Integrated Bilingual Education: An Alternative Approach

Ester de Jong
University of Florida

Abstract

Despite the importance of the integration of English language learners with native English speakers for social, academic, and linguistic purposes, few models of integrated bilingual education, other than two-way immersion programs, exist. This article describes one district's effort to design a K–5 late-exit bilingual program with an integration component. The study focused on the experiences of 35 bilingual and standard curriculum teachers who integrated their students for content area instruction. Analysis of written reflections submitted over 1 school year illustrates the positive influence of integration on social relationships and program status, and highlights teacher collaboration as a condition for success. The study also stresses that issues of language status and unequal student participation must receive explicit attention in integrated classrooms.

Introduction

Bilingual programs have often been criticized for segregating bilingual students from fluent English-speaking peers for an extended amount of time, restricting opportunities for second-language (L2) acquisition and/or acculturation (e.g., Porter, 1998, 1999; Snow, 1990). Programmatic responses to this criticism have been limited. Advocates of English-only instruction argue for a rapid placement in a mainstream classroom. Bilingual education supporters point to two-way immersion (TWI) programs as an example of integration in a bilingual program context. The TWI programs integrate native English speakers and native language-minority speakers for most or all of the day and aim for high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy for their students (Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003).

There is no particular reason, however, why the integration of English language learners (ELLs) with native English speakers should be limited to these two options. The purpose of this article is to describe one district's effort to implement an integrated bilingual education (IBE) model other than a TWI program. After a brief review of the literature and a description of IBE, the article explores the experiences of 35 bilingual, English as a second language (ESL), and standard curriculum teachers to integrate ELLs and fluent English-speaking students as part of a late-exit bilingual program.

Background

In a review of the rationales for and against bilingual education, Catherine Snow (1990) points out that "it seems paradoxical to try to teach children English by isolating them from the large numbers of native English speakers available in the mainstream classes of their schools" (p. 61). Current research on L2 learning and acculturation emphasizes the importance of opportunities for ELLs to interact with fluent English speakers (Fillmore, 1991). Briefly, interactions with native or fluent speakers can provide the L2 learner with access to native target language models and assistance from native speakers (Christian, 1994; Fillmore, 1991; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Lack of exposure to fluent L2 models may result in early fossilization of non-native-like target language forms (Fillmore, 1982; Swain, 1995). Second, native and non-native speaker interaction can facilitate negotiation of meaning and provide increased comprehensible input (Long & Porter, 1985; Pica, 1994) and can create meaningful opportunities for comprehensible output (Swain, 1995). Finally, engaging in tasks with more proficient peers can facilitate the appropriation of ways that language is used for a wide range of communicative purposes to carry out social and academic language functions (Gibbons, 2002; Lantolf, 2000).

Interactions between ELLs and native English speakers have also been considered from a cultural perspective, though few studies focus specifically on ELLs. Research indicates that racially and ethnically mixed settings can have a positive influence on cross-cultural relationships, language attitudes (Cazabon, Lambert, & Hall, 1993; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994; Lindholm, 1994) as well as general attitudes towards school (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001), particularly when such integrated settings include cooperative learning (Cohen, 1994; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Slavin, 1985). Bilingual program graduates indicated that the lack of interaction with members of the Anglo culture prior to exiting into a grade-level classroom was a major barrier to becoming full members in the standard curriculum classroom (Brisk, 1994).

Providing opportunities for interaction between native and non-native English speakers is considered important for linguistic as well as cultural reasons. Yet, as has been argued amply in the literature, it is also crucial to provide bilingual students with access to comprehensive instruction in their

native language (Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Both components can be considered legitimate outcomes of schooling for language-minority children; however, they may lead to contradictory policies. While the former goal calls for the placement of ELLs with native English speakers in the same classroom, the latter objective requires clustering students by native language group. This tension between integration (or desegregation) and bilingual education programs has been represented in federal legislation, such as the Bilingual Education Act (Bangura & Muo, 2001) and school-based policies (Donato & García, 1992; Donato, Menchaca, & Valencia, 1991). Moreover, it has at times been explicitly addressed in court cases where desegregation policies and bilingual programming coincided (e.g., McFadden, 1983; Teitelbaum & Hiller, 1977; Zirkel, 1977).

Currently, the only programs in the United States that purposefully aim to avoid segregation while maintaining a bilingual focus are TWI programs. TWI programs integrate native English speakers and language-minority students for most or the entire day and reach for high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and positive socio-affective outcomes. Started in the early 1960s, the number of TWI programs has steadily increased to reach about 300 nationwide. The theoretical underpinnings (Christian, 1994; Howard et al., 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Valdés, 1996), program implementation issues (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003; Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; de Jong, 2002a; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005; Soltero, 2004), and program outcomes (e.g., Cazabon, Nicoladis, & Lambert, 1998; de Jong, 2002b, 2004; Krashen, 2004; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Thomas & Collier, 2002) of TWI programs have been well-documented in the literature. The existence of successful TWI programs illustrates not only that bilingual education can be enrichment education for all students, but also that bilingual programs do not always have to be segregationist, as its opponents allege.

