Dueling Models of Dual Language Instruction: A Critical Review of the Literature and Program Implementation Guide

Jill Kerper Mora
San Diego State University

Joan Wink and Dawn Wink
California State University Stanislaus

Abstract

This article describes a system for categorizing various theoretical models of dual language instruction. The use of the term "immersion" in the popular parlance is contrasted with its meaning for language educators in describing programs implemented to conform to specific enrichment or compensatory educational principles and goals. A paradigm is presented for examining the congruence, or match, among the theoretical model, teachers' beliefs, and actual classroom practices to determine the fidelity, and therefore, effectiveness, of a dual language program. Examples from school districts that exhibit high levels of congruence, and counter examples of programs lacking fidelity to their theoretical underpinnings, are presented to illustrate potential pitfalls of implementation. The results of California's Proposition 227 in providing coherent guidelines for program implementation are analyzed based on the congruence paradigm. Proposition 227 is judged to be a decontextualized procedural model rather than a sound theoretical model for educating language minority students.

Introduction and Background

Recent political and policy initiatives have brought about dramatic shifts in policies for educating language minority children and bilingual education programs in the United States. These policy shifts stem from struggles over social dominance among cultural and ethnic groups within the larger society (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The ideology of cultural and linguistic assimilation and the relative power and status of speakers of different world languages

among mainstream, immigrant, and minority populations have spawned conflicting social and political agendas that play themselves out in reform initiatives in the public schools. Bilingualism and bilingual education in the United States became the subject of renewed controversy as schools felt the impact of increasing immigration to the United States and California in particular. The most salient example of this societal power struggle is California's Proposition 227, which passed in 1998 with a 61% majority vote. Proposition 227 severely restricted bilingual education for the state's 1.4 million students classified as limited English proficient (LEP), among which 82% are native speakers of Spanish. The law was rejected by Latino voters by a 2 to 1 margin (Los Angeles Times/CNN Exit Poll, 1998), almost the mirror image of support for the proposition among the majority of White voters who identified themselves as conservative. Proposition 227 required that instruction in the primary language (L1) of limited English proficient students be replaced by a one year-program of intensive English language instruction labeled "structured English immersion" (SEI).

The all-encompassing nature of Proposition 227's requirements for educating language minority students was not based on a coherent theoretical model that could be interpreted into sound language teaching practices. Instead, the ballot initiative was an attempt to implement language policy by imposing a decontextualized procedural model of second language (L2) instruction in local school districts through legal mandate. Enforcement of the law was through a provision that allowed parents to file personal liability lawsuits against non-compliant educators in the civil courts (Sahagun, 1999, July 1). Proposition 227 restricted access to programs based on theoretical models of dual language instruction, including transitional bilingual education, dual immersion, and content-based foreign language instruction (Johnson & Swain, 1997; Stryker & Leaver, 1997). Consequently, the availability of resources for dual language instruction and access to sound second language acquisition and learning opportunities through native language (L1) instruction for all students were severely restricted.

Prior to passage of Proposition 227 only 29% of California's language minority students received instruction in a language other than English through transitional bilingual education programs. Following Proposition 227, the number of students in bilingual programs enrolled through the parental waiver process dropped to 12% (California Department of Education, 1999). Students whose parents did not choose to waive Proposition 227's mandatory one year of intensive English before entering mainstream classrooms were enrolled in SEI programs. Nine percent of California's teachers provide primary language instruction to English language learners in programs under parental waivers (California Department of Education, 1999). The other 91% of teachers are legally prohibited by law from using students' L1 as a medium of instruction in the classroom.

Purpose

The purpose of this article is to examine the pedagogical principles embodied in different models of dual language instruction and to identify the pitfalls of effective implementation of these models, given the sociopolitical contexts in which educational reforms take place in local schools and communities. This article focuses specifically on language minority students in bilingual immersion programs. The terms “bilingual,” “dual,” and “two-way” will be used interchangeably in this article when referring to this one program model. We explore diverse case studies of schools addressing the growing interest and need for universal bilingualism among majority and minority populations. We examine efforts to remain faithful to sound principles of second language acquisition and effective schooling practices for language minority students in spite of attitudes of reductionism and power imbalances within ethnic communities in a diverse society. The outcomes of dual language programs for language minority populations demonstrate that long-term persistent underachievement of language minority students cannot be ameliorated by addressing linguistic factors in the absence of conscientious efforts to also affect issues of status and power (Cummins, 2000; Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997; Valdés, 1997). In dual immersion programs that serve both language majority and minority students in the same classroom, factors related to language prestige and expectations for different linguistic groups are salient in determining program outcomes.

The results of Proposition 227 have compelled a reassessment of the relationship between models of instruction for language minority students and program implementation. A report by the University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, García, Asato, Gutiérrez, Stritikus, & Curry, 2000) indicated that Proposition 227 exacerbated variations in the quality and type of programs provided for language minority students. The initiative lacked a definition of the one-year sheltered English immersion program and the absence of clear guidelines for continuing services for students who had not met exit criteria after one year of intensive English instruction. The new law compounded school districts’ implementation problems because of its incoherent mandate without a basis in sound pedagogical principles of second language education and effective schooling practices for students with limited English proficiency (Mora, 2000). We present a paradigm for sound dual language instruction program design and implementation with a formula for analyzing and addressing the complexities and pitfalls in translating a theoretical model into effective schooling practices.

Models of Bilingual Education

Role of Theoretical Models

It is essential to understand the importance of a sound theoretical model of bilingual instruction in effective program implementation for minority and majority language learners. A model of dual language instruction serves several functions. A theoretical model embodies statements about the goals and objectives of the program, providing a "road map" for program implementation and evaluation. A model of bilingual instruction is based on certain philosophical assumptions and pedagogical principles that are articulated into a coherent and continuous progression of teaching and learning activities to meet the specified program goals. In second language education, a theoretical model makes explicit the value placed on bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism in developing children's human potential as well as in promoting their academic achievement. Theoretical models are expanded and more clearly articulated for implementation through decisions about teacher qualifications, student groupings, language teaching methods, and the scope and sequence of academic content.

