LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

Instructional Experiences and Schooling Factors of Long-Term English Learners

by

Rafael Gaeta

A dissertation presented to the Faculty of the School of Education,

Loyola Marymount University

In partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education

2014

UMI Number: 3667916

UMI®
Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3667916

ProQuest®

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

Instructional Experiences and Schooling Factors of Long-Term English Learners

Loyola Marymount University
School of Education
Los Angeles, CA 90045

This dissertation written by Rafael Gaeta, under the direction of the Dissertation Committee, is

approved and accepted by all committee members, in partial fulfillment of requirements for the

degree of Doctor of Education.

_____November 3, 2014_____
Date

Dissertation Committee

_____
Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D., Committee Chair

_____
Marta Baltodano, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____
Elvira Armas, Ed.D., Committee Member

ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Magaly Lavadenz, Committee Chair, who patiently guided me through the dissertation process. Your constant support and guidance were noticed and appreciated.

Dr. Martha Baltodano, Committee Member, thank you for all help, support and guidance.

Dr. Elvira Armas, Committee Member, thank you for all your help, support and guidance.

To the six student participants, thank you for your candid responses and constant smiles. You are an inspiration to us all.

DEDICATION

To my family and friends, for always believing in me and being the inspiration for everything I do.

To Josie, for your unconditional love, support and never giving up on me.

To Droopy and Daisy, for making me smile and giving me those needed breaks to relax and refocus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Full Term
ALD	Academic Language Development
CAHSEE	California High School Exit Exam
CELDT	California English Language Development Test
CST	California Standards Test
CSU	California State University
ELD	English Language Development
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
ESL	English as a Second Language
LESA	Limited English Speaking Ability
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
ROP	Regional Occupational Program
SDAIE	Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English
SEI	Structured English Immersion
TBE	Transitional Bilingual Education

ABSTRACT

This phenomenological study includes exploration of the instructional experiences and the schooling factors that have been in place both assisting and failing academically six long-term English learners who attend a comprehensive urban high school in Los Angeles. Long-term English learners have attended schools in the United States (U.S.) for more than six years and are not yet fully proficient in English. Qualitative and quantitative data sources, include demographic questionnaire, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using English learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), academic transcript analysis, and a focus group, were analyzed using descriptive content analysis and Critical Sociocultural Theory (Handsfield, 2012; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). The researcher identified two instructional experiences-lessons not engaging students in social interactions or learner-centered activities, and instruction did not help students gain proficiency in the English language-that hindered these students' advancement-and three schooling factors-enrollment in Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs throughout schooling, lack of knowledge about the reclassification process and low academic literacy skills and lack of understanding of how to succeed. To remedy this situation as it impacts numerous students, Legislators should pass laws that support bilingual education and schools should offer English learners the opportunity to develop their native language to be successful in developing bilingualism.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Long-term English learners have been defined as those who have attended schools in the United States (U.S.) for more than six years and still required language support services. Although at the time of this study, these students comprised a significant portion of the secondary English learner population in Los Angeles County Schools and the U.S., and many scholars have examined the needs of English learners, much less has been published on long-term English learners specifically. This phenomenological study explored the characteristics and academic needs of six long-term English learners at a comprehensive urban high school in Los Angeles and analyzed the current academic practices and the history of the federal and state legislation that have been in place and have both assisted and failed this population of students academically.

English learners or *English language learners* have been defined as those children for whom there has been a report of a primary language other than English on the state-approved Home Language Survey and who, on the basis of the state approved oral language and literacy assessment procedures have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs (California Department of Education, 2012). The term English learner is used throughout this study, but either term (English learner or English language learner) can be used to describe this population of students.

Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) defined long-term English learners as English learner children who were enrolled in any grades six to 12, have been enrolled in schools in the U.S. for

more than six years, have remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive years as determined by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), and have scored far below or below basic on the English language arts of the California Standards Test (CST). Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) also defined English learners who were at risk of becoming long-term English learners as those who were enrolled in any of grades five to 11 in U.S. schools for four years, who scored at the intermediate level or below on the CELDT, and who scored in the fourth year at the below basic or far below basic level on the English language arts section of the CST. Over time, these students accumulated major academic deficits. Olsen (2010b) found that long-term English learners developed characteristics that, unless educators could intervene, would thwart their access to higher education and increase their likelihood of dropping out of high school.

General Problem

Educators who have worked with long-term English learners have asked themselves the following questions: Why have we had students with limited English proficiency in English Language Development (ELD) classes who were born in the U.S. or who started their schooling in the U.S. and who never met the requirements to be reclassified as Fluent English Proficient students? These students were labeled as limited in English proficiency in kindergarten. By high school, they were still part of the ELD Program and have not met the criteria to reclassify. How has the ELD program designed to exit students with near proficiency in English in four years failed so many students?

Research has been needed on long-term English learners since their numbers have continued to rise. By 2015, English language learner enrollment in the U.S. will have reached

ten million, and by 2025, one out of every four public school students will be an English language learner (Calderon & Minaya-Rowe, 2011).

Reclassification has been defined by school districts' process of applying state guidelines to determine if an English language learner has acquired sufficient English language fluency to perform successfully in core academic subjects. Once a student has met the necessary requirements, the student's classification could be changed from Limited-English Proficient to Redesignated Fluent English Proficient. Reclassification of long-term English learners has been one of the many challenges that Prosperity High School has encountered. (Prosperity High School was the pseudonym used for the high school in this study to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the students.) The school district in this study used four requirements for reclassification:

- CELDT overall score of Early Advanced or Advanced with a score of Intermediate or above in each subtest;

- A score of 325 or higher on the CST in English Language Arts, or a score of proficient on the California Modified Assessment in English Language Arts (CMA ELA);

- A grade of C or better in the English class for the two most recent semesters or a passing score on the English Language Acquisition (ELA) section of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE); and

- Parents who agree to the student being reclassified. (Prosperity High School Self-Study Report, 2013).

Students must have met all four criteria simultaneously to reclassify. If a student did not meet all of the criteria, he or she remained classified as an English learner.

Study Focus

Research in this dissertation addressed the question: What instructional experiences and schooling factors contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles?

Study Purpose

This qualitative phenomenological study included exploration of the phenomenon of students' long-term English learner status with the purpose of identifying the instructional experiences and schooling factors that blocked or hindered reclassification for these students, and to give schools practical guidelines to improve these students' reclassification and academic achievement. My aim was to continue using my personal experiences as a teacher, administrator, and doctoral student, to develop effective approaches and solutions to help long-term English learners overcome barriers to accessing higher education, to increase their chances of completing high school, and to continue to find ways to improve the educational system that was meant to help them reclassify in four years but in reality has failed to help them achieve proficiency in English.

Olsen (2010b) found that long-term English learners tended to go unnoticed in secondary schools. These students had distinct characteristics that separated them from other English learners, although they were usually counted with the English learner population. For example, Olsen (2010b) stated they were born or spent most of their lives in the U.S. and did not share an immigrants' unfamiliarity with the culture or lack of exposure to the English language. Long-term English learners were able to function in social situations in both their primary language and in English. They were exposed to English because they lived most of their life in the U.S.

As a result, many long-term English learners have developed a non-standard form of the English language which differed from academic English language. Nonetheless, they sounded in many ways like their peers, adolescents whose first language was English (Olsen, 2010b).

Soto (2012) defined academic English language development as the explicit teaching of the registers of academic oral language itself, which included teaching the distinctions between social language defined as basic vocabulary, grammar, form, and function of language; and academic language defined as content-area vocabulary and syntax in context to reading and writing. According to Kinsella (2007), there were several components to academic language development including vocabulary development, syntax, grammar, and register. Olsen's (2010b) research showed that long-term English learners also had significant gaps in reading and writing. Olsen (2010b) stated that "writing is generally weak" (p. 18) because it lacked English syntax, grammar, and vocabulary. Long-term English learners chronically remained at or below the intermediate level of English proficiency. Many have also developed habits of non-engagement and have not developed behaviors associated with academic success. Olsen (2010b) also found that the majority of long-term English learners wanted to go to college, but these students were unaware of whether their academic skills, academic record, and course work would prepare them for college. In addition, Olsen (2010a) noted that long-term English learners had become discouraged learners who were disengaged towards academics and were ready to drop out of school.

Study Importance

This study included analysis of the phenomenon of students with long-term English learner status at an urban high school in Los Angeles using five methodologies: a demographic

questionnaire (See Appendix A), one-on-one focused interviews (See Appendix B), classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) (See Appendix C), academic transcript analysis (See Appendix D), and a focus group (See Appendix E). There has been a need for more research on long-term English learners since their numbers have been increasing. How could researchers or educators identify and serve the needs of a group of students that has not even been effectively enumerated? Consequently, closing the achievement gap for English learners has become a priority. The majority of these students would become long-term English learners if the policies and procedures that guide school districts and the instructional practices that take place in classrooms settings did not change to assist in their reclassification and beyond.

Inquiry Framework

In this dissertation, the researcher analyzed the literature through the lens of Critical Sociocultural Theory (Handsfield, 2012; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje 2007). Critical Sociocultural Theory has been developed by language and literacy researchers to extend traditional sociocultural theory to account for how both learning and teaching influence and are influenced by power relations (Handsfield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2007). Applied to teaching emergent bilingual students, a critical sociocultural approach embraced social interaction and scaffolding, including moderating language, opportunities for student-to-student interaction, relating instruction to students' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2005), and engaging collaborative and experimental learning (Dixon-Krauss, 1995). The Critical Sociocultural approach "supports students in negotiating multiple expectations for social and academic language use and the power relationships that they imply" (Handsfield, 2012, p. 44).

Research Design

This qualitative, phenomenological study describes the essence of the school experiences of long-term English learners whose primary language was Spanish. Participants in the study had not been reclassified as English Language Proficient although they had been in U.S. schools throughout their academic careers. Through a variety of data collection methods and Descriptive Content Analysis, the researcher sought to identify the instructional experiences and schooling factors that helped or hindered the study participants in becoming fluent in English.

Qualitative Methodology

To explore the instructional experiences and schooling factors of long-term English learners in an urban high school in Los Angeles, the research was based on qualitative study. Qualitative methods had the power to provide an in-depth understanding about the instructional experiences and schooling factors of long-term English learners in an urban high school in Los Angeles. Maxwell (1996) stated that the main benefit of conducting a qualitative study lies in the credible results and theories based on experiences, an opportunity to improve practice, and an ability to collaborate with participants rather than just study them. Maxwell (1996) affirmed that qualitative work emphasizing the perspectives of students in the school setting usually had more potential for informing educational practitioners, which was one of the main reasons qualitative research methodology was the most appropriate to answer the research questions.

Phenomenological Study

A phenomenological study design was a critical part of this qualitative research methodology. Merriam (2009) defined phenomenology as the study of people's conscious experience and their life-world, that is, their "everyday life and social action" (Schram, 2003, p.

71). The six-participant qualitative phenomenological design was the best fit for this study because phenomenological research has been defined as a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher identifies the essence of human experience about a phenomenon as described by participants (Creswell, 2009). The researcher analyzed the phenomenon of long-term English learner status through examining data from a demographic questionnaire (See Appendix A), one-on-one focused interviews (See Appendix B), classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) (See Appendix C), academic transcript analysis (See Appendix D), and a focus group (See Appendix E) of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles.

Investigation Site

At the time of the study, Prosperity High School was a large urban high school with enrollment of approximately 1,700 students in grades nine through 12, in Los Angeles. Three ethnic groups comprised the student population at the time of the study: 77% Hispanic, 17% Asian, and 6% White. English learners represented 32.4% of the school's population or 554 students. Out of 554 English learners, 400 are long-term English learners. The ethnic breakdown of the 400 long-term English learners was 95% Hispanic and 5% Asian (Prosperity High School Self-Study Report, 2013). Prosperity High School was a pseudonym to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the students.

Participants

Six 11th-grade long-term English learners from Prosperity High School participated in the study. The researcher used purposeful sampling to select the six students for the phenomenological study. The Instructional Coach nominated the pool of participants who met

the criteria to participate in the study. Merriam (2009) stated that a researcher must first

determine the selection criteria which were essential in choosing the people or site to be studied.

The criteria established for purposeful sampling directly reflected the purpose of the study and

guided in the identification of information-rich cases (Merriam, 2009). Merriam (2009) also

stated that the researcher of the study should establish the study criteria. Reflecting this criteria,

participants in the study met the Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) definition of long-term English

learner status:

- English learners enrolled in any grade six to 12;

- English learners enrolled in schools in the U.S. for more than six years; and

- Students who remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or

  more consecutive years as determined by the CELDT and scores far below basic or

  below basic on the English language arts segment of the CST.

In addition, to address gender and ethnicity issues, participants included only male and

female long-term English learners of Hispanic origin. The study did not include students who

were also receiving special education services because their reclassification was based on

alternative methods not addressed in this study. The selection of 11th-grade long-term English

learners ensured longevity over the course of the study and to ensure the longest academic

history available.

Methods of Data Collection

The data collection for this phenomenological study consisted of five methodologies:

demographic questionnaire (See Appendix A), one-on-one focused interviews (See Appendix B),

classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) (See

Appendix C), academic transcript analysis (See Appendix D), and a focus group (See Appendix E). From the questionnaires, the researcher collected participants' demographic data. To get the essence or basic underlying structure of the meaning of an experience, the focused interview was the primary method of data collection (Merriam, 2009). Analysis of qualitative data from observations and focused interviews helped to answer the research question. All data collected brought to light the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles. The process also created opportunities for the participants to articulate the academic experiences that helped or hindered them in achieving academic success or reclassification.

Demographic Questionnaire

Students completed a demographic questionnaire (See Appendix A) before participating in the one-on-one focused interviews (See Appendix B). This instrument allowed the researcher to gain initial familiarity with each participant. Merriam (2009) stated that all questionnaires containing questions that referred to the particular demographics such as age, income, education, number of years on the job of the participant were relevant to the research study.

One-on-One Focused Interviews

The interview questions addressed the research question by bringing to light the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contribute to long-term English learner status of Latino students. The interviews created space in which the participants could articulate the academic experiences that led or hindered them to become academically successful or to reclassify. I interviewed each participant three times for a total of 18 interviews using closed-ended and open-ended questions (See Appendix B). The Loyola Marymount University

Institutional Review Board approved the focus interview questions. Questions from the second round of interviews addressed any unanswered questions and clarified other questions that arose during the study. A third phone interview allowed participants to further clarify any questions the researcher had concerning their feelings, experiences or previous responses.

Classroom Observation: English Learner Shadow Study Protocol

 I used the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2102) (See Appendix C) during classroom observations. During observations, I referred to the written profile of each student I observed. The written profile included demographic information such as name, date of birth, date of entry to the U.S., and date of entry to the district. The profile also included test results such as Language Proficient Assessment, state assessment results for CST English Language Arts and mathematics, grade point average (GPA), and CAHSEE scores. The researcher collected the written profile data from the academic transcripts information provided by the Instructional Coach.

The English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) process allowed teachers to see firsthand a classroom like their own and to see the sense of urgency that exists when the specific needs of English language learners are not addressed systematically (See Appendix C). Soto (2012) stated that the English Language Shadow study was a way to create urgency around the instructional and linguistic needs of English language learners, either in teacher training or in staff development.

Academic Transcript Analysis

The research included analysis of quantitative data including GPA, CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, retention, teacher comments, and years in school from the six participants to examine

the K-11 educational history of each participant to assist in answering the research question (See Appendix D). The quantitative data collected provided a controlled description of the courses, test data, and schooling experiences the participants lived through their past and current schooling (Merriam, 2009).

Focus Group

A focus group based on specific questions followed after the three one-on-one interviews with each participant (See Appendix E). The focus group took place during one lunch period with the students. The goal of the focus group was get to get to know the participants in a more social setting versus the structured one-on-one interview format, to ask further clarifying questions, to thank the participants for their participation, and to bring closure to their participation in the study. Merriam (2009) stated that as a method of qualitative research data collection, a focus group was an interview on a topic with a group of people who had knowledge of the topic and who were selected through purposeful sampling (Krueger, 2008; Stewart, Shamdasani, & Rook, 2006). Merriam (2009) also stated that data obtained from a focus group was socially constructed within the interactions of the participants, therefore a constructivist perspective was the basis of this procedure to collect data. Merriam (2009) affirmed that "focus groups work best for topics people could talk about in their everyday lives but don't" (Macnaghten & Myers, 2004, p. 65).