Integrated Bilingual Education

Despite the importance of integration and the successful history of TWI programs, few examples of IBE models other than TWI programs have been documented in the literature. IBE can be defined as a structured approach to bilingual education that includes the systematic integration of ELLs with native speakers of the target language, in order to teach the target language as a L2 and develop the ELLs' native language (L1). Integration in this context can be defined as "a process aimed at bringing students and their education together as a whole, recognizing language-minority students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds as an integral part of the educational environment, but without systematically segregating their schooling" (de Jong, 1996a, p. 233; see also Brisk, 2006). In other words, IBE programs aim to retain the integrity

of a bilingual program's goals, move beyond the haphazard or random putting together of ELLs and fluent English-speaking students, and include carefully planned integration efforts throughout ELLs' participation in the program.

Few IBE programs (other than TWI) have been documented in the United States (see Glenn & de Jong, 1996, chap. 8, for examples in Sweden and Denmark). A notable exception is a study by Brisk (1991), who described a model that integrated two fifth-grade classes, one transitional bilingual classroom and one monolingual classroom. Students were grouped by their own homeroom (the monolingual or the transitional bilingual classroom) for morning activities, social studies, and ESL but were integrated for reading and language arts, math, and science. Flexible grouping practices were important to the success of the program: students had access to Spanish-only, English-only, or bilingual instruction throughout the school day depending on their individual linguistic and academic needs. De Jong (1996a) reported similar efforts at integration in four Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs, where standard curriculum teachers and bilingual teachers integrated their students on a weekly basis. Students attended in their own standard curriculum and bilingual homerooms for most of their instructional time but were consistently integrated for one or two subject areas, particularly science. Some teachers also scheduled for the students in the TBE program to teach their L1 to the native English speakers.

Participating teachers in Brisk (1991) and de Jong (1996a) reported positive outcomes in terms of student learning, attitudes, social relationships, as well as teaching practices. One drawback was that the integration efforts were limited to the particular teachers and grade level involved. In none of the schools did the integration effort take place across grade levels nor was it conceptualized as a programmatic change. This gap in the literature prompted this study to document an IBE model in the context of a late-exit K–5 bilingual education program.

Method

This study took place in a medium-sized school district in the Northeastern United States. At the time of the study, the district enrolled close to 8,700 students and implemented three different types of programs for students identified as limited English proficient (pre-K–12): a late-exit bilingual program for Spanish and Portuguese speakers, a TWI program for fluent English and Spanish speakers, and an ESL program for low incidence populations. The focus of this study is on the Portuguese and Spanish late-exit elementary (K–5) bilingual programs.

The Integrated Bilingual Education Model

The late-exit bilingual program model was designed for native Spanish and Portuguese speakers who were identified as limited English proficient and who were dominant in their L1. The program emphasized grade-level content learning, strong L1 literacy development, and a consistent L2 development component. The model represented an important shift from the existing early-exit TBE program that had been implemented in the district for many years. Designed as late-exit K–5 model, the new program did not expect students to exit until fourth or fifth grade and provided continued access to L1 literacy development. The distribution of the students' L1 and English was approximately as follows: K–1 (L1: 85%; English: 15%), Grade 2 (L1: 75%; English: 25%), Grade 3 (L1: 60%–50%; English: 40%–50%), Grades 4–5 (L1: 30%; English: 70%). The model included an integration component beyond the special areas (music, art, and physical education) for Grades 3–5 for content area instruction (math, science, and social studies). During integration time, students would participate in an integrated classroom consisting of 50% bilingual program students and 50% standard curriculum students for part of their instruction in these areas. The primary language of instruction during the integration time was English although teachers used the students' L1 as needed and allowed students to use their L1 freely. Teachers typically selected one content area for integration purposes. The new model was developed in collaboration with the bilingual and ESL staff and officially presented to the school board. The integrated model was first implemented on a voluntary basis in a few fourth- and fifth-grade classrooms in 1998 and was subsequently expanded to all third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade bilingual classrooms in the district (a total of five schools, three with a Spanish bilingual program and two with a Portuguese bilingual program). The actual implementation of the integration component varied by teacher pair. In most cases, bilingual and standard curriculum teachers selected one content area to focus their integration efforts (most often science or social studies) and integrated their students for either complete units or selected lessons within units.

The rationale for including the integration component was twofold. First, as a K–5 design, the bilingual program carried the danger of segregating the bilingual and fluent English speakers for their entire elementary school years. This social and academic segregation was considered detrimental to both student populations. Second, the bilingual program was looking for ways to more effectively accommodate the linguistic needs of recent arrivals and students who had been in the program for 3 or more years. The increased content demands at the upper elementary level often forced bilingual teachers to increase the use of the L1 in order to allow optimal access to the curriculum for all their students. While this ensured grade-level content learning, it also prevented students who were ready to tackle the content through (sheltered)

English from doing so. The integration component was a mechanism to provide more advanced ELLs with an opportunity to continue to develop their academic English proficiency through interactions with native English speakers.

Data Collection and Participants

The integration component of the bilingual program was organized as follows. Each third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade bilingual teacher was paired up with a grade-level standard curriculum teacher. The choice of standard curriculum partner teachers was informed by the bilingual teacher and the principal of the school. The implementation of the integration component was supported by professional development for the bilingual and standard curriculum teacher pairs. During the school year, six full-day meetings were held by grade level, for example, third-grade pairs from the three Spanish bilingual programs and the two Portuguese bilingual programs across the district attended the workshops together. At the suggestion of the teachers and in collaboration with a local university, the workshops were offered as a course that allowed the participants to earn graduate course credit toward recertification or a salary increase.