Ruiz (1984) describes three perspectives on language: (a) language as a problem, (b) language as a right, and (c) language as a resource. The "language as a problem" perspective is reflected in models of bilingual education that view limited English proficiency as a handicap or deficiency that must be overcome and corrected through a focus on intensive English instruction and a remedial approach to instruction. The broad category of programs labeled English immersion in the United States for language minority students falls into this category. The "language as a right" perspective emphasizes the need for equal access to the curriculum through instruction in students' L1 in literacy and all content areas. Transitional bilingual education is often seen as a means of addressing the issue of linguistic rights.

Under the rubric of "language as a resource" models of dual language instruction, we find three program models: (a) dual maintenance bilingual education for language minority students, (b) French Canadian immersion for language majority students learning a second language, and (c) dual or two-way immersion programs that serve majority and minority language groups together in a single program. Lambert (Lambert & Tucker, 1972) identified "additive versus subtractive" forms of bilingual education based on whether the programs' goals were to produce students with bilingual and biliteracy skills or whether programs were designed to only achieve proficiency in a second, and usually socially dominant, language. 'True' immersion programs take an additive approach to bilingualism and are elective enrichment programs established by parents who wish to give their children the advantages of becoming bilingual and biliterate. With the growing awareness of linguistic human rights, dual language immersion programs are often cited as the best

manner to provide minority students with equitable education, as well as developing bilingualism in language majority students (Thomas & Collier, 1998; Christian, 1996; Collier, 1995). Ideally, minority and majority students exit the program fully bilingual and achieve high levels of academic success in both languages.

Dual Language Models: Compensatory vs. Enrichment

Dueling Models

Language education program models fall along a continuum. Using Ruiz's (1984) categories to describe a range of theoretical approaches, we can identify two extremes: compensatory models versus enrichment models of dual language instruction. At one extreme we have monolingual/monocultural models that view second language teaching and learning as compensatory education to overcome the "problem" of lack of language proficiency among language minority students. In this model the role of students' L1 is minimal or even restricted by local school district policies or state law, as in the case of Proposition 227. At the other extreme we have approaches to dual language program design that view second language learning as enrichment that provides clear advantages to students in attaining high levels of academic achievement, with eventual benefits in expanded career choices and economic opportunities. This is the view of multilingualism as a resource. Transitional bilingual education falls near the midpoint on the continuum because it is a compensatory model that addresses the linguistic and educational rights of language minority students, while providing the incidental benefits of some development of language and literacy skills in L1 as a byproduct of dual language instruction.

Some critics of bilingual education (Porter, 2000) acknowledge the benefits of bilingual "enrichment" programs while claiming that such programs are too costly and too complicated to offer to language minority students. We question the morality of such a position being enacted as a matter of public policy that denies the most effective and enriching programs to our most disadvantaged and vulnerable student populations. (For an alternative viewpoint, see Valdés, 1997.)

Successful Models

Successful dual language programs must be guided by participants' personal and professional experiences that build cultural-linguistic capital for both majority and minority language students. The theoretical models of dual language instruction affirm these values and beliefs: (a) becoming bilingual and biliterate is the path to the future; (b) dual language programs, when implemented correctly, are far superior to English immersion programs; and (c) failure rates in programs that do not foster full development of L1 and bilingualism and biliteracy are unacceptable.

Language is acquired best when it is the medium of instruction, not solely as the object of instruction. Students who acquire a language while they are learning content-area information are engaged in meaningful discussions and have a real reason to use and acquire the new language. In a bilingual immersion setting, students communicate with their peers and teacher to make meaning, explain, describe, and problem-solve in both their native and second languages. Their language acquisition has real and relevant purposes for the students (Christian, Montone, Lindholm, & Carranza, 1997). In well-implemented dual language programs all students acquire a second language while continuing to develop their first. All students receive instruction in their native language, providing the necessary linguistic foundation for the later acquisition of their L2 and development of full proficiency in both languages (Cummins, 2000). In this way, high expectations for both language groups are maintained as they are challenged and supported in reaching full proficiency and command of content-area knowledge in both languages.

For a description of the characteristics of various models of dual language instruction, see Table 1, adapted from Wink (2000).

Table 1

Dual Language Models of Education

Program	Goals	Students	Teacher Preparation	Role of L1/L2	Program Duration
Bilingual (dual, 2-way immersion)	1. English and another language (bilingualism/ biliteracy) 2. High academic achievement 3. Positive cross-cultural relations	Language Majority & Minority Populations	Credentialed Bilingual	L2 taught using second language methodology L1 and L2 used as a medium of instruction	K–6
French Canadian Immersion	1. English and another language (bilingualism/ biliteracy) 2. High academic achievement 3. Positive cross-cultural realations in goals	Language Majority Population	Credentialed Bilingual	L2 used as a medium of instruction in early grades L1 and L2 used as a medium of instruction in later grades	K–6
Maintenance/ Enrichment Bilingual Education	1. English and another language (bilingualism/ biliteracy) 2. High academic achievement 3. Positive cross-cultural relations	Language Majority & Minority Population	Credentialed bilingual or with expertise in L2 methods	L2 taught using second language methodology in early grades L1 and L2 used as a medium of instruction	K–6

Table 1 (cont.)

Dual Language Models of Education

Program	Goals	Students	Teacher Preparation	Role of L1/L2	Program Duration
Content-based Foreign Language Instruction	1. Full oral and academic proficiency in a second/foreign langauge 2. High academic achievement	Language Majority Population	Credentialed foreign language teacher specialized in L2 as an academic subject	L2 used as a medium of instruction	6–12 and Higher Education toward International Baccalaureate
Transitional Bilingual Education	English Only	Language Minority Population	Credential and/or support from an aide	L2 taught using second language methodology L1 used as a medium of instruction, but phased out as L1 proficiency increases L2 becomes the exclusive medium of instruction	K–3 Usually 3–4 years in "early exit" programs
Structured and/or Sheltered English Immersion	English	Language Minority Population	English-dominant or English monolingual	L2 taught using second language methodology L2 used as the exclusive medium of instruction	9 Months

Kontra, Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Varady (1999) suggest an application to program models of Ruiz' s (1984) description of attitudes toward language that carries us forward in our understanding of the interrelation of social, political, and pedagogical factors in program design and implementation. These authors point out how making the "language as right" and the "language as resource" orientations dichotomous or contradictory can mitigate against the view of a language minority group's human right to utilize their linguistic resources as a form of "cultural-linguistic capital." A linguistic-human rights orientation implies that everyone can identify positively with his or her native language and expect to have that identification accepted and respected by others.

