in the implementation and the practices that take place within the program (Wright, 2010). Specific English language acquisition programs are reviewed next.

Monolingual Education Programs. There are a variety of ways for how English is taught to ELLs. The most commonly encountered English language acquisition monolingual program for ELLs in the U.S. is *ESL pullout* at the elementary level and *ESL taught as a subject* at the secondary (Collier & Thomas, 1997, 1999, 2009; Rennie,

1993). Within the elementary ESL pullout program, students at various ages and levels are lumped in with one ESL teacher during pull out time. In the secondary ESL taught as a subject program, students are not placed in mainstream courses with their peers and miss out on the mainstream curriculum while acquiring basic and social English. At both elementary and secondary levels, the ESL teacher is not responsible for teaching academic subjects. No support for development of academic skills through the students' native language is provided. The main role of the ESL teacher in ESL pullout and ESL taught as a subject programs is to teach the structure of the English language during the very short allotted time. A variation of these programs is the *ESL resource center* which brings students together from several classrooms or schools. The ESL resource center concentrates ESL materials and staff into one location and is typically staffed by one ESL teacher (Rennie, 1993). The longitudinal research from Collier and Thomas (2009) which spans across numerous school districts indicates that the average achievement levels of high school graduates who were initially placed in ESL pullout programs is in the 11th percentile by the end of high school. Consequently, those who do not drop out of high school and graduate are clearly not prepared to continue their schooling in higher education (Collier & Thomas, 2009).

ESL taught through academic content (also called sheltered instruction) is another delivery method for ESL. This program adds academic content to the responsibilities of the ESL teacher and adds academic and cognitive development in English; which are not part of the ESL pullout method. The ESL teacher is generally endorsed in both ESL and the content area. ESL taught through academic content generally provides one more year of support than does ESL pullout for a total of three to four years (Collier & Thomas,

2009). A variation of this program is the *structured English immersion program* where ESL is not explicitly taught but rather English is taught through content areas (Rennie, 1993; Collier & Thomas, 2009). Collier and Thomas (2009) pointed out in two major national studies (1997, 2002) that ELLs in ESL taught through academic content programs close half the achievement gap, graduating high school at the 22nd national percentile.

Monolingual ESL programs are generally considered to be remedial and subtractive in nature. What makes monolingual ESL programs subtractive is that the goal of these English language acquisition programs is for ELLs to quickly achieve English proficiency (Wright, 2010) but to provide no support to the native language skills ELLs already possess. Cummins (1987) pointed out that children who lack the support for literacy development in their native language develop a subtractive form of bilingualism in which the native language skills are replaced by English skills

Bilingual Education Programs. Bilingual Education programs can be delivered in many ways. *Dual Language (DL)* programs seek to help the growing number of ELLs learn English and achieve academically while also giving language majority students the opportunity to develop proficiency in a second language (Rennie, 1993; Collier & Thomas, 2009). These DL programs differ fundamentally from ESL and traditional world language programs in two important ways: 1) teachers deliver grade-level curricular content through a "partner language" but do not generally teach the partner language as a subject; and 2) students receive instruction in the partner language as early as kindergarten and may continue through high school.

Transitional bilingual education or *Transitional DL programs* are commonly encountered programs in the U.S., especially in areas with large numbers of ELLs of one language background, such as Spanish speakers (Rennie, 1993). While the Transitional DL program does initially provide some support in the native language, this type of program is designed to move ELLs into all English instruction as soon as possible, generally after two to three years. Academic, cognitive, and linguistic development, are provided through both English and the native language. The classes are generally self-contained, separate from the mainstream, and perceived as remedial classes just like in the monolingual ESL programs. ELLs in Transitional DL programs generally also close half the achievement gap by reaching the 24th national percentile by the end of high school (Collier & Thomas, 2009).

According to Collier and Thomas (2009), *one-way* and *two-way DL programs* were the least common models in U.S. school several years ago, but today are rapidly increasing in number. Thomas and Collier (2012) pointed out, “Dual language programs have the potential to raise student-achievement to the highest levels we have seen in any school innovation” (p. 117). Instruction within the one-way and two-way DL programs is the curricular mainstream, but taught through two languages. DL students are taught together throughout the day in cognitively challenging, grade-level academic content. The difference between one-way and two-way DL programs is in the demographic mix of students. One-way refers to one language group of students who attend DL classes whereas two-way refers to two language groups who attend the same DL classes. Typically after six to eight years, DL students become academically proficient in two languages of instruction and are able to do academic work on grade level in either

language (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Unlike in all previously mentioned programs, students in one-way or two-way DL programs can fully close the achievement gap, reaching the 50th percentile in both their native language and in English by middle school years and graduate above grade level by the end of high school (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Students do not exit one-way and two-way DL programs unlike monolingual ESL and transitional DL programs.

Within the one-way and two-way DL programs, two subset DL models exist: the *90:10 model* and the *50:50 model*. According to Collier and Thomas (2009), the 90:10 model requires initial emphasis on the native language because typically this language is less supported by the broader society. In the 90:10 model, students generally receive 90% of the instructional time in the native language and only 10% in English for the first two years of schooling. Gradually the percentage of English increases throughout the upper grades until both languages are given equal instructional time. DL students in the 90:10 model are generally proficient in both languages by the sixth-grade (Collier & Thomas, 2009). On the other hand, in the 50:50 model, students receive instructional time in the native language and English language about 50% of time in each. These DL students alternate half the instructional time between the two languages and are generally proficient in both languages by the eighth-grade (Collier & Thomas, 2009). According to Collier and Thomas (2009), the most effective DL program is the two-way 90:10 model, which closes the gap 95% to 100% by the fifth-grade followed by the two-way 50:50 model which closes the gap by 70%-100% by the fifth-grade. Also, Collier and Thomas (2004, 2009) pointed out that DL programs are the only English acquisition programs that help fully close the achievement gap. For example, in a study involving 1,599 ELLs

where parents had refused bilingual services and submersed their students into English only programs in the Houston Independent School District showed that these students only scored in the 12th national percentile by grade eleven (Collier & Thomas, 2009). In a separate study in the Houston Independent School District, Collier and Thomas (2009) compared two groups of kindergarteners that began school with no English proficiency. One group was enrolled in an ESL taught through content program while the other group enrolled in a 90:10 DL model. By the time these groups reached the junior year of high school, the DL students had outperformed the ESL taught through content program students. The DL students reached the 45th national percentile compared to the 32nd percentile for the ESL taught through content program students.

Bilingual Education programs are generally considered to be enrichment and additive models because rather than achieving English proficiency at the cost of the native language, ELLs achieve English proficiency while they also build high levels of proficiency in their native language. Additive bilingualism refers to the acquisition of a second language at no cost to one's first language (Wright, 2010). Within these additive models, languages are seen as a resource and ELLs are not put into a position where one language is more important than the other but where both languages are of equal status and bilingualism is promoted.

In summary, longitudinal research findings demonstrate that the highest quality ESL content programs only close about half the achievement gap (Collier & Thomas, 2004, 2009). ELLs schooled all in English initially may outperform those schooled in DL programs when tested in English, but later in the secondary school years, the DL-schooled students outperform the monolingually-schooled students (Collier & Thomas,

1997, 2004, 2009; Gomez, 2006). Gomez (2006) compared the results of the Texas academic state assessment (TAKS) of fifth-graders in two DL elementary schools with all other elementary schools in a school district in Texas. Ninety-four percent of the fifth-grade DL students ($N = 95$) met the state reading standard as opposed to only 73% of the non-DL students ($N = 1, 578$). The TAKS results for the fifth-grade mathematics standards resulted in similar findings when comparing the two DL elementary schools to the school district totals. The results revealed 93% of DL students met math standard versus 78% for the district total.

Second Language Acquisition Theories

Many educators do not understand theories of SLA and how they relate to academic outcomes (Cummins, 1987). Despite the supporting research that it takes five to seven years to reach academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1981, 1987; Collier & Thomas, 2009), there are misconceptions of what it means to be proficient in English. For example, students are usually thought to be fluent simply because they can converse socially in English. However, these basic conversational skills are acquired within one to two years but conversational skills alone do not help ELL students close the achievement gap (Cummins, 1981, 1987; Collier & Thomas, 2009). There is also a misconception that more is better in language study, but research has not supported this reasonable approach (Cummins, 1981, 1987; Collier & Thomas, 2009). Some case studies have shown an inverse relationship between the amount of time spent on English and English language acquisition (Cummins, 1987; Oller & Eilers, 2002). Cummins (1987) pointed out that the research in SLA has not been lacking, but what has been lacking is a “rational” process of examining the research. Research in SLA has been

carried out from different perspectives. For example, linguists are interested in the structural aspects of language whereas psycholinguists are interested in both linguistics and psychology. Neurolinguists are interested in how the language is represented in the brain whereas sociolinguists study the influences of social and cultural factors on language development. All four areas of research have contributed to the development of current SLA theories (Freeman & Freeman, 2001). The main goal in this chapter is not only to bring more interaction between theoretical and applied research in SLA by linking theory, research, and practice as means of contributing to the improvement of English language acquisition for ELLs, but also to give educators the research they need to provide appropriate guidance, instruction, and programs to ELLs.

Theories by Jim Cummins

A widely considered expert in the field of language development is Jim Cummins, who also specializes in theories of language acquisition and development. He has researched, lectured, and written extensively in the field of bilingual education. Cummins is well known for creating the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP), Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) constructs in SLA, and the Interdependence and Threshold hypotheses, which are explained in detail next.

Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP). Cummins (2000) believes that in the course of learning a language a child acquires a set of skills and implicit meta-linguistic knowledge that can be drawn upon when working in another language regardless of the difference between the languages. This CUP, as he calls these skills and knowledge, is, as he refers to it, a “central processing system” that provides the base for the development of

both the first and second language. For instance, linguistic universals, academic knowledge, life experiences, and cognitive development fall under the CUP umbrella. Any expansion of CUP that takes place in one language will have an advantageous effect on the other languages. Cummins (2000), states that conceptual knowledge developed in one language helps make input in the other language more comprehensible. If a learner already understands the concept of "addition" in the native language, all the learner has to do is acquire the label for the term in English. However, the learner has a far more difficult task if he or she has to acquire both the label and the concept in the second language. This theory also helps explain why it becomes easier and easier to learn additional languages (Cummins, 1983, 2000).

Neris, Jackson, and Goldstein (2010) examined whether English-only vocabulary instruction or English vocabulary instruction enhanced with Spanish bridging produced greater word learning in young Latino native Spanish-speakers learning English ($N = 22$). The results of this study showed that when instruction was provided in Spanish, the expressive definition scores were significantly higher than when it was provided in English, $F(1, 20) = 5.77, p = .026$. The Spanish-speaking children showed an improved ability to define targeted English words when the definitions and explanations of the word meanings were taught in their native language, lending empirical evidence to Cummins' CUP construct; which suggests a positive transfer of knowledge between the first and second language. Similarly, in a study of the Fairfax County Public Schools, Thomas, Collier, and Abbott (1993) compared academic data of DL students ($N = 719$) enrolled in eight different DL schools in grades first through third to the academic data for an English-only comparison group of similar abilities ($N = 1320$). The comparison

group of English-only students was controlled and selected based on the first grade Cognitive Abilities Test. The DL programs in the eight schools included 90:10 DL models in English/French, English/Japanese, and English/Spanish. The national standardized Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading was given in grades two and three, a locally developed district criterion-referenced mathematics test and the Student Oral Proficiency Rating (SOPR) in grades one, two, and three. The results showed that students participating in all three 90:10 DL programs scored at least as well as or better than the English-only comparable group. No evidence showed that students' academic and cognitive development had been slowed down in any way by learning in two languages simultaneously. In fact, the evidence showed that in year two of the 90:10 DL programs, the performance of the DL students in math ($F = 24.45$, $df = 1, 613$, $p < .00000149$, effect size = .42) and in other content areas had been enhanced as a result of learning in two languages, and, more importantly, clearly showed that knowledge transfer between languages had occurred since students had taken the test in English but with content instruction mostly in the target language.

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). According to Cummins (2000), BICS are the "surface" skills of listening and speaking which are typically acquired within two years by many students; particularly by those from language backgrounds similar to English who spend a lot of their school time interacting with native speakers. BICS can only be acquired through exposure to "acquisition rich" environments and requires interpersonal connections to come to realization (Baker & Hornberger, 2001).

Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Cummins (2000) states that while many children develop near native speaker fluency (i.e., BICS) within two years of immersion in the target language, it takes children between five to seven years to acquire CALP, which is more cognitively demanding than BICS and allows them to be working on a level with native speakers. Unlike BICS, CALP can be developed through home study without interpersonal contact (Baker & Hornberger, 2001). Cummins (1982) pointed out that the mistake many educators make is in assuming that ELLs have learned sufficient English or have become English proficient when they have only acquired peer-appropriate fluency in everyday communication or BICS. This misconception reflects a failure to recognize the crucial difference between the language proficiency involved with everyday social language (BICS) versus academic and cognitive demanding language (CALP) needed to be successful in an academic setting. Consequently, ELLs are exited from English acquisition programs prematurely when they show high levels of BICS in English. Baker and Hornberger (2001) pointed out that just like first language (L1) BICS tells one little about L1 CALP, so does second language (L2) BICS tell one little about L2 CALP because both constructs are not interconnected as is L1 CALP with L2 CALP. As such, Baker and Hornberger (2001) pointed out that measures of L1 CALP would provide a more adequate basis for exiting students from English acquisition programs than L1 BICS.

Longitudinal research by Thomas and Collier (2009) pointed out that ELLs in the primary grades made good progress acquiring English within the first two years of ESL pullout instruction. However, as these students moved into more cognitively demanding work in the upper grades, their lack of academic and cognitive development was more

readily observed. This research lends empirical support to the fact that CALP takes longer to acquire than BICS and also clearly informs one that the implications of assuming a student is falsely proficient in English after being able to simply converse in English are damaging. In another longitudinal study of English acquisition in the U.S., Oller and Eilers (2002) analyzed the test results (oral language and literacy measures) for students who were bilingual from birth and those who first learned English in school. Both groups scored lower on measures of English at kindergarten, but by the time the children were in the fifth-grade, the gaps in performance between the bilingual and monolingual children were almost non-existent and in some cases inverted. This is fitting with the Cummins CALP construct that it takes five to seven years for children to acquire the level of academic English needed to be successful in an academic setting.

The Interdependence hypothesis. According to Cummins (1983, 1987, 2000), the interdependence hypothesis states that academic language proficiency transfers across languages under appropriate conditions of student motivation and exposure to both languages, such that students who have developed literacy in their native language will tend to make stronger progress in acquiring literacy in the second language. What this means is that a student learning in Spanish is also developing a deeper conceptual and linguistic proficiency; which will help with the development of English. The cognitive underlying proficiency (CUP) makes possible the transfer of cognitive, academic, and literacy related skills across both the languages. Thus time spent learning in the native language is not wasted learning time. To the contrary, it is advantageous for acquiring English and for academic achievement. Cummins has provided a visual representation for this hypothesis referred to as the "dual-iceberg" model. The iceberg analogy refers to

the assumption that on the surface (peaks above the water) the first and second languages appear to be functioning in isolation but under the surface (below the water) there are academic and intellectual processes that are common to both languages. To the contrary, supporters of English only or quick exit transitional DL programs implicitly assume the validity of a “Separate Underlying Proficiency” (SUP) model where each language is learned independently of each other and stimulation in one does not imply stimulation to the other (Baker & Holdberger, 2001). However, various longitudinal studies support the Interdependence hypothesis (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Ramirez, 1991). For example, Ramirez (1991) followed Spanish-speaking language minority students enrolled in English immersion and two different DL programs (early exit and late exit) for eight years and found that students who were provided with more support in their native language (late exit program), over the long haul, did better in mathematics, English language, and English reading skills than those students in English immersion programs and early exit DL programs. Similarly, Collier & Thomas (2009) pointed out that all of their research on long-term effectiveness, in which 6.2 million student records from across the U.S. were analyzed, consistently confirms that when students have the opportunity to do academic work in their native language, in the long term, they are academically more successful in the second language. These longitudinal studies and hypothesis provide support for the usefulness of native language development in facilitating the acquisition of English language skills.

The Threshold hypothesis. Cummins (2000) asserts that for positive effects of bilingualism to be reached and for cognitive deficits to be avoided, there is a “threshold level” of proficiency that children must reach in their native language that is necessary to

support academic achievement in the second language. Neris, Jackson, and Goldstein (2010) examined whether English-only vocabulary instruction or English vocabulary instruction enhanced with Spanish bridging produced greater word learning in young Latino native Spanish-speakers learning English (N=22). The 22 Latino students (11 girls, 11 boys) were broken up into two different ability groups (high Spanish-low English and low Spanish-low English) and key vocabulary during reading times were explained in Spanish to both groups. The results showed that children with a higher level Spanish proficiency and limited English skills outperformed the children with low-level skills in both English and Spanish. These results provide empirical evidence that a certain “threshold level” in the native language is necessary to support academic achievement in the second language and that children with better home language skills in Spanish demonstrate greater responsiveness to vocabulary expansions during shared book reading.

Social, Cultural, and Psychological Factors on Second Language Acquisition

A significant study by SLA researcher, John Schumann (1978) revealed that social, cultural and psychological variables affect how second language learners acquire the second language. Social, cultural, and psychological factors, such as anxiety, motivation and self-confidence can either help or hinder the success of the second language learner (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Cummins, 1987, 2000; Krashen, 1987, 1992, 2003; Schumman, 1978). A brief overview of social, cultural, and psychological factors that impact SLA is covered next.

Schumman’s Acculturation Model. Schumann (1978) developed the acculturation model after an intensive longitudinal study of six language learners. He

focuses on social cultural and psychological factors that affect the language learner. Schumann claims that acquiring a new language is part of a more general process of acculturation. However, he does not discuss any internal cognitive processing that might take place during the language learning process. Schumann's hypothesis on the one hand is that the greater the social and psychological distance between two cultures, the greater the difficulty the learner will have in learning the second language. On the other hand, the smaller the social and psychological distance, the greater are the chances for acquiring the second language. Schumann lists eight factors that influence social distance and these factors often interact so that one will affect another:

1. Social dominance. Social dominance refers to the cultural, political, technical, or economical dominance one group has over another. Social distance is greatest when one group dominates the other and smallest when both groups have equal power.
2. Integration pattern. Integration pattern refers to the pattern of integration being followed by the secondary group, whether it is assimilation, acculturation, or preservation. Social distance is greatest when there is a pattern of limited integration.
3. Enclosure. Enclosure involves factors like institutional separation and associational clustering as in separate schools and laws. Social distance is greatest when the two groups never interact or relate with one another.
4. Cohesiveness. Cohesiveness involves the minority group being tight-knit. Social distance is greatest when members of the minority group are too cohesive and only associate with each other.

5. Size. Size is closely related to cohesiveness in that the larger the minority group, the more cohesive members are with each other. Social distance is greatest when group members only associate and interact with each other.
6. Cultural Congruence. Cultural congruence refers to when both groups are culturally very similar. Social distance increases when both groups are very different culturally.
7. Attitude. Another factor that affects social distance is the attitude both groups have toward each other. The social distance decreases when both groups have favorable attitudes toward each other.
8. Intended lengths of residence. The length of residence also affects social distance and the social distance is greatest when the minority group only intends to stay in the country a short time.

In addition to the social distance between groups, Schumann also identifies psychological distance as a second factor that can be used to predict an individual's degree of language acquisition. There are three main factors that determine the psychological distance between a second language learner from the target language and culture:

1. Motivation. The more motivated the individual, the more likely he/she will acquire the language.
2. Attitude. Individuals with a positive attitude for the language and culture are more likely to acquire the language than those with a negative attitude.
3. Culture shock. Experiencing culture shock (fear, anxiety, or depression) can hinder acquiring the second language.

Mother Tongue. Children learn better in the second language if they have a higher level of mother-tongue competence (Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010). The mother tongue plays a critical role in second language development. When children first learn their mother tongue they develop their language skills and intellectual capacities, which then strengthen their second language learning capability and as a result, children with a rich vocabulary in their mother tongue find it easier to learn the second language, and learn to read and write earlier (Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010). In a 1999 study of migrant Turkish families, Yazici found that children, both bilingual and monolingual, who had higher levels of mother-tongue competence also had higher levels of reading-readiness (Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010), making it clear that time spent at home in the child's native language does not impede the development of academic skills in the second language (Cummins 1981, 1983). However, it is important to note that if the language use in the home is haphazard and unplanned, with frequent fluctuation of languages by the same person speaking to the child, the mother tongue will unlikely develop adequately (Cummins, 1981). Whether it is at home or in school programs in which ELLs' native language is reinforced, the learners tend to be more successful (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Cummins, 1991; Ramirez, 1991). Cummins (1987) emphasizes that a considerable amount of research from around the world indicates that children exposed to a home-school language switch experience no academic delays.

Language Connected to Ethnic Identity. Thirty-eight years ago the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Lau v Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974) linked language to ethnicity and said that one's language cannot be separated from one's ethnicity and race. Language clearly involves so much more than the ability to communicate; it also conveys a desire

to understand and participate in a culture. Language is linked to an individual's culture in that it helps to maintain ethnic participation and provides access to the ethnic community (Regh & Waack, 2009), but when the language dies, so does much of the culture that it expressed (Crawford, 2004). Consequently, when ELLs do not develop their native language and do not master English, they may not feel part of either culture and may experience personality or identity problems (Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010) that result in cultural dissonance. They may also become ashamed of their native language and culture, which can lead to academic difficulties (Wright, 2010). Beyond identity problems, cultural loss also has academic consequences for ELLs (Wright, 2010). Collier and Thomas (2009) pointed out, "Since first language is closely connected to identity, they (ELLs) come to view themselves as not worthy, not valued or respected for who they are. This leads to lower academic achievement in English in the long term" (p. 66). Without a strong identity and pride in their origins, ELLs are not like to be able to counter some of society's negative messages about their origins, but more importantly, are prone to encounter problems in school (Crawford, 2004).

Language Attitudes. Language attitudes in the learner, the peer group, or the school can also have an effect on the SLA, both positive and negative. In a study involving 150 Latino students in grades seven through 12, Regh & Waack (2009) pointed out that the Latino group educated in a DL program had more preference for usage of their native language than did the Latino group educated in a traditional education program. In settings where the language is seen as strange and unpopular, peer pressure often reduces the desire of the language learner to work toward native pronunciation because the sounds of the target language may be regarded as bizarre (Walqui, 2000).

Consequently, students who perceive negative attitudes in the school setting toward their first language will choose to give up on being bilingual (Lessow-Hurley, 2000).

According to Cummins (1987, 2005), teachers who adopt culturally relevant pedagogy value ELLs' cultural and linguistic backgrounds and create learning environments that foster, promote, and embrace the identities of ELLs. Cummins (1991) pointed out that a program that accepts and respects the language and culture of its students empowers them to feel confident enough to risk getting involved in the learning process; which is what we hope all students come to do in school. Clearly, a positive attitude and a positive self-concept are necessary for achieving maximum learning potential (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Cummins, 1991).

Language Status. While U.S. schools no longer have official policies banning Spanish, or a system of penalties for students who speak their native language within school premises (Reyes, 2011), non-English languages are still viewed as less prestigious and less important than English (Cummins, 1987; Reyes, 2011). Consequently, students whose native language has a low status may lose their first language because they may feel like they have to give up their own language and culture to join the more prestigious culture associated with the dominant language (Walqui, 2000; Hernandez, 2012).

Bilingualism

During much of the 20th century bilingualism was considered a source of academic retardation and cognitive confusion and efforts were exhausted to rid bilingual students of their native tongue (Cummins, 2000; Lessow-Hurley, 2000). Cummins (1981) pointed out that researchers and educators alike tended to regard bilingualism as a major cause of poor school performance because many minority language children were

showing low levels of proficiency in both languages. However, he noted that these difficulties should have been attributed not to bilingualism itself, but the lack of full bilingualism and schools' attempts to do away with bilingualism, often by means of humiliation and punishment, in minority children in hopes to help them learn English and identify with the dominant group (Cummins 1981, 1982, 1987; Reyes, 2011). When analyzing the effects of bilingualism among children whose proficiency in both languages has continued to develop, a completely different conclusion emerges (Cummins, 1981). For example, some benefits to being bilingual are obvious and practical, such as, the ability to communicate and connect with other cultures or giving one a political and economic advantage (Rovira, 1998; Buchholz, 2002). In today's global society bilingualism can also be a leg up for college admission and serve as a resume builder (Schwartz, 2011). Furthermore, recent brain research reveals that bilingualism is not just practical but actually makes one smarter and can have a profound effect on the brain (Bhattacharjee, 2012). The "executive function" part of the brain which houses the ability to focus, decipher, compare, problem solve, etc. has been shown to be developed ahead of time in bilingual children, as young as three or four (Schwartz, 2011; Bhattacharjee, 2012). Bilingualism not only improves cognitive skills but also gives bilinguals a heightened ability to monitor the environment because of the need to have to switch languages and has also been linked to shielding against dementia (Bhattacharjee, 2012). What is more, bilinguals tend to be better at learning new languages than monolinguals (Schwartz, 2011). However, a common misunderstanding is that bilingual education is only for immigrant students (Rovira, 1998), when in reality the benefits of bilingualism can be for all students. "Students are enabled—not disabled, by

being bilingual; they are empowered by knowing more than one language” (Rovira, 1998, p. 1). Proficient bilingualism is a desirable goal which can bring cognitive, academic, cultural, and economic benefits to individuals and to the nation (Crawford, 1997).