The content of the six workshops focused on sheltered English-teaching strategies and assessment, and provided partner teachers with time for planning and opportunities for group problem solving. The workshops emphasized that the integrated settings were bilingual settings, not English-only settings. Teachers were encouraged to incorporate the bilingual students' use of and access to their L1 into lesson planning and to promote the value of bilingualism. Second, the workshops stressed that the integrated time was to be aligned with the district's grade-level curriculum expectations for math, science, or social studies. The emphasis on academic content learning was included to avoid an exclusive focus on social activities (e.g., playing games) during the integration and to communicate that the integration should be treated as an integral part of the regular curriculum.[1] At each workshop, the teachers were asked to respond to a series of written, primarily open-ended questions developed and administered by the workshop leader. Teachers only indicated their grade level on each reflection. Besides the organization of the integration time (what subject, how often, what times/days), the questions focus on instructional issues. They asked teachers to describe their experiences with their initial integration efforts (What helped your first integration activities to be successful? What went less well as you implemented the first integration activities?), instructional issues (What have been some of the challenges or issues that you have encountered so far in the area of materials, language, interaction, and instruction? How have you been able to create a bilingual setting during your integration activities? As you are preparing for teaching a complete unit together, what do you foresee as your major challenges for yourself, for your students, for your partner's students?), assessment of

learning (In what ways have you assessed the bilingual and standard curriculum students on the content learned during the integrated activities? What have you learned from these assessments?), as well as their perceptions of the outcomes of integration (Can you share an event, lesson, or activity where the language, social, or academic goals of the integration activities were achieved? How do you think your students have benefited from participating in this year's integration activities?).

Six third-grade pairs, four fourth-grade pairs, and five fifth-grade pairs ($n = 30$) responded to 24 questions regarding these topics. One fifth-grade pair had been involved in the integration for 2 years; one fourth-grade bilingual teacher had worked with integration for 1 year. For all others, this was the first year of implementing a formal integration component, though two bilingual teachers had been involved in informal efforts prior to this year. In addition, five ESL teachers responded to some but not all questions (they had been unable to attend all workshops) (see Table 1). A total of 35 participants therefore contributed their reflections.

Data Analysis

Each teacher's written response was coded by grade level, position (i.e., bilingual, ESL, or standard curriculum). In addition, for the bilingual teachers, the L1 was also indicated (Spanish or Portuguese). Teachers' responses for all three grades were accumulated for each question and organized into one document. After reading the responses several times, recurring themes were noted and developed across grade levels and across programs.

Table 1

Grade Levels and Positions of the Participants

Grade	Bilingual Spanish	Bilingual Portuguese	Standard curriculum	ESL[a]	Total
3	2	4	6	1	13
4	2	2	4	3	11
5	3	2	5	1	11
Total	7	8	15	5	35

[a]This column reflects the grade-level workshops the ESL teachers attended and the grade level of the integration partners they worked with the most. However, the ESL teachers taught all grade levels and often participated in the integration at more than one grade level, K–5.

Findings

The main themes that emerged from the analysis of the teachers' reflections are related to the outcomes of integration, teacher collaboration, and bilingual student participation.

Teacher's Reflections on the Impact of Integration

Teachers were asked to reflect on how the integration component of the IBE program affected their students and themselves. They predominantly focused on the social dimension in terms of relationships between bilingual and standard curriculum students, although they referred to linguistic and programmatic issues as well.

Integration and social interaction

The integrated lessons were often the first time that students found themselves in a classroom setting with students from another classroom to learn math, science, or social studies. Teachers reported little resistance to the integration, though sometimes there was an initial period of hesitance or awkwardness because students did not know each other. Over time, social barriers disappeared and students developed positive working relationships within the integrated classroom. For instance, a fourth-grade standard curriculum teacher saw a great improvement in her students:

> In the beginning, it was disheartening to see that there was clearly a division amongst the classes. The students felt awkward and shy with one another, reluctant to share thoughts and ideas either individually or in small groups. . . . Towards the end of the integration activities, the students were sharing more interpersonal conversations and appeared much more relaxed.

If students were hesitant, the teachers felt it was generally because of the student's inability to handle change and new situations rather than an unwillingness to work with the other students. Over time, and with their teachers' support, even the most reluctant students became more comfortable, as the following example illustrates:

> In September, Tom (not his real name) was visibly afraid to sit down in my classroom and moved his desk away from his Spanish-speaking partner! [He] now checks out our [Spanish] schedule every day and lets me know that he has figured out what we have next! (a fifth-grade bilingual teacher)

Teachers agreed that initial social, get-to-know-each-other activities facilitated the integration process. Notably, this step was still considered important even after several years of being in the same school and integration through the special areas (music, art, physical education). A third-grade bilingual teacher commented:

One thing that played a big factor in their positive behaviors was the pre-integrations that we had in which we just focused on the social aspect of the integration. Both my partner and I were always encouraging the kids to be with their partners.

Most teacher pairs started the school year with an icebreaker activity that allowed students to learn each other's name in a non-threatening environment. For example, at the beginning of the school year, two partner teachers took pictures of each student in their class and their students had to find their partner during integration. The students interviewed each other about what they had in common and how they were different.