<div align="center">**Data Analysis**</div>

The research included multiple methods of data collection for the purpose of triangulation. Glesne (1999) stated that triangulation gave the opportunity to offset potential threats to the validity of the data. The demographic questionnaire (See Appendix A), one-on-one

focused interviews (See Appendix B), classroom observations using English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) (See Appendix C), academic transcript analysis (See Appendix D), and focus group (See Appendix E) discussion provided me with different types of data to analyze.

Descriptive Content Analysis

The researcher analyzed the data using the descriptive content analysis methodology. The Foresight enriched Research Infrastructure Impact Assessment Methodology (FenRIAM) website (2012) described the goal of the descriptive content analysis methodology as a way to analyze and present the collected information (http://www.fenriam.eu/descriptive-content-analysis.html). The research included descriptive content analysis to examine the quantitative and qualitative data collected through methods such as demographic questionnaire (See Appendix A), one-on-one focused interviews (See Appendix B), classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) (See Appendix C), academic transcript analysis (See Appendix D), and a focus group (See Appendix E) with the aim of summarizing the informational contents of these data with respect to the research question.

<div align="center">

Limitations

</div>

With a sample of only six participants, the results of this research could not be generalized broadly. I did not mean for the conclusions drawn from this study to reflect what was happening in all schools where long-term English learners were enrolled, but rather to share the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to the status of Latino students at one urban high school in Los Angeles.

Reasons students participated in the study were another limitation. Because the Instructional Coach knew the students and teachers personally, I was confident that they would be more than willing to participate in the dissertation study. This made access easier, but the participants might have felt obligated to participate even though they might not want to participate.

Definitions of Terms

The following are clarifications of terms used in this research report. Most definitions were taken from the glossary of terms that the California Department of Education used in language data reports.

Academic Language: Academic language has been defined as the explicit teaching of the register of academic oral language itself, which includes teaching the distinctions between social—basic vocabulary, grammar, form, and function of language—and academic—content-area vocabulary and syntax in context to reading and writing—language (Soto, 2012). According to Kinsella (2007), there were several components to academic language development including vocabulary development, syntax, grammar, and register.

English Language Development (ELD): English-language development was the term used for a specialized program of English language instruction appropriate for the English learner's identified level of language proficiency. This program has been implemented and designed to promote second language acquisition of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (California Department of Education, 2012).

English learner or English language learner: English learners or English-language-learners (formerly known as Limited-English-Proficient students) were those students for whom there has been a report of a primary language other than English on the state-approved Home Language Survey and who, on the basis of the state approved oral language (grades kindergarten through grade 12) assessment procedures and literacy (grades three through 12 only), and who have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs. (California Department of Education, 2012).

Fluent English Proficient: Students who were fluent-English-proficient were the students whose primary language was other than English and who have met the district criteria for determining proficiency in English. These included both those students who were identified as Fluent English Proficient on initial identification and students redesignated from English learner (California Department of Education, 2012).

Long-Term English Learner: Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) defined long-term English learners as English learners who were enrolled in any grade six to 12, have been enrolled in schools in the U.S. for more than six years, have remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive years as determined by the CELDT, and scored far below basic or below basic on the English language arts of the CST. Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) also defined English learners who are at risk of becoming long-term English learners as English learners who have been enrolled in any of grades five to 11 in U.S. schools for four years, who scored at the intermediate level or

below on the CELDT and scored in the fourth year at the below basic or far below basic level on the English language arts section of the CST.

Primary Language: A student's primary language was identified by the Home Language Survey as the language first learned, most frequently used at home, or most frequently spoken by the parents or adults in the home. Primary language was also referred to as *L1*. The languages reported on the Language Census represent languages other than English spoken by English learners and fluent-English-proficient students in California public schools (California Department of Education, 2012).

Primary Language Support: Primary language support was defined as instructional support provided through the English learner's primary language. This support did not take the place of academic instruction through the primary language but could be used to clarify meaning and facilitate student comprehension of academic content area concepts taught mainly through English. It could also include oral language development in the English learner's primary language. Primary language support may be provided by teachers fluent in the English learner's primary language or by bilingual paraprofessionals (aides). A credentialed teacher supervised the aides (California Department of Education, 2012).

Redesignated Fluent English Proficient: The category of Redesignated Fluent English Proficient students contained English learners who were redesignated as fluent-English-proficient since the prior-year census. These students were redesignated according to the multiple criteria, standards, and procedures, based on general state guidelines, adopted by the district and demonstrate that students who were redesignated had an English-language

proficiency comparable to that of average native English speakers (California Department of Education, 2012).

Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English: Specially Designated Academic Instruction in English was defined as an approach to teach academic courses to English learners in English. It was designed for nonnative speakers of English and focused on increasing the comprehensibility of the academic courses typically provided to students with fluent English proficiency and English-only students in the district. Students reported in this category received a program of English language development and, at a minimum, two academic subjects required for grade promotion or graduation taught through this program (California Department of Education, 2012).

Structured English Immersion: Structured English immersion classes are those in which English learners who had not yet met local district criteria for having achieved a good working knowledge (also defined as reasonable fluency) of English were enrolled in an English language acquisition process for young children in which nearly all classroom instruction was in English but consisted of a curriculum and presentation designed for children who were learning the language (California Department of Education, 2012).

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter One of this study included an introduction to the different parts of the phenomenological study. The study research addressed the question: What instructional experiences and schooling factors contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles?

In the research, I sought to advance knowledge on the topic of long-term English learners with the purpose of identifying the instructional experiences and schooling factors that hindered their reclassification and academic achievement, and to give schools practical guidelines to improve long-term English learner reclassification and academic achievement. The theoretical lens of Critical Sociocultural Theory formed the structure with which to address the research question.

Chapter Two includes a discussion of the relevant literature surrounding the topic. Critical Sociocultural Theory was the theoretical framework for the study. In addition to the literature on Critical Sociocultural Theory, it includes a summary of the relevant research and literature in three sections. Section one includes a review of the literature and research on the instructional experiences that affected and contributed to long-term English learner status. Section two includes the schooling factors, a brief history of bilingual education in the U.S. including an examination of the political and ideological beliefs surrounding bilingual education on federal policies, federal court cases, and state level policies, plus descriptions of bilingual education models and instructional models after voters passed Proposition 227—also known as the English Language Education for Immigrant Children Act—in 1998, that contributed to long-term English learner status. The literature review concludes with sub-section three, which summarizes the current research on long-term English learners. The literature review suggests two conclusions:

- There was a need for more research and real solutions for the problems that our long-term English learners faced because their numbers were increasing and the achievement gap was widening.

- By 2015, English learner enrollment in the U.S. will have reached 10 million, and by 2025, one out of every four public school student will be an English learner (Calderon & Minaya-Rowe, 2011).

Chapter Three includes the methodological approach used to conduct the six-participant qualitative phenomenological study. The study participant sample included six 11th-grade long-term English learners from Prosperity High School. In the research, the researcher utilized purposeful sampling to select the participants for the phenomenological study. All six participants were 11th-grade Hispanic students who met the Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) definition of long-term English learner status.

A demographic questionnaire, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), academic transcript analysis, and a focus group were the primary instruments to enhance the researcher's understanding of the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to the long-term English learners' status of these Latino students. Quantitative data from the participants' academic transcripts enriched the data collection. Overall, I designed the phenomenological study to learn about students' past and present schooling experiences, and to increase understanding of their language usage and preferences.

Chapter Four includes details of the data and results of its analysis using descriptive content analysis. Descriptive content analyses was a method of examining and triangulating the quantitative and qualitative data collected through methods such as demographic questionnaire, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study

Protocol (Soto, 2012), academic transcript analysis and a focus group with the aim of summarizing the informational contents of these data with respect to the research question.

Chapter Five includes the findings in perspective based on the current context of education. It also includes a discussion of the potential impacts this research could have on future policies as they relate to long-term English learners at the school, district, and state levels. The findings suggested practical guidelines that school districts and schools could use to improve long-term English learner reclassification.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study focused on an investigation of the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to long-term English learner status of six Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles. Critical Sociocultural Theory was the theoretical framework for the study. In addition to the literature on Critical Sociocultural Theory, the research included a summary of the relevant research and literature in three sections:

- A review of the literature and research on the instructional experiences that affected and contributed to long-term English learner status;

- The schooling factors; and

- A brief history of bilingual education in the U.S. including an examination of the political and ideological beliefs surrounding bilingual education on federal policies, federal court cases, and state level policies, plus descriptions of bilingual education models and instructional models after voters passed Proposition 227 (1998) that contributed to long-term English learner status.

The literature review ends with section three which includes the current research on long-term English learners.

Theoretical Framework

In order to examine the instructional experiences and schooling factors of the participants that facilitate reclassification and academic achievement of English learners the researcher based this study on Critical Sociocultural Theory. This aided in examining the language-learning process in the context of social and cultural elements of the students' experiences.

21

Critical Sociocultural Theory

The researcher analyzed the literature on long-term English learners through the lens of Critical Sociocultural Theory. Critical Sociocultural Theory was preferable to sociocultural theory for this study because "critical social perspectives are the only available tools to demonstrate how youth's opportunities to learn are both supported and constrained by everyday interactions of student and teachers and by the systems and structures that shape the institution of schooling" (Moje & Lewis, 2007, p. xii). Also, sociocultural theory has been criticized for not adequately addressing issues of power and ideology (Collins & Blot, 2003; Handsfield, 2012), which Critical Sociocultural Theory does. Gutiérrez and Larson (1994) pointed out that sociocultural theory was very useful for understanding the relationship between culture and learning but that the additional framework of critical pedagogy was needed to fully understand the relationship between power, ideology, and schooling (Lewis et al., 2007). Handsfield (2012) also noted that this criticism was important with respect to teaching and research on historically marginalized students such as long-term English learners.

Critical Sociocultural Theory was developed by language and literacy researchers to extend traditional sociocultural theory to account for how both learning and teaching influence and are influenced by power relations (Handsfield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2007). Moje and Lewis (2007) stated that critical sociocultural perspectives may be the only available tools for demonstrating how youth's opportunities to learn are both supported and constrained by everyday interactions of students and teachers and by the systems and structures that shape the institution of schooling.

Moje and Lewis (2007) stated that Critical Sociocultural Theory research provided methods of for rigorous analysis of how power was produced in everyday interactions and of how large-scale power differentials serve to frame the possibilities for people's everyday interactions. Moje and Lewis (2007) also stated that the overall purpose of critical social cultural theorist was to ask what people learned in this activity and what their opportunities were to learn or to teach. Given this theoretical stance, learning and literacy has been shaped by identity, power and agency.

Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2007) defined power as a field of relations that circulate in social networks rather than originating from some point of domination. Lewis et al. (2007) also stated that Foucault (1977) saw both resistance and dominance as part of the same discourse constituted in particular regimes power. Therefore, the macro and micro were mutually constitutive (Foucault, 1977). Lewis et al. (2007) clarified that power did not reside in macrostructures, but rather it was produced in and through individuals as they were circulated in larger systems of power and as they participated in and reproduced those systems.

Moje and Lewis (2007) defined agency as the strategic making and remaking of selves, identities, activities, relationships, cultural tools and resources and histories, as embedded within relations of power. Moje and Lewis (2007) also stated that at times, but not always, the relations of power themselves are disrupted and remade. Lewis et al. (2007) added that they did not see agency stemming from and internal state of mind, but rather a way of positioning oneself so as to allow for new ways of being, new identities. Jones and Norris (2005) pointed out that researchers could not simply observe and ascribe agency to participant actions without also being aware of their own interpretation and explanations of what it meant to be agentic in particular

situations. Thus, the researcher was part of the process of determining what counted as agency (Lewis et al., 2007).

Lewis et al. (2007) defined identity as a stable, internal state of being. Lewis et al. (2007) also described identity as a fluid, socially, and linguistically mediated construct that takes into account the different positions that individuals enact or perform in particular setting within a given social, economic, and historical relations (Bucholtz, Liang, & Sutton, 1999; Gee, 1999; Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). Lave (1996) and Gee (2001) argued that learning could be conceptualized as shifts in identity; that is, one learns to make new identities along with new forms of knowledge and participation (Moje & Lewis, 2007). Moje and Lewis (2007) also stated that learning involved both awareness of differences and distinctions, and ultimately, an act of subject formation—identification with particular communities.

Gonzalez et al. (2005) found that, applied to teaching emergent bilinguals, a Critical Sociocultural approach embraced social interaction and scaffolding, including moderating language, opportunities for student to student interaction, relating instruction to students' funds of knowledge, and engaging collaborative and experimental learning (Dixon-Krauss, 1995). The Critical Sociocultural approach "supports students in negotiating multiple expectations for social and academic language use and the power relationships that they imply" (Handsfield, 2012, p. 44).

Critical Sociocultural Theory has been traced back to Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1962/1978). The theoretical framework stipulated that social interaction played a fundamental role in the development of cognition. According to Vygotsky (1962/1978), the use of language and mental development were the core characterization of a culture. Vygotsky (1978) believed

that every "function in a child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level, first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological)" (p. 57). This applied equally to voluntary attention, logical memory, and concept formation. Vygotsky believed that all the higher mental functions originated between the individual and the relationships among individuals.

According to Vygotsky (1978/1981), learning was a social practice, and it occurred through interaction between people (Yoon, 2012). Vygotsky (1978/1981) also viewed learning as a joint activity between a more knowledgeable person and less knowledgeable person in social contexts (p. 156). The process of arranging for such learning to occur in a joint activity was known as *scaffolding* (Bruner, 1975). Yoon (2012) stated, "Scaffolding or mentoring meant that the more experienced people guide learners to reach the level of independent problem-solving through interaction" (p. 156). Teachers played a role in providing scaffolding as they offered opportunities for students to participate in learning activities (García, Pearson, Taylor, Bauer, & Stahl, 2011; Yoon, 2012). Scaffolding did not mean that the teachers simply transmit knowledge or do the activity on behalf of the students, but rather, students played an active role in the mental process of interpersonal process (Yoon, 2012), and the teacher facilitated children's cognitive thinking in "the zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86).

Vygotsky (1978) defined the zone of proximal development as the difference between what a learner could do without help and what he or she could do with help. The full development of the zone of proximal development depended upon the social interactions in which the student participated with adults or peers that exceed the student's current state of

cognition. Vygotsky's central goal from this theory was to explain cognition as the end product of socialization.

A teacher must be able to understand a child's sociocultural historical knowledge and work with this knowledge to move a child along as he acquires the English language. Gonzalez et al. (2005) found that the teacher or researcher discovered the funds of knowledge when they visited the student's household. Teachers went to the home to identify and document existing knowledge versus the traditional home visits which were made to discuss problems the student was having at school. They discovered funds of knowledge that were abundant and diverse including construction, trade, business and finance. The discovery of funds of knowledge was extremely important for the teachers so that the information could be brought back to the classroom and used to assist the students in acquiring the English language.

The acquisition of the English language for English learners has taken different forms depending on the political debates over bilingual educational policy occurring at that given time. The history of bilingual education in the U.S. necessarily included an examination of the political and ideological beliefs surrounding bilingual education in the nation and states. It also included examination of the literature and research on the schooling factors for English learners that have contributed their long-term English learner status.

Instructional Experiences for Latino Immigrant Students

The literature reviewed in this section focused on instructional experiences of Latino immigrant students. This included language literacy development and the role of the primary language in learning the secondary language. How have researchers described the impact of ELD and English as a Second language (ESL) programs on those students? How have content

instruction and Sheltered Instruction strategies impacted them? What have the principles of

effective instructional practices for English learners been?

Language and Literacy Development

Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) pointed out that second-language learning was a social

process: Language developed largely as a result of meaningful interaction with others (Long, &

Porter, 1985), much as a first language did (Krashen, 1982). Saunders and Goldenberg (2010)

also stated that language use was emphasized more than language knowledge.