Clearly, knowing more than one language is not an impediment or handicap; bilingual children have greater cognitive flexibility and better language skills than monolingual children (Lessow-Hurley, 2000). Bilingualism not only prepares students for today’s global economy, it promotes cognitive development and instills pride (Rovira, 1998). In the end, bilingual education supports children’s’ personal development and assists a positive exchange between two languages and cultures (Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010).

Additive Bilingualism Model. There have been many empirical studies carried out in the past few decades that reported a positive association between additive bilingualism and students’ linguistic, cognitive, or academic growth (Collier, Thomas, & Abbott, 1993; Collier & Thomas, 1997, 2009; Cummins, 1987, 2000; Lambert, 1975). Lambert (1975) distinguishes “additive” from “subtractive” bilingualism. Additive bilingualism refers to the acquisition of a second language at no cost to one’s first language (Wright, 2010). Within this model, language is seen as a resource and ELLs are not put into a position where one language is more important than the other but where bilingualism is promoted. ELLs are not treated as linguistically deficient, but instead schools recognize and build upon the skills, knowledge, and resources that these students bring with them (Collier & Thomas, 1997; Crawford, 1997). Students are encouraged to take pride in their backgrounds and are empowered to do so (Crawford, 1997). Schools that strive for additive models have fared better in academic achievement (Ramirez et al., 1991) and in sociocultural advantages too (Crawford, 1997). Additive approaches have a

strong impact on student attitudes toward school and themselves because low self-esteem is a syndrome of disempowerment and alienation (Crawford, 1997). The linguistic and academic benefits of additive bilingualism for students provide an additional reason to support ELLs in maintaining their native language while they are acquiring English (Cummins, 1983, 1987, 2000). Children of all ages, but especially at adolescence, have a strong need to belong and to fit with the group. If children feel that their native language and culture are not accepted by their peers and teachers, they will often try to hide that their background is different and avoid speaking the native language publicly (Cummins, 1981). Instead, within this additive model, schools intentionally set out to affirm students' linguistic differences by activating students' prior knowledge and making it known that what these children are bringing into the classroom is important and relevant to their learning (Cummins, 2000). A program that accepts and respects the language and culture of its students empowers them to feel confident enough to get involved in the learning process (Cummins, 1991).

Subtractive Bilingualism Model. Children who lack educational support for literacy development in their native language frequently develop a subtractive form of bilingualism in which native language skills are replaced by English skills (Cummins, 1987; Wright, 2010). Those who oppose the teaching of students' native language frequently argue that the promotion of the native language will impede the development of English. Common sense would suggest that less time spent on English will result in lower achievement in English. However, evaluations of bilingual education programs conducted in several countries show that there is no basis for this common sense assumption (Cummins, 1981, 1983, 1987). Within a subtractive model, schools view

differences as obstacles to learning and are uncomfortable with unfamiliar cultures (Reyes, 2011). Despite the fact that the vast majority of native speakers of any language come to school at age five or so fluent in the conversation or social language of their homes and have acquired many of the grammar or linguistic rules, schools using a subtractive model do not assess dimensions of students' native language; such as conversation fluency or pronunciation, that most children have already mastered by the time they arrive in school (Cummins, 2000). The difference between an additive model and a subtractive model is best analyzed in the words of Cummins (2000) as "language-as-problem" versus "language-as-resource." The difference can also be explained in terms of enriched versus remedial education. Remediation refers to the impulse to fix ELLs' language disability rather than recognizing the native language as a resource to support English acquisition (Crawford & Krashen, 2007). The difference between additive and subtractive bilingualism models does impact ELLs' cultural adjustment and their academic and cognitive development (Crawford & Krashen, 2007). In the landmark study Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study that followed 5,000 middle and high school students who were second-generation immigrants over several years, Portes and Hao (1998) reported that acquiring English alone was no guarantee of success in school or psychological well-being and that students who had become largely monolingual in English rated lower in family harmony, self-esteem, and educational aspirations than those who had maintained their bilingualism.

Deficit Model. The deficit view blames the students for their inadequacies, but assumes that the deficit can be corrected through remediation (Lessow-Hurley, 2000). ELLs are assessed from a deficit perspective where what is missing is more important

than the knowledge and experiences the student already has (Collier & Thomas, 2009). For instance, the U.S. federal government refers to students learning English and for whom English is not their native language as “Limited English Proficient” students (LEPs) (NCLB, 2001; Collier & Thomas, 2009, Wright, 2010). Today most ELLs spend their time in regular classrooms with teachers who feel that they are ill-prepared to meet their needs (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011). In the deficit model, the aim of the school program is to expose minority language students to the second language in order to compensate for these deficient linguistic and cultural background experiences (Cummins, 1982). Also, within this model, educators have deficit views of minority language students. For instance, Latinos are considered “at-risk” if they speak no English (Reyes, 2011). Ultimately, ELLs are treated as if they have a learning problem, a message that tends to be self-fulfilling (Crawford & Krashen, 2007).

Critical Theories in Biliteracy

The role of the native language in second language learning has generated a number of studies that have addressed questions related to meta-linguistic awareness (MA) and cross-linguistic transfer (Lervag & Lervag, 2011). Understanding MA and cross-linguistic influence will help understand the nature of bilingualism and how learning two or more languages is different than learning only one (August & Shanahan, 2006; Melby-Lervag & Lervag, 2011).

Meta-linguistic Awareness. Meta-linguistic Awareness (MA) is a term used to describe a construct to explain the interaction between language and written text, primarily in bilingual students’ literacy development (Bialystok, 1991, 2001). MA is the ability to reflect on and manipulate the structural features of language (Nagy &

Anderson, 1995). MA can also be defined as a conscious awareness of the linguistic form and structure of the language and how they relate to and produce the underlying meaning of words. It entails the ability to compare and contrast two language systems to discover commonalities as well as differences (Bialystok, 1991, 2001). In short, the awareness to understand and use two languages is referred to as one's MA (Garcia & Nunez, 2011). Code-switching, translation, and the understanding of cognates in languages are examples of bilinguals' MA. For example, knowing that the English word *science* and the Spanish word *ciencias* are cognates would be an example of a bilingual's MA (Garcia & Nunez, 2011).

To the extent that a language learner has MA, SLA is facilitated because a language outline is available (Bialystok, 1991, 2001). Therefore, ELLs need not relearn the original principles of language structure because these are already known from the MA knowledge that grew out of their native language acquisition (Bialystok, 1991, 2001). Furthermore, Dillon (2009) pointed out that MA is transferable to any language; the awareness that there are parts of speech (nouns, verbs, prepositions, etc.) in one's native language can assist in learning the second language in that it helps the student know what to look for. As first-language MA is established, bilingual readers can automatically activate and apply this skill to reading in their second language because learning to read is fundamentally MA (Nagy & Anderson, 1995). Bilingual Education enhances MA because of the juxtapositioning of two language systems as students learn listening, speaking, reading, and writing in Spanish and English.

Cross-linguistic transfer. Studies of bilingual cross-linguistic transfer of skills indicate that there is a high level of transfer of skills and strategies from the first to the

second language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Dillon, 2009; Foursha-Stevenson & Nicoladis, 2011; Melby-Lervag & Lervag, 2011). In a significant meta-analysis of 293 methodologically-sound research studies from 1980 to 2002, August & Shanahan (2006) confirm that there is a positive transfer between the first and second language in several areas: Phonemic awareness and phonological processes, decoding and word recognition strategies, use of cognates, and overall comprehension strategies such as strategies in reading. This meta-analysis also confirms that the greater the similarity in the writing systems of the two languages, the greater the degree of transfer, thus reducing the time and difficulties involved in learning to read the second language. For example, it would be easier for a native Spanish speaker to learn French than Chinese. The degree of cross-linguistic transfer is greatest when both languages have alphabetic writing systems that have many of the same letter-sound relationships, such as in the case of Spanish and English (Bialystok, 2001). Overall, the research findings support the premise that explicit instruction in two languages is helpful for developing effective reading strategies in bilingual learners. August and Shanahan (2006) pointed out that, “Language-minority students (LMS) who are literate in their first language are likely to be advantaged in the acquisition of English literacy” (p.17), and that studies demonstrate that LMS instructed in their native language as well as in English on average perform better on English reading measures than their peers taught only in English at the elementary and secondary levels because the MA construct speeds up second language acquisition. In a qualitative study, Beltran (2010) examined the nature of fifth grade student ($N = 30$) interactions in a dual immersion school to analyze affordances for bilingual language learning, language exchange, and co-construction of language expertise. Data was collected by observation,

interviews, and audio recordings of classroom discourse over one academic year and the findings revealed that student interactions offer rich affordances for language learning when student are given the opportunity to draw on two or more languages simultaneously. As such, Beltran (2010) makes the following conclusions:

1. “The students’ use of two languages use not only deepened MA analysis but also multiplied the language learning affordances within interactions” because students were able to draw on two linguistic codes simultaneously (p. 260).
2. Two languages inspire cross-linguistic word analysis and linguistic creativity.
3. Two languages bridge gaps for some students while becoming learning opportunities for others.
4. Two languages promote MA and private speech becomes collaborative. In a setting where two languages were available all of the time, this study demonstrated that the ongoing process of acquisition in two languages can occur simultaneously without any negative interference on the learning of English.

Conclusion

The influx of ELLs to school across the U.S. over the past few decades has had a profound impact on the country. However, there continues to be an absence of rational policy when it comes to the education of ELLs in the U.S. Despite the fact that the 2010 Census shows the U.S. to be a multilingual society, it is inaccurately and widely assumed to be a monolingual nation. Monolingual beliefs, in which language diversity is seen to be problem, coupled with undependable data, has resulted in policy that is for the most part shaped by beliefs and attitudes rather than by reliable data, research, or proven pedagogies. That ELLs must learn English to participate, contribute, and prosper in the

U.S. is unarguable. The question is how to best meet ELLs' linguistic and academic needs in a manner that is pedagogically sound, culturally responsive, and honors their basic human right to speak their native language while they strive to lead productive lives and learn English in the U.S.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The purpose of the study was to compare the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students from the same urban elementary school who received instruction in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program from kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students who received instruction in a Dual Language (DL) program from kindergarten through fourth-grade to determine the effectiveness of both programs that are aimed at helping English Language Learners (ELLs) acquire the English language.

Participants

Individuals who participated in this study were identified upon entering the research elementary school in kindergarten, Hispanic ELLs whose home language and school correspondence language is Spanish and enrolled in the research elementary school's ESL program compared to Hispanic ELLs whose home language and school correspondence language is Spanish and enrolled in the research elementary school's DL program. Individuals who participated in this study attended the same elementary school from entry in kindergarten until fourth-grade, the completion of their elementary school education.

Number of participants. The maximum accrual ($N = 34$) for this study was a naturally formed group of students ($n = 16$) who started kindergarten in the ESL program and remained in the same ESL program through fourth-grade and a naturally formed

group of students ($n = 18$) who started kindergarten in the DL program and remained in the same DL program through fourth-grade.

Gender of participants. Students who received instruction in the ESL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade were male $n = 7$ (44%) and female $n = 9$ (56%). Students who received instruction in the DL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade were male $n = 10$ (56%) and female $n = 8$ (44%). The gender of the study participants was congruent with the research school's gender demographics for students in the elementary school.

Age range of participants. The age range for all study participants was from 10 years to 11 years. All participants were in the fourth-grade during the final posttest measures. The age range of the study participants was congruent with the research school's age range demographics for students in the elementary school.

Racial and ethnic origin of participants. Of the total number of selected subjects who received instruction in the ESL program $n = 16$ (100%) were Hispanic. Of the total number of selected subjects who received instruction in the Dual Language program $n = 18$ (100%) were Hispanic. The racial and ethnic origin of the study participants was congruent with the research school's racial and ethnic origin demographics for students receiving English language instruction in the elementary school.

Inclusion criteria of participants. Study participants consisted of fourth-grade Hispanic ELLs who scored a 1, 2, or 3 in the oral Pre-LAS assessment in kindergarten and enrolled in the research elementary school's ESL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade ($n = 16$), and fourth-grade Hispanic ELLs who scored a 1, 2, or 3 in the oral

Pre-LAS assessment in kindergarten and enrolled in the research elementary school's DL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade ($n = 18$).

Method of participant identification. Study participants who had no English language skills or some English language skills upon entering kindergarten at the research elementary school were placed into the ESL or into the DL program at the research elementary school. Reason for referral to the English Language Acquisition programs of entering kindergarten students at the research elementary school indentified for English language proficiency testing prior to school entry included: (a) parent selection of a language other than English used at home on the Home Language Survey (HLS), and (b) a score on the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) of: an oral Pre-LAS score of 1 for a non-English speaker or 2 or 3 for a limited English speaker (criteria used at kindergarten and first grade level).