There was variability in the extent to which these positive relations carried over to out-of-classroom settings, such as lunchtime and recess. One fifth-grade standard curriculum teacher stated: "We have not broken down the invisible energy that separates the groups at recess but they know each other better and will be more open to friendships as they move on to middle school." Other teachers did observe students reaching out to each other outside the classroom. A third-grade bilingual teacher found that "during recess, lunch, or other activities different from the curriculum, we see students looking for their partners, shaking hands, and sharing time together."

While there were exceptions, the standard curriculum and bilingual teachers in this study noted observable changes in their students' relationships at a social level. Students became more and more comfortable working with each other in the same classroom, even though this comfort level did not always extend outside the classroom.

Integration and a second language use

While no formal assessments were conducted, the teachers also commented on the linguistic impact of integrating the bilingual and fluent English speakers. First, teachers commented on the opportunities of (academic) English use. They observed that even beginning ELLs tried their English with monolingual English speakers. The integration created an authentic environment for communication and use of the target language. A fifth-grade bilingual teacher commented that "the integrated setting 'forces' the students to try out their language and gives them a chance to hear 'native' language children—this is an experience that we cannot create in an isolated bilingual classroom." Another fifth-grade teacher also reported "much more engagement in the English language around content area."

Second, since many activities during the integrated time were cooperative in nature, the native English speakers had to negotiate with speakers of other languages who were not as fluent in English. Some standard curriculum students learned the Portuguese or Spanish vocabulary. They also developed more positive attitudes towards their bilingual partners. They learned to rely

on other bilingual students as translators when communication became difficult. One third-grade standard curriculum teacher summarized the impact of the integration component on her students as follows:

> [My] children have a better idea of how to work with someone who speaks another language than them. They learned how to communicate their needs through either non-verbal communication or to seek out someone to translate their needs in the other person's language. Some of the children even got the chance to learn some Portuguese phrases from their integration partners, which boosted both children's self-esteem.

In short, the integration component supported natural language learning environments for both English and the minority language.

Integration and program status

The observed impact of the integration component went beyond the classroom. Prior to the integration, bilingual and standard curriculum teachers often knew little about what was happening in each other's classroom, though each presumably was following the district's curriculum guidelines. The lack of communication easily resulted in myths (e.g., everything in the bilingual classroom is in Spanish, the bilingual students are doing something completely different than the rest of the grade-level classrooms, and so on) that generally treated the bilingual classroom with a lower status. As part of the implementation of the integrated lessons, however, teachers met frequently and planned their units together. Through this process, it became evident that both classrooms were engaged in the same grade-level work. A bilingual fifth-grade teacher, who had been involved in the integration for 3 years, described integration as an important equalizer:

> Academically, it has been great for the kids to get used to changing classes and having different teachers. . . . It has been good for my students to see others working hard, all engaged in the same endeavors together. This has been helpful to us as teachers in maintaining a high academic standard for all students. We have been a united front in terms of our expectations, and the kids have risen to those expectations.

The issue of program status was not limited to students and teachers in the bilingual program. A third-grade standard curriculum teacher identified the same advantage for her students:

> They reported to me that her class was also studying Native Americans like we were. They noticed the same pictures of the houses and books with pictures of Native Americans. Although it was written in Portuguese, a language unfamiliar to them, they recognized that it was the same content, another great benefit of integration.

Thus, including integration as a component of the bilingual program design not only formalized relationships between the bilingual program and the standard curriculum. Teachers noted that it also increased the status of the bilingual classroom by showing that all were involved in the same curriculum content.

Teacher Collaboration

The teachers unanimously and repeatedly stressed the importance of planning to make the integrated lessons successful. They acknowledged that implementing the integration component required them to be flexible, to be willing to meet to plan, and to frequently engage in reflective discussions about the successfulness of their approach. One of the third-grade standard curriculum teachers recommended to future integration partners: "Discuss how the lessons went with the other teacher afterwards. Mention any concerns and share the things that worked well—the students who knew the information or contributed ideas." To achieve this goal, the teachers pointed to the need for common planning time and indicated their appreciation for planning as part of the professional development. During the school day, common planning time was created by partnering the integration classrooms for the special areas (art, music, and physical education), thus freeing up both teachers at the same time. During planning, teachers initially discussed logistics (setting the times of integration and for ongoing planning, selecting content area lessons) and created their student grouping. For instance, in the first workshop the teachers spend much of their planning time talking about their students and grouping them together, considering each student's academic, linguistic, and social strengths and challenges to ensure optimal heterogeneous groupings by gender, academic skills, English oral proficiency, and literacy skills. As the year progressed, they focused on identifying supplementary and native language materials and developing hands-on activities.

The success of the collaboration and implementation of the integration activities was highly dependent on the attitudes of the individuals involved. The teachers emphasized the importance of their own values, commitment, and enthusiasm for integration. A fourth-grade bilingual teacher felt that "both of us were excited about integrating our children. This rubbed off onto the children." The teachers' commitment to the integration process was also illustrated by their willingness to work with students who were initially reluctant to participate. Rather than exempting them from the integration process, teachers supported these students in this change of learning environments. Moreover, they addressed any interpersonal conflict between the bilingual and standard curriculum students immediately. A fifth-grade bilingual teacher explained the need for "prompt action to stop negative comments/giggles in response to mispronunciation/poor spelling" to support the integration process.