At the collective level, a linguistic human rights orientation implies the right of a community of speakers of a common language to use the language as a medium of instruction in public schools and to have control over curricula and teaching in their own language. These collective rights are exercised within

a minority community to enhance their children's learning and to allow them to exploit their bilingualism as a social and material resource in reaching their full human potential (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1986). Language is acknowledged as a sentimental resource in sustaining familial bonds and exchanges across international boarders among migrant populations. The importance of bilingualism in social and economic terms in regions with open borders and high levels of transnational exchange and trade is more recognized today than with immigrant groups in the past who virtually severed ties with their homelands (Rumbaut, 1995, Torres, 1998). Conflicts over majority and minority groups' access to cultural-linguistic capital are at the core of dueling models of dual language instruction.

Immersion Confusion

There are "immersion" programs that bear the label but that are not true immersion programs (Wink, 1991). The simultaneous and contradictory meanings assigned to immersion result in misinformation and myths that language researchers and educators are challenging (Flood, Lapp, Tinajero, & Hurley, 1997). Bilingual education is a general term for a complex array of programs, each with different goals and objectives for different student populations (Rubin, 1977; Trueba, 1980). Any discussion of bilingual education programs must be understood within a broader social, political, and educational context.

It is often difficult for well-meaning educators and community members to understand the confusion surrounding immersion. When we think about these various program models and realize that there are individual differences in each program depending on the unique needs of a community, it is fairly easy to understand why we are experiencing immersion confusion. In our experience, an effective maintenance bilingual education classroom looks very much like a bilingual immersion classroom in that they are joined with parallel goals of bilingualism and biliteracy for all students. However, they often differ in the population served based on the demographics of the community. The relative success and measurable outcomes in students' academic achievement of different models of bilingual programs have been the subject of research studies (see for example, Ramírez , Yuen, & Ramey, 1991).

International language education scholars decry how terms used in formulating just and equitable language policy are usurped in the United States to inculcate Eurocentric values and language and to maintain the hegemony of English speakers (Wren, 1997). In their volume on international immersion education, Johnson and Swain (1997) state the following:

> Given the core features we have proposed, we would argue that there are some programs labeled immersion that have overextended the use of this term to the point at which a discussion of common issues and problems become difficult, if not impossible. A good example of inappropriate over-extension is the labeling of English-only programs

> for Spanish-speaking minorities in the United States as 'immersion education.' Such English-only education leads to replacive or subtractive bilingualism in the academic domain, the wide use of the L2 in public domains leads to the development of interpersonal and social proficiency that immersion students do not have the opportunity to acquire. (p. 12)

In this article we attempt to make clear the differences between what we will call the "popular parlance" and the definitions used by language educators to identify program models. By popular parlance we mean the casual way in which language model labels are expanded and reduced according to the particular purposes of the user of the terminology. The term "immersion" has many simultaneous, and even contradictory, meanings when used in different educational and political contexts. However, as language educators we need to acknowledge common understandings of programmatic models because our lack of attention to clear and accurate discourse has contributed to distortions of our philosophy and misuse of research findings (Edelsky, 1996). See Appendix A for a comparison of an enrichment model with a remedial model of L2 instruction.

Proposition 227 provides an example of the imprecise use of program descriptors, which leads to ambiguity in school districts' attempts to implement programs in compliance with the law (Zehr, 2000). Proposition 227's Article 2, Section D provides this definition of the mandated program for limited English proficient students into the education code (California Secretary of State, 1998):

> 'Sheltered English immersion' or 'structured English immersion' means an English language acquisition process for young children in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language.

This definition of SEI is ambiguous. Is structured English immersion a language acquisition process, a program, a technique, a method, a curriculum, a presentation, or a class? The law provides no clear guidance to school district administrators and teachers, implying only that there are curricular modifications and different methods required for teaching English language learners.

A highly controversial aspect of this model of language minority education is the duration of the program, since SEI is considered a remedial program, with the goal being rapid exit into regular curriculum or "mainstream" classes (Rossell, 2000). Studies of the patterns of acquisition of the level of academic language proficiency to perform more cognitively demanding literacy and critical thinking tasks suggest that an average of five to seven years is required to attain parity with native speakers (Collier, 1995; Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000; Cummins, 1981). This body of research calls into question the validity of a theoretical model of language education that fails to make provisions for normal rates of learning L2 and academic skills and content simultaneously.

Nomenclature meant to describe additive dual language instruction programs is erroneously applied to second language teaching from a language-deficit position, as in the case of structured English immersion mandated by Proposition 227 (see Table 2).

Structured immersion, or as it has more recently been called in California, sheltered English immersion or structured English immersion, is the opposite of the Canadian model. It is designed to serve only language minority students. The current goal is English dominance sufficient for students to participate in mainstream classes within one year. Teachers or paraprofessionals need not speak the language of the students, and the language of instruction is overwhelmingly in English (Krashen, 1998).

Bilingual (dual or two-way) Immersion

Authentic bilingual immersion is designed to serve majority and minority students. This is one program model with three different names: Two-way bilingual education, dual immersion, and French Canadian immersion. The program's goals are bilingualism and biliteracy, high academic achievement, and positive intergroup relations. Bilingual immersion programs generally cover a span of seven years of schooling, usually from kindergarten through the sixth grade. The model presupposes that teachers are credentialed (or certified) bilingual (or multilingual) speakers of the target language (L2) and that students' share a common native language (L1). In some cases, students with different native languages may be grouped together to learn a target language.

At times, bilingual immersion is referred to as two-way bilingual education when students are from two different language groups, each learning the language of their peers as a second language. The goal of the program is to develop proficiency in both languages for both groups of students using L1 and L2 as a medium of instruction for delivery of the core curriculum (August & Hakuta, 1997). In other words, in this one program model, two groups of students (majority and minority language students) learn together in the same classroom; they learn two languages and they learn *in* two languages. A key component in this program's design and implementation is the use of students' L1 and L2 as a medium of instruction and as the vehicle for academic content. Consequently, the role of specific second language instructional methodology is limited to strategies for making the content comprehensible without narrowing the focus of instruction to discrete points of language or vocabulary development.