Description of Procedures

Research design. The extended in time quasi-experimental efficacy study design is displayed in the following notation.

Group 1 $X_1 Y_1 O_1 O_2$

Group 2 $X_1 Y_2 O_1 O_2$

Group 1 = study participants #1. A naturally formed group of students ($n = 16$).

Group 2 = study participants #2. A naturally formed group of students ($n = 18$).

X_1 = study constant. All study participants attended the same research elementary school kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Y₁ = study independent variable, English as a Second Language program placement, condition #1. The first independent variable was student participation in English as a Second Language (ESL) program.

Y₂ = study independent variable, Dual Language program placement, condition #2. The second independent variable was student participation in the Dual Language (DL) program.

O₁ = study posttest dependent measure #1. (1) Language as measured by third-grade English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scores. (2) Achievement as measured by (a) third-grade Nebraska State Accountability reading (NeSA-R) score. (3) Engagement as measured by total days absent from school at end of third-grade.

O₂ = study post-posttest dependent measure #2. (1) Language as measured by fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scores. (2) Achievement as measured by (a) fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability reading (NeSA-R) score. (3) Engagement as measured by total days absent from school end of fourth-grade.

Independent Variable Conditions

The study has two independent variables with one condition each. Independent variable, participation in the English as a Second Language program, condition #1 was a naturally formed group of ELLs with no or very limited English language skills that enrolled in the research elementary school in kindergarten. Independent variable, participation in the DL program, condition #2 was a naturally formed group of ELLs with no or very limited English language skills that enrolled in the research elementary school in kindergarten. An oral Pre-LAS assessment and English language proficiency level

prior to kindergarten enrollment determined the placement of students into the English language acquisition programs at the research elementary school. Parent selection and space availability determined enrollment in the DL program.

Description of the English language acquisition programs.

Omaha Public Schools serve nearly 50,000 students. The ESL program serves close to 7,000 K – 12 students at all schools while the DL program serves close to 1, 500 K – 12 students at five elementary, three middle, and one high school. The ESL program is staffed by teachers who hold endorsements for teaching ESL students and who are typically trained in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) method. ESL teachers are supported with translators, ESL liaisons, and paraprofessionals. The DL program is staffed by teachers who are bilingual in English and Spanish, generally trained in DL instruction and generally hold endorsements for teaching ESL students and/or bilingual education. The DL teachers are also supported with DL liaisons, paraprofessionals, and a building coordinator.

Home language survey. Each year many students with native languages such as Spanish, Karen, Nepali, Nuer, Somali, Vietnamese, Arabic, Chinese, Hmong, Russian, and other non-English languages arrive at the Omaha Public Schools to register as students. These students come primarily from Mexico, South, and Central America, and a smaller percentage from Asia, Africa, and other countries. One of the steps for any new family entering the Omaha Public Schools is to complete a Home Language Survey (HLS) as part of the enrollment process. The HLS is composed of three separate questions: (1) what language did your child first speak? (2) does your child now speak a language other than English? If yes, which language? (3) is there a language other than

English used in your home regularly? If yes, which language? If the family indicates something other than English in response to question number two, the family is immediately referred to the ESL bilingual liaison that is trained to administer the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) to determine possible qualification for ESL services.

English Language Acquisition programs for elementary students. At the elementary level, the Omaha Public Schools has three service models for the English language acquisition program: ESL inclusion (available in schools with large numbers of ELL students), ESL Resource (available in all elementary buildings), and Dual Language (available in a few elementary schools).

Implementation of the English Language Acquisition Programs. The ESL curriculum is based upon the Omaha Public Schools grade level language arts standards and the K – 12 Guidelines for English Language Proficiency (NDE, Draft, 2003). Teachers utilize a balanced literacy approach for instruction in the area of reading and writing, including the use of guided reading at the students' instructional level. ESL is taught through content area instruction. A classroom observational checklist is utilized to ensure that optimal instruction is provided. The checklist is based on the Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) model. Classroom teachers are trained ELL methodology through the ESL endorsement program, the ESL Fall and Spring Conferences, and ongoing coaching by the ESL teacher trainers. Elementary ELLs are served in whatever school he/she chooses to attend. The schools that have larger numbers of ELLs have more ESL services for students and families. The additional services may include a Family Resource Center, a building-based bilingual liaison, and additional paraprofessional support.

The English as a Second Language (ESL) program at Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School includes the following:

- K – 3rd grade students are assigned to a regular classroom with a teacher and a paraprofessional. All ESL students are served in the regular classroom.
- Elementary ESL students participate in guided reading lessons at their instructional level.
- 4th grade students receive approximately one hour of ESL per day and a paraprofessional provides in-class support to ESL students.
- 2nd - 4th grade newcomer (students new to the U.S. with limited or no previous exposure to the English language) ESL students receive approximately two hours of ESL a day with an ESL resource teacher and/or ESL paraprofessional.
- A Family Resource Center (FRC) of materials for students and families. These materials include bilingual materials that can be checked out by the parents and used with students at home.
- Conversational English classes are also provided.
- Summer school
- After school and Saturday enrichment classes are provided at some targeted sites.

The Dual Language (DL) program at Spring Lake Magnet Elementary School includes the following:

- Literacy and content instruction is provided in English and Spanish for all DL students in grades K – 12. At the elementary level, teachers alternate language of instruction daily or during half the day depending on grade level.
- Teachers maintain a specified target language rather than switch from one language to another during instruction.
- Balanced literacy is implemented on both English and the Spanish side in grades K – 6.
- Every K – 6 DL teacher implements a daily take-home book/reading program. Students have equal exposure to English and Spanish literature.
- Curriculum is aligned with the district content standards and grade level expectations.
- Reading, Writing, and Oral language assessments are provided in both English and Spanish.
- Parental support is an essential component of the program and highly supported.
- DL partner teachers are expected to work as a team, lesson planning together on a weekly basis (at a minimum). Building administrators ensure that teachers have a joint plan time as appropriate.
- Summer school

- After school and Saturday enrichment programs are provided at some targeted sites

Dependent Measures

The study's three dependent variables were (1) language as measured by English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scores. (2) Achievement as measured by (a) third and fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA-R) reading scores. (3) Engagement as measured by total days absent from school at end of third and fourth-grade years.

Research Questions and Data Analysis

Research question one analyzed the third-grade English Language Development Assessment scores compared to the fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores of students who participated in English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #1. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening, (b) Speaking, (c) Reading, (d) Writing measures, and (e) Comprehension?

Sub-Question 1a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening?

Sub-Question 1b. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (b) Speaking?

Sub-Question 1c. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (c) Reading?

Sub-Question 1d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (d) Writing?

Sub-Question 1e. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language

Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (e) Comprehension?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question two analyzed the third-grade English Language Development Assessment scores compared to the fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores of students who participated in Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #2. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening, (b) Speaking, (c) Reading, (d) Writing measures, and (e) Comprehension?

Sub-Question 2a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development

Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening?

Sub-Question 2b. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (b) Speaking?

Sub-Question 2c. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (c) Reading?

Sub-Question 2d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (d) Writing?

Sub-Question 2e. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (e) Comprehension?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, and 2e were analyzed using dependent t tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question three analyzed the English Language Development Assessment scores of students who participated in the English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Post-Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #3. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade have congruent or different ending fourth-grade post-posttest English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening, (b) Speaking, (c) Reading, (d) Writing measures, and (e) Comprehension?

Sub-Question 3a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research

elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (a) Listening?

Sub-Question 3b. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (b) Speaking?

Sub-Question 3c. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (c) Reading?

Sub-Question 3d. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (d) Writing?

Sub-Question 3e. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores for (e) Comprehension?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, and 3e were analyzed using independent t tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade ending fourth-grade English Language Development Assessment scores. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question four analyzed the third-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to the fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score of students who participated in English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #4. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Sub-Question 4a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Analysis. Research Sub-Question #4a was analyzed using dependent t tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question five analyzed the third-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to the fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score of students who participated in Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #5. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Sub-Question 5a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Analysis. Research Sub-Question #5a was analyzed using dependent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading score. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question six analyzed the Nebraska State Accountability Reading scores of students who participated in the English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Post-Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #6. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade have congruent or different ending fourth-grade post-posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading scores?

Sub-Question 6a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading score?

Analysis. Research Sub-Question #6a was analyzed using independent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade ending fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability Reading scores. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question seven analyzed the third-grade total days absent from school compared to the fourth-grade total number of days absent from school of students who participated in English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #7. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Sub-Question 7a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total days absent from school?

Analysis. Research Sub-Question #7a was analyzed using dependent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest total number of days absent from school. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question eight analyzed the third-grade total number of days absent from school compared to the fourth-grade total number of days absent from school of students who participated in Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #8. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade lose, maintain, or improve their entering total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Sub-Question 8a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest total number of days absent from school compared to ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Analysis. Research Sub-Question #8a was analyzed using dependent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade entering third-grade posttest total number of days absent from school. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Research question nine analyzed the total number of days absent from school of students who participated in the English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program and lived in homes where the primary language was Spanish and the primary language for correspondence with the school was also Spanish.

Overarching Post-Posttest-Post-Posttest Language Achievement Research

Question #9. Did students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade have congruent or different ending fourth-grade post-posttest total number of days absent from school?

Sub-Question 9a. Will there be a significant difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through ending fourth-grade total number of days absent from school?

Analysis. Research Sub-Question #9a was analyzed using independent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program kindergarten through fourth-grade ending fourth-grade total number of days absent from school. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level will be employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations will be displayed on tables.

Data Collections Procedures

All student English language proficiency, achievement, and engagement data was retrospective, archival, and routinely collected school information. Permission from the appropriate school research personnel was obtained. Naturally formed groups of 16 students in one arm and 18 students in the other group included English language proficiency, achievement, and engagement data. Non-coded numbers were used to display de-identified English language proficiency, achievement, and engagement data. Aggregated group data, descriptive statistics, and parametric statistical analysis were used and reported with means and standard deviations in tables.

Performance site. The research was conducted in the public school setting through normal educational and assessment practices. The study procedures did not interfere with the normal educational and assessment practices of the public school and will not involve coercion or discomfort of any kind. Data was stored on spreadsheets and computer flash drives for statistical analysis in the office of the primary researcher and

the dissertation chair. Data and computer files were kept in locked file cabinets. No individual identifiers were attached to the data.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of Human Subjects

Approval Category. The exemption categories for this study were provided under 45CFR.101 (b) categories 1 and 4. The research was conducted using routinely collected archival data. A letter of support from the district was provided for IRB review.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to compare the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students from the same urban elementary school who received instruction in an ESL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students who received instruction in a DL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade to determine the effectiveness of both programs that are aimed at helping English Language Learners acquire the English language.

Implementation of the Independent Variables

The study has two independent variables with one condition each. Independent variable, participation in the English as a Second Language program, condition #1 was a naturally formed group of ELLs with no or very limited English language skills that enrolled in the research elementary school in kindergarten. Independent variable, participation in the Dual Language program, condition #2 was a naturally formed group of ELLs with no or very limited English language skills that enrolled in the research elementary school in kindergarten. An oral Pre-LAS assessment and English language proficiency level prior to kindergarten enrollment determined the placement of students into the English language acquisition programs at the research elementary school. Parent selection and space availability determined enrollment in the DL program.

Description of the English language acquisition programs. Omaha Public Schools serve nearly 50,000 students. The ESL program serve close to 7,000 K – 12 students at all schools while the DL program serves close to 1, 500 K – 12 students at five elementary, three middle, and one high school. The ESL program is staffed by teachers who hold endorsements for teaching ESL students and who are typically trained in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) method. ESL teachers are supported with translators, ESL liaisons, and paraprofessionals. The DL program is staffed by teachers who are bilingual in English and Spanish, generally trained in dual language instruction and generally hold endorsements for teaching ESL students and/or Bilingual Education. The DL teachers are also supported with DL liaisons, paraprofessionals, and a building coordinator.

Dependent Measures

The study's three dependent variables were (1) language as measured by English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scores. (2) Achievement as measured by (a) third and fourth-grade Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA-R) reading scores. (3) Engagement as measured by total days absent from school at end of third and fourth-grade years. Table 1 displays demographic information of individual students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program. Demographic information of individual students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program is displayed in Table 2.

Table 1

Demographic Information of Individual Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program

Student Number	Gender	Ethnicity	Correspondence and Home Language
1.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
2.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
3.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
4.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
5.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
6.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
7.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
8.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
9.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
10.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
11.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
12.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
13.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
14.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
15.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
16.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish

Note. All students were in attendance in the research school kindergarten through fourth-grade.