While planning took much time and energy and could sometimes create a burden, the teachers also pointed to the benefits of collaboration. A fourth-grade standard curriculum teacher commented, "I learned how interesting and exciting it is to co-teach a unit. By having someone to discuss ideas and teaching strategies with, it took a lot of weight off my shoulders." Similarly, teachers' opportunities to solve problems during the workshops were also seen as invaluable. Teachers also realized that their collaboration served as a role model for their students as they had to work together. A third-grade standard curriculum teacher reflected,

> I think one of the most important lessons that I have realized is that the behavior that we want children to have has to start with adults. I always knew that you should practice what you preach but I think this manifested itself even more as I integrated this year. My students noticed and made comments about how I paid attention while [the Portuguese bilingual teacher] was translating the directions in Portuguese.

Common planning time is crucial to support the integration effort. Planning provides an opportunity to discuss grouping, curriculum, activities, and to share resources. Many partners met regularly before and after school to ensure that the integrated lessons would go well. Their willingness to collaborate and plan was highly dependent on their positive attitudes and commitment to the integration process.

Bilingual Student Participation

Despite the positive social and linguistic effects of the integration, the bilingual teachers expressed concern with the extent to which their students felt comfortable participating in the integrated classrooms. They observed a lack of confidence of the bilingual students to participate equally in the integrated settings, as the following comments illustrate:

> I also have concerns that some students from my class will not share all that they know when they are in the integrated setting. (a fourth-grade bilingual teacher)

> Some students in my bilingual classroom are tentative and timid about using English in front of their native English-speaking classmates. (a fifth-grade bilingual teacher)

> [A challenge for bilingual students will be] gaining more confidence in a situation in which their strong language is not the principal medium of instruction. (a third-grade bilingual teacher)

A questionnaire used by one of the fifth-grade teacher pairs to elicit feedback from their students about the integration component confirmed this

concern. When asked whether they were comfortable speaking in the integrated group, almost half of the bilingual students (44%) indicated that they were "not at all" comfortable, compared to 6% of the native English speakers.

This lack of confidence was attributed to the students' level of English proficiency and a fear of being discriminated against if they did not speak English correctly. One ESL teacher observed about a fifth-grade bilingual student, "Julio (not his real name) was passively resistant because of language skills. As his English skills strengthened, his attitude and participation in class improved enormously." Not surprisingly, new arrivals had a more difficult time feeling at home in the integrated classroom. Teachers also referred to the role of personality. A fifth-grade teacher concluded that, based on her experiences, "[c]onfident students with a friendly, outgoing personality had an easier time working in an integrated setting." Confidence, English proficiency level, and a student's willingness to engage in interactions with the students from the standard curriculum classroom were often closely intertwined.

Another factor that emerged as affecting bilingual students' ability to be an equal participant during the integrated time was background knowledge. Teachers commented on the importance of topic choice and pre-teaching. For instance, a fourth-grade bilingual teacher noted, "When students worked in pairs/groups of three on Venn diagrams of Ancient Egypt/Egypt maps, there were some great interactions. I think the nature of activity helped and because nobody knew more than another." As bilingual teachers presented key concepts and vocabulary prior to the integrated time, their students felt more secure. A fifth-grade bilingual teacher said, "I'd done significant pre-vocabulary so the students entered the situation with background knowledge in place. They actively and enthusiastically participated in English in the whole class discussion."

Discussion

This qualitative study described teachers' experiences with the system-wide implementation of an integrated bilingual education program, K–5. The program was a late-exit bilingual model, which included an integration component with the standard curriculum in Grades 3–5. The model had been developed in response to the need to expose intermediate English fluent students to more academic English and avoid long-term student segregation. Through the analysis of teachers' written reflections in response to prompts, the study considered the experiences of 35 third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade bilingual, ESL, and standard curriculum teachers during 1 year of integrating their students during science, math, or social studies lessons. The analysis of the written reflections illustrated both the rewards and the complexities of classroom settings that integrate native and non-native speakers.

First, while formal student assessment data were not collected as part of this study, teachers pointed to the linguistic, programmatic, and particularly the social benefits of integration. Linguistically, they noted the increased use of academic English and the use of bilingual communication strategies between native English speakers and bilingual students. These observations confirm the advantages of authentic L2 learning environments that promote the meaningful use of the target language to communicate with others (e.g., Fillmore, 1991). Working with native speakers on content materials encouraged even the beginning ELLs to use as much English as they could.

From a program perspective, the integration of bilingual and standard curriculum classrooms increased the status of the bilingual program. Teacher and students experienced and observed similar activities, curriculum content, and expertise in both classrooms. Thus, the integration component helped to overcome the marginalization that often accompanies self-contained TBE programs (de Jong, 1996b). This status effect was also noted by Brisk (1991) who commented that the bilingual teachers "have benefitted because their status has changed not only among their colleagues but among mainstreamed students. Bilingual teachers bring a new image of the bilingual adult to English-speaking students" (p. 126). Three factors that may have contributed to this outcome were (a) the inclusion of the integration component as an integral part of the late-exit bilingual program design (formally presented to the district's school board), (b) the system-wide implementation at three grade levels, and (c) the professional development that accompanied the implementation of the IBE model. In other words, the integration efforts were not marginalized or limited to individual teachers' enthusiasm for the idea. Rather, the district-wide approach provided visibility and legitimacy in each of the schools and tangible administrative support.