French Canadian Immersion

French Canadian immersion is a term used in the United States to refer to a dual language program that historically serves only language majority students (see Appendix A).The goals are bilingualism/ biliteracy and high academic achievement in seven years. The teachers are credentialed (or certified) bilingual (or multilingual) teachers. Students enrolled in these programs tend to be from middle- or upper-class families and are

predominantly members of the language majority. This program model is often what the public means when speaking of "that immersion program in Canada that works." The reality is that this type of immersion works for those who are allowed to enroll: language majority students. Participation is voluntary, which leads to high levels of parental involvement and support for program goals, but also contributes to high attrition rates in the upper elementary grades (Cummins, 1995).

Dual-Language Program Implementation

Effective Program Implementation

In order for any dual language program to be effective, these characteristics must be present:

1. A pedagogically-sound model of instruction that fits the demographic realities and resources of the school community;
2. Fidelity to the model of instruction in all aspects of implementation, that is, congruence;
3. A means of assessing and addressing appropriately, and in a timely manner any incongruity between the model of dual language instruction, the needs of the school community, and the systems created to faithfully implement the model.

The first step in sound program implementation is selection of a contextually-appropriate model and a clear articulation of how its principles are applied to meet the needs of language minority and language majority students. We focus here on some of the pitfalls of dual language program implementation that we have observed in our research, even when programs are based on sound pedagogical models and appear to be appropriate for the target population. However, all educational programs encounter implementation problems due to lack of coherence and continuity in program design, lack of sufficient and appropriate resources, inadequately trained and unqualified teachers, and lack of thorough administrative leadership.

Dual language programs potentially face all of these problems, plus the additional challenges of differential power and status between and among the students. Furthermore, the sociocultural understandings necessary to implement quality dual language models add additional layers of complexity. Therefore, bilingual program administrators and teaching staff must be constantly aware of aspects of actual program functioning that do not support or that are inconsistent with the espoused goals and objectives of the program. A theoretically sound program can be taken off track when there are conflicting interpretations of program goals and requirements among and between administrators, teachers, and parents. Miramontes, Nadeau, and Commins (1997) describe poor congruence between theory and practice as it is expressed through contradictions regarding what is espoused as good educational practice

and the policies and instruction that are actually implemented in schools serving language minority populations (p. 10).

Congruence, or program quality, is achieved through on-going assessment, adjustments, and refinement of a sound model of instruction in a program with continuity from year to year as students progress academically. Language and content learning must be tracked and evaluated through multiple forms of language, literacy, and content knowledge assessments, as educators continually seek to make the implementation reflect the theoretical model. Oftentimes, there will be a mission statement or policy document in a school district that clearly defines the underlying principles and values of the dual language program (Brisk, 1998). The values embodied in the mission are then expressed through policies that support a positive school climate, staffing patterns, curriculum and instructional practices, student assessment and program evaluation.

The profession has learned over the past 100 years that it is educationally defeating to isolate language from its social, cultural, and political surroundings (Cummins, 2000; Freire, 1985; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Vygotsky, 1962). High quality programs somehow manage to balance the tension between social and political concerns and effective schooling practices for educating language minority students.

Pitfalls of Program Implementation

Effective dual language program implementation depends on the level of "fit" or "match" between program guidelines, teachers' instructional strategies, and actual use of the languages as a medium of instruction to achieve the programs' specified goals and objectives. Contrarily, a lack of consistency, or incongruence, between the theoretical principles and the programmatic practices results in a failure of a dual language program to achieve the desired linguistic and academic outcomes (Kerper, 1985). Therefore, if a program's theoretical model is sound, incongruence results from faulty or inconsistent program implementation. This can occur at different points and levels of the implementation process, such as through inadequate or contradictory administrative guidelines and policies, or at the classroom level through improper or inadequate instruction in either or both languages. As teachers interpret the theories and philosophical assumptions that are articulated in a dual language instructional model into classroom practices, oftentimes something is "lost in the translation" (García, 1994; Woods, 1996). The National Association for Bilingual Education (1995) reported a compendium of research findings concluding that, when taught by teachers who understand and believe in the important role of primary language in literacy learning, ELL students showed higher levels of achievement in school.

There are three program implementation factors that are considered when determining the congruence between a theoretical model of dual language instruction and actual classroom practice. These factors include the dual

language program model itself, teachers' beliefs about dual language instruction, and patterns of L1 and L2 language use in the classroom. The interrelationship among these factors represent a paradigm for evaluating program quality at three different levels: (a) The level of congruence between the dual language model and teachers' beliefs about dual language instruction, (b) the level of congruence between teachers' beliefs about the program and patterns of use of the two languages as mediums of instruction, and (c) the level of congruence between teachers' actual language use patterns and the guidelines of the dual language program model.

In the discussion that follows, we present examples from case studies of programs that illustrate a high level of match between the dual language instruction model and implementation. Following each example of congruent implementation, we describe a case where there is a lack of congruence between the espoused goals and principles of bilingual education and what actually occured in classrooms and with program participants. The set of values and beliefs about the role of the languages of instruction in implementing a bilingual program is defined as the Teacher's Language Use Policy (TLUP). The actual use of the languages for management and instructional purposes is defined as the Classroom Language Use Pattern (CLUP).

Levels of Model-Implementation Congruence

Congruence Between Program Model and Teachers' Beliefs

Congruence Level 1: Program model—Teacher Language Use Policy (TLUP)

This level represents a match between the program guidelines articulated in theoretical model for using the languages of instruction and teachers' beliefs about dual language instruction.

In curriculum design, a theoretical model is translated into program guidelines (standards, performance objectives, timeline and schedules, required teaching and learning activities, student assessment procedures, etc.). To ensure efficacy of implementation, these guidelines must be congruent with teachers' own beliefs about the value of bilingual instruction and their understanding of effective classroom practices. Teachers' philosophy of bilingual instruction must be consistent with these program guidelines if they are to demonstrate a high level of commitment and utilize classroom practices that are consistent with the goals and objectives spelled out in the program's mission statement or other policy documents. If teachers' use of students' L1 and L2 is inconsistent with the philosophical underpinnings, students may pick up on unconscious messages about the value of bilingualism for all and the relative prestige of the two languages. These implicit messages may cause inequities in classroom participation and disrupt group cohesion and interaction (Legaretta-Marcaida, 1977).