Table 2

Demographic Information of Individual Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program

Student Number	Gender	Ethnicity	Correspondence and Home Language
1.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
2.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
3.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
4.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
5.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
6.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
7.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
8.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
9.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
10.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
11.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
12.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
13.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
14.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
15.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
16.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish
17.	Male	Hispanic	Spanish
18.	Female	Hispanic	Spanish

Note. All students were in attendance in the research school kindergarten through fourth-grade.

Research Question #1

Table 3 displays third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program. The first hypothesis was tested using the dependent t test.

Sub-Question 1a. As seen in Table 3 the null hypothesis for Listening English Language Development Assessment score was not rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Listening subtest score pretest $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.04$; posttest $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.81$; and $t(15) = 0.53$, $p = .30$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.201$.

Sub-Question 1b. As seen in Table 3 null hypothesis for Speaking English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Speaking subtest score pretest $M = 3.87$, $SD = 0.80$; posttest $M = 4.68$, $SD = 0.60$; and $t(15) = 4.96$, $p < .001$ (one-tailed), $ES = 1.154$.

Sub-Question 1c. As seen in Table 3 null hypothesis for Reading English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Reading subtest score pretest $M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.41$; posttest $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.10$; and $t(15) = 4.07$, $p < .001$ (one-tailed), $ES = 1.556$.

Sub-Question 1d. As seen in Table 3 null hypothesis for Writing English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Writing subtest score pretest $M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.71$; posttest $M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.95$; and $t(15) = 2.74$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 1.556$.

Sub-Question 1e. As seen in Table 3 null hypothesis for Comprehension English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Writing subtest score pretest $M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.75$; posttest $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.10$; and $t(15) = 3.30$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 1.076$.

Table 3

Third-Grade Pretest English Language Development Assessment Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program

Source	Level Scores						ES	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	
	Pretest		Posttest		ES	<i>t</i>				<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>						
Listening	3.81	(1.04)	4.00	(0.81)	0.201	0.53	.30 [†]			
Speaking	3.87	(0.80)	4.68	(0.60)	1.154	4.96	.000***			
Reading	2.62	(0.41)	3.81	(1.10)	1.556	4.07	.000***			
Writing	2.62	(0.71)	3.12	(0.95)	0.597	2.74	.007**			
Comprehension	2.81	(0.75)	3.81	(1.10)	1.076	3.30	.002**			

Note. English Language Development Assessment Scores: 5 = Proficient; 4 = Advanced; 3 = Intermediate; 2 = Beginning; 1 = Pre-Functional.

[†]*ns.* ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Research Question #2

Table 4 displays third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program. The second hypothesis was tested using the dependent t test.

Sub-Question 2a. As seen in Table 4 the null hypothesis for Listening English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Listening subtest score pretest $M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.09$; posttest $M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.68$; and $t(17) = 2.72$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.812$.

Sub-Question 2b. As seen in Table 4 the null hypothesis for Speaking English Language Development Assessment score was not rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Speaking subtest score pretest $M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.67$; posttest $M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.66$; and $t(17) = 0.82$, $p = .211$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.247$.

Sub-Question 2c. As seen in Table 4 the null hypothesis for Reading English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Reading subtest score pretest $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.53$; posttest $M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.32$; and $t(17) = 2.85$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.622$.

Sub-Question 2d. As seen in Table 4 the null hypothesis for Writing English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Writing subtest score pretest $M = 2.94$, $SD = 0.72$; posttest $M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.95$; and $t(17) = 1.93$, $p < .05$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.607$.

Sub-Question 2e. As seen in Table 4 the null hypothesis for Comprehension English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Comprehension subtest score pretest $M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.30$; posttest $M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.32$; and $t(17) = 3.18$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.719$.

Table 4

Third-Grade Pretest English Language Development Assessment Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program

Source	Level Scores						ES	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	
	Pretest		Posttest		ES	<i>t</i>				<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>						
Listening	3.61	(1.09)	4.33	(0.68)	0.812	2.72	.007**			
Speaking	4.11	(0.67)	4.27	(0.66)	0.247	0.82	.211 [†]			
Reading	3.00	(1.53)	3.88	(1.32)	0.622	2.85	.005**			
Writing	2.94	(0.72)	3.44	(0.92)	0.607	1.93	.035*			
Comprehension	2.94	(1.30)	3.88	(1.32)	0.719	3.18	.002**			

Note. English Language Development Assessment Scores: 5 = Proficient; 4 = Advanced; 3 = Intermediate; 2 = Beginning; 1 = Pre-Functional.

[†]*ns.* * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Research Question #3

Table 5 displays fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program. The third hypothesis was tested using the independent t test.

Sub-Question 3a. As found in Table 5 the null hypotheses for Listening English Language Development Assessment scores was not rejected in the direction of greater posttest mean scores for students completing the research elementary school's Dual Language program compared to students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program where Dual Language students' Listening subtest score posttest $M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.68$ compared to English as a Second Language students' Listening subtest score posttest $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.81$; and $t(32) = 1.29$, $p = .103$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.444$.

Sub-Question 3b. As seen in Table 5 the null hypothesis for the Speaking English Language Development Assessment score was rejected in the direction of a greater posttest score for students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program where the Speaking subtest score posttest $M = 4.68$, $SD = 0.60$ compared to students completing the research elementary school's Dual Language program posttest $M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.66$; and $t(32) = -1.87$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.644$.

Sub-Question 3c. As found in Table 5 the null hypotheses for Reading English Language Development Assessment scores was not rejected in the direction of greater posttest mean scores for students completing the research elementary school's Dual

Language program compared to students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program where Dual Language students' Reading subtest score posttest $M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.32$ compared to English as a Second Language students' Reading subtest score posttest $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.10$; and $t(32) = 0.18$, $p = .429$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.062$

Sub-Question 3d. As found in Table 5 the null hypotheses for Writing English Language Development Assessment scores was not rejected in the direction of greater posttest mean scores for students completing the research elementary school's Dual Language program compared to students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program where Dual Language students' Writing subtest score posttest $M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.92$ compared to English as a Second Language students' Writing subtest score posttest $M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.95$; and $t(32) = 0.99$, $p = .164$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.340$.

Sub-Question 3e. As found in Table 5 the null hypotheses for Comprehension English Language Development Assessment scores was not rejected in the direction of greater posttest mean scores for students completing the research elementary school's Dual Language program compared to students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program where Dual Language students' Comprehension subtest score posttest $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.10$; and $t(32) = 0.18$, $p = .429$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.628$.

Table 5

Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest English Language Development Assessment Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program

Source	Level Scores						ES	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Posttest English as a Second Language		Posttest Dual Language Program		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
Listening	4.00	(0.81)	4.33	(0.68)	0.444	1.29	.103 [†]		
Speaking	4.68	(0.60)	4.27	(0.66)	-0.644	-1.87	.035*		
Reading	3.81	(1.10)	3.88	(1.32)	0.062	0.18	.429 [†]		
Writing	3.12	(0.95)	3.44	(0.92)	0.340	0.99	.164 [†]		
Comprehension	3.81	(1.10)	3.88	(1.32)	0.628	0.18	.429 [†]		

Note. English Language Development Assessment Scores: 5 = Proficient; 4 = Advanced; 3 = Intermediate; 2 = Beginning; 1 = Pre-Functional.

[†]*ns.* **p* < .05.

Research Question #4

Sub-Question 4a. Table 6 displays third-grade pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores compared to fourth-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program. The fourth hypothesis was tested using the dependent t test. As seen in Table 6 the null hypothesis for reading was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading score pretest $M = 78.12$, $SD = 24.20$; posttest $M = 95.31$, $SD = 22.28$; and $t(15) = 3.48$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.739$.

Table 6

Third-Grade Pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program

Source	Reading Scaled Scores						ES	t	p
	Pretest		Posttest						
	M	SD	M	SD					
Reading	78.12	(24.20)	95.31	(22.28)	0.739	3.48	.001**		

Note. Exceeds the Standards 135 and above; Meets the Standards 85-134; Below the Standards 84 and below.

** $p < .01$.

Research Question #5

Sub-Question 5a. Table 7 displays third-grade pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores compared to fourth-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program. The fifth hypothesis was tested using the dependent t test. As seen in Table 7 the null hypothesis for reading was rejected in the direction of posttest score improvement where the Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading score pretest $M = 76.94$, $SD = 25.67$; posttest $M = 96.16$, $SD = 32.51$; and $t(17) = 3.61$, $p < .01$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.660$.

Table 7

Third-Grade Pretest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Dual Language Program

Source	Reading Scaled Scores						ES	t	p
	Pretest		Posttest						
	M	SD	M	SD					
Reading	76.94	(25.67)	96.16	(32.51)	0.660	3.61	.001**		

Note. Exceeds the Standards 135 and above; Meets the Standards 85-134; Below the Standards 84 and below.

** $p < .01$.

Research Question #6

Sub-Question 6a. Table 8 displays fourth-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program compared to fourth-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program. The sixth hypothesis was tested using the independent t test. As seen in Table 8 the null hypothesis for the Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores was not rejected in the direction of a greater posttest mean score for students completing the research elementary school's Dual Language program where the Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading scores posttest $M = 96.16$, $SD = 32.51$ compared to students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program posttest $M = 95.31$, $SD = 22.28$; and $t(32) = 0.09$, $p = .464$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.311$.

Table 8

Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest Nebraska State Accountability Assessment Reading Scores of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program

Source	Posttest English as a Second Language		Posttest Dual Language Program		ES	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Reading	95.31	(22.28)	96.16	(32.51)	0.311	0.09	.464 [†]

Note. Exceeds the Standards 135 and above; Meets the Standards 85-134; Below the Standards 84 and below.

[†]*ns.*

Research Question #7

Sub-Question 7a. Table 9 displays third-grade pretest school days absent compared to fourth-grade posttest school days absent of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program. The seventh hypothesis was tested using the dependent t test. As seen in Table 9 the null hypothesis for school days absent was not rejected in the direction of fewer absence frequencies posttest score improvement where the absence frequencies score pretest $M = 6.81$, $SD = 4.92$; posttest $M = 5.93$, $SD = 3.97$; and $t(15) = -1.03$, $p = .159$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.199$.

Table 9

Third-Grade Pretest School Days Absent Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program

Source	School Days Absent						ES	t	p	
	Pretest		Posttest		ES	t				p
	M	SD	M	SD						
Absences	6.81	(4.92)	5.93	(3.97)	-0.199	-1.03	.159 [†]			

Note. Negative t result is in the direction of decreasing posttest absence frequencies.

[†]*ns.*

Research Question #8

Sub-Question 8a. Table 10 displays third-grade pretest school days absent compared to fourth-grade posttest school days absent of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program. The eighth hypothesis was tested using the dependent t test. As seen in Table 10 the null hypothesis for school days absent was not rejected in the direction of fewer absence frequencies posttest score improvement where the absence frequencies score pretest $M = 2.96$, $SD = 3.90$; posttest $M = 3.16$, $SD = 3.16$; and $t(17) = 0.18$, $p = .429$ (one-tailed), $ES = 0.056$.

Table 10

Third-Grade Pretest School Days Absent Compared to Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program

Source	School Days Absent						ES	t	p	
	Pretest		Posttest		ES	t				p
	M	SD	M	SD						
Absences	2.96	(3.90)	3.16	(3.16)	0.056	0.18	.429 [†]			

Note. Positive t result is in the direction of increasing posttest absence frequencies.

[†]*ns.*

Research Question #9

Sub-Question 9a. Table 11 displays fourth-grade posttest school days absent of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program compared to fourth-grade school days absent of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program. The ninth hypothesis was tested using the independent t test. As seen in Table 11 the null hypothesis for school days absent was rejected in the direction of a greater posttest mean score for students completing the research elementary school's Dual Language program where days absent scores posttest $M = 3.16$, $SD = 3.16$ compared to students completing the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program posttest $M = 5.93$, $SD = 3.97$; and $t(32) = -2.26$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed), $ES = 0.770$.

Table 11

Fourth-Grade Posttest School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's English as a Second Language Program Compared to Fourth-Grade School Days Absent of Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program

Source	School Days Absent						ES	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Posttest English as a Second Language		Posttest Dual Language Program		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
Absences	5.93	(3.97)	3.16	(3.16)	-0.770	-2.26	.015*		

Note. Negative *t* result is in the direction of lower posttest mean absence frequencies for Students Enrolled in the Research Elementary School's Dual Language Program.

**p* < .05.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Discussion

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to compare the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students from the same urban elementary school who received instruction in an ESL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade compared to the achievement, engagement, and English acquisition of students who received instruction in a DL program from kindergarten through fourth-grade to determine the effectiveness of both programs whose aim is to help ELLs acquire the English language. All study achievement and behavior data related to each of the dependent variables were retrospective, archival, and routinely collected school information. Permission from the appropriate school research personnel was obtained before data were collected and analyzed.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the study for each of the nine research questions.