According to Krashen's acquisition-learning hypothesis, there were two independent

ways to develop our linguistic skills: acquisition and learning (Krashen, 1981). Krashen (1981)

explained acquisition as a subconscious process where the individual was not aware of the

language process taking place and when the new language was acquired. Consequently, the

acquirer generally did not realize the he or she possessed any new knowledge. According to

Krashen (1981), both adults and children could subconsciously acquire language. Both written

and oral language could be acquired. Krashen (1981) compared the adult language acquisition

process to the process children underwent when learning a new language. Krashen (1981) also

pointed out that acquisition required meaningful interaction in the target language, during which

the acquirer was focused on meaning rather than form.

Krashen (1981) pointed out that learning language was a conscious process, similar to

what people experienced when learning a new language in school. Krashen (1981) also stated

that new knowledge or language forms were represented consciously in the learner's mind,

frequently in the form of language rules and grammar. The process often involved error

correction. There were significant differences between language learning and language

acquisition (See Table 1). Language learning involved formal instruction, and according to

Krashen (1981), was less effective than acquisition.

Table 1

Characteristics of Language Acquisition Versus Language Learning

Language Acquisition	Language Learning
Implicit; subconscious	Explicit; conscious
Informal situations	Formal situations/Formal instruction
Uses grammar "freely"	Uses grammatical rules
Depends on attitudes	Depends on aptitude
Stable order of acquisition	Simple to complex order of learning
Depends on attitudes	Depends on aptitude
Stable order of acquisition	Simple to complex order of learning
Similar to learning native language	Learning a new language in school

Note. Adapted from *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning* (p. 87), by S. D. Krashen, 1981, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Copyright 1981 by Stephen Krahsen. Used with permission.

Both, McLaughlin (1984) and Collier (1987) presented their findings regarding the time

that it took young English learners to acquire a second language. In general, we might think that

it was fairly simple for young children to acquire a second language, but some second language

acquisition researchers have documented a very complex process that occurred over a long

period of time (McLaughlin, 1984). Collier (1987) found that limited-English-proficient

students who entered ESL programs at ages eight through 11 were the fastest achievers. These

students required two to five years to reach the 50th percentile on national norms in all the

subject areas tested. Collier (1987) also found that limited-English-proficiency students who

entered the program at ages five through seven were one to three years behind the performance

level of their limited-English-proficiency peers who had entered the program at ages eight

through11, when both groups had the same length of time enrolled in the program. Collier

(1987) also reported that students who arrived at ages 12 through 15 experienced the greatest difficulty and were projected to require as much as six to eight years to reach grade-level norms in academic achievement when schooled entirely in the second language. Collier (1987) concluded that although it might take some groups of limited-English-proficient students two years to reach proficiency, it was projected that at least four to eight years were required for all ages of limited-English-proficient students to reach national grade-level norms of native speakers in all subject areas of language and academic achievement, as measured on standardized tests.

Lesaux and Geva (2006) pointed out that language minority students entered U.S. schools needing to learn oral language and literacy in a second language, and they had to learn with enormous efficiency if they were to catch up with their monolingual English classmates. Thus, "understanding the basics of these students' literacy development, including the domains where they can be expected to learn in ways like their classmates and domains whey they unique development trajectories, is of the utmost importance" (Lesaux & Geva, 2006, pp. 53-54).

August and Shanahan (2006) stated that the ultimate goal of literacy instruction was to build students' comprehension and writing skills. Regrettably, what happened with language-minority students was quite different. August and Shanahan (2006) stated that most of the available studies that compared the comprehension development of language-minority students with their native-speaking peers have indicated that the reading comprehension performance of language-minority students fell well below that of their native-speaking peers (Aarts & Verhoeven, 1999; Droop & Verhoeven, 1998; Hacquebord, 1994; Hutchinson, Whitley, Smith, & Connors, 2003; Verhoeven, 1990/2000; Lindsey, Manis, & Bailey, 2003). The research on how best to teach literacy to English learners was not thorough or specific enough to create a

detailed, research-based plan for such instruction. Nevertheless, it was possible to derive some useful guidelines for the design of such instruction from the systematic analysis of the existing research (August & Shanahan, 2006). August and Shanahan (2006) devised eight basic guidelines for effective literacy instruction of English learners:

- Guideline One: Effective instruction for English learners emphasizes essential components of literacy;

- Guideline Two: Effective instruction for English learners is similar to effective instruction for native speakers;

- Guideline Three: Effective literacy curriculum and instruction for English-learner must be adjusted to meet their needs;

- Guideline Four: Effective literacy instruction for English learners is comprehensible and multidimensional;

- Guideline Five: Effective literacy instruction for English learners develops oral proficiency;

- Guideline Six: Effective literacy instruction for English learners is differentiated;

- Guideline Seven: Effective literacy instruction for English learners requires well-prepared teachers' and

- Guideline Eight: Effective literacy instruction for English learners is respectful of home language.

Another aspect of English literacy development involved students' abilities to detect the differences between everyday English and academic English. Scarcella (2003) contended that academic English entailed more than linguistic dimensions; it also involved cognition. Readers

must have thought about a text in order to have interpreted it. Readers must also have done more than associate sounds, graphemes, meanings, and words. They must also have predicted, inferred, and synthesized meaning to create and transform knowledge (Scarcella, 2003). Critical literacy, the ability to read for intentions, question sources, and identify your own and others' assumptions, was an essential skill for students to develop (Scarcella, 2003). The cognitive dimensions of academic English minimally included knowledge, critical literacy, and cognitive and metalinguistic strategies.

Bialystok (1997) examined children's understanding of print awareness and found that bilingual learners were better than monolingual children in their understanding of the general symbolic properties of written English. Specifically, Bialystok (1997) studied French-English and Chinese-English elementary-aged bilingual students and compared them with monolingual English speakers of the same age on their understanding of how print related to language. All the children in the study had similar levels of understanding of the formal concepts of print such as knowledge of the alphabet, letter identification, and ability to print or recognize their name, and their general language proficiency as assessed by vocabulary was about the same. Bialystok (1997) found that bilingual children understood better than the English monolinguals the general symbolic representations of print.

Role of the Primary Language

The process of language acquisition has been made more complex in situations where children have been exposed to and required to be competent in two languages to navigate their world. For this study, the researcher examined both empirical and theoretical literature on the role of the first language, and the viable instructional approaches that shared the important role

students' first languages have played in the acquisition of the English language and academic success for English learners.

Soto-Hinman and Hetzel (2009) reported from the meta-analysis by August and Shanahan (2006) that 17 studies comparing English-immersion and bilingual education concluded that teaching English language learners to read in their primary language and then in their secondary language, or in both languages simultaneously at different times during the day, as compared to teaching only in English, increased achievement in English. Soto-Hinman and Hetzel (2009) also stated that the reason for this seemed to be what educational psychologists and cognitive scientists have called *transfer*. They described transfer as when students learned something in the first language and were able to apply those concepts and skills to the second language more rapidly (Soto-Hinman & Hetzel, 2006).

August and Shanahan (2006) also reported on the phenomenon of transferring of skills from the first to the second language in their empirical study which showed that students who learned to read and write in their first language were likely to apply many of their skills to the process of literacy development in the second language. Their research found that teaching children to read in their primary language Spanish promoted achievement in their secondary language English. August and Shanahan (2006) also stated that English learners can learn to read in first and second languages simultaneously since English learners can transfer literacy skills from the first to the second language. The researchers also stated that a comprehensive review of studies comparing English-only instruction to bilingual instruction demonstrated that language-minority students receiving instruction in both their native language (usually Spanish in these studies) and English did better on English reading measures than language-minority

students instructed only in English (Francis, Lesaux, & August, 2006). The researchers stated that these findings held true at both elementary and secondary schools (August & Shanahan, 2006).

The benefit of instruction in the first language to the acquisition of the English language was also reported by Escamilla (1994). The researcher examined whether the *Descubriendo La Lectura* Program, a Spanish reading-recovery intervention program, achieved acceleration with Spanish-speaking first graders from Arizona, equivalent to English Reading Recovery Programs in New Zealand and Ohio. Escamilla found that 21 of the 23 *Descubriendo La Lectura* Program students (91%) achieved end-of-the-year scores that either equaled or exceeded the average end-of-the-year scores of all first graders. The results showed that a Spanish reading-recovery intervention program achieved student acceleration (Escamilla, 1994). Escamilla's findings also supported the idea that native language programs were an effective vehicle to assist language-minority children struggling with literacy acquisition. Consequently, development of a reading recovery program in Spanish has been deemed the most theoretically sound approach given the research in bilingual education that has found the use of the student's native language to be the most appropriate medium of instruction (Cummins, 1989; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Ramírez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991) and the research in reading-recovery intervention programs which emphasized children's competence and not their deficits (Clay, 1989; Pinnell, 1990).

Collier and Beeman (2000) investigated the effects of teaching literacy skills to first graders of Hispanic background in English or Spanish. Their study focused on two classes of first graders who attended the same school in successive years in which the students were taught literacy in English or Spanish. In the fall, these students were given standardized tests of

language and reading. In the spring of the first grade, the students were given measures of listening and reading comprehension, and writing in both Spanish and English. Collier and Beeman (2000) found that children who were taught in Spanish did not differ from those taught in English on English reading and writing but were significantly stronger on Spanish reading and writing. In predicting performance in the fall of the second grade on reading comprehension measures in Spanish and in English, Collier and Beeman (2000) found that the children's vocabulary in that language made a significant contribution. Collier and Beeman (2000) also found that being taught literacy in Spanish contributed to performance in Spanish reading comprehension, but being taught in English did not have the same positive effect on performance in English reading comprehension.

Tong, Lara-Alecio, Irby, Mathes, and Kwok (2008) examined the effectiveness of a two-year kindergarten and first-grade oral English intervention provided their Hispanic English learners with Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs. Their empirical study concluded that primary language instruction did not impede the learning of a second language (Tong et al., 2008). The authors used latent growth modeling. They compared instructional programs in relation to growth trajectories and rates in academic English oral ability. In addition to primary language instruction, however, ELD also played a vital role in the acquisition of the English language for English learners.

ELD and ESL Programs

The research findings in the previous sections dealt with language acquisition and the role of primary language in learning a secondary language as well as the history of language education and legislation governing it in the U.S. In keeping with the laws written to govern

teaching English-learning students, schools and teachers developed strategies for working with students whose primary languages were not English. This section includes a summary of the research on viable instructional approaches—ELD and ESL—that shared how English learners have acquired the English language and succeeded academically. The empirical literature and theoretical literature showed the importance of ELD and ESL to English learners' acquisition of English.

Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) affirmed that the primary goal of ELD was learning and acquiring English. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) also stated that ELD instruction was designed specially to advance English learners' knowledge and use of English in increasingly sophisticated ways. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) affirmed that ELD instruction was designed to help English learners learn and acquire English to a level of proficiency (e.g., advanced) that maximizes their capacity to engage successfully in academic studies taught in English. Consequently, helping English learners succeed in academic contexts is no doubt the most challenging goal and most likely the greatest need to emerge in recent English learner research (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010).

Dutro and Kinsella (2010) presented a rigorous standards-aligned instructed ELD taught during a dedicated course of study. They included illustrative examples and practical tools to inform ELD program design in their theoretical research. The researchers stated that an effective ELD program as an integral part of socially and academically vibrant schooling for language-minority students targeted instruction at their English levels, prioritized explicit teaching of vocabulary, provided syntactical structures for significant academic and social purposes, and allotted consistent practice opportunities (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010). Secondary school minority-

language students whose language learning needs could be met would have the tools to be successful in their other academic goals as well as their real-life goals.

The purpose of Rosborough's (2012) theoretical study was to explore how a teacher's use of gesture assisted the learning of English as a second language in a second grade classroom. The author used sociocultural theory to demonstrate how gesture was an important factor in assisting second language learners' in making meaning of their spelling words:

> Particular to this activity, the teacher created multiple opportunities for the students to use gesture as an embodied form for learning the word. The embodied form played a central role in extending dialogue about the subject. (Rosborough, 2012, p. 63)

Most importantly, the use of gesture provided joint-attention and shared meaning-making between the teacher and students. The findings of the study included how gesture was a vital part of the language learning experience for English learners. Implications from the theoretical study included the recommendation that teachers heighten their conscious awareness of gesture and formally recognize its role in the second-language-learning process.

Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) identified guidelines for ELD instruction from existing research that was relevant to ELD instruction and categorized them based on the nature of the evidence. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) categorized the guidelines in the following manner: First, guidelines for which there were relatively strong supportive evidence; second, findings that contained emerging hypotheses; and finally guidelines applicable to ELD instruction but grounded with non-English learner populations. They categorized the guidelines:

- Guidelines Based on Relatively Strong Supporting Evidence from English Learner Research

  o Providing ELD instruction is better than not providing it.

  o ELD Instruction should include interactive activities among students, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.

- Guidelines Based on Hypothesis Emerging from Recent English Learner Research

  o A separate block of time should be devoted daily to ELD instruction.

  o ELD instruction should emphasize listening and speaking although it can incorporate reading and writing.

  o ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, functions, and conventions).

  o ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language.

  o ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.

  o Use of English during ELD instruction should be maximized; the primary language should be used strategically.

  o Teachers should attend to communication and language-learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.

  o ELD instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language.

  o ELD instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (early advanced) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).

- Guidelines Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-English Learner Research

  o ELD instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language
  objectives in mind.

  o English learners should be carefully grouped by language proficiency for ELD
  instruction; for other portions of the school day they should be in mixed
  classrooms and not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency.

  o The likelihood of established and/or sustaining an effective ELD instructional
  program increases when schools and districts make it a priority. (Saunders &
  Goldenberg, 2010)

Content Instruction and Sheltered Instruction for English Learners

Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) stated that, in contrast to ELD, the primary purpose of

sheltered English instruction is teaching skills and knowledge in the content areas, more

specifically the content identified in standards for English Language Arts, math, science social

studies, physical education and the arts. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) also stated that where

use of the primary language is not possible, instruction is "sheltered" or adjusted in order to help

students learn skills and concepts taught in a language they do not fully comprehend. In doing

so, sheltered instruction ideally also supports ongoing learning and acquisition of English

specifically as it pertains to the content areas (math, science social studies, etc.) (Saunders and

Goldenberg, 2010).

Krashen (1985) proposed sheltered classes out of his theory of second language

acquisition (SLA) in response to transition problems or the dilemma of what to do with students

who possessed intermediate proficiency in the language of instruction yet were not ready to be optimally successful in regular academic courses (Krashen, 1981/1985). Fritzen (2011) stated that according to Krashen's theory of SLA, learners gradually and naturally develop linguistic proficiency as they were exposed to large amounts of *comprehensible input.* Comprehensible input is language that the learner can understand with the aid of context, extra linguistic support such as visuals, and speech or text modifications (Krashen, 1982/1985), supported by and authentic communicative purpose and a low-anxiety environment (Krashen, 1982).

Frtizen (2011) defined sheltered instruction as a form of content-based instruction, a large collection of pedagogical models which integrated the teaching of content with the teaching of another language. Fritzen (2011) also explained that sheltered instruction was rooted in 1970s British language-across-the-curriculum movement and the Canadian French immersion programs (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989). Fritzen (2011) also stated that at the heart of content-based instruction was the assumption that language was best learned when embedded in meaningful, comprehensible and relevant contexts (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Grabe & Stoller, 1997). Additionally, content-based instruction has been embraced because of its potential to meet the twin needs of students in the K-12 setting who are engaged in academic pursuits requiring them to concurrently learn another language and academic content (Fritzen, 2011). Sheltered instruction was proposed as a viable option for English learners during the dramatic increase of their numbers in English-speaking schools in the 1980s and 1990s while learning English and also keeping up with grade-level academic content learning (Fritzen, 2011; Faltis, 1993; Genessee, 1999, Grabe & Stoller, 1997; Short, 1991/1994).