Calexico School District

An example of a dual language program with a high level of congruence between the program guidelines and teachers' language use is Calexico's K–12 maintenance bilingual education program. Calexico is a rural district with a predominantly Latino population located on the U.S.-Mexico border in southern California (Jones, 1998; Mora, Jones, & Palacio, 1999). The goals of the program reflect a strong ethic supporting bilingualism and bicognitive development in students throughout their schooling. The program focuses on Spanish literacy and English language development in the elementary grades. Students learn to read and write in Spanish while the amount and complexity of instruction in English increases as students develop higher levels of proficiency. However, Spanish is maintained as a medium of instruction in "Spanish for Spanish speakers" courses in middle school and high school. These courses include study of composition, rhetoric, and classic and contemporary literature from Spain and Latin America.

An ethnographic case study and a survey of teachers' attitudes and beliefs about bilingual education and biliteracy instruction in Calexico (Mora, Jones, & Palacio, 1999) described how teachers' language use in classrooms reflected equal affirmation for the primary language and English. Teachers were highly aware of issues of the unequal status of Spanish and made conscious efforts to elevate Spanish as a basis for learning and thinking. Teachers emphasized the development of primary language skills for communication, analysis, and metacognition with the aim of long-range academic achievement and biliteracy.

Dorado School District

An example of a lack of congruence between the program model and teachers' beliefs about dual language instruction is taken from a case study of a school district in central California, which we will give the pseudonym "Dorado School District" (Wink, 1998). In this context the guidelines of the theoretical model are solidly grounded in a pluralistic perspective of providing quality service to language minority and majority children. However, as will be seen in the following data, if the teachers' beliefs are not a good fit, or are not congruent with dual language instruction, the stated goals are irrelevant to actual program practice.

All language learning is cultural learning (Brice-Heath, 1986). Children do not merely learn sounds, words, and order. They also learn appropriate language use for specific situations within their cultural context. Most Anglo-American students begin in a Dorado School District elementary school with the cultural capital needed to succeed. In the current structure of Dorado's immersion program, Spanish-dominant students begin school without that cultural capital and background knowledge.

Monica, a native speaker of Spanish, was in the dual language program since kindergarten. Her family initially came to the United States as migrant farm workers and followed the crops. Initially, they lived in migrant labor

camps on the outskirts of towns, but her family chose to break the migrant cycle for their children's education, and more specifically, because of the dual language program this town offered. They now live in an apartment. The youngest child in the family of 10, Monica was born in the United States.

Monica was bilingual and could converse easily in both English and Spanish. She had been labeled a "low reader" in school. Wink (1998) often heard her fourth-grade teacher make negative appraisals of Monica's motivation and achievement, such as these comments: "She is just lazy. She won't do any of her work." The researchers' visits with Monica provided a better understanding and deeper insight into the reality of school for this bilingual learner. The researchers' findings contradicted the teacher's assessment of this student's motivation to learn English and the causes of her lack of engagement with the academic content and learning tasks in this classroom context.

Based on interviews with Monica, the research concluded that there was a multiplicity of specific incidents the student remembered and described to support her feelings of marginalization in the dual immersion program. The researcher found a common theme among the Latino students in the program of feelings of isolation and discrimination, similar to Monica's accounts of blatant discrimination against her and her classmates. Monica' described the teacher's attitude toward the students of Mexican origin with these words: "*Las maestras piensan que los mexicanos somos más sucios.* (The teachers think we Mexicans are dirtier.) Monica's reaction to the teacher is an example of a teacher's implicit message that clearly contradicted the dual language program's goal of providing equity and parity of participation for both majority and minority language students.

Congruence Between Teachers' Beliefs and Patterns of Language Use

Congruence Level 2: Teachers' language use policy (TLUP) and classroom language use patterns (CLUP)

Level 2 is the match between teachers' beliefs regarding dual language instructional strategies and their behaviors, based on what they are allowed to, and are able to do, in order to adhere to the program guidelines.

Several studies of teachers' beliefs about bilingual and second-language instruction (Karna & Lara, 1992: Kerper, 1985) suggest the powerful influence of their belief system on their classroom practices, regarding the use of language as a subject, and dual languages as a medium of instruction. Woods (1996) described bilingual teachers' belief system as a "finely and elegantly interwoven design," underlying their perceptions of the second-language curriculum and how it was implemented in the classroom, from overall organization of units down to specific classroom activities. A language teacher's belief system appeared to shape their interpretation of curricular mandates and requirements. These interpretations in turn influenced

interactions in the classroom between teacher and learners. García (1992) found that teachers of language minority students who were characterized as "effective" were able to clearly articulate what they were doing in their classrooms with distinct beliefs about their teaching role and strategies. Kerper (1985) concluded that teachers' language use in bilingual instruction is a manifestation of their judgments about affective factors, such as patterns of teacher-student interaction and academic learning factors based on the needs and abilities of their students. Consequently, in dual immersion programs that serve both majority and minority language students, teachers' beliefs about the importance and efficacy of each of the languages of instruction for different purposes will result in different patterns of language use within a particular classroom setting.

Taylor School District

An example of this level of congruency between teachers' beliefs and their patterns of dual language use can be seen in the Taylor (pseudonym) School District (Wink, 1998). Two major shifts in policy regarding language minority students in California have contributed to incongruence between teachers' beliefs and their patterns of language use in the classroom. Passage of Proposition 227 in June 1998 made dramatic changes in services provided to language minority students (Mora, 2000). That same year, California instituted a new accountability system, called the Student Reporting and Accountability System (STAR), that mandated annual standardized testing for all students in grades 2–11 (Zehr, 2000).