Conclusions: Research Question #1

Research Sub-Question #1a for English as a Second Language program students' English language listening skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates Listening skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 3.81 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 4.00

falling within the Advanced level of English proficiency for an overall mean Listening score improvement of +0.1875 indicating one level of English proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Research Sub-Question #1b for English as a Second Language program students' English language speaking skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates Speaking skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 3.87 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 4.68 falling within the Advanced level of English proficiency for an overall mean Speaking score improvement of +0.8125 indicating continuance of an Advanced level of English proficiency.

Research Sub-Question #1c for English as a Second Language program students' English language reading skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates Reading skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 2.62 falling within the Beginning level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 3.81 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency for an overall mean Reading score improvement of +1.1875 indicating continuance of an Intermediate level of English proficiency.

Research Sub-Question #1d for English as a Second Language program students' English language writing skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates Writing skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 2.62 falling within the Beginning level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 3.12 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency for an overall mean Writing score improvement of +0.50 indicating one level of English proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Research Sub-Question #1e for English as a Second Language program students' English language comprehension skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates Comprehension skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 2.81 falling within the Beginning level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 3.81 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency for an overall mean Comprehension score improvement of +1.00 indicating one level of English proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Conclusions: Research Question #2

Research Sub-Question #2a for Dual Language program students' English language listening skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-

grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates Listening skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 3.61 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 4.33 falling within the Advanced level of English proficiency for an overall mean Listening score improvement of +0.7222 indicating one level of English proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Research Sub-Question #2b for Dual Language program students' English language speaking skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates Speaking skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 4.11 falling within the Advanced level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 4.27 falling within the Advanced level of English proficiency for an overall mean Speaking score improvement of +0.1667 indicating continuance of an Advanced level of English proficiency.

Research Sub-Question #2c for Dual Language program students' English language reading skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates Reading skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 3.00 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 3.88 falling within the Intermediate level

of English proficiency for an overall mean Reading score improvement of +0.8889 indicating continuance of an Advanced level of English proficiency.

Research Sub-Question #2d for Dual Language program students' English language writing skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates Writing skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 2.94 falling within the Beginning level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 3.44 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency for an overall mean Writing score improvement of +0.50 indicating one level of English proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Research Sub-Question #2e for Dual Language program students' English language comprehension skills. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest English Language Development Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest English Language Development Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates Comprehension skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 2.94 falling within the Beginning level of English proficiency to a mean posttest score of 3.88 falling within the Intermediate level of English proficiency for an overall mean Comprehension score improvement of +0.9444 indicating one level of English proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Conclusions: Research Question #3**Research Sub-Question #3a for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' English language listening skills.**

Students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction had non-statistically greater posttest English language listening skills measured within the Advanced Level compared to students completing fourth-grade English as a Second Language program instruction who also had listening skills measured within the Advanced Level indicating that both English language acquisition programs equally prepared students for full participation in their next school year fifth-grade academic instruction.

Research Sub-Question #3b for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' English language speaking skills.

Students completing fourth-grade English as a Second Language program instruction had statistically greater posttest English language speaking skills compared to students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction although posttest scores for both groups of students were measured within the Advanced Level indicating that both English language acquisition programs prepared students for full participation in their next school year fifth-grade academic instruction.

Research Sub-Question #3c for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' English language reading skills.

Students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction had non-statistically greater posttest English language reading skills measured within the Intermediate Level compared to students completing fourth-grade English as a Second

Language program instruction who also had reading skills measured within the Intermediate Level. Both groups of students began the third-grade with measured Beginning level reading skills indicating a one level of reading improvement over time that could be sustained to the Advanced level with continued fifth-grade reading classroom support.

Research Sub-Question #3d for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' English language writing skills.

Students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction had non-statistically greater posttest English language writing skills measured within the Intermediate Level compared to students completing fourth-grade English as a Second Language program instruction who also had writing skills measured within the Intermediate Level. Both groups of students began the third-grade with measured Beginning level writing skills indicating a one level of writing improvement over time that could be sustained to the Advanced level with continued fifth-grade writing classroom support.

Research Sub-Question #3e for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' English language comprehension skills. Students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction had non-statistically greater posttest English language comprehension skills measured within the Intermediate Level compared to students completing fourth-grade English as a Second Language program instruction who also had comprehension skills measured within the Intermediate Level. Both groups of students began the third-grade with measured Beginning level comprehension skills indicating a one level of comprehension

improvement over time that could be sustained to the Advanced level with continued fifth-grade comprehension classroom support.

Conclusions: Research Question #4

Research Sub-Question #4a for English as a Second Language program students' Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates reading skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 78.12 falling within the Below Standards range of reading proficiency to a mean posttest score of 95.31 falling within the Meets Standards range of reading proficiency for an overall mean reading score improvement of +17.1875 indicating one level of reading proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Conclusions: Research Question #5

Research Sub-Question #5a for Dual Language program students' Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment scores compared to fourth-grade posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment scores of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates reading skill improvement from a mean pretest score of 76.94 falling within the Below Standards range of reading proficiency to a mean posttest score of 96.16 falling within the Meets Standards range of reading proficiency for an

overall mean reading score improvement of +19.2222 indicating one level of reading proficiency nomenclature improvement.

Conclusions: Research Question #6

Research Sub-Question #6a for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment. Students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction had non-statistically greater posttest Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment scores measured within the meets standards range compared to students completing fourth-grade English as a Second Language program instruction who also had Nebraska State Accountability Reading Assessment scores measured within the meets standards range indicating that both English language acquisition programs equally prepared students for full participation in their next school year fifth-grade academic instruction.

Conclusions: Research Question #7

Research Sub-Question #7a for English as a Second Language program students' School Days Absent. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest school days absent frequencies compared to fourth-grade posttest school days absent frequencies of students enrolled in the research elementary school's English as a Second Language program indicates school days absent frequencies improvement from a mean pretest frequency of 6.81 falling within the low range of absences to a mean posttest frequency of 5.93 remaining within the low range of absences for an overall mean absence frequency improvement of -0.8875 indicating the positive impact of continuous school attendance.

Conclusions: Research Question #8

Research Sub-Question #8a for English as a Second Language program students' School Days Absent. Pretest compared to posttest change frequencies for third-grade pretest school days absent frequencies compared to fourth-grade posttest school days absent frequencies of students enrolled in the research elementary school's Dual Language program indicates school days absent frequencies increase from a mean pretest frequency of 2.96 falling within the very low range of absences to a mean posttest frequency of 3.16 remaining within the very low range of absences for an overall mean absence frequency increase of 0.20 indicating the positive impact of continuous school attendance.

Conclusions: Research Question #9

Research Sub-Question #9a for English as a Second Language program students compared to Dual Language students' School Days Absent. Students completing fourth-grade Dual Language program instruction had statistically fewer posttest school days absent frequencies (3.16 days absent) measured within the very low range of absence frequencies compared to students completing fourth-grade English as a Second Language program instruction who had school days absent frequencies (5.93) measured within the low range of absence frequencies. While students in both English language acquisition programs had commendable levels of attendance students in the Dual Language program were less likely to be absent from their school program.

Discussion

As ELLs continue to increase in the U.S., schools will have to continue to grapple with what amounts to truly appropriate action to overcome English language barriers. How will schools respond as our student demographics inevitably continue to shift? Must ELLs be expected to assimilate to the cultural and linguistic norms held by White, non-Hispanic Americans? Or do we have a moral and professional duty to make sure that all cultures and languages are respected, preserved, and accommodated to the degree possible? Is effective teaching for fluent English speakers effective teaching for all students? Or do we have a responsibility to make sure that effective teaching is adjusted to meet the needs of students whose native language is something other than English?

Today schools face the enormous challenge of closing the achievement gap between White and students of color. At the same time, ELLs exhibit some of the lowest levels of academic achievement of any student subgroup (Abedi & Dietel, 2004; Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Fry, 2007, 2008). This alarming data clearly reveals that unprecedented student demographic changes of the 21st century demand that schools find more effective ways to engage and educate students of all linguistic, cultural, and academic backgrounds.

Under our current educational system, languages other than English are seen as inferior (Reyes, 2011). Furthermore, Salomone (2010) puts it this way: “Language is now viewed socially and politically as both a skill of international necessity and a symbol of national threat, especially when the language is Spanish or Arabic” (p. 12). Hence, school practices for ELLs today involve both subtractive models that discontinue ELLs’ native languages and additive models that foster the continuation of ELLs’ native

languages, encouraging bilingualism (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). Within the subtractive model, ELLs are treated from a deficit perspective where the lack of English skills is a problem to be fixed in order for them to be successful in English-only classrooms (Cummins, 1987; Crawford & Krashen, 2007). Despite the fact that many ELLs come to school at the age of five fluent in the social language (BICS) of their native language and have acquired many of the grammar or linguistic rules, schools that follow a subtractive model do not assess or incorporate dimensions of students' native languages (Cummins, 2000). Additionally, a basic learning principle in education for all grade levels and subjects is that new learning should build on prior knowledge (Marzano, 2000, 2004; Sousa, 2006). However, ELLs in a subtractive model are not provided with this opportunity when learning the English language. What if educators were instead to treat all languages as an asset upon which to build a solid foundation for academic success? Within an additive model, educators view and treat languages as a resource, encourage students to take pride in their backgrounds and empower them to do so (Crawford 1997; Collier & Thomas 1997, 2009; Lambert 1975). The positive associations between additive models and students' linguistic, cognitive, or academic growth are supported through several empirical studies carried out in the past few decades (Collier, Thomas, & Abbot, 1993; Collier & Thomas, 1997, 2009; Cummins, 1987, 2000; Lambert, 1975). It is also documented that schools that strive for additive models have fared better in academic achievement for ELLs (Ramirez et al, 1991). The linguistic, cognitive, and academic benefits of additive bilingualism for students provide an additional reason to support ELLs in maintaining their native language while they are acquiring English (Cummins, 1983, 1987, 2000).

Taken together, the results of this study further reaffirm the benefits of an additive bilingualism model and noticeably reveal that DL students served in the research urban elementary school's additive DL program had higher fourth-grade posttest scores, albeit not statistically significant, in all but one of the areas assessed compared to fourth-grade posttest scores of ELLs served in the research urban elementary school's subtractive monolingual ESL program. Although the higher posttest scores for the DL students compared to the ESL students are not all statistically significant, it is worth mentioning that the duration of this study spans only across five years of participation in the DL or ESL program and concluded by the end of the fourth-grade or the elementary school years. This is an important point to make because through national K – 12 longitudinal data, Collier and Thomas (2009) have confirmed that within the first few years of instruction, ELLs schooled all in English may initially outperform those schooled in DL programs when tested in English. For example, in this study, by fourth-grade, ELLs enrolled in the ESL program had shown a statistically significant ($p < .05$) improvement in the ELDA Speaking score ($M = 4.68$) compared to ELDA Speaking score ($M = 4.27$) for ELLs enrolled in the DL program. However, Collier and Thomas (2009) have pointed out that later in the secondary years where the work is more cognitively demanding, the DL-schooled students, who need at least six years of full DL participation to be able to do academic work on grade level in either language, statistically and significantly outperform the monolingual-schooled students. Based on the trajectory of the scores, it could be argued that with another year of participation in the DL program, for a total of six years, the DL students may have statistically and significantly separated themselves from the ESL students, as Collier & Thomas (2009) have repeatedly pointed out in their

longitudinal data. The research elementary school is a K - 4 building which limited the duration of this study to five school-years.

The higher fourth-grade posttest scores for DL students, except for the ELDA Speaking score, can be explained and supported with the common underlying proficiency (CUP), which Cummins (2000) calls a “central processing system.” According to Cummins (2000), the CUP provides the base for the development of the first and second language and any expansion of CUP that takes place in one language will have an advantageous effect on the other languages. Even with the fact that the DL students in this study received at least half of their kindergarten through fourth-grade academic instruction in Spanish but were assessed in English, they plainly had all but one higher posttest scores compared to ESL students who received 100% of their instruction in English. Despite the fact that all assessments were English, the DL students were able to transfer knowledge learned in Spanish to English. According to Cummins (1983, 1987, 2000), the CUP makes possible the transfer of cognitive, academic, and literacy related skills across both languages. Thus the study results validate the CUP construct and provide support for the usefulness of native language development in facilitating the acquisition of English language skills.