Fritzen (2011) stated that researchers identified instructional techniques such as using visual representation, using graphic organizers, drawing connections between the course content and students' prior knowledge, and paying special attention to language issues such as explicitly teaching key vocabulary terms and necessary linguistic structures (Echeverria, Vogt, & Short, 2003; Rosen & Sasser, 1997; Short, 1999). Short (1993) also mentioned that cooperative learning and alternative assessment models were also common features of sheltered instruction. Fritzen (2011) stated that in an effort to synthesize and streamline sheltered instruction, sheltering pedagogies were organized into instructional frameworks for planning and teaching sheltered content lessons. Two prominent models for sheltered instruction are Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) (Cline & Necochea, 2003; Sobul, 1995) and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echeverria, Vogt, & Short, 1999/2003). Fritzen (2011) also stated that in many ways sheltering pedagogies resembled what might be considered high quality instruction in any context, scholars emphasized that sheltered instruction addressed the unique needs of English learners in purposeful ways that moved beyond "just good teaching" (Echeverria et al., 2003; Hansen-Thomas, 2008; Harper & de Jong, 2004).

Gibbons (2002) shared practical strategies that have helped mainstream classroom teachers who had little or no specialized ESL training to meet the challenges of teaching linguistically diverse students. According to Gibbons, language was developed when a teacher created lessons which *scaffold* language and learning in all content areas. She defined scaffolding as not simply another word for help but a special kind of help that assisted learners in moving toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding. In other words, scaffolding was

a temporary assistance that the teacher used to assist the learner in acquiring a particular skill but will then be able to perform that same skill without the assistance.

Gibbons (2002) also showed how to integrate the teaching of English with the content areas of the regular mainstream classroom. This author began by giving a strong theoretical explanation for her practice, using a functional model of language, sociocultural theories of learning, and current research on second-language development. After clarifying how the regular school curriculum offered the best language-learning environment and opportunities for ESL students, Gibbons (2002) demonstrated the ways in which content areas provided a context for the teaching of English skills from speaking and listening to reading and writing. These skills could be integrated in the learning of all academic subjects with a wide range of activities across the curriculum. The author made a point of sharing that language was not a simple linear process but that language involved the continuous development of skills for various purposes.

Walqui (2006) stated that scaffolding made it possible to provide academically challenging instruction for English language learners in secondary schools. Bruner (1983) defined scaffolding as a process of setting up the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he become skilled enough to manage it. Walqui (2006) stated that in education, scaffolding could be thought of as three related pedagogical scales. First, there was the meaning of providing a support structure to enable certain activities and skills to develop. Second, there was actual carrying out of particular activities in class. Finally, there was assistance provided in moment-to-moment interaction (Walqui, 2006). Walqui (2006) described six types of instructional scaffolds in assisting English language learners in both ESL classes or in subjects to achieve academic success: modeling,

41

bridging, contextualization, building schema, re-presenting text, and developing metacognition. These six practical strategies and tasks could be used to provide rigorous, deep, challenging and responsible education to students who needed to develop conceptually, academically and linguistically (Walqui, 2006).

In some cases, instructional practices that focused on offering specially-designed instruction for English learners helped reduce the achievement gaps among states and schools. Rumberger and Tran (2010) also found that the eleven large urban districts that offer native-language instruction to their English learners had smaller math achievement gaps. These findings supported the idea that some form of specially-designed instruction, either in English or the primary language, could help reduce the English learners' achievement gap. The fact that only about half of all students received any form of specially-designed instruction and that some states were much more likely to provide it than others meant that more efforts should be directed toward providing appropriate instructional support for English learners (Rumberger & Tran, 2010). The findings did not share a definite answer to the question of whether English or native-language instructional support was better at closing the English learner achievement gap. However, the findings did support the argument that state policies and school practices that restrict the use of native-language instruction could be a factor in states and schools failing to close the English-learning students' achievement gap.

Effective Instructional Practices

Freeman and Freeman (1998) presented seven effective principles for successful practice for English-learning students. The authors explained that the instruction that many English-learning students received was, for the most part, fragmented and disempowering (Brisk 1998;

42

Cummins 1996; Flores 1982; Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997; Valdés 1996). They felt

that a new approach was required so that English-learning students could succeed beyond high

school and into college; therefore, the following principles they presented could reverse the trend

of failure. The authors also explained that if teachers used the principles in their daily lessons

versus commonsense assumptions, they could help all their students to succeed:

- Principle One: Learning proceeds from whole to part.

- Principle Two: Lessons should be learner centered.

- Principle Three: Lessons should have meaning and purpose for students now.

- Principle Four: Lessons should engage students in social interaction.

- Principle Five: Lessons should develop both oral and written language.

- Principle Six: Lessons should support students' first language and cultures.

- Principle Seven: Lessons should show faith in the learner to expand students'

  potential. (Freeman & Freeman, 1998)

Valdés, Kibler, and Walqui (2014) reported that since there was a rapid shift with

unknown consequences occurring in English language education because of the ongoing debate

in the new Standards era, ESL professionals needed accurate information to make principled

decisions about student learning, teaching, and assessment. Valdés, Kibler, and Walqui (2014)

also stated that ESL professionals needed to engaging in productive collaboration and advocate

for the best interests of English learners. Valdés et al. (2014) also stated that ESL professionals

needed to inquire or question how the new Standards would change learning for English learners,

specifically in math, English and science classes. The content standards might have differed to

varying degrees from those previously used by states so might have applied greater or fewer

changes to K-12 teachers' curricula (Valdés et al., 2014). Finally, Valdés et al. (2014) pointed

out that the Standards explicitly included English learners and clearly framed content learning as

engagement in disciplinary practices, therefore implying an active learning process in which

language played a key role.

This section has included review of the literature on those instructional experiences that

long-term English learners encountered that hindered or assisted their academic achievement.

The next section includes a review of the literature on the schooling factors that have also

hindered or assisted the academic success of long-term English learners.

Schooling Factors for Latino Immigrant Students

I have long been a proponent of bilingual education who believed in bilingualism and

supported helping children acquire strong academic proficiency in two languages. With the

passage of Proposition 227 (1998) and other anti-language polices, I began to believe that it was

imperative and morally important to help second language learners acquire advanced proficiency

in English.

As history has shown, the federal and the state governments generally do not support

linguistic minorities' development of their first language; therefore, the federal and state

governments must minimally provide strong academic support for the acquisition of English.

Macedo, Denddrinos, & Gounari (2003) stated, "Policy makers and conservative educators

arrogantly dismiss the empirical evidence supporting bilingual education" (p. 8). These same

policy makers and conservative educators manipulated the data to use it to their advantage to

eradicate bilingual education, while ignoring the empirical research supporting the cognitive and

social advantages of bilingualism (Macedo et al., 2003). Unfortunately, the laws that govern

language instruction for language minority students have changed frequently depending on who has been elected. Students have been the scapegoats of politicians manipulating the educational system to their liking. The constant changes led to a subtractive schooling effect for our students, where the students' culture and language were taken away, which caused the students to become long-term English learners in the process.

Menken and Kleyn (2010) documented how the experiences of long-term English learners in U.S. elementary and middle schools have been subtractive, and therefore contributed to their limited academic literacy skills, which then negatively impacted their overall academic performance. Valenzuela (1999) analyzed subtractive schooling and found that school subtracted resources from students two ways: "First, it dismisses their definition of education which is not only thoroughly grounded in Mexican culture, but also approximates the optimal definition of education advanced by Noddings (1984) and other caring theorists" (p. 6). Second, schools encompassed subtractive assimilative policies and practices that were designed to deprive Mexican students of their culture and language.

Menken, Klyne, and Chase (2012) stated that to make the matter even worse, the typical high school English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual program was not designed for emergent bilinguals such as long-term English learners with limited native language literacy skills (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2000). Menken et al. (2012) also stated that most high-school programs were designed to meet the needs of emergent bilinguals who arrived in U.S. high schools with adequate prior schooling and native language literacy skills, which for the most part, long-term English learners do not have (Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002; García, 1999).

At the time of this study, bilingual education was not a modern phenomenon; it had

existed on one form or another for over 5,000 years (Mackey, 1978). A multitude of Federal

policies, court cases and state policies from the early 20th century to the present have affected

bilingual education and academic achievement for English learners (See Tables 1, 2, and 3).

Baker (2011) noted, "In the United States, bilingual education has been determined partly by

federal government, partly by state government, partly by local initiatives and partly by

individuals" (p. 184). It had become imperative to understand that even though states have

engaged in planning and bilingual education policy making, the federal government has

maintained power and exerted major influence on bilingual education through funding,

legislation, and law (Baker, 2011). Therefore, the states seemed to be acting in a reactionary

fashion in their decisions regarding bilingual education policies so that federal funding would not

be lost for English learners.

Federal Bilingual Education Policies

A summary of federal bilingual education policies affecting the history of U.S. bilingual

education showed that over time, bilingual education in the U.S. has moved through various

changes in perspectives of politicians, administrators, and educators that indicated underlying

shifts in ideology, preference, and practice (Anderson & Boyer, 1970; Baker, 2011; Crawford,

2004; García, 2009; Kloss, 1977/1998; Lyons, 1990; McCarty, 2004; Miguel, 2004; Ovando,

2003; Perlmann, 1990; Schlossman, 1983; Schmidt, 2000; Wiley, 2002) (See Table 2).

Table 2

Federal Bilingual Education Policies

Year	Federal Legislation Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implication
1906	Nationality Act Passed	The number of immigrants increased dramatically around the turn of the 20th century. Classrooms in many public schools were filled with immigrants. This gave rise to fear of new foreigners, and a call for the integration, harmonization and assimilation of immigrants.	First legislation requiring immigrants to speak English to become naturalized
1950	Amendments to the Nationality Act of 1906	Amendment to the Nationality Act of 1906 added English Literacy as a requirement for naturalization.	English Literacy was required for naturalization.
1958	National Defense Education Act (NDEA)	In 1958, the NDEA was passed promoting foreign language learning in elementary schools, high schools, and universities.	This was the first federal legislation to promote foreign language learning.
1965	Immigration and Nationality Act	The Act eliminated racial criteria for admission expanding immigration especially from Asia and Latin America. The Act also emphasized the goal of "family unification" over occupational skills.	The passage of the act encouraged increased immigration by Mexicans in particular.
1965	Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	The ESEA was passed in 1965 as a part of the "War on Poverty." ESEA emphasized equal access to education and establishes high standards and accountability. The law authorized federally funded education programs that were administered by the states.	Funds were granted to meet the needs of "educationally deprived children".
1968	Title VII , an amendment to ESEA also known as the Bilingual Education Act	Texas Senator, Ralph Yarborough, introduced a Bilingual Education Act as an amendment of the 1965 ESEA.	Provided funding to establish bilingual programs for students who did not speak English and who were economically poor.

Table 2 (continued)

Year	Federal Legislation Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implication
1974	Reauthorization of Bilingual Education Act Title VII of ESEA (1968)	Native-language instruction was required for the first time as a condition for receiving bilingual education grants. Bilingual education was defined as Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE).	Grants could support native-language instruction only to the extent necessary to allow a child to achieve competence in the English language. Funding was thus restricted to TBE; maintenance and Dual Language Programs were ineligible for funding.
1978	Reauthorization of Bilingual Education Act Title VII of ESEA (1968)	In 1978, Congress reauthorized the Bilingual Education Act. The 1978 version lifted the restrictions on dual language programs, but political climate still favored TBE in which the native language was to be used only to the extent necessary for the child to achieve competence in the English language.	Restrictions of Dual Language programs lifted; the term Limited-English Proficient introduced, replacing Limited English Speaking.
1983	U.S. English Movement launched	The Reagan administration was generally hostile to bilingual education. Reagan believed that preservation of the native language meant neglect of English language acquisition.	Debates about the dominant place of English in law, society, and education became more prominent.
1984	Reauthorization of Bilingual Education Act Title VII of ESEA (1968)	The 1984 and 1988 amendments allowed support for more developmental and maintenance programs, but also increased percentage of the funds were made available specifically for programs where student's first language was not used.	While most funding was reserved for TBE, monies for maintenance programs were once again permitted. However, for the first time funds were made available for special alternative English-only programs.
1988	Reauthorization of Bilingual Education Act Title VII of ESEA (1968)	The 1984 and 1988 amendments Allowed support for more developmental and maintenance programs, but also increased percentage of the funds made available specifically for programs where student's first language was not used	Same as 1984, but 25% of funding given for English-only Special Alternative Instructional (SAIP) programs.

Table 2 (continued)

Year	Federal Legislation Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implication
1994	Reauthorization of Bilingual Education Act Title VII of ESEA (1968) (Improving America's Schools Act)	Full bilingual proficiency recognized as a lawful educational goal. The new law sought to bring Limited-English Proficient students into mainstream school reform efforts, making it more difficult for their particular needs to be ignored in policy making.	Funded Dual Language programs that include English speakers and programs to support Native American languages. The quota for funding SAIP programs was lifted.
2001	No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation as a reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965 and a repeal of the Bilingual Education Act (1968)	The Title VII Bilingual Education Act (1968) was eliminated and becomes Title III. NCLB (2001) makes states, districts and schools accountable for the academic performance and English language development of Limited-English Proficient students.	Mandates for accountability through high-stakes testing in content areas and English proficiency, and the threat of sanctions associated with failures to make adequate yearly progress encourage a move towards more English-only programs.

Note. Adapted from *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *5th ed*. (pp.196-198), by C. Baker, 2011, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. Copyright 2011 by Multilingual Matters. Used with permission.

Although the U.S. Constitution said nothing about language (Spolsky, 2011), federal lawmakers have taken upon themselves to exert their powerful influence through funding, legislation, and law (Baker, 2011). In the mid-1960s, students with limited English proficiency received little or no assistance from many school districts, which consequently alerted the Office of Civil Rights of unjust educational practices. As a result, the Office of Civil rights issued a memorandum clarifying what school districts were required to provide for students with limitations in the English language. The memorandum supported equal participation in the educational program by directing school districts to take positive steps to correct language deficiencies of English learners.

In 1967, Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough introduced a bill to assist school districts in meeting the needs of Limited English Speaking Ability (LESA) students by establishing educational programs. The bill contained recommendations to create programs that would help

Spanish-speaking students develop an appreciation of their culture and native language, to teach Spanish as a native language, and to teach English as a second language (Stewner-Manzanarez, 1988).

As a result, bilingual education programs received more attention and funding (Crawford, 1991). This bill was regarded as the first piece of federal legislation to recognize the special needs of LESA students. It provided funds to school districts in the form of competitive grants.

The Bilingual Education Act—also known as Title VII of the ESEA—of 1968 required neither bilingual instruction nor the use of the students' native language for educational purposes. However, innovative programs designed to teach the students English were encouraged. This act excluded families with moderate-income levels, even those with non-English-speaking students. Instead, it placed a priority on low-income families (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988).

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was also ambiguous, as school districts were left largely to their own devices to create novel programs because few guidelines were given for the instruction of LESA students (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). The act was extremely important and has continued to be scrutinized and changed each time it has been reauthorized by Congress (Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Lessow-Hurley, 1990). In 1974, Congress amended the Act in an attempt to clarify the intent and design of programs for LESA students. It specified program goals, capacity-building efforts, the definition of a bilingual education program, and regional support centers. The main goal of a bilingual program was to adequately prepare LESA students to assimilate as quickly as possible and participate fully in the regular classroom. This

amendment removed the low-income criterion from the original 1968 Act in order to cover all LESA students.

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was reauthorized in 1974. For the first time in U.S. history, native-language instruction was required as a condition to receive bilingual education grants. In the reauthorization, Congress defined bilingual education as Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE). Grants could support native-language instruction only to the extent necessary to allow for the student to achieve competence in the English language (Baker, 2011). Funding was restricted to TBE; therefore, maintenance and Dual Language programs were ineligible for funding.

Then in 1978, Congress reauthorized the Bilingual Education Act. The reauthorization lifted restrictions on dual language programs but TBE was still favored by policy makers. The term Limited-English Proficient was introduced to replace Limited English Speaking.