Prior to 1998, Taylor School District had a dual language program for an equal number of language minority and language majority students in a middle-class community. This relationship is evident in various ways: (a) the guidelines of the theoretical model and this particular bilingual credentialed teacher are in harmony; (b) the students scored high on the standardized test in prior academic years, and the community took pride in the bilingualism/biliteracy of the students; and (c) the teachers were satisfied with their school assignments and their positions in the dual language program. However, with the increased pressure on this program to do even better, changes were instituted. The language minority students previously had 60 minutes of English language development daily; since the advent of emphasis on only specific standardized test scores, more value was placed on English language acquisition.

In the Taylor School District, the teacher referred to it as "the great groan" of test pressure that had caused the district to make changes. Since the advent of more testing requirements, instead of oral language development for 60 minutes a day, both groups of students used this hour to practice test-taking skills from a specific program, purchased by the district. One teacher told the researcher, "Now, my class sits for an hour a day practicing test-taking skills, instead of developing language. They are bored, and I am frustrated. We know that language develops cognition, but at this rate, I have no idea what I am developing in my students in the dual language program."

Teachers' Perspectives

California's Proposition 227 presents an example of lack of congruence between the expectations set for teachers and their actual classroom behaviors, especially their use of students' native language as a medium of instruction as compared with the stated goals of the program. Since the advent of Proposition 227, teachers now are often in a position of understanding and the ability to articulate their own pedagogical beliefs, but are not being allowed to act according to these beliefs in actual classroom practices (Gándara et al., 2000).

The following are examples of the lack of congruence between teachers' professional beliefs and their behaviors from Wink (1998). The data included these comments collected from teachers from different school districts during the 1999–2000 academic year:

> Teacher A: We invited the families to come to school to share their concerns now that there is no more bilingual education. The families were a mixture of Hispanic, Euro-Americans, and Filipinos. Everyone wanted their children to be bilingual; we tried to think of ways we can do this and work around Prop. 227. We all decided we would have classes in Spanish after school.
>
> Teacher B: It is a must that I follow the curriculum at my school; it is mandatory in reading, language, and math. The curriculum tells me exactly what materials are needed and exactly word for word what to say when.
>
> Teacher C: Before Prop. 227, during our English as a Second Language (ESL) time, we had Spanish as a second language (SSL) for the English-only students. Since Prop. 227, we aren't allowed to have ESL and SSL anymore.
>
> Teacher D: I have a fifth-grade student who came from Mexico last year. In his language he was above grade level in literacy and every content area. This year he does everything in English and works after school with a tutor. I nominated him for Honor Society, and he was denied. Instead, he was retained because he wasn't at grade level reading in English.
>
> Teacher E: Prop. 227 has had a profound effect on our small campus. Bilingual education is out, and a new immersion program is in. The teacher is English only and tries to move them into the mainstream classes fast, but because of class size reduction, this doesn't work either. I have noticed that some of our immersion classes have become like quasi-resource classrooms.
>
> Teacher F: I only wish that the [immersion] teacher knew that talking slower and louder doesn't help a child who cannot understand English.

> Teacher G: One of the best things, considered one of the worst things by charter school critics, about our charter schools is that they are mostly exempt from the State Education Code, which also exempts us from Prop 227.

Wink (1998) concluded that these teachers' reactions to the discrepancies between Proposition 227's espoused goals of rapid acquisition of English and competencies to enter "mainstream" classes with their own beliefs about effective educational practices for language minority students, represent the negative impact of externally-imposed theoretical models of second-language acquisition on dual language classrooms. Gándara et al. (2000) have documented teachers' high levels of frustration and stress, as teachers attempt to conform to policies that are incongruent with their knowledge and beliefs about effective school practices for their student populations.

Congruence Between Patterns of Language Use and Program Model

Congruence Level 3: Program guidelines—classroom language use patterns

Level 3 is the match between teachers' actual patterns of use of the two languages for different purposes in the classroom and dual language program's stated goals and philosophy.

In other words, we examined program implementation to determine whether or not the use of the languages is congruent with the stated program goals and objectives for developing L1 language and literacy skills and achieving full native-speaker equivalent proficiency in L2. Kerper (1985) concluded that discrepancies between what actually occurs in the classroom in terms of language use and what the instructional model indicates about optimal program outcomes may negatively affect program effectiveness.

An example of this level of congruency can be seen in the dual language program in Taylor School District, which is located in a lower socioeconomic area for both Anglos and Latinos. The children in school reflect the demographics of the neighborhood with a balance between Spanish-dominant and English-dominant families. The goals and philosophy of the program are bilingualism, biliteracy, full academic achievement for all, and positive intergroup relationships. The needs of the two groups of children have many similarities; specifically, all children in the program receive an enriched language arts program in both languages. To a very high degree, the teachers feel fortunate to be working in this site because the families are actively involved at all levels of the school community.

This program stands in sharp contrast to the program in Dorado School District, although the stated goals and philosophy of the two school districts' dual immersion programs are the same. In Taylor School District, there is congruence between the goals and philosophy and the patterns of use of the two languages for different purposes. In contrast, the case study of Dorado

School District, located in much higher socioeconomic community, documented the disparities in academic success between English-dominant and Spanish-dominant students in a dual language program (Griego-Jones, 1994). Wink (1998) concluded that merely providing instruction in the primary language of language minority students did not necessarily provide educational equity nor opportunities for language majority students. The data reveal that incongruity between the goals and philosophy of the program, and the actual patterns of use of the two languages as mediums of instruction.

Although the stated goal of the immersion program is to promote fluency and literacy in Spanish, the power and status of the dominant language of the society, English, manifested themselves throughout the program. With the majority of students being English dominant, the program overwhelmingly served their needs, although the goals stated that the program was designed to serve the needs of language minority and language majority students. The teachers recognized that the English-dominant children needed to learn Spanish vocabulary, particularly in kindergarten. Therefore, the kindergarten curriculum focused on the acquisition of oral Spanish and introduction to the alphabet. Emphasis on vocabulary served the needs of the English-dominant students but did not address the needs of the Spanish-dominant students for conceptual development and higher order thinking skills development. Teachers altered their language and teaching methods to reinforce simple vocabulary, because English-dominant students did not initially understand anything but the most basic vocabulary. This left native Spanish-speaking students unchallenged.