In addition, all but one of the higher posttest scores for the DL students could also be explained and supported through the MA construct. Language learners with MA have a conscious awareness of the linguistic form and structure of the language and how they relate to and produce the underlying meaning of words. They also have the ability to compare and contrast two language systems to discover commonalities as well as differences (Bialystok, 1991, 2001). Code-switching, translation, and the understanding

of cognates in languages are examples of MA. For example, knowing that the English word *science* and the Spanish word *ciencias* are cognates would be an example of MA (Garcia & Nunez, 2011). Bialystok (1991, 2001) pointed out that to the extent that a language learner has MA, second language acquisition is facilitated because a language outline is available. Therefore, ELLs in the DL program need not relearn the original principles of language structure because these are already known from the MA knowledge that grew out of their native language acquisition. Dillon (2009) pointed out that MA is transferable to any language; the awareness that there are parts of speech (nouns, verbs, prepositions, etc.) in one's native language can assist in learning the second language in that it helps to know what to look for. DL enhances MA because of the juxtapositioning of two language systems as students learn listening, speaking, reading, and writing in Spanish and English. Furthermore, cross-linguistic transfer of skills indicates that there is a high level of transfer of skills and strategies from the first to the second language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Dillon, 2009; Foursha-Stevenson & Nicoladis, 2011; Melby-Lervag & Lervag, 2011). For example, phonemic awareness, decoding, word recognition strategies, and overall comprehension strategies such as those in reading have been shown to be areas that can positively transfer from one language to another (August & Shanahan, 2006). The degree of cross-linguistic transfer is greatest when both languages have alphabetic writing systems that have many of the same letter-sound relationships, such as in the case of Spanish and English (Bialystok, 2001). August and Shanahan (2006) pointed out that non-native English speakers who are literate in their first language are likely to be advantaged in the acquisition of English. In this study, the DL students who were literate in their native Spanish language after receiving at least

half of their kindergarten through fourth-grade in Spanish were assessed in English and showed slightly higher posttest scores than the ESL students who were instructed and assessed in English 100% of the time. Clearly the DL students demonstrated a high level of MA and cross-linguistic transfer between Spanish and English and it could be argued that MA and cross-linguistic transfer sped up the acquisition of English for the DL students in this study.

Moreover, the higher posttest scores for the DL students in this study also support Schumann's hypothesis that social, cultural, and psychological variables affect how second language learners acquire the second language. In a significant longitudinal study of language learners, Schumman (1978) concluded that the greater the social and psychological distance between two cultures, the greater the difficulty the learner will have in learning the second language. In the study, the DL group's social and psychological distance to the English language and culture was smaller than the social and psychological distance of ESL students to the English language and culture. In the research elementary school's two-way DL program, a native English-speaking group of students and a native Spanish-speaking group were formed into a single and cohesive group for learning, as such, the distance between two languages and cultures was significantly reduced and the native Spanish-speaking students were interconnected with the native English-speaking group. Thomas and Collier (2009) pointed out that when students are kept together to build a classroom that respects and values all students, social and cultural relationships are transformed and the attitudes of students toward each other are generally more favorable, with one group rarely dominating the other. This creates a positive learning environment where both groups have favorable attitudes toward each

and other and each other's languages, making language learning for both groups more likely. In addition to the social distance in this study being smaller for the DL students compared to the ESL students, the psychological distance also was significantly reduced for the DL students compared to the ESL students. Schumann (1978) pointed out that when the psychological distance is smaller, the greater the chances for acquiring the language. Clearly the DL students had higher fourth-grade posttest ELDA scores compared to fourth-grade ELDA posttest scores of the ESL students, except for Speaking. It could be argued with these study results, that the DL students were more motivated to learn the English language, held positive attitudes toward each other, and by and large were comfortable with each other. Hence, the social and psychological distance, as Schumann (1978) describes impacted language learning.

Lastly, the DL students' fourth-grade higher posttest scores compared to fourth-grade posttest scores on school engagement support the hypothesis that overall student attendance and engagement was statistically and significantly better in the DL program. It is clear that students and parents who speak the partner language feel genuinely more welcomed, empowered, and engaged in the DL program than students and parents in the English-only ESL program. Cummins (1991) pointed out that programs that accept and respect the language and culture of its students empower them to feel confident enough to risk getting involved in the learning process. In this study, by the end of the third-grade and fourth-grade, ELLs enrolled in the DL program had accumulated statistically significant ($p < .05$) fewer school days absent (pretest $M = 2.96$; posttest $M = 3.16$) than ELLs enrolled in the ESL program who had accumulated more school days absent (pretest $M = 6.81$; posttest $M = 5.93$). Even though ELLs enrolled in the ESL program are

still in the low range of days absent from school, their school attendance data may represent an area of concern for because attendance is closely linked to school engagement and academic achievement. Absences for any students, but specifically for the ELL students who many times are considered “at risk”, can obviously be a significant factor in their academic achievement.

Implications for practice. Schools do not have the option to leave the success of their students to chance, especially those that serve high concentrations of ELLs because they provide these students their greatest and, in all probability, only chance to break away from poverty and achieve economic security (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011). In the 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama told our nation: “We know a good teacher can increase the lifetime income of a classroom by over \$250, 000. A great teacher can offer an escape from poverty to the child who dreams beyond his circumstance.” It is no secret that teachers and public schools have a privileged position in the life of ELLs and it is the obligation of everyone fortunate to work with ELLs in the school setting to understand the significant impact their actions, or lack thereof, may have on these students and their families.

It is no longer good enough to assume that current educational pedagogy will reach this unprecedented culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse population of ELLs across the U.S. It is no longer okay to expect ELLs to adapt to an English-only classroom environment that reflects White, middle class, native English-speaking curricula. It is no longer excusable to collect a paycheck from these public-serving schools while knowing and doing nothing about the separate and unequal education of ELLs (Crawford, 1997). It is no longer tolerable to contradict research findings

exclusively on emotion and personal beliefs, without acknowledging effective pedagogy and valid research. There is no time to continue debating the merits of Bilingual Education versus English-only instruction. All schools must develop high levels of English language proficiency for ELLs. Regardless of which English language acquisition program of instruction is chosen, schools must take action this instant. The status quo is not acceptable and schools must embrace a new educational paradigm that reflects and includes an unprecedented school population. Schools must now recognize and adjust for the needs of students who are more linguistically, culturally, and academically different than previous waves of immigrants who had their origins in Europe (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

School principals are instrumental in the selection and development of their school's English language acquisition program and must understand the many factors that may impact their options in choosing among these English language acquisition programs. The demographic profile of the ELL student, size and linguistic heterogeneity of the ELLs, the mission and vision of the school and community, the quantity of bilingual teachers, and the political climate and legislation of the area all can impact the selection (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). However, as Wright (2010) pointed out, the success of any English language acquisition program lays not in the name but in the implementation and the practices that take place within the program. For instance, principals who understand the critical role the native language plays in ELLs' learning seek to hire bilingual educators who can communicate with these ELLs (August & Hakuta, 1998). Principals who understand SLA recognize that bilingual educators may recognize the challenges ELLs face in learning in a second language in ways others may

not. Principals who recognize the social, cultural, and psychological factors on SLA understand that ELLs need to have positive role models who demonstrate the value of being bilingual, bicultural, and biliterate.

Most of all, regardless of the program supporting English language acquisition selected, cultural and linguistically responsive teaching is the essential element of any effective language acquisition program for ELLs. Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching requires that students' cultures and languages are integral components of the curricula and pedagogies (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). Teachers must go beyond surface-level inclusion to provide equitable learning opportunities for culturally and linguistically diverse students. They must also recognize that conversational communication skills (BICS) differ from academic English (CALP) (Cummins, 2000). It is important to know that while some ELLs may use their second language fluently in everyday language, they can still experience considerable academic difficulties in school (Baker & Hornberger, 2001). Teachers must ensure that the goal of English language proficiency is understood as being proficient in cognitive demanding and academic English (CALP), which is generally acquired within five to seven years (Cummins, 2000). Teachers must understand that fluency in everyday social language (BICS) does not necessarily guarantee proficiency in English CALP (Baker & Hornberger, 2001) and must stop exiting ELLs from English acquisition programs based on fluency in social language (BICS) alone. Baker and Hornberger (2001) suggested that teachers in exit-type English acquisition programs go off of CALP in the first language (L1) to determine exit criteria because L1 CALP is more indicative of higher levels of CALP in the second language (L2). Additionally, teachers who truly embrace culturally and linguistically

responsive teaching recognize the importance of helping ELLs make meaningful connections between their existing prior knowledge and content area concepts and skills. Teachers ought to recognize that language, culture, and prior knowledge and experiences are the foundation of ELLs' meaning-making processes (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012) and that learning most effectively occurs in the language that the learner knows best (Cummins, 2000).

Teachers who would like to include culturally and linguistically responsive teaching in their classrooms can support the native languages for their students without worrying that time spend on the native language will somehow impede or slow the progress in learning English. Worth mentioning again, all but one of the fourth-grade posttest-posttest scores comparisons between ELLs enrolled in the monolingual ESL program compared to ELLs in the DL program were in the direction of higher posttest (albeit not statistically significant) scores for ELLs in the DL program. Considering that the DL students received at least half of their instruction in Spanish but were assessed in English clearly shows that instruction and support in the native language is advantageous, not an impediment to acquiring the English language. Monolingual teachers, even if they do not speak the languages of their students, can incorporate the use of ELLs' native languages to promote cognitive development, as well as, reinforce a positive self-identity for students by encouraging ELLs to use their native languages for academic purposes in small collaborative groups, enlisting parent support in developing native language literacy in the home, encouraging finding cognates between the languages, supporting code switching as means to better comprehend or to better express ideas, and by providing instructional materials in the native languages of their ELLs (Brooks &

Karathanos, 2009) .

In addition to educators, parents also impact the education of their ELLs and should value and advocate for both the native and second language acquisition. While it is the duty of schools to provide the education, it is the responsibility and right of parents to understand issues related to their child's education. Schools must educate both students and parents on the importance of native language support and development as it relates to SLA. Children learn better in the second language if they have a higher level of mother tongue competence (Yazici, Ilter, & Glover, 2010). After five years of receiving half of their academic instruction in Spanish, the DL students clearly had a higher level of mother tongue competence and higher fourth-grade posttest scores for English acquisition, achievement, and engagement compared to ESL students who were not provided the opportunity to further develop their mother tongue in school. Regardless if it is at home or in school, programs or practices in which the native language is reinforced, the language learners tend to be more successful (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Cummins, 1991; Ramirez, 1991). However, how parents convey crucial messages in subtle ways to their children about the validity of their language and cultural identity impacts SLA (Cummins, 1987). Parents must be encouraged to have pride in their home cultures because the parental ambivalence towards the home and majority culture can lead to school failure when students are not motivated to maintain their native language (Baker & Hornberger, 2001). Parents must also be told that perhaps the most important area for development in the native language is literacy and be supported and encouraged to have their students read in their mother tongue at home. We know that ELLs who have high levels of literacy in their native languages generally develop high levels of literacy in

their second language; whereas, ELLs who have low literacy development in their native languages often struggle to develop high levels of literacy in their second languages (August & Hakuta, 1997).

It is imperative to acknowledge one more time that the name of the English acquisition program is not as important as what is being transacted between educators and students within the school and classroom (Wright, 2010). Some English language acquisition programs maybe labeled as Bilingual Education and may make little effort to value and incorporate two languages of instruction. On the other hand, some English-only ESL programs could view the blend of the native language into classroom practices as an integral part. Regardless of the English language acquisition program in the school, school principals are responsible for ensuring that teachers develop fundamental understandings of SLA and receive professional development on how to integrate content and language instruction. Principals must also make sure that ELLs have access to a high-quality curriculum and pedagogy and that all teachers recognize that they are language teachers too. More importantly, principals need to ensure the socialcultural integration of ELLs because we know that self-efficacy is among the strongest predictors of academic achievement and language learning (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). The fact that some school principals are not bilingual, biliterate, or bicultural does not excuse them from the myriad of responsibilities noted above, but does underscore their need to be creative in designing and leading the English language acquisition program.

Implications for policy. Language and education policies at the national, regional, and local levels can facilitate or inhibit strong SLA. Policymakers must understand that there is not only one way to teach ELLs effectively. In fact, it is highly

unlikely that a single instructional program, approach, or method is likely to be effective for all ELLs, given the diversity and backgrounds, resources, English proficiency levels, and the educational achievement these students bring to the learning environments (Wright, 2010). Policy makers cannot feel comfortable in knowing that, on average, today's monolingual English acquisition programs produce ELLs that are 1.2 national standard deviations behind their native English-speaking peers by the end of high school (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Policy makers cannot feel at ease knowing that ELLs are primarily educated in schools with the least experienced teachers and the fewest resources (Wright, 2010). This is not the standard that will allow our ELLs to succeed, compete, and achieve socioeconomic success. Policy makers must make the education of ELLs a priority and start by ensuring that schools with high concentrations of ELLs have more experienced teachers and more resources.