The reauthorization in 1984 gave local school districts a greater voice in deciding how students with limited English proficiency should be taught under the Bilingual Education Act. The act addressed the need for increased flexibility in the implementation of programs for students with limited English proficiency. Congress made funds available to school districts for different types of programs that used various teaching strategies. This new approach to educating students with limited English proficiency reflected changes from the *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) Remedies, which in the 1970s, had called for the instructional method to include the use of the native language (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). Up to 4% of overall funds would be allowed to go to programs that did not require the use of the native language. However, TBE programs would still receive 75% of funds that had been allocated for instructional programs

(Crawford, 1987). The Federal Court Cases section pf this chapter includes discussion of *Lau v. Nichols* (1974).

William Bennett, former Secretary of Education, proposed the Bilingual Education Initiative in 1985. The high dropout rates of students with limited English proficiency led him to conclude that programs that had previously been implemented were not effectively meeting the needs of these students. Under the Bilingual Education Initiative, there was increased flexibility, and local school districts were allowed to determine the most suitable method for teaching students with limited English proficiency. Rapid attainment of English fluency was the clear goal of these programs (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988).

In 1988, the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized in the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Act. Different from previous reauthorizations, it reflected contemporary emphasis on the diversity of students with limited English proficiency and ways to approach their education. It authorized 75% of total grant funds for TBE in school districts. Instead of the 4% to 10% in previous authorizations, up to 25% of grant funds could now go to special alternative instructional programs. This reauthorization was significant because school districts that deemed TBE not feasible were given a greater opportunity to select effective alternatives (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988).

Then in 1994, the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized as Improving America's Schools Act. The reauthorization recognized full bilingual proficiency as a lawful educational goal (Baker, 2011). The act funded dual language programs that included English speakers and programs that supported Native American languages. The reauthorization also sought to bring

students with limited English proficiency into mainstream school reform, which consequently made it difficult for policy makers to ignore their needs.

In 2001, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, eliminated the Bilingual Education Act (1968), and replaced it with Title III. NCLB (2001) passed under the administration of George W. Bush. Its goals differed greatly from the goals of the Bilingual Education Act (1968), which emphasized putting structures and programming in place to promote learning, while NCLB (2001) focused on accountability and educational outcomes. The legislation encouraged districts and schools to move towards more English-only programs (Baker, 2011). It required that all students, including English learners, meet high standards by showing proficiency in English Language Arts and mathematics by 2014. The Act required districts and schools to assist English Learners and other subgroups to make continuous gains toward the proficiency goals. Standardized state tests measured proficiency goals. If the goals were not met, the districts and schools risk major consequences.

Menken (2010) highlighted the key issues surrounding key assessments and mandates of NCLB (2001) and English learners. The legislation required English learners to take high-stakes tests in English; these tests assessed competency in areas that English learners had not yet mastered. Menken (2010) also presented English learners' performance data, which showed that schools serving English learners would be penalized in accordance with NCLB's (2001) requirements. The reality was that when a test was given in English to English learners, it became impossible to entirely divorce language proficiency from content knowledge (Menken, 2000/2008). Testing research has shown that a content-area test given to an English learner in English is unlikely to give a true picture of what the student knows or is able to do, since

language proficiency impacts the results. Therefore, some researchers argue that it is not valid to give an English learner an academic content test in English and use the results for high-stakes decision making such as school evaluation or to determine high school graduation, grade promotion, and program placement (Gándara & Baca, 2008; Menken, 2008; Solórzano, 2008).

NCLB (2001) pushed states to establish performance targets or annual measurable achievement objectives to hold districts and schools accountable. There were three annual measurable achievement objectives to which the English learners in California were held accountable:

- Make annual progress toward achieving English Proficiency, measured by the CELDT;

- Achieve and maintain English Proficiency, measured by CELDT; and

- Demonstrate adequate yearly progress in English Language Arts (and Mathematics, measured by the CST, CAHSEE or the California Modified Assessment. (NCLB, 2001)

According to Abedi and Dietal (2004), there were four challenges that English learners faced because of the annual measurable achievement objectives NCLB (2001) prescribed:

- State tests have shown that English learners' school performance was far below that of other students and little improvement has been shown across many years.

- Language demands of tests negatively influenced accurate measurement of English learner performance because the tests measured both achievement and language ability.

- When high-achieving English learners reclassified as English-proficient students, the English learner subgroup suffered because of the addition of new students who were typically low achieving.

- Factors outside the schools controlled negatively affect student learning, which then affected student achievement on the prescribed standardized tests.

Menken (2006) researched the impact of the implementation of NCLB (2001) on language policy, curriculum and instruction for English learners. In Menken's (2006) study, fieldwork was conducted in a purposeful sample of ten New York City high schools serving English learners to see how high-stakes tests influenced instructional practices and the learning experiences of English learners in high schools, and to see what the language policy implications of the focus on assessments were.

Menken (2006) found that the results of the study illustrated the ways that educators "teach to the test," thereby establishing language policy in schools (p. 526). The language policy that was established included changes to the curriculum to teach lessons aligned to the test school-wide, and changed how instruction took place in the classroom. The researcher also found that across school sites, participants reported that state-mandated tests have been used to determine language policy, curriculum and teaching. The schools and individuals differed greatly in how their policies and practices have changed to prepare students for the tests. Therefore, the best practice per this study is to eliminate NCLB (2001) and teach-to-the-test policies.

Several court cases followed suit to change the discriminatory federal policies that affected all language minority students by not meeting their academic needs to acquire the English language.

Federal Court Cases

The *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) federal court case was symbolic of the dynamic and continuing contest to establish language rights in the U.S. particularly through testing the law in the courtroom (Baker, 2011, Crawford, 2004: Lyons, 1990; Schmidt, 2000). A multitude of Federal Court Cases has affected the history of bilingual education in the U.S. (See Table 3).

Table 3

Federal Court Cases Impacting Bilingual Education

Year	Federal Court Cases Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implication
1923	*Meyer v. Nebraska* ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court	In 1923, the U.S. Supreme Court declared that a Nebraska state law prohibiting the teaching of foreign languages to children in private language classes was unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment.	The ruling outlawed, as an unconstitutional infringement of individual liberties, arbitrary restrictions on the teaching of languages other than English outside the regular school hours.
1954	*Brown v. Board* of *Education*	*Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) was a landmark U.S. Supreme Court case in which the Court declared state laws establishing separate public schools for black and white students unconstitutional. The decision overturned the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896, which allowed state-sponsored segregation, insofar as it applied to public education. Handed down on May 17, 1954, the Warren Court's unanimous decision stated that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."	As a result, *de jure* racial segregation was ruled a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This ruling paved the way for integration and was a major victory of the civil rights movement.

Table 3 (continued)

Year	Federal Court Cases Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implications
1974	*Lau v. Nichols*	A court case was brought on behalf of Chinese students against San Francisco School District in 1970. The case concerned whether or not non-English speaking students received equal education opportunities when instructed in a language they could not understand.	Established that language programs for language minorities not proficient in English and who were necessary to prove equal education opportunities.
1975	Lau Remedies	These remedies acknowledged that students not proficient in English needed help.	Informal guidelines on school's obligations toward Limited-English Proficient students. This required provision of bilingual education in districts where the civil rights of such student had been violated.
1976	*Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado*	The Denver, Colorado school system built a new elementary school in Park Hill which utilized divided student attendance zones, optional zones and mobile classroom units. Keyes and others brought suit against School District Number One (1976) alleging unconstitutional racial segregation not only in the Park Hill school district, but in all Denver schools. The district court found that for almost a decade since 1960, the school board had engaged in unconstitutional and deliberate racial segregation only in its Park Hill schools, and ordered the school board to desegregate the Park Hill schools. Further, the district court fractionated the school district and held that Keyes was required but failed to prove *de jure* segregation in each separate area of the city, and therefore refused to order desegregation in the other Denver schools.	Established bilingual education as compatible with desegregation.
1980-1981	Lau Regulations	The Carter Administration attempted to formalize the Lau Remedies, requiring bilingual education for Limited-English Proficient students where feasible.	The Reagan Administration withdrew the proposal, leaving uncertainty about schools' obligation in this area.

Table 3 (continued)

Year	Federal Court Cases Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implications
1981	*Castañeda v. Pickard*	The case of *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) was tried in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas in 1978. This case was filed against the Raymondville Independent School District in Texas by Roy Castañeda, the father of two Mexican-American children. Mr. Castañeda claimed that the district was discriminating against his children because of their ethnicity. He argued that the classroom his children were being taught in was segregated, using a grouping system for classrooms based on criteria that were both ethnically and racially discriminating. Mr. Castañeda also claimed the Raymondville Independent School District failed to establish sufficient bilingual education programs, which would have aided his children in overcoming the language barriers that prevented them from participating equally in the classroom.	In 1981, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled in favor of the Castañedas, and as a result, the court decision established a three-part assessment for determining how bilingual education programs would be held responsible for meeting the requirements of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974. The criteria are listed below: • The bilingual education program must be "based on sound educational theory." • The program must be "implemented effectively with resources for personnel, instructional materials, and space." • After a trial period, the program must be proven effective in overcoming language barriers/handicaps.

Note. Adapted from *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 5th ed.* (pp. 196-198), by C. Baker, 2011, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. Copyright 2011 by Multilingual Matters. Used with permission.

Lau v. Nichols (1974) was the most important legal case for bilingual education in the

U.S. (Baker, 2011). The case was brought against San Francisco Unified School District by the

parents of nearly 1,800 Chinese students. The case started in 1970 as a discrimination case

against the district because a student could not understand his lessons, and he was not given any

assistance with acquiring the English language. San Francisco Unified School District posited

that students were not being discriminated against because the same lesson was given to all

students regardless of national origin. The district felt that the lack of English proficiency by the

student was not the district's fault. Initially, the lower courts favored the school district, but then

in 1975, the U.S. Supreme Court favored the plaintiffs. The verdict required that school officials provide limited-English-proficient students appropriate services so they could have meaningful participation in the district's educational program. The Supreme Court ruled that providing the same instruction to language minority students that is offered to language proficient students does not provide access to the benefits of schooling. Students who do not understand English do not have access to the content being presented. *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) did not provide a specific bilingual education policy, but it directed school districts to take steps to establish equal educational opportunities for all students.

In the absence of specific policy instructions, it was difficult to determine whether a particular school district was meeting the spirit of the *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) decision. In 1981, *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) made a great impact on bilingual education by filling the policy gap that existed under *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) (Lyons, 1992). *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) gave more specific guidelines to the public to determine whether equal opportunities were being created for all students. Additionally, this case ruled that language minority students' civil rights were violated by educational neglect and that school districts had two responsibilities: to ensure academic content instruction was accessible and to teach English. Programs designed to serve students limited in English proficiency had to meet certain criteria, as outlined by the court. The ruling stated that programs must have adequate personnel and resources and be effectively implemented. It also mandated that they must be evaluated after a trial period and determined to be effective in overcoming language handicaps. They must be based on a theory that is educationally sound (Crawford, 1995). Though essential for the expansion of educational opportunities for English learners, neither *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) nor *Castañeda v. Pickard*

(1981) addressed a distinct but related hurdle faced by many of these students: documentation status.

In 1982, the case of *Plyler v. Doe* had a positive impact on bilingual education when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that states and public schools are prohibited from excluding undocumented students solely on the basis of their immigration status. The right to education was based on residence, not citizenship status. The majority of the Court's opinion stated that an alien plaintiff may claim the benefit of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection. The opinion also noted that regulation of immigration is exclusively a federal function. As states had no authority with respect to the classification of aliens, immigration classification matters were rarely relevant to legislation by a state or to policy set by school districts, which were established through state law (Castro Feinberg, 2002).

State Bilingual Education Policies

Federal legislation and court decisions are not alone in official impacts on bilingual education. State bilingual education polices have also targeted language minority students and sought to impose severe restrictions on native language instruction for English learners in many states throughout the U.S. California as the setting of this study is one of the states so impacted.

Since the passage of Proposition 227 in 1998 in California, English instruction for the state's language minority students has not been the same. The English for the Children Initiative, Proposition 227's (1998) other name, sought to impose racist restrictions on native-language instruction for English learners in California. Proposition 227 (1998) served as a model for the passage of similar restrictive language policies in other states, including Arizona and Massachusetts. A similar proposition was proposed in 2002 in Colorado, Amendment 3, but the

state constituents defeated the proposition (Baker, 2011). State legislatures have passed many

bilingual education polices starting with the pre-Proposition 227, California's Assembly Bill

1329 (1976) (See Table 4).

Table 4

State Bilingual Education Policies

Year	State Legislation Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implications
1976	Chacone-Moscone Bilingual Education—Bicultural Education Act of 1976	Assembly Bill 1329 (1976), also known as the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act was passed in 1976. This piece of legislation, which essentially replaced Assembly Bill 2284 (1972), was the first state legislative act that mandated school districts to provide language minority students with equal educational opportunities despite their limited proficiency in English. This Act was a response to the *Lau v. Nichols* 1974 Supreme Court decision.	Note, however, that this Act, unlike federal legislation, which left decision-making regarding program type for English learners to localities, explicitly proclaimed bilingual education as a right of English language learners.
1998	Proposition 227 passed in California	The *Unz* Initiative—English for the Children—sought to impose severe restrictions on native-language instruction for English learners in California.	Most bilingual programs dismantled.
2000	Proposition 203 passed in Arizona	Unz's English for the Children Initiative passed in Arizona; ended most bilingual programs.	Ended most bilingual programs.
2002	Question 2 passed in Massachusetts	Unz's English for the Children Initiative passed in Massachusetts; ended most bilingual programs.	Ended most bilingual programs.
2000	Amendment Three defeated in Colorado	Unz's English for the Children Initiative defeated in Colorado.	The measure would have required that all public school students be taught in English unless they were exempted under the proposal.
2012	State Seal of Biliteracy	Assembly Bill 815 (2012) Program recognized high school graduates who have obtained a high level of proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing one or more languages in addition to English.	It was the intent of the Legislature to promote linguistic proficiency and cultural literacy in one or more languages in addition to English.

Table 4 (continued)

Year	State Legislation Affecting Bilingual Education	Description	Implications
2012	Long-Term English Learner Official Definition	Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) defined "long-term English learners" and "English learner."	The measure required the California Department of Education to annually ascertain and provide to school districts and schools the number of pupils in each school district and school, as specified, who are, or are at risk of becoming, long-term English learners.

Note. Adapted from *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 5th ed*. (pp. 196-198), by C. Baker, 2011, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. Copyright 2011 by Multilingual Matters. Used with permission

In California, Assembly Bill 1329**,** also known as the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act, was passed in 1976. This piece of legislation, which essentially replaced Assembly Bill 2284 from 1972, was the first state legislative act that mandated school districts to provide language minority students with equal educational opportunities despite their limited proficiency in English. This Act was a response to the *Lau v. Nichols* 1974 Supreme Court decision. The *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) ruling was mandated and supported by state law. The Chacon-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act (AB 1329, 1976), unlike federal legislation, which left decision-making regarding program type for English learners to localities, positively declared bilingual education as a right of English language learners.

Bilingual Education Instructional Models

Bilingual education programs have existed under a variety of program models in the U.S. There are five main Bilingual Education instructional models, but the most prevalent in California has been the two-way immersion model of bilingual education (See Table 5).

Table 5

Types of Instructional Models of Bilingual Education

Instructional Model	Definition and Characteristics	When Appropriate
Early-Exit Transitional	• Goal is to develop English skills without sacrificing or delaying learning of academic core and develop English fluency to successfully move students to mainstream classrooms. • Students are English learners and from the same language background. • Some content instruction in naïve language, transition to English as rapidly as possible. • Transition to mainstream in two to three years.	• Sizeable group of English learners who speak the same language and are in the same grade. • Limited number of bilingual teachers available to teach in the higher grades.
Late-Exit Transitional/Developmental or Maintenance	• Goal is to develop academic proficiency in English and students' first language. • Transitional Programs: Generally place less emphasis on developing students' first language and more emphasis on the first language as a bridge to English language development. • Developmental Programs: Generally place equal emphasis on developing and maintaining students' primary language and academic English proficiency. • Students are English learners and from same language background. • Significant amount of instruction in native language while continuing to increase instruction in English (four to six years).	• Sizeable group of English learners who speak the same language and are in the same grade. • Bilingual teachers available to teach in the higher elementary (or later) grades. • Interest and support from language-minority community to maintaining primary language, learning English, and achieving academically in both languages.
Bilingual Immersion	• Goal is English language development. • Students are English learners and from same language background. • Most instruction in English; first hour of the day, teachers teach primary language literacy and explain concepts in students' primary language. • Sheltered English for all subjects. • Students may use primary language even when instructed in English. • Transitional model, usually two to four years, then enter mainstream.	• Sizeable group of English learners who speak the same language and are the same grade. • Limited number of bilingual teachers to teach in the higher grades.