When asked who benefits most from the immersion program, one Spanish-dominant student, María, responded: "*Depende quién es. Para su hijo sería un buen programa. El podría aprender español. Es mejor para alguien quien no habla español muy bien*." (Depends who it is. For your son, it would be a good program. He could learn Spanish. It's better for somebody who doesn't speak Spanish well.)

The focus of Dorado School District's immersion program in the first three grades was on Spanish language vocabulary development for English-dominant students. Thus, teachers used very basic and rudimentary Spanish with their classes in order for the majority of the students to understand. Native Spanish speakers were not surrounded by the enriched language and vocabulary development appropriate to their needs.

Wink's (1998) findings tend to affirm the concerns about group interaction and the power and status of the languages of instruction expressed by Valdés (1997). Valdés posits the possibility that language majority and language minority students may not benefit equally from dual language instruction, due to the larger context and status conflicts within the communities where such programs are implemented. In the case of Dorado School District, although curriculum in the immersion program was provided in Spanish, the format of the curriculum assumed children have internalized the norms of language use in academic life in the United States. Consequently, patterns of

language use became established in this setting that worked to the advantage of the majority language group while precluding full and equal participation of native-Spanish speakers. This artifact of dual language instruction in Dorado School District may be incongruent with the goals of the program, since the stated goal of the program was educational opportunities for language minority and majority students to achieve high academic levels and equal prestige for Spanish and English.

Conclusion

When dual language programs are well implemented, students have access to optimal conditions for academic development in both languages However, simply labeling a particular program "bilingual" or "dual language" or "two-way immersion" does not guarantee success in meeting linguistic and academic goals. Neither can we expect high levels of academic achievement for students in programs that operate under ill-conceived models based on erroneous assumptions and misinterpretations of pedagogical theories and scholarly research. Complex social, linguistic, and cultural factors constantly call upon us to rethink even those dual language programs that ultimately offer the greatest potential for students of the twenty-first century. We proponents of dual language instruction become vulnerable to attack when we criticize some programs labeled "bilingual" because they are not bilingual enough. We run the risk of having our words be cast as condemnation of dual language programs and used to promote an English-centric perspective.

We have learned that we must advocate for sound and effective language policy that supports the advantages of bilingualism as a valuable resource in our competitive global economy and culturally diverse society. We must also demand sound educational policy that supports implementation of effective schooling practices and programs based on coherent theoretical models. In moving forward, our focus is on educational enrichment through dual language instruction for all students.

References

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). (Eds.). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences.

Brice-Heath, S. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

California Department of Education (1999). Language census report. Retrieved January 24, 2001, from: http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reports/#swlep

California Secretary of State (1998). Proposition 227. *California voter information guide*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Christian, D. (1996). Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, *80*, 66–76.

Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K., & Carranza, I. (1997). *Profiles in two-way immersion education*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Collier, V. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in language and education* Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/directions/04.htm.

Cummins, J. (2000). Beyond adversarial discourse: Searching for common ground in the education of bilingual students. In C. J. Ovando & P. McLaren (Eds.), *The politics of multiculturalism and bilingual education* (pp. 126–147). Boston, MA; Mcgraw-Hill Higher Education.

Cummins, J. (1995). The European schools model in relation to French immersion programs in Canada. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), *Multilingualism for all* (pp. 159–168). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V.

Cummins, J. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics, 2,* 132-149.

Edelsky, C. (1996). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education* (2nd ed.). Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis Inc.

Flood, J., Lapp, D., Tinajero, J., & Hurley, S. (1997). Literacy instruction for students acquiring English: Moving beyond the immersion debate. *The Reading Teacher, 50* (4), 356–358.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., García, E., Asato, J., Gutiérrez, K. Stritikus, T., & Curry, J. (2000).*The initial impact of Proposition 227 on the instruction of English learners*. Davis, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Center.

García, E. E. (1994). Linguistically and culturally diverse children: Effective instructional practices and related policy issues. In H. C. Waxman, J. Walker de Félix, J. E. Anderson, & H. P. Baptiste, (Eds.), *Students at risk in at-risk schools: Improving environments for learning* (pp. 65–86). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Griego-Jones, T. (1994). Assessing students' perceptions of biliteracy in two-way bilingual classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, *13*, 79–93. Retrieved January 30, 2002, from http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/jeilms/vol13/assess13.htm.

Hakuta, K., Butler, G. Y., & Witt, D. (2000, January). *How long does it take learners to attain English proficiency?* Santa Barbara, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute .

Johnson, R. K., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Immersion education: International perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, E. B. (1998). *Mexican American Teachers As Cultural Mediators: Literacy and Literacy Contexts Through Bicultural Strengths*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Karna, H. T., & Lara, M. (1992). The support factor as empowerment and teachers' perceptions of bilingual programs. *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 11*, 187–206.

Kerper, J. (1985). *A study of the congruence between bilingual education program guidelines for language use, teacher language use policy, and teacher language use patterns in the classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.

Kontra, M., Phillipson, R., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Varady, T. (Eds.). (1999). *Language: A right and a resource*. Budapest, Hungary: Central European University Press.

Krashen, S. (1998). Is 180 days enough? *TESOL Bilingual Basics*, *1* (2), 1–4.

Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, R. T. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Legarreta-Marcaida, D. (1977). Effective use of the primary language in the classroom. In California State Department of Education, *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Los Angeles Times/CNN (1998, June 4). California elections: Profile of the electorate. *The Los Angeles Times*, Record Edition, p. 30.

Miramontes, O. F., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. L. (1997). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Mora, J. K. (2000). Policy shifts in language-minority education: A mismatch between politics and pedagogy. *The Educational Forum*, *64* (3), 204–214.

Mora, J. K., Jones, E. B., & Palacio, E. J. (1999, January 26–30). *The Calexico success story: Identifying variables in the literacy achievement of Hispanic students*. Denver, CO: National Association for Bilingual Education Conference.

National Association for Bilingual Education (1995, August). Teaching literacy to bilingual children: Effective practices for use by monolingual and bilingual teachers. *NABE News*. Washington, DC: Author.

Phillipson, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Rights to language: Equity, power, and education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Porter, R. P. (2000). The benefits of English Immersion. *Educational Leadership, 57* (4), 52–56.