The teachers particularly emphasized the positive changes in the social interactions among students. They did not take the integration process for granted, but purposefully facilitated positive social relationships. Most integration pairs started the school year with activities that allowed students to get to know each other by name and used cooperative learning activities for grade-level content learning during the integration time. In an integrated school, given the appropriate context, "everyday experiences with children of different ethnic backgrounds will increase the probability that cross-ethnic peers will be viewed as individuals rather than members of a stereotyped group" (Howes & Wu, 1990, p. 537; see also Lambert & Cazabon, 1994). This emphasis on the social dimension was also found in another study that examined integrated TBE settings (de Jong, 1996a). In this study, the TBE teachers mentioned that one of the main reasons why they integrated their students was to overcome the social barriers among the students.

Some teachers reported that students continued to self-select by language background during lunch and recess. This lack of carry-over from the integrated classroom to informal settings was also found in other IBE programs (de Jong,

1996a). This may be partially due to the fact that students identified with their homeroom where they spend most of their instructional time. However, even within the context of TWI programs, such patterns have been observed. Based on student surveys, Lambert and Cazabon (1994) noted that in the Amigos TWI program, despite completely integrated instruction, preference for ethnic groups still occurred "on issues of eating lunch with, sitting next to, and inviting home for a party, suggesting that these types of interaction are especially determined in an ethnic framework" (p. 25). These findings show that external factors also influence social networks within the school setting. Student friendship patterns are often connected to their lives outside of school. If ELLs are bused into their schools (as was the case in this district), they have few opportunities for after-school interactions with the native English speakers. In this case, the lack of integration during recess or lunch may at least partially be a function of residential segregation patterns. This is not necessarily a negative outcome. Tatum (1997), for example, argues that it may academically and socially be beneficial for minority students to have an opportunity to identify with their own group (see also Faltis, 1994).

The second major finding of this study is that successful integration goes well beyond placing students physically in the same classroom. It requires a complex negotiation process between the bilingual teacher and the standard curriculum teacher. Successful collaboration between the bilingual and the standard curriculum teachers was key. As teaching partners, they had to resolve a variety of issues, including practical matters (when to plan, when to schedule the integrated time) and pedagogical decisions (what to teach, how to present information, how to provide comprehensible input, how to group students, how to incorporate the L1, how to select and develop appropriate materials). Several teacher qualities facilitated this problem solving process, such as a positive attitude toward the integration, flexibility, and a willingness to reflect and solve problems. Teachers were also aware that their collaboration served as an important role model for their students during the integrated lessons. The importance of such collaboration has also been found in desegregated schools. For example, Metz (as cited in Smith & Scott, 1990) found that interracial cooperation and interracial friendships were more common in schools where teacher collaboration was a key ingredient. Documenting an effective elementary school with a bilingual program, Carter & Chatfield (1986) also emphasized teacher collaboration as a way to include the bilingual program in the larger school setting and to develop positive attitudes towards the program:

> Collaborative teaching has contributed to a total ownership of the bilingual program. The bilingual strand is not separated from the total school endeavor. Monolingual teachers and aides commented in interviews that the bilingual program was important and positive. (p. 223)

It is important to acknowledge that these positive collaborative relations cannot be taken for granted and may have to be scaffolded for teachers who are less compatible in their teaching philosophy or style or who show more resistance toward such collaboration (e.g., Levine, 1990). Other factors that can influence the effectiveness of the collaboration are the relative teaching experience of the teachers or perceived status differences between the teachers as well as linguistic and cultural barriers (de Jong, 1997).

The study's third finding points to issues of status in the integrated setting. Bilingual teachers indicated that their students appeared less confident in the integrated setting and expressed their concern that the bilingual students were unable to show their knowledge. Other studies have also noted less participation of bilingual students in standard curriculum setting versus bilingual or ESL classrooms (Davidson, 1997; Flanigan, 1988; Ongteco, 1990). Flanigan found that the bilingual student she observed was more verbal and more confident in the ESL classroom than in the standard curriculum classroom. Davidson reports on a bilingual high school student who "often falls silent in integrated settings, not speaking unless spoken to" (p. 28). Research on Mexican American students in desegregated classrooms has noted that teachers created fewer opportunities for interaction and participation (Losey, 1995). Similar patterns are found in standard curriculum classrooms where L2 learners often find themselves excluded from classroom discourse (e.g., Biggs & Edwards, 1991; Harklau, 1999; Harper & Platt, 1998; Verplaetse, 2000).

This finding points to the role that societal status differences can play in integrated settings that include bilingual students and native or fluent English speakers. Cohen (1994, 1997) illustrates how different status ascriptions (i.e., high or low academic, peer, or social status) create expectations within the classroom for the teacher as well as for other students. Without intervention, chances are that majority students will dominate the interaction in small groups. Cohen, Lotan, Scarlos, and Arellano (1999) and Cohen, Kepner, and Swanson (1995) describe how tasks can be structured so that they value multiple abilities and specifically place minority students in leadership roles.