In today's global economy, being bilingual can no longer remain a privilege reserved for the select few. Becoming bilingual is a right that must be provided to all socioeconomic groups. Denying any students the right to become bilingual is a mistake and an injustice. It is vital that educators and policy makers examine and understand monolingual beliefs. In particular educators and policy makers must understand that learning a second language does not have to mean giving up one's native language, but rather, it should involve adding a new one. Policy makers must also stop working from a deficit perspective where ELLs are blamed for their inadequacies (Lessow-Hurley, 2000) and stop labeling ELLs as "Limited English Proficient," which has a negative connotation because it implies that ELLs are deficient and must be fixed. ELLs are not deficient but many are lacking the opportunity to enroll in English acquisition programs

that play up to their strengths and take into consideration the language skills they already have. Lastly, it is important that policy makers ensure that rather than having an educational system that works for most students, that the system reaches and works for all students. In this lies the promise of democracy and equal opportunity.

Implications for further research. In order to improve the education of ELLs, we need to collect better data to make the case to policy makers. Specifically, we need to know: What are the educational outcomes of the ELLs in this study as they move up the secondary level and graduate from high school? Longitudinal research suggests that the full benefits of DL instruction may not become more apparent until the sixth year of instruction (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Thomas & Collier, 2012), however, this study concluded after five years in the English acquisition programs. Would the ELL students in the DL program continue to make significant gains and statistically and significantly bypass their ELL peers in the monolingual ESL program by the end of the fifth-grade, as several longitudinal studies would suggest?

We also need to be able to address some larger questions: Which English language acquisition programs are most effective and what are their replicable characteristics? How can we help more educators, parents, and policy makers understand that the ability to speak several languages is truly a gift? What should the role of public education be in preserving our state's heritage languages? How do we gather the data we need to advocate for our ELLs? How do we tell the story of our ELL students and their families more effectively?

Relative to the goal of principal and teacher preparedness, how do school leaders gain the requisite knowledge of SLA that will allow them to provide the leadership

needed in culturally and linguistically diverse schools? How can districts collaborate with local institutes of higher education to provide this support, and how can university faculty of educational leadership programs work with other university departments to integrate such supports into their educational leadership preparation programs?

Relative to the goal of academic achievement, the results of this study support the efficacy of both the ESL and DL programs for native Spanish-speakers. However, there is a need for research on the development of learners from other major ethnolinguistic groups in the U.S. For instance, in OPS, students from Asia or Africa could be studied because they are a significant growing group of ELLs in the district. There is also a pressing need for additional research on ELLs who enter the U.S. educational system in the middle or high school levels, particularly those with little or no prior schooling.

Education has the power to change lives and educators are in the unique and privileged position to impact the lives of ELLs. We have a moral and professional obligation to determine, through research and analysis, how to best educate our ELLs so that their academic and economic success may be realized without the loss of their native language and cultural participation. For ELLs, being bilingual means having the better of two worlds—their native language and culture and our nation's culture and English language. For native English-speakers, learning a second language means opening up their horizons to the richness of cultural diversity and becoming active participants in today's global society. A common misunderstanding is that Bilingual Education is only for immigrant students (Rovira, 1998), when in reality the benefits of bilingualism are for everyone that becomes bilingual. Bilingualism can be a leg up for college admission and a resume builder (Schawartz, 2011), or it can provide one with a political or economic

advantage too (Rovira, 1998; Buchholz, 2002). Bilingualism also improves cognitive skills and provides one with a heightened ability to monitor the environment because of the need to switch languages frequently (Bhattacharjee, 2012).

In no way should academic and economic success require supplanting one language and culture with another. We need to completely rethink the ways in which we educate all students, moving toward a system in which all students, not just ELLs, experience the benefits of learning and excelling in at least two languages. Proficient bilingualism is a desirable goal that can bring cognitive, academic, cultural, and economic benefits to individuals and to our nation (Crawford, 1997). The U.S. needs well-educated bilingual citizens for the many jobs in government, business, and service (Wright, 2010). The American experience will only be made stronger, not weaker, by citizens who can traverse two or more languages and cultures.

References

- Abedi, J., & Dietel, R. (2004). Challenges in the No Child Left Behind Act for English-language learners. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(10), 782-785.
- August, D., Hakuta, K., & National Research Council (U.S.). (1998). *Educating language-minority children*. Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Baker, C., & Hornberger, N. (2001). An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 29*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Barnett, S., Yarosz, D., Thomas, J., Jung, K., & Blanco, D. (2007). Two-way and monolingual English immersion in preschool education: An experimental comparison. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22, 277-293.
- Beltran-Martin, M. (2010). The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing bilingual language learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 254-277.
- Bhattacharjee, Y. (2012). Why bilinguals are smarter. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Bialystok, E. (1991). *Language processing in bilingual children*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Brooks, K., & Karathanos, K. (2009). Building on the cultural and linguistic capital of English learner (EL) students. *Multicultural Education*, 16(4), 47-51.
- Buchholz, B. (2002). Bilingual benefits. *Crain's Chicago Business*, 25 (21). Retrieved from <http://www.crainschicagobusiness.com>
- Castañeda v. Pickard, 648 F. 2d 989 (1981)
- Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *Future Of Children*, 21(1), 103-127.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2012). *Directory of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs in the U.S.* Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>
- Collier, V. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(2), 187-212.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (1997). *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2 (1).
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.
- Crawford, J. (1997). *Best evidence: Research foundations of the Bilingual Education Act*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
Downloaded July 12, 2012 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/rcd/>
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English Learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

- Crawford, J., & Krashen, S. (2007). *English learners in American classrooms: 101 Questions and 101 Answers*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/Academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, No 19, 127-129.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority-language children: Language and literacy series* (ED 215 557). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Toronto, Ontario.
- Cummins, J. (1982). *Tests, achievement, and bilingual students* (ED 238 907). National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Rosslyn, VA.
- Cummins, J. (1983). *Language and literacy learning in bilingual instruction: Policy Report Summary* (ED 245 576). Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Austin, TX.
- Cummins, J. (1987). *Empowering minority students: Teacher training project for bilingual & English speakers of other languages teachers* (ED 299 330). United States Department of Education Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. Washington, DC.
- Cummins, J. (1988). The role and use of educational theory in formulating language policy. *TESL Canada Journal*, 5(2), 11-19.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Empowering culturally and linguistically diverse students with learning problems (ED 333 622). *ERIC Clearinghouse*. Reston, VA.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters LTD.

- Dillon, A. M. (2009). Metalinguistic awareness and evidence of cross-linguistic influence among bilingual learners in Irish primary schools. *Language Awareness, 18*(2), 182-197.
- Duran, L. (1993). *Some connections between bilingual education and ESL programs* (Report No. FL-021 465). Washington, DC: National Association for Bilingual Education Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 873).
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible to English language learners: The SIOP model*. Boston: Allen and Bacon.
- Fleming, T. (2003). Education on equal terms: Why bilingual education must be mandated in the public schools for Hispanic LEP high school students. *Georgetown Immigration Law J, 17*(2), 325-346.
- Flynn, K., & Hill, J. (2005). *English Language Learners: A growing population*. Denver, Colorado: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Foursha-Stevenson, C., & Nicoladis, E. (2011). Early emergence of syntactic awareness and cross-linguistic influence in bilingual children's judgments. *International Journal Of Bilingualism, 15*(4), 521-534. doi:10.1177/1367006911425818
- Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2001). *Between Worlds: Access to second language acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, Y., Freeman, D., & Mercuri, S. (2005). *Dual language essentials for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fry, R. (2007). *How far behind in math and reading are English language learners?* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Available from: www.pewhispanic.org/topics/?TopicID=4

- Fry, R. (2008). *The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Available from: www.pewhispanic.org/topics/?TopicID=4
- Garcia, E., & Nanez, J. (2011). *Bilingualism and cognition: Informing research, pedagogy, and policy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2006). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 9(1), 363-385.
- Gomez, R. (2006). Promising Practices: Dual language enrichment for ELL students K-12. *TABE Journal*, 9(1), 46-65.
- Hernandez, A. (2012). *The Dynamics of language status in two-way bilingual immersion*. Unpublished Powerpoint presented at the California Association for Bilingual Education, Newport Beach, California.
- Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. UK: Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen, S. (1992). *Fundamentals of language education*. Chicago, IL: Laredo Publishing.
- Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Lambert, W. E. (1975). *Culture and language as factors in learning and education*.
 In A. Wolfgang, ed., *Education of Immigrant Students*. Toronto: Ontario
 Institute for Studies in Education.
- Language. (1996). In *Random House Webster's Dictionary* (p. 372). New York:
 Ballantine Books.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2000). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. New York:
 Longman.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2009). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. Boston, MA:
 Pearson Education, Inc.
- Lau v Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974)
- Marzano, R. (2000). *What works in classroom instruction*. Alexandria, VA. Association
 for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement*.
 Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maxwell, L. (2009, January 8). Shifting landscape: Immigration transforms communities.
Education Week, 28(17).
- Melby-Lervåg, M. & Lervåg, A.. (2011). Cross-linguistic transfer of oral language,
 decoding, awareness and reading comprehension: a meta-analysis of the
 correlational evidence. *Journal of Research In Reading*, 34(1), 114-135.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2011). *The growing
 numbers of English language learners*. Washington, DC: Author. Available
 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/faqs/>

- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2010). *Nebraska rate of EL growth*. Washington, DC: Author. Available from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/20/Nebraska_G_0708.pdf
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2011). *Omaha Public Schools. District Focus: Nebraska, School Year 2009–10*. Washington, DC: Author. Available from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/T3SIS_LEA/ne_omaha.pdf
- Nagy, W., & Anderson, R. (1995). *Metalinguistic awareness and literacy acquisition in different languages* (Technical Report No. 618). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Champaign, Illinois.
- Neris, M., Jackson, C., & Goldstein, H. (2010). Facilitating vocabulary acquisition of young English language learners. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 41, 314-327.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2001).
- Obama, B. The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. (2012). *Remarks by the president in state of union address* Washington, D.C.: Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/01/24/remarks-president-state-union-address>
- Oller, D. K., & Eilers, R. E. (2002). *Language and literacy in bilingual children*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ovando, C. (1990). *Politics and Pedagogy: The Case of bilingual education*. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 341-357.

- Passel, J., & Cohn, D. (2008). *U. S Population Projections: 2005-2050*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Available from: <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-population-projections-2005-2050/>
- Payne, R. K. (2005). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Highlands, Tex: aha! Process.
- Portes, A., & Hao, L. (1998). E Pluribus Unum: Bilingualism and loss of language in the second generation. *Sociology of Language*, 71, 269-94.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ramirez, D., Yuen, S., Ramey, D., Pasta, D., & Billings, D. (1991). *Final Report: Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual educational programs for language-minority children*. Executive Summary. San Mateo, Calif.: Aguirre International.
- Regh, P., & Waack, J. (2009). Education, ethnic identity, and acculturation as predictors of self-esteem in Latino adolescents. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87(1), 47-54
- Rennie, J. (1993). *ESL and bilingual program models*. Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, 60(1), 315-340.
- Reyes, M. (2011). *Words were all we had: Becoming biliterate against the odds*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Rovira, L. (1998). Let's not say adios to bilingual education. *U.S. Catholic*, 63(11).

- Rumberger, R. W. (2006). *Tenth grade dropout rates by native language, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status*. UC Berkeley: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Retrieved from:
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2903c3p3>
- Scanlan, M., & Lopez, F. (2012). Vamos! How school leaders promote equity and excellence for bilingual students. *Educational Administration Quarterly* (48)4, 583-625.
- Sheng, Z., Sheng, Y., & Anderson, C. J. (2011). Dropping out of school among ELL students: Implications to schools and teacher education. *Clearing House: A Journal Of Educational Strategies, Issues And Ideas*, 84(3), 98-103.
- Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schwartz, C. (2011, August 15). Why it's smart to be bilingual. *Newsweek*, 158(07). Retrieved from <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek.html>
- Solomone, R. (2010). *True American: Language, identity, and the education of immigrant children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sousa, D. (2006). *How the brain learns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (January 01, 2011). Leading Inclusive ELL: Social Justice Leadership for English Language Learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47, 4, 646-688.
- Thomas, W., Collier, V., & Abbot, M. (1993). Academic achievement through Japanese, Spanish, or French: The first two years of partial immersion. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77.

- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership*, 55(4), 23-26.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1999). Accelerated schooling for English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 56 (7), 46-49.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2001). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students. Long-Term Academic Achievement*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence. Retrieved from:
http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 61-64.
- Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *The Condition of Education 2005* (NCES 2005-094). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *26 More States and D.C. Seek Flexibility from NCLB to Drive Education Reforms in Second Round of Requests*. Washington, DC: US. Press Office. Retrieved July 15, 2012 from
<http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility>
- Walqui, A. (2000). Contextual factors in second language acquisition. *Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC. (ERIC Identifier: ED444381).

- Wright, W. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.
- Yazici, Z., Zeliha, I., & Glover, P. (2010). How bilingual is bilingual? Mother-tongue proficiency and learning through a second language. *Journal of Early Years Education*, 18(3), 259-268.