Table 5 (continued)

Instructional Model	Definition and Characteristics	When Appropriate
Integrated TBE	• Goals are ELD and partial bilingualism. • Targets minority students within majority classroom. • Allows teachers and students to use native language in mainstream classrooms.	• When there are significant numbers of students with same language background, but not necessarily enough for a whole class. • Bilingual teachers and/or assistants, who are available and trained, share a classroom with a monolingual-English teacher.
Dual Language Immersion (also known as Two-Way Bilingual)	• Goal is to develop strong skills and proficiency in students' first language and a second language. • About half the students are native speakers of English and half are English language learners from the same language group. • Instruction in both languages ("90/10") begins 90% no-English/10% English, gradually increasing to ("50/50") 50% English for all students from the beginning.	• Approximately half of the students are native English speakers and half are native speakers of another language. • Bilingual teachers who are trained to teach learners in both languages.

Note. Adapted from *Fostering Academic Success for English Learners: What Do We Know?* (p. 6), *by R. Linquanti, 1999,* San Francisco, CA: WestEd. Copyright 1999 by WestEd. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org. Used with permission.

Before Proposition 227 (1998) was passed, bilingual education for English learners followed the transitional program model. TBE aims to shift the child from the home, minority language to the dominant, majority language (Baker, 2011). In TBE, students are instructed in the primary language and are transitioned into the secondary language usually by the third grade. The idea behind transitional programs was to use the primary language as the method to acquire the secondary language. The primary language was eventually abandoned, with the ultimate goal being assimilation (Baker, 2011). Baker (2011) stated that transitional bilingual education was a brief, temporary swim in one pool until the child was capable of moving into the mainstream pool.

TBE approaches were split into two models: early exit and late exit. Early exit programs offered instruction in the student's primary language for approximately two to three years

(Linquanti, 1999; Baker, 2011). Late-exit programs offered instruction in the student's primary language for up to 40% of the instructional time to sixth grade, or four to six years (Linquanti, 1999; Baker, 2011). The student population in both types of programs consisted of students with the same primary language.

Instructional Options for English Learners after Proposition 227 (1998) Passed

Since the passage of Proposition 227 (1998), also known as the Unz Initiative–English for the Children, English instruction for language minority students has not been the same. Bilingual education was virtually eliminated; sheltered or structured English-immersion programs were put in place (Baker, 2011; Crawford, 2004; Orellana, Ek & Hernandez, 1999; Quezada, Wiley, & Ramirez, 1999). There have been a limited number of instructional options for English learners since Proposition 227 (1998) passed in California (See Table 6).

Table 6

Instructional Options for English Learners after Proposition 227 (1998) *Passed*

Structured English Immersion (SEI) Program	Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) Program	Dual Language Program
• Program designed to provide instruction in English.	• Program designed to provide grade-level instruction in the primary language while students acquire English.	• Program designed to provide grade level content instruction in English and target language.
• Limited primary language support and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) are used to meet grade level content standards.	• Language arts, mathematics, social studies and science are first taught in the primary language.	• Instruction in both languages begins in Kindergarten and continues for a minimum of six years.
• Students are placed in the Mainstream Program once they reach fluency or ELD Level Five.	• As students increase their English proficiency, teachers decrease the amount of instruction provided in the primary language.	• Both English learners and English proficient students receive access to the core curriculum and language development instruction for both languages.
• Mainstream Program provides grade level academic instruction in English and is designed for native speakers.	• Students are placed in the Mainstream Program once they reach fluency or ELD Level Five.	
• English learners continue to receive support to meet the requirements to be reclassified as fluent English proficient.	• Mainstream Program provides grade level academic instruction in English and is designed for native speakers.	
	• English learners continue to receive support to meet the requirements to be reclassified as fluent English proficient.	

Note. Adapted from *Program Alternatives for Linguistically Diverse Students, Educational Practice Report No. 1* (p. 3), by F. Genesee, 1999, Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence. Copyright 1999 by CREDE/CAL. Used with permission.

The provisions behind Proposition 227 (1998) required schools to teach students with

limited English proficiency only in English with material that helped the students to acquire the

English language. Research stated that it took from four to eight years for a student to become

proficient in the English language (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). Students with less than

reasonable fluency in English were placed in the Structured English Immersion (SEI) Program.

The SEI program provided instruction in English, including content-based ELD, primary

language support, and SDAIE. The students' English proficiency level was used to group them

for daily ELD or ESL instruction in both elementary and secondary schools. Secondary English

learners who were placed in beginning or intermediate level may have received introductory ESL

classes in math, science, and history during their first year to assist them with grade-level courses

the following year. This may have delayed access to grade-level standards the following year.

English learners were placed in the Mainstream Program once they reach reasonable fluency.

The Mainstream Program provided grade-level academic instruction in English, which is

designed for English speakers. English learners continued to receive additional instructional

support in order to meet the requirements to be reclassified as fluent English proficient.

Two alternative programs were available to parents for their children. The TBE Program

had bilingual teachers who used primary language to teach grade-level academic subjects.

English language development was also taught daily. As students progressed in their English

proficiency, English instruction was increased in academic subjects. Parents needed to file a

waiver to place their child in a Transitional Bilingual class and Dual Language Programs

(Stritikus, 2001).

The Dual Language Program included both English learners and English proficient

students. These students received instruction in two languages in the same classroom with the

goal of developing academic proficiency in both languages. Instruction in both languages began

in kindergarten for a minimum of six years.

Hakuta, Butler, and Witt (2000) conducted empirical research at four different school districts, two in California and two in Canada, on how long it took English learners to become proficient in English in ESL compared to bilingual education programs. Their results indicated that rapid acquisition of English through sheltered English programs lasting no more than one year, like Proposition 227 (1998) suggested, were highly unrealistic. Rather, they found that oral proficiency took three to five years to develop, and academic English proficiency took four to seven years.

Segregation of Latino Students and English Learners

Gándara and Orfield (2010) looked at empirical research that showed the impact of segregation of Latino and English Learners in Arizona in "A Return to the 'Mexican Room': The Segregation of Arizona's English Learners." The study also looked at the court decisions regarding English learners' rights to be integrated with their mainstream classmates. Gándara and Orfield (2010) found that segregation by school was an increasing problem for Latino students and English learners in Arizona and the nation. Minority segregated schools were usually also affected by poverty and were more likely to have inadequate facilities and materials, less experienced and less qualified teachers and less successful peers. All of these factors taken together tended to produce lower educational achievement for the students who were assigned to these schools. This study was important because of the increased scrutiny that Arizona English learners and Latinos have been facing recently through various laws that affect their community. At the time of the study, Arizona was the epicenter of different laws and policies that were affecting English learners and Latinos in the state.

English Learner Academic Achievement

Rumberger and Tran (2008) addressed the question on the achievement gap between English learners and English-only students among schools and states across four achievement areas, reading in grades four and eight and math in grades four and eight. Their analysis of the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress revealed English learner achievement gaps in all four areas (Rumberger & Tran, 2008). The achievement gap was larger in reading than in math and larger in the eighth grade than in the fourth grade, when at least some English learners had reclassified as Redesignated Fluent English Proficient students and were no longer included in the English learner category of the study. The study also found that the extent of specially-designed instruction for English learners varied extensively among schools and states. Generally, only about half of all English learners nationwide received any form of specially-designed instruction. While most of these students received ESL as their specially-designed instruction, 5% or fewer received native-language instruction. In eighth-grade math, less than 40% of English learners received specially-designed instruction.

The analysis of the National Assessment of Educational Progress data showed a range of factors that described the differences in mean achievement and the English learner achievement gap among states and among schools. In general, the factors that predicted mean student achievement differed from the factors responsible for the English-learner student achievement gap. In some cases, reading proficiency of English learners predicted student achievement across the four test outcomes. While in other cases, different factors predicted student achievement across the four test outcomes (Rumberger & Tran, 2010). Most of the effects on English learners' achievement were small, while student composition factors were somewhat

69

larger. Rumberger and Tran (2010) stated that the findings suggested that individual state-level and school-level predictors exerted a relatively small effect on student achievement and the English learner achievement gap.

Challenges in Secondary Schools

Dutro and Kinsella (2010) addressed the issues that emerged for students who were trying to acquire English while simultaneously trying to succeed in a secondary school environment with fast-paced schedules, specialized courses, rigorous content, high-stakes assessments, and a variety of instructional methods. For English learners, who had to navigate these complexities while acquiring English, the demands intensified significantly (Dutro & Levy, 2008). The authors presented an approach for rethinking English language and acquisition for adolescent English learners based on current research and promising practices. They did this by providing:

- A discussion of the linguistic challenges adolescent English learners face;
- An overview of the diversity among English learners in grades six to 12 and standards-based English proficiency levels;
- A rationale for instructed ELD in the secondary school context;
- An analysis of common course placements for adolescent English learners and their potential shortcomings of those placements; and
- A model for instructed ELD in the secondary school context.

Predictive Value of Several Variables on Ninth-Grade GPA

Adams, Astone, Nunez-Wormack, and Smodlaka (1994) reported in their empirical study the predictive value of several variables on ninth-grade GPA of Mexican American and

70

Puerto Rican high school students. The language variable of the study focused on English and Spanish proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding the languages, as well as the use of Spanish or English in the home. The students' immigration status, gender, place of geographic residence and mother's education were also included as variables. Adams et al. (1994) reported that gender and immigrations status significantly affected both groups of students. Adams et al. (1994) also reported that English proficiency was significantly different for the two groups of students. Surprisingly, they found that the more English proficient Mexican-Americans did more poorly in high school. Finally, the researchers found that no other language variables were significant predictors of the students' GPAs in the study.

Social Interaction

The purpose of the theoretical research by Akrofi, Janisch, Lewis, and Zebedi (2012) was to examine one teacher's social interactional roles that fostered effective literacy learning in an ESL-inclusion second grade classroom. The study applied sociocultural and activity theories to a single case study. The researchers used multiple qualitative methods and inductive procedures for data collection and analysis. From the data analysis, the authors concluded that the teacher's facilitation of learning through peer collaboration enabled English learners to become more capable students and increased language acquisition (Akrofi, Janisch, Lewis, & Zebedi, 2012).

Theoretical research by Yoon (2012) was grounded in sociocultural theory with the purpose of examining a regular classroom teacher's teaching approaches to promote English learners' interaction and participation in language and literacy activities. The study suggested that the teacher's awareness of English learners' cultural and social needs, cultural inclusivity approach, and utilization of English learners as a cultural resource contributed to the students'

71

learning. The findings of the research had significant implications for regular classroom teachers who work with English learners in the mainstream classroom.

Course-Taking Patterns of English Learners

Finkelstein, Huang, and Fong (2009) analyzed school transcript information from 54 high schools to identify specific course-taking patterns of English learners. The authors wanted to test the correlation between the patterns by which English learners completed ninth-grade English and mathematics and how that linked to the accumulation of comprehensive sequence of rigorous courses by the time English learners were high school seniors (Finkelstein et al., 2009). Finkelstein et al. (2009) found that approximately 8% of English learners and 20% of non-English learners finished high school having taken the necessary set of required courses to be minimally eligible to attend the California State University (CSU) system. Finkelstein et al. (2009) stated that the reasons this pattern occurred were numerous and pointed to the combination of early preparation for rigorous coursework and additional educational options for English language learners in the schools they attend. Valdés (2001) reported that because of poor performance on standardized assessments, English language learners were placed in remedial courses and judged to be unable to participate in more advanced college preparatory classes. These actions were reinforced by expectations and misinformation. Antonio and Bersola (2004) noted that students in high school—both English language learners and non-English language learners—were often surprised to learn that the low-level courses they had taken did not count as college preparatory credits.

Finkelstein et al. (2009) also stated that course-taking patterns that began before high school as a result of poor performance on assessments and remedial coursework may have

continued in the ninth grade with limited completion patterns of a single couplet of courses—one year of English coupled with one year of mathematics. Finkelstein et al. (2009) emphasized that by the time English language learners in their study completed high school, more than 92% would not be able to matriculate to a four-year state college in California without remediation.

Finkelstein et al. (2009) also stated that these findings suggested that getting students on track early in high school during ninth grade by ensuring access to college preparatory coursework in English and mathematics was critical to keeping them on track to fulfilling college entrance requirements. Finkelstein et al. (2009) stated that academic supports should be put in place to allow English learners to meet such requirements by high school graduation. Finkelstein et al. (2009) also stated that the findings in this study suggested that students had a better chance of completing the CSU entrance requirements if they were identified early as being English learners. The fact that late-identified English learners were only about 39% as likely as early-identified English language learners to complete CSU entrance requirements suggested that early identification was highly important (Finkelstein et al., 2009). In conclusion, Finkelstein et al. (2009) stated that English learners, regardless of when they are identified, showed considerable difficulty fulfilling CSU entrance requirements when compared to non-English learners. The findings here highlighted this point, suggesting that more needed to be done to support English language learners' chances of completing college entrance requirements by the end of 12th grade.

Achievement Patterns of English learners

De Jong (2004) disaggregated data on achievement patterns in English, math, and science classes of former English learners in bilingual or ESL programs. This research examined

whether length of program participation and the grade level at which the student exited the program played a significant role in predicting academic achievement patterns of students who exited the program. Fourth-grade students were more closely parallel to non-English learners' achievement patterns than eighth-grade students. The study shared evidence that the achievement gap between English learners and other students got wider between elementary school and high school.

High School Experiences of Talented Immigrant Students

Duran and Weffer (1992) examined the high school experiences of talented immigrant students to identify the behavioral process by which they were successful academically. Duran and Weffer (1992) found that family educational values had an important effect on achievement when these values translated into participation in math and science enrichment programs. Duran and Weffer (1992) concluded that although immigrant students achieved below their native-born counterparts prior to high school, their strategies for increasing learning during high school enabled them to perform better on standardized achievement tests, though not on GPA.

District Sample of Restructured Services

Whitlock-Robles (2010) shared how Ventura Unified School District in California successfully restructured its services to increase the number of long-term English learners who reclassify as Fluent English Proficient students. The district was able to restructure their services to English learners by including teacher, administrator, support staff, and student input in a participatory model. At the time of the study, Ventura Unified School District served a total of 17,331 students, including 2,568 English learners (Whitlock-Robles, 2010). At the secondary level, there were 949 English learners, 821 of them considered long-term English learners

(Whitlock-Robles, 2010). More long-term English learners were able to meet the reclassification criteria once the participatory model was put into place. The participatory model could be a practice modeled in other districts so they could have the same type of success.

Importance of Parent and Community Involvement and Engagement

Parent involvement and engagement were shown to be an effective practice for academic achievement by Ferlazzo (2009). The purpose of parent involvement was to support students by strengthening and assisting school programs and priorities. Ferlazzo (2009) noted that in parent engagement, the purpose was to support students by developing parent relationships, strengthening families, and helping families develop more English skills and self-confidence so they felt more energized and capable of working to improve their local communities. The literature showed that there was a strong relationship between English learners' academic achievement and parent involvement or engagement in the school. If the parent knew what was happening at the school site with their students, then the students would succeed since there would be accountability from all stakeholders.