In the case of IBE settings, English proficiency level can become a mediating variable that can influence bilingual students' status in the integrated setting. First, as the teachers explained, lack of fluency in English may be intimidating and limit interactions. One student in a study on successful bilinguals recalled, "I had friends … that didn't dare walk into a monolingual class because they were scared and embarrassed. And if they had an accent it was worse" (Brisk, 1994, p. 27). Second, limited English proficiency may affect a student's status. Given the wide range of proficiency levels in integrated classrooms (reinforced by recent arrivals), it is likely that proficiency level played a role as status factor. In a bilingual setting, Neves (1997) found that students with limited language skills in both English and Spanish had low

status and were the least likely to interact and talk in small groups. This factor may be related to students' limited English-reading ability, a factor that has been strongly associated with status problems (Cohen & Lotan, 1995).

Another factor that appears to have influenced bilingual students' participation patterns is academic or experiential background differences between the native and the non-native speakers. For instance, the teachers in this study pointed to the increase of bilingual student participation when the topics were unfamiliar for standard curriculum and bilingual students alike, when content had been pre-taught, and when key vocabulary was explained bilingually. It appeared that these strategies were crucial in increasing the academic status of the bilingual students during the integrated time. While these strategies did not necessarily result in leadership roles for bilingual students, they provided the bilingual students with preparatory skills to participate more successfully in the integrated classroom. Zuengler (1993) similarly found that if less proficient L2 learners possessed expert content knowledge, they could be active participants in the conversation. Cohen and Lotan (1995) noted that "when there are dramatic differences in academic skills, the effects of status problems on interaction will be more visible" (p. 110). These examples illustrate the importance of finding ways to "level the playing field" during the integrated time linguistically as well as academically.

The purpose of this study was to describe one district's effort to integrate ELLs with native English speakers. One limitation of the study was its reliance on written reflections. Follow up interviews would have allowed for deeper probing and discussion of the complex issues that arise in integrated settings. Additionally, classroom observations and student interviews would have further strengthened the study to include multiple perspectives on integration and to document of actual classroom practices that support or hinder integration efforts.

Conclusion

IBE avoids the negative effects of segregation while supporting an additive bilingual framework. This study illustrates that integration does not have to be limited to TWI programs, as is currently the case. In fact, the importance of the integration of bilingual students with native English speakers for cross-cultural development and for L2 learning requires that policy makers and educators consider such student integration as part of any program implemented for ELLs. The study also emphasizes, however, that bringing students from a standard curriculum and a bilingual classroom together is a complex process. Successful student integration requires system-wide support, resources, careful planning, sustained teacher collaboration, and conscious attention to group status differences. Only when these variables

are purposefully addressed within a systematic effort at school and program reform can the integration of native English speakers and bilingual students have positive social, linguistic, and programmatic outcomes.

References

Bangura, A. K., & Muo, M. C. (2001). *United States Congress & bilingual education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Biggs, A. P., & Edwards, V. (1991). "I treat them all the same." Teacher–pupil talk in multi-ethnic classrooms. *Language and Education, 5*(3), 161–176.

Brisk, M. E. (1991). Toward multilingual and multicultural mainstream education. *Journal of Education, 173*(2), 114–129.

Brisk, M. E. (1994). *Portraits of success: Resources supporting bilingual learners*. Boston, MA: A Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education Monograph.

Brisk, M. E. (2006). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling* (2nd ed.). Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Calderón, M. E., & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2003). *Designing and implementing two-way bilingual programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Carter, T., & Chatfield, M. (1986). Effective schools for language minority students. *American Journal of Education*, *97*, 200–233.

Cazabon, M., Lambert, W. E., & Hall, G. (1993). *Two-way bilingual education: A progress report on the Amigos program*. Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second-Language Learning.

Cazabon, M. T., Nicoladis, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1998). *Becoming bilingual in the Amigos two-way immersion program*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence.

Christian, D. (1994). *Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages*. Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second-Language Learning.

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Cohen, E. G. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, E. G. (1997). Equity in heterogeneous classrooms: A challenge for teachers and sociologists. In E. G. Cohen & R. A. Lotan (Eds.), *Working for equity in heterogeneous classrooms: Sociological theory in practice* (pp. 3–14). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, E. G., Kepner, D., & Swanson, P. (1995). Dismantling status hierarchies in heterogeneous classrooms. In J. Oakes & K. H. Quartz (Eds.), *Creating new educational communities: Ninety-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, *Part I* (pp. 16–31). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, E. G., & Lotan, R. A. (1995). Producing equal-status interaction in the heterogeneous classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(1), 99–120.

Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., Scarloss, B. A., & Arellano, A. R. (1999). Complex instruction: Equity in cooperative learning classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 38*(2), 80–86.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Davidson, A. L. (1997). Marbella Sanchez: On marginalization and silencing. In M. Seller & L. Weis (Eds.), *Beyond Black and White: New faces and voices in U.S. schools* (pp. 15–44). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

de Jong, E. (1996a). *Integrating language minority education in elementary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

de Jong, E. (1996b, February 14–18.). *Integration: What does it mean for language minority students?* Paper presented at the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), Phoenix, Arizona. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED394347)

de Jong, E. (1997). Teacher collaboration in bilingual settings. In J. Gimbel, T. Hetmar, A. Holmen, & J. N. Jorgensen (Eds.), *Portraits: Denmark and its linguistic minorities seen in an international perspective with special emphasis on grade school education of bilingual children* (pp. 73–116). Copenhagen: Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism 28, Royal Danish School of Educational Studies.

de Jong, E. (2002a). Developing a successful elementary two-way bilingual program. *Sunshine State TESOL Journal, 1*(1), 8–17.

de Jong, E. (2002b). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(1), 65–84.

de Jong, E. (2004). L2 proficiency development in a two-way and developmental bilingual program. *NABE Journal of Research & Practice, 2*(1), 77–108.