Ramírez, J. D., Yuen, J. D., & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children: Executive Summary.* [Prepared for the United States Department of Education, under Contract No. 300-87-0156.] Retrieved January 24, 2002, from: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/ramirez/longitudinal.htm

Rossell, C. H. (2000). Different questions, different answers: A critique of the Hakuta, Butler, and Witt report, "How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?" The READ Institute. Retrieved February 5, 2002, from http://www.ceousa.org/READ/hakuta.html.

Rubin, J. (1977). Bilingual education and language planning. In B. Spolsky & R. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Frontiers in Bilingual Education* (pp. 282–294). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Rueda, R., & García, E. (1996). Teachers' perspectives on literacy assessment and instruction with language-minority students: A comparative study. *Elementary School Journal, 96* (3), 311–332.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 7, 15–34.

Rumbaut, R. G. (1995). The new Californians: Comparative research findings on the education progress of immigrant children. In R. G. Rumbaut & W. A. Cornelius (Eds.), *California's immigrant children: Theory, research, and implications for educational policy* (pp. 17–70). San Diego: University of California, San Diego, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.

Sahagun, L. (1999, July 1). L.A. schools are abusing Prop. 227, report says. *Los Angeles Times*, Record Edition, p. 3.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1986). Who wants to change what and why: Conflicting paradigms in minority education research. In B. Spolsky (Ed.). *Language and education in multilingual settings* (pp. 153–181). Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Bilingualism or not: The education of minorities.* Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Stryker, S. B., & Leaver, B. L. (Eds.). (1997). *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership, 56* (7) 23–26.

Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. Oxford, England: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Trueba, H. T. (1980). Bilingual education models: Types and designs. In H. T. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), *Bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice* (pp. 54–73). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67* (3), 391–429.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language* (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wink, J. (2000). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Wink, J., & Wink, D. (2000). Dual language models and intergenerational inspirations. In R. Phillipson (Ed.), *Rights to language: Equity, power, and education* (pp. 259-263). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Wink, D. (1998). Bilingual Immersion: Variables for language minority student success. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento, Sacramento, California.

Wink, J. (1991). Immersion confusion. *TESOL Matters,1* (6), 10.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.

Wren, H. (1997). Making a difference in language policy agendas. In W. Eggington & H. Wren (Eds.), *Language policy: Dominant English, pluralist challenges* (pp. 3–28). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Zehr, M. A. (2000, May 3). Prop. 227 makes instruction less consistent, study says. *Education Week, 19* (34), 7.

Appendix

Enrichment versus Compensatory Models of Language Education

Enrichment Model: French Canadian Immersion	Compensatory Model: Structured English Immersion (SEI)
Goals & Structure	
Is considered a form of bilingual education.	Is considered a form of English-only education.
Program objective is full bilingualism and biliteracy based on an additive model of bilingualism.	Program objective is proficiency in English based on a subtractive model. L1 literacy is not developed.
L1 and L2 are equally prestigious and recognized as valuable by the community as a resource.	L1 is a minority language. L2 is the majority language. L1 is denigrated and relegated to inferior status. The message is conveyed that only English is valid or important.
Minimum of four to six years to acquire "receptive" skills of listening and reading; higher levels of oral and literacy skills acquired gradually and reinforced through cross-linguistic instruction.	Students expected to gain proficiency enough to enter mainstream classes in one year.
Role of L1 and L2	
Uses L2 as the medium of instruction. Focuses on learning the target language through content teaching rather than on teaching the language.	Uses L2 as the medium of instruction. Focus depends on L2 proficiency, with L2 teaching the focus at the beginning levels and shifts to developing language through content teaching as students acquire L2 oral language proficiency.
The curriculum is designed to have coherence, balance, breadth, relevance, progression and continuity. Students at all points receive a curriculum parallel to non-immersion students. Initial focus is on understanding L2, and later on speaking L2 in a natural and gradual progression.	One-year of immersion is seen as "normal." Students may be re-enrolled for longer with parental consent. Students transfer into mainstream classes that may or may not be connected in terms of curriculum content. Students must be provided "appropriate services to overcome language barriers" until they attain academic achievement equivalent to average native English speakers.
Initial literacy developed in the second language. L1 language arts instruction often delayed, but phased in over time until biliteracy is achieved.	Initial literacy developed in the second language. L1 literacy not developed as a part of the program.

Student Population & Grouping	
Approximately 6% of total school population enrolled in immersion. Parents of students place them voluntarily. Programs are promoted and supported by parents. Parents are generally middle class or upper class. Students are all at the same academic level—usually progress as a cohort group beginning with no L2 proficiency. Presumes a homogeneous language classroom—most students are native speakers of the same L1.	Of total school population 25% are enrolled, unless students are granted "parental exception waivers." Sheltered immersion is the "default mode" for limited English proficient students. Under special circumstances, parents may opt out of the program; otherwise, it is mandatory. Parents are generally lower socioeconomic class and are non-to-beginning English speakers themselves. Students grouped by English proficiency levels, but multi-grade level grouping permitted. Encourages heterogeneous classrooms—students are expected to speak a variety of native languages.
Teacher Qualifications	
Teachers are highly skilled bilinguals with a strong commitment to bilingualism and multiculturalism as educational aims. Teachers serve as linguistic role models. Teachers use L2 methodology systematically. Teachers are trained to provide comprehensible input through the use of their L1 skills and appropriate methodology.	Teachers may be monolingual English speakers with or without specialized training in L2 methodology (ESL or equivalent L2 credential). Teachers may or may not value bilingualism. Bilingual teachers assigned to SEI are restricted by law in the use of L1 as a medium of instruction. Only non-instructional uses of L1 are permitted.
Historical & Expected Student Outcomes	
Students' expressive skills in L2 often lag behind the native-speaker norm in a range from one to three years, although listening and reading skills may be nearly equivalent. Predicted rates of L2 acquisition are based on the distinction between basic oral and conversational abilities, ranging from 3–5 years and cognitive academic proficiency to meet the demands of higher-level thinking and literacy tasks, ranging from 5–7 years average.	There is no research evidence to demonstrate what levels of competency in the four language skills are attainable in a one-year program. Assumptions are made that classroom language will be comprehensible when students acquire "a good working knowledge of English" so that students can transfer into a "mainstream English" program and out of remedial classes.