The empirical study by Aspiazu, Bauer, and Spillett (1998) showed that community involvement and empowerment improved academic achievement for the 16 study participants. The study examined the creation of the Oakwood Family Education Center, a community based education center that was created using the principles of liberation theology. Liberation theology originated in Latin America and was shaped distinctively by the Latin America situation (Brown, 1990). Aspiazu et al. (1998) stated that liberation theology provided a conceptual lens for viewing critical reflections by educational practitioners in their efforts to build communities, promoting the emergence of the laity into positions of leadership. Aspiazu et al. (1998) also

stated that community was an empowerment construct in liberation theology and that the context of the theology was shaped by the experience of oppression, within groups who became conscious of this and came together to work with a sense that the situation must change. The result of the study showed that all 16 participants had improved academically.

This section included schooling factors that have hindered or assisted the academic success of long-term English learners. The next section includes a review of the empirical literature on long-term English learners.

Long-Term English Learners

The material presented in the previous sections presented empirical and theoretical studies and articles on the processes involved in acquiring a second language and in legal prescriptions and strategies for teaching that second language. This section includes a summary of the research and literature that was available regarding the focus population of this research: long-term English learners in U.S. schools.

The definitions of long-term English learner and English learners who are at risk of becoming long-term English learners that I have used throughout this study come from Assembly Bill 2193 (2012). This California legislation defined long-term English learners as English learners who were enrolled in any grade six to 12, who have been enrolled in schools in the U.S. for more than six years, have remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive years as determined by the CELDT, and who have scored far below basic or below basic on the English language arts of the CST. Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) also defined English learners who were at risk of becoming long-term English learners as English learners who were enrolled in any of grades five to 11 in U.S. schools for four years, scored at

the intermediate level or below on the CELDT, and scored in the fourth year at the below basic or far below basic level on the English language arts section of the CST.

Menken (2013b) stated that long-term English learners have been primarily educated in the country where they were attending secondary schools, yet whose schools have failed to provide them with the language and literacy skills needed to succeed academically. Menken, Kleyn, and Chase (2013) also stated that most secondary school programs were designed to meet the needs of students who arrive in U.S. with adequate prior schooling and native language literacy skills (Freeman et al., 2002; García, 1999). Since these secondary school programs assumed literacy skills from students, they were not prepared to explicitly teach student the literacy skills across content areas that were necessary to navigate the secondary curriculum, and consequently did not meet the academic needs of long-term English learners (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2007; Callahan, 2006).

Menken (2013a) grouped long-term English learners as part of emergent bilingual student population who took longer than average to exit their English-learner status. García (2009) defined emergent bilingual students as those—typically immigrant children of immigrants or indigenous people—who added the dominant state language taught in school to their home language, and became bilingual in the process. Menken (2013a) pointed out that long-term English learners, until now, largely remained invisible in research and practice nationally. Menken (2013a) also stated that most of the English-learner research focused in the primary grades. There was urgency expressed for older English learners, who were also long-term English learners, because they faced unique challenges in secondary schools with greater cognitive and linguistic demands.

Secondary school English learners should have developed two skill areas:

- The ability to comprehend, speak, read, and write more advance course content; and

- The ability to demonstrate deep comprehension on tests that demand advanced
  English skills. (Calderon & Minaya-Rowe, 2011)

Calderon and Minaya-Rowe (2011) stated that these students did not have the time to catch up to their English-proficient peers, nor have they been taught the skills necessary to compete academically.

Olsen (2010b) spoke to the lack of quality interactions for marginalized learners and gave recommendations to amend the crisis regarding long-term English learners:

- Develop a standard definition for long-term English learners;

- Ensure availability of appropriate and effective English Development materials to
  promote access to core content;

- Set expectations for student progress based on the differentiated needs of long-term
  English learners;

- Train teachers and administrators to be more prepared to work with English learners
  and long-term English learners;

- Ensure English learners have access to the full curriculum;

- Provide parents with information regarding their students' language needs; and

- Invest in research and innovation to further the knowledge base and prevent the
  development long-term English learners.

Olsen (2010b) examined survey data collected from 40 school districts throughout California. The survey data included close to 176,000 English learners—almost one-third of all

English learners in the state. Long-term English learners had distinct characteristics that separated them from other English learners although they were usually counted with the English learner population. Long-term English learners tended to go unnoticed in secondary schools (Olsen, 2010b). They were born or had spent most of their lives in the U.S. and did not share immigrants' unfamiliarity to American culture or exposure to English language. Consequently, their standardized test scores were similar to a struggling native speaker. Long-term English learners were able to function in social situations in both their primary language and in English. They developed a non-standard form of the English language, which differed from academic English. Nonetheless, they sounded in many ways like their adolescent peers whose first language was English (Olsen, 2010b). Olsen (2010b) also stated that long-term English learners had significant gaps in reading and writing. "Writing is generally weak" because it lacks English syntax, grammar, and vocabulary (Freeman et al., 2002, p. 54). Long-term English learners were stuck at or below the intermediate level of English proficiency (Olsen, 2010b). They had also developed habits of non-engagement and had not developed behaviors associated with academic success. The majority of long-term English learners wanted to go to college, but they were unaware of whether their academic skills, academic record, and course work would prepare them for college. Finally, long-term English learners had become discouraged learners who tuned out academics and may have been at greater risk of dropping out of school. Sinclair and Ghory (1987) stated that one reason students became marginalized was a lack of quality in the interactions between the learner and the environment.

Conclusion

In designing this study, I felt it was important to identify the instructional experiences and the schooling factors that affected the participant long-term English learners as they strove to acquire the English language. Critical Sociocultural Theory was developed by language and literacy researchers to extend traditional sociocultural theory to account for how both learning and teaching were influenced by power relations (Handsfield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2007). Applied to teaching emergent bilingual students, a critical sociocultural approach embraced social interaction and scaffolding, including moderating language, opportunities for student-to-student interaction, relating instruction to student' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005), and engaging collaborative and experimental learning (Dixon-Krauss, 1995). The Critical Sociocultural approach "supports students in negotiating multiple expectations for social and academic language use and the power relationships that they imply" (Handsfield, 2012, p. 44).

The literature pointed to the major conclusion that there was a need for greater research through which solutions could be found for the problems that our long-term English learners have faced because their number has been increasing and the achievement gap has continued to widen. Previous studies have examined issues and policies that affect long-term English learners. One factor that all the studies had in common was that they were motivated by a desire to bring to light the factors that affected the long-term English learner population so they could create situations in which those students could succeed in gaining academic achievement and not drop out from academia.

Chapter Two also included a summary of the literature on the instructional experiences and schooling factors that were in place to see how they supported or failed to support long-term

English learners. With Critical Sociocultural Theory as the lens through which the literature was analyzed, the review included details of instructional experiences that have been in place that have hindered or assisted long-term English learners. In addition, it included the federal policies, federal court cases, and California policies that have affected Bilingual Education. It also contained the current description of long-term English learner used in research and literature.

Based on the review of the literature, Chapter Three includes an explanation of the methodological approach the researcher used to conduct the six-participant qualitative phenomenological study.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Researchers have found that ELD programs designed to exit students with near proficiency in English in four years have failed many of the students, leaving them with a lack of proficiency in the English language. There has been a need for greater research on long-term English learners since their number has continued to rise (Olsen, 2010b). This research included an analysis of the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to long-term English learner status for six students in an urban comprehensive high school in Los Angeles. I designed the study to consider these factors through the lens of the literature from the previous chapter, my previous experience, and structured phenomenological qualitative data gathering and phenomenological analysis. The research included collecting data from interviews, classroom observations, academic records, and a focus group discussion. To analyze the data, the researcher distilled and defined the essence of the long-term English learner experience from the data. This analysis enabled the researcher to explore further the topic of long-term English learners both to identify the instructional experiences and schooling factors that hinder reclassification for them, and to propose practical guidelines for schools to improve their reclassification based on this small sample of study participants.

Research Question

To explore further the instructional experiences and schooling factors of long-term English learners, I examined the research question: What instructional experiences and

schooling factors contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles?

Positionality

My goal for this dissertation and the base for my research question was to continue using personal experiences as a teacher, administrator, and doctoral student, to develop effective approaches and solutions to help long-term English learners have options to continue their academic career, to reduce high school dropouts, and to continue to find ways to improve the educational system for long-term English learners.

I was drawn to study this student population both professional and personal reasons. The students from the research site had similar academic characteristics to the long-term English learners with whom I have worked at the underserved schools in Los Angeles. Therefore, I sought to aid the participants to excel academically and to have access to a rigorous education experience. As an immigrant from Mexico, I felt familiar with the struggles with which many students and their families deal daily. Hence, one of my daily goals as an administrator has been to provide them with successful and positive academic experiences so that they do not perceive education negatively.

<div align="center">

Research Design

</div>

A phenomenological design was an essential part of this study's qualitative research methodology. A qualitative approach provided an in-depth understanding about the school factors and instructional experiences of long-term English learners in an urban high school in Los Angeles. Merriam (1998) stated that qualitative research is "based on the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting in their social worlds" (p. 6). Merriam (2009) defined

phenomenology as the study of people's conscious experience and their life-world, that is, their "everyday life and social action" (Schram, 2003, p. 71). Creswell (2009) defined phenomenological research as a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher identified the essence of human experience about a phenomenon as described by participants.

In this phenomenological study, research tools included demographic questionnaires, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), academic transcript analysis, and a focus group to collect data for this study. I used questionnaires to collect participants' demographic data. To get the essence or basic underlying structure of the meaning of an experience, the phenomenological interview has been identified as the primary method of data collection (Merriam, 2009). Gathering qualitative data through focused interviews and classroom observations was to assist in answering both research questions. Through the observations and interview responses, the researcher hoped to bring to light the school factors and instructional experiences that contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles. These tools also assisted the participants to articulate the academic experiences that lead or hindered them to become academically successful or reclassified.

Qualitative Methodology

This qualitative study explored the instructional experiences and schooling factors of long-term English learners in an urban high school in Los Angeles. Qualitative methods had the power to provide an in-depth understanding about the instructional experiences and schooling factors of the long-term English learner participants. Merriam (1998) stated that qualitative research was "based on the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting in their

social worlds" (p. 6). Creswell (2009) also stated that the idea behind qualitative research was to purposefully select participants, sites, documents, or visual material that helped the researcher understand the problem and the research question. Further, a qualitative approach allowed me to describe the characteristics of the programs, groups, or activities instead of identifying the shared patterns exhibited by the chosen group in a "moment in time" (Yin, 2003, p. 6).

Maxwell (1996) stated that the main benefit to conducting a qualitative study lay in the credible results and theories based on experiences, an opportunity to improve practice, and an ability to collaborate with participants rather than just study them. Maxwell (1996) also affirmed that qualitative work emphasizing the perspectives of students in the school setting usually had more potential for informing educational practitioners, which was one of the main reasons qualitative research methodology was the most appropriate to answer the research questions. The six-participant qualitative phenomenological design was the best fit for this study because this type of research includes a strategy of inquiry in which I could identify the essence of human experience about a phenomenon as described by participants (Creswell, 2009).

Phenomenological Study

The study employed a *phenomenological study* design as part of qualitative research methodology. Merriam (2009) defined phenomenology as the study of people's conscious experience and their life-world—their "everyday life and social action" (Schram, 2003, p. 71). Creswell (2009) defined phenomenological research as a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher identified the essence of human experience about a phenomenon as described by participants. Understanding the lived experiences has marked phenomenology as philosophy as

well as method, and the method involves studying a small number of subjects through extensive and prolonged engagement to develop patterns and relationships of meaning (Moustakas, 1994).

Creswell (2009) described the product of phenomenological study as a "composite description that presents the 'essence' of the phenomenon, called the essential, invariant structure (or essence)" (p. 62). The description represented the structure of the experience being studied. "The reader should come away from the phenomenology with the feeling, 'I understand better what is like for someone to experience that' (Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 46)" (Creswell, 2007, p. 62). Merriam (2009) stated that the phenomenological approach was well suited to studying affective, emotional, and often intense human experiences. Merriam (2009) described the task of a phenomenologist as to depict the essence or basic structure of experience. Often these studies were of intense human experience such as love, anger, betrayal and so on (Merriam, 2009). The researcher analyzed the phenomenon of long-term English learner status revealed through examining interview and school records, as well as classroom observations at an urban high school in Los Angeles. The participants completed demographic questionnaires which provided critical demographic data as a context.

Investigation Site

At the time of the study, Prosperity High School was a large urban high school with enrollment of approximately 1,700 students in grades nine through12. The school was located about 15 miles from downtown Los Angeles. Three ethnic groups comprised the student population: 77% Hispanic, 17% Asian, and 6% White. The ethnic composition of the high school reflected the city in which it was located, with an emerging population of Pacific Islander, Filipino, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Taiwanese residents.

Access. I selected Prosperity High School because a former counselor from the high school at which I am Principal is now an Assistant Principal at the site. I contacted this Assistant Principal and asked if he would be willing to assist in conducting research at the site. He received permission from both the Principal and the Superintendent for me to conduct the study at the site. The Instructional Coach at Prosperity High School then nominated a pool of participants who met the criteria to participate in the study and provided access to the data that was necessary to complete the research on long-term English learners' academic progress over time.

English learners at Prosperity High School. English learners represented 32.4% of the school's population or 554 students. Out of those 554 English Learners, 400 were long-term English learners. The ethnic distribution of the 400 long-term English learners was 95% Hispanic and 5% Asian (Prosperity High School Self-Study Report, 2013).

There are four criteria for reclassification from English learner to fluent-English-proficient student at Prosperity High School:

- The student must have earned a 2.00 GPA in English, math, science and social studies;
- The student must have met the district's cut off point of 325 scale score or above in the English Language Arts portion of the CST and the student must score at Early Advanced or above overall;
- The student must have achieved scores at Intermediate or higher in listening/speaking, reading, and writing in all areas of the CELDT; and
- The student's parents must have agreed to the student being reclassified.

The criteria held that students must have met all four conditions simultaneously to reclassify. If any of the criteria were not met, the student remained an English learner.

Academic Language Development courses at Prosperity High School. To address the needs of long-term English learners, Prosperity High School offered Academic Language Development (ALD) courses: ALD 1 in the fall semester and ALD 2 in the spring semester. These courses were designed to help students achieve proficiency in reading, writing, and oral expression. To reinforce the student's primary English course, students were assigned to ALD classes taught by their core English teacher. According to the Prosperity High School March 2013 Accreditation Self-Study, students enrolled in ALD 1 were enrolled in English One with the same instructor. This course shared the same core curriculum as the English Class along with other supporting activities and instructional strategies to increase student command of academic language and Standard English conventions. Both the ALD 1 and ALD 2 courses placed greater focus on language development, opportunities to practice meaningful discourse about topics related to the core content, and developmental literacy skills. Both classes also addressed all four domains of language.

Per the Prosperity High School March 2013 Accreditation Self-Study, long-term English learners at Prosperity High School were also enrolled in college preparation courses in all core academic areas to meet high school graduation and college admission requirements. Students were also enrolled in CAHSEE prep classes in either English or math or both to assist with the passage of the CAHSEE, if that high school graduation requirement was not already met.

Participants

The Instructional Coach nominated the pool of participants who met the criteria to participate in the study. The Instructional Coach knew the population of students very well because she worked with these students directly. She administered the CELDT to them, assisted with their correct placement of all academic classes, and provided academic guidance to those students who were failing.

The researcher used purposeful sampling to select the six 11th graders for the phenomenological study. Merriam (2009) stated that a researcher must first determine what selection criteria are essential in choosing, the people, or site to be studied. The criteria established for purposeful sampling directly reflected the purpose of the study and guided in the identification of information-rich cases (Merriam, 2009).

Selection Criteria. The following criterion were used for the selection of the six participants: Eligible participants were required to meet the Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) definition of long-term English learner status including being English learners enrolled in any grade six to 12, having been enrolled in schools in the U.S. for more than six years, and having remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive years as determined by the CELDT and scores far below or below basic on the English Language Arts portion of the CST. In addition, to address gender and ethnicity, participants included only male and female long-term English learners of Hispanic origin. Long-term English learners who also received special education services were not included because they were reclassified based on alternative methods not within the scope of this study. The selection included only 11th-grade

students to ensure longevity over the course of the study and to ensure the longest academic history available.