Donato, R., & García, H. (1992). Language segregation in desegregated schools: A question of equity. *Equity & Excellence, 25*(2–4), 94–99.

Donato, R., Menchaca, M., & Valencia, R. R. (1991). Segregation, desegregation, and integration of Chicano students: Problems and prospects. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990s* (pp. 27–63). London: The Falmer Press.

Faltis, C. J. (1994). Doing the right thing: Developing a program for immigrant and bilingual students. In R. Rodríguez, N. J. Romano, & J. A. Ruiz-Escalante (Eds.), *Compendium of readings on bilingual education: Issues and practice* (pp. 39–47). San Antonio, TX: Texas Association of Bilingual Education.

Fillmore, L.W. (1982). Instructional language as linguistic input: Second-language learning in classroom. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Communicating in the classroom* (pp. 283–296). New York: Academic Press.

Fillmore, L.W. (1991). Second-language learning in children: A model of language learning in social context. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 49–69). Cambridge University Press.

Flanigan, B. O. (1988). Second language acquisition in the elementary schools: The negotiation of meaning by native-speaking and nonnative-speaking peers. *Bilingual Review, 14*(3), 25–40.

Freeman, D., Freeman, Y., & Mercuri, S. (2005). *Dual language essentials for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Glenn, C. L., & de Jong, E. (1996). *Educating immigrant children: Schools and language minorities in twelve nations*. New York: Garland.

Harklau, L. (1999). The ESL learning environment in secondary school. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism & ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 42–60). New York: Teachers College.

Harper, C. A., & Platt, E. J. (1998). Full inclusion for secondary school ESOL students: Some concerns from Florida. *TESOL Journal*, *7*(5), 30–36.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003*). Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research*. Report 63. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Howes, C., & Wu, F. (1990). Peer interactions and friendships in an ethnically diverse school setting. *Child Development, 61*, 537–541.

Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The acquisition of academic English by children in two-way programs: What does the research say?* Retrieved February 20, 2006, from http://www.sdkrashen.com/articles/the_2-way_issue/all.html

Lambert, W. E., & Cazabon, M. (1994). *Students' views of the Amigos program*. Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second-Language Learning.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Levine, J. (1990). Mainstreaming, partnership teaching, teacher action research. In J. Levine (Ed.), *Bilingual learners and the mainstream curriculum* (pp. 29–53). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Lindholm, K. J. (1994). Promoting positive cross-cultural attitudes and perceived competence in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. In R. A. DeVillar, C. J. Faltis, & J. P. Cummins (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 189–206). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

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

Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2001). *Impact of two-way bilingual programs on students' attitudes toward school and college.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 207–228.

Losey, K. M. (1995). Mexican American students and classroom interaction: An overview and critique. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 283–318.

McFadden, B. J. (1983). Bilingual education and the law. *Journal of Law & Education, 12*(1), 1–27.

Neves, H. A. (1997). The relationship of talk and status to second language acquisition of young children. In E. G. Cohen & R. A. Lotan (Eds.), *Working for equity in heterogeneous classrooms: Sociological theory in practice* (pp. 181–192). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ongteco, B. C. (1990). Teacher–student interaction patterns in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *NABE Journal, 14*(1–3), 129–144.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*, 493–527.

Porter, R. P. (1998). The case against bilingual education. *Atlantic Monthly, 281*(5), 28–39.

Porter, R. P. (1999). Educating English language learners in U.S. schools: Agenda for a new millennium. In J. E. Alatis & A. Tan (Eds.), *Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics: Language in our time* (pp. 128–138). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1985). Cooperative learning: Applying contact theory in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(3), 45–62.

Smith, S. C., & Scott, J. J. (1990). *The collaborative school: A work environment for effective instruction*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Snow, C. E. (1990). Rationales for native language instruction: Evidence from research. In A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, & C. M. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 60–74). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Soltero, S. W. (2004). *Dual language: Teaching and learning in two languages*. Pearson Education.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *"Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.

Teitelbaum, H. T., & Hiller, R. J. (1977). Bilingual education: The legal mandate. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*(2), 138–170.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study on the school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Final Report: Project 1.1*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence. Retrieved February 20, 2006, from http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_conclusions.html

Valdés, G. (1996). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391–429.

Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). How content teachers allocate turns to limited English proficient students. *Journal of Education, 182*(3), 19–35.

Zirkel, P. (1977). Bilingual education and school desegregation: A case of uncoordinated remedies. *Bilingual Review, 4*(3), 180–187.

Zuengler, J. (1993). Encouraging learners' conversational participation: The effect of content knowledge. *Language Learning*, *43*(3), 403–432.

Endnote

[1] This also allowed teachers to address any concerns from mainstream classroom parents about the impact of the integration component on their children's academic progress.