The Instructional coach asked about 35 **11th grader**s who met the selection criteria to meet with the researcher who presented the study and explained the research process to the eligible participants. Six 11th-grade long-term English learners from Prosperity High School returned the consent forms signed by both the participants and their parent/guardian (See Appendix F) and participated as subjects in the research. The first six students who returned their permission slips became participants as a convenience sample. Consequently, the five male participants and one female participant did not represent proportionally the genders of eligible students.

Methods of Data Collection

Over a 60-day time period, the researcher recruited students for this research, administered a demographic questionnaire, conducted one-on-one focused interviews, completed classroom observations, analyzed academic transcripts, and facilitated a participant focus group (See Table 7).

Table 7

Methods of Data Collection

	Demographic Questionnaire	One-on-One Focused Interviews	Classroom Observations – English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012)	Academic Transcript Analysis	Focus Group
Who	All six participants completed the demographic questionnaire.	Met with all students three times; Participant Five had a fourth interview since he was moved to a continuation school and could not participate in the focus group.	Researcher observed participants in their ALD or English classes.	Researcher	Met with five participants that were still enrolled at Prosperity High School (PHS).
What	Demographic data: Gender, age, ethnic origin, socioeconomic status, frequency English was used at home, other primary language spoken, country of birth, years in school in U.S., high school GPA, ESL coursework taken, and family history information, including education preparation of parents or guardians and number of siblings who attended and/or have graduated from college.	Open-ended questions to bring to light the instructional experiences and schooling factors that hindered long-term English learners from becoming academically successful.	The English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) was used for collecting classroom observation data.	Quantitative Data was analyzed.	Open-ended questions for further clarification and to bring closure and acknowledge the students.
Where	Parent Center @ PHS	Parent Center at PHS	ALD and English classes at PHS	Home Office	Parent Center at PHS
How	Participants completed demographic questionnaire immediately after they turned in their permission slip to participate in the study.	Researcher went to pick up participants from class and interviewed each student individually three separate times.	Researcher went to the participants ALD or English class to observe for 2 hours.	The Instructional Coach provided a copy of the cumulative folder to the researcher.	Instructional Coach summoned all participants

Table 7 (continued)

	Demographic Questionnaire	One-on-One Focused Interviews	Classroom Observations – English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012)	Academic Transcript Analysis	Focus Group
Why	The data allowed the researcher to gain initial familiarity with each participant	To interview students regarding school factors and instructional experiences that have hindered or assisted them academically.	To collect qualitative data to analyze the instructional experiences that led to greater success or contributed to long-term English learner status of the student.	Quantitative data including GPA, CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, retention, teacher comments and years in school from the six participants were analyzed to examine the K-11 educational history of each participant to assist the research questions.	The researcher needed to ask further clarifying questions regarding academic experience at Prosperity High School and he also wanted to thank them for their time and participation.
Timeline to complete	10-15 min. for participants to complete questionnaires	Eight days to interview and transcribe data. 45-60 min. per participant / per interview	Seven days for classroom observations Two hours per participant / per observation	Five days to analyze and code data	One lunch period (35 min.) and three hours to transcribe data
Appendix	Appendix A	Appendix B	Appendix C	Appendix D	Appendix E

Sources for the data for this phenomenological study included a demographic questionnaire, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), academic transcript analysis, and focus groups interviews. To obtain the data to distil the essence or basic underlying structure of the meaning of an experience, the researcher conducted a series of three focused interviews with each participant as the primary method of data collection (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative data also emerged from a series of three focused interviews, conducting classroom observations using the English Learner

Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), and conducting a focus group over a two-month period. The observations and interview responses brought to light the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles. They also created opportunities for the participants to articulate the instructional experiences and schooling factors that helped or hindered them in achieving academic success or reclassification.

Demographic Questionnaire

Merriam (2009) stated that all questionnaires should contain questions that referred to the particular participant demographics such as age, income, education, number of years on the job relevant to the research study. The researcher administered a demographic questionnaire to the participants after they returned all the required signed participation forms and before he conducted the one-on-one focused interviews (See Appendix A). Participants completed the questionnaire in about 10 to 15 minutes. This instrument allowed the researcher to gain initial familiarity with each participant.

The specific demographic questionnaire used for this research documented participant-supplied information including gender, age, ethnic origin, socioeconomic status, frequency English is used at home, other primary languages spoken, and country of birth, as well as information on academic preparation including years in school in the U.S., high school GPA, and ESL coursework taken and family history information, including education preparation of parents or guardians and number of siblings who attend and/or have graduated from college.

One-on-One Focused Interviews

Yin (1994) described a *focused* interview as when a respondent was interviewed for a short period of time, with open-ended questions a conversational manner. However, Merton, Fiske, and Kendall (1990) noted that such interviews often followed a certain set of questions. Lichtman (2010) stated that during focused interviews, researchers obtained information from participants which was not slanted toward what the researcher preferred to hear or investigate. Lichtman (2010) also stated that the purpose of focused interviews was to hear what participants had to say in their own words, in their own voices, with their language and narrative. Therefore, participants could share what they knew and had learned and could add a dimension to our understanding of what was being studied that quantitative and survey data did not show.

In this study, the researcher used the interview data to address the research question by bringing to light the schooling factors that contributed to the long-term English learner status of participating Latino students. The interviews created space in which the participants could articulate their academic experiences that led or hindered them to become academically successful or to reclassify. The results of the research will help others understand factors of the academic experiences that benefitted or hindered them from becoming academically successful or reclassified as English proficient.

After the participants completed the demographic questionnaire, the researcher returned to campus for four days to conduct the one-on-one focused interviews. I interviewed all six participants three times. Each interview lasted between 45 minutes and an hour. The interviews took place in the Parent Center of Prosperity High School. The IRB approved focus interview questions for Interviews One, Two and Three (See Appendix B) and participants and their

parents signed consent forms (See Appendix F). The second and third rounds of interviews gave

participants the opportunity to answer any unanswered questions and to clarify other questions

that remained. A phone interview was necessary for some participants to clarify additional

questions raised in the primary interviews. Jesus participated in a fourth interview. Jesus was

checked out of Prosperity High School in to a continuation school at the end of the first semester

and during that interview provided details of that move directly.

Classroom Observations: English Learner Shadow Study Protocol

Once the researcher had gathered demographic, interview, and written school records

data for each student in the study, he conducted individual classroom observations using the

English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) (See Appendix C). The English Learner

Shadow Study Protocol is a tool to collect qualitative data to analyze the instructional

experiences that led to greater success or contributed to long-term English learner status of the

student. This is a viable tool for this research because as Soto (2012) stated, the English Learner

Shadow Study Protocol can enhance and accompany other initiatives by placing the spotlight on

the needs of English learners within a system. Soto (2012) also stated that once specific needs

have been determined for English learners using the shadowing experience, existing structures

that are in place can be used alongside the initiatives to assist with sustaining instructional

change.

Soto (2012) stated that the English Learner Shadowing Project was a way to create

urgency around the instructional and linguistic needs of English learners, either in teacher

training or in staff development. The English learner shadowing process allowed teachers to see

firsthand a classroom like their own and to see the sense of urgency that existed when the

specific needs of English learners were not addressed systematically (Soto, 2012). Soto (2012) also stated that the English learner shadowing project allowed teachers within a system–whether at grade level, department, entire school, district, or county office–to focus on the specific needs of an English learner through the lens of one child at a time.

This protocol was an effective tool for observing the six participants for two hours each or for two periods in their ALD and/or English classes. The observation process required five days observing students individually.

The English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) included activity description of what the student was doing in five-minute intervals. The researcher observed each student for two hours, collecting 24 data activity descriptors per student. Three activity descriptors characterized what the students were doing at five-minute intervals:

- Academic Speaking,

- Academic listening one-way or two-way, and

- Student not listening.

 Academic speaking was when the student or the adult was communicating using academic language. Academic listening was when the student is listening to the teacher, other students, a small group, or the whole class. In the Student not listening category, the participant could have been reading or writing silently or off task. Each activity descriptor had sub-categories that specified how the activity was taking place and by whom.

The comment section of the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) was used to annotate what the teacher was doing in five-minute intervals as well. Those observations

were important so that the instructional experiences were analyzed to see if they assisted or hindered the participants' academic progress.

Academic Transcript Analysis

The Instructional Coach gave the researcher access to the academic transcript information for the six participants. He analyzed the quantitative data as part of the triangulation of data. After completing the focused, one-on-one in-depth interviews with the six selected subjects, the researcher referred to the written profile of the six long-term English learners selected for the study. The written profile included demographic information such as name, date of birth, date of entry in U.S., and date of entry to the district. The profile also included test results, such as Language Proficient Assessment, state assessment results for English Language Arts and mathematics, as well as GPA and CAHSEE scores. The written profile data from the academic transcripts information provided by the Instructional Coach created a context for observing students in the classroom settings.

Focus Group

A focus group followed after the three one-on-one interviews with each participant. The focus group took place during one lunch period with specific questions for the students (See Appendix E). Merriam (2009) stated that as a method of qualitative research data collection, a focus group was an interview on a topic with a group of people who have knowledge of the topic who are selected through purposeful sampling (Krueger, 2008; Steward, Shamdasani, & Rook, 2006). Merriam (2009) also stated that data obtained from a focus group was socially constructed within the interactions of the participants, therefore a constructivist perspective was the basis of the procedure to collect data. Merriam (2009) affirmed that "focus groups work best

for topics people could talk about in their everyday lives but don't" (Macnaghten & Myers, 2004, p. 65).

The Instructional Coach asked all the participants to come to the Parent Center where the focus group took place. The goal of the focus group was get to get to know the participants in a more social setting versus the structured one-on-one interview format, to ask further clarifying questions, to thank the participants for their participation, and to bring closure to their participation in the study. The researcher provided pizza, chips, and soda to eat while the group had free flowing conversations. The participants had previously met with their counselor to talk about graduation and their plans after graduation, so after answering clarifying questions, they turned the conversation to the topic of graduation for the majority of the hour. The researcher explained the Getting Ready For College document all participants received from their counselor. The document included six sections:

- Your progress in meeting college entrance requirements,

- Your course-taking progress,

- Your course-taking plans,

- What you can do next,

- Where to find more information, and

- Paying for college.

The participants appreciated discussing the document because they felt that their counselor had not taken enough time to explain all of the parts to them. They were also grateful for the snacks and the food I brought for them.

Together, these methods yielded a rich collection of data. Analysis promised to give an in-depth picture of the essence of the participants' experiences as English learners.

Data Analysis

Multiple methods of data collection in this phenomenological study provided data for *triangulation*. Merriam (1998) defined triangulation as a process of using multiple sources of data, multiple investigators or multiple methods to confirm the findings of the study. Triangulation also gave the opportunity to offset potential threats to the validity of the data (Glesne, 1999) and to increase the credibility of the study. Academic transcript analysis, one-on-one in-depth interviews, and the English Learner Shadow Protocol, and a focus group provided data for this study. For the interviews, English Learner Shadow Protocol, and focus group, the researcher used transcripts prepared immediately after the events from voice recordings, as well as his notes to review the data. The researcher then triangulated the data to analyze the phenomenon of long-term English learner status with the purpose of identifying the instructional experiences and schooling factors that blocked or hindered reclassification for long-term English learners and to give practical guidelines to improve long-term English learner reclassification (See Table 8).

Table 8

Triangulation of Data

Research Question	Methodology	Instrument
What instructional experiences and schooling factors contribute to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles?	Survey	Demographic Questionnaire
	Interviews	One-on-One Interviews
	Focus Group	Focus Group
	Classroom Observations	English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012)
	Document Analysis	Academic Transcript Analysis

Academic Transcript Analysis

The researcher used quantitative data included GPA, CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, retention, teacher comments and years in school from the six participants were to examine the K through 11 educational history of each participant to assist me in answering the research question. The quantitative data collected provided a controlled description of the courses, test data, and schooling experiences the participants had lived through their past and current schooling (Merriam, 2009) (See Appendix D). Analysis of quantitative data, such as GPA, CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, retention, teacher comments and years in school, from the six participants using the Cum Study protocol (See Appendix D) described the K through 12 educational history of the participant to assist in seeing the instructional experiences that the participant had had and which have contributed to the participant's long-term English learner status. The academic transcript analysis of the study was modeled after a study on high school course taking patterns for English learners by Finkelstein et al. (2009). Finkelstein et al. (2009) found that by looking at high school course-taking patterns of English learners, researchers could determine whether the student was complying with college entrance requirements and also if he was proficient in core areas of the curriculum. The analysis of these data also could assist the researcher in answering both research questions by showing the schooling experiences of the long-term English learner and assisting the student in articulating why they have been successful or have not.

Analyzing these data also assisted in answering the research question by showing the schooling experiences of the long-term English learners and assisting the student in articulating why they have or have not been academically successful. Specifically, the researcher analyzed the transcripts to see if there were patterns of success and patterns of the participant needing

academic assistance. I analyzed and coded data in the transcripts data over a five-day period and created open-ended questions based on the analysis of academic records used during the one-on-one interviews. During the interviews, the participants had an opportunity to articulate what was happening academically during particular semesters highlighted in their academic records. Participants also had the opportunity to review test data and articulate positive or negative results. In the interviews, they also had the opportunity to react to and reflect on their GPAs and number of completed credits.

Descriptive Content Analysis

Descriptive content analysis methodology was the primary tool for data analysis in this study. The FenRIAM (Foresight-enriched Research Infrastructure Impact Assessment Methodology) website (2012) described the goal of the descriptive content analysis methodology as to analyze and present the collected information. Descriptive content analysis was used to examine quantitative and qualitative data collected through methods such as document analysis, interviews, or surveys with the aim of summarizing the informational contents of these data with respect to the research question. The informational content was presented in a straight and descriptive summary structured according to the needs of the study. Elo and Kyngas (2007) stated that when using content analysis, the aim was to build a model to describe the phenomenon in a conceptual form. Elo and Kyngas (2007) also stated that inductive content analysis could be used in cases where there were no previous studies dealing with the phenomenon or when it was fragmented and that a deductive content analysis was useful if the general aim was to test previous theory in a different situation. Merriam (2009) stated that all qualitative data analysis was content analysis in that it was in the content of the interviews, field

notes, and documents that were analyzed. Merriam (2009) also stated that analysis was inductive: "Although categories and 'variable' initially guide the study, others are allowed and expected to emerge throughout the study" (Altheide, 2008, p. 68). Merriam (2009) concluded by stating that qualitative content analysis looked for insights in which "situations, settings, styles, images, meanings and nuances are key topics" (Altheide, 2008, p. 68).

Four steps of descriptive content analysis were described on the FenRIAM (2009) website:

- Define the research question(s);

- Review the collected data (excerpts from document analyses, interview transcripts and notes, survey and questionnaire evaluation reports, etc.) with respect to the research question(s);

- Identify the informational contents with respect to the research question(s); and

- Prepare a concise descriptive summary of the key informational content.

Limitations

With a sample of only six participants, the results of this research could not be generalized broadly. The conclusions drawn from this study were not meant to reflect what was happening in all schools in which long-term English learners were enrolled, but rather to share the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at one urban high school in Los Angeles.

Another limitation was that because the Instructional Coach knew the students and teachers personally, I was confident that they would be willing to participate in the dissertation

study. This made access easier for me, but the participants might have felt obligated to participate.

In regards to interviews and classroom observations, two more limitations are that the students may have given answers that they thought the researcher wanted to hear, and that the activities in the classroom may have been different because there was a visitor observing. Therefore, the behaviors I observed may not have been typical.

Summary

The qualitative methodology based on phenomenological research with triangulation of data from use of multiple methods of collection yielded rich and insightful results. Chapter Three included description of the multiple methods for obtaining and analyzing. Chapter Four includes the data and research findings derived from the descriptive content analysis methodology.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The insights derived from this study were based on data from a variety of sources. Data from the demographic questionnaire yielded descriptive information about the participants. The researcher analyzed data from the one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations, academic transcript analysis and focus group to find the school factors and instructional experiences that contribute to long-term English learner status of Latino students an urban high school in Los Angeles. The research included multiple methods of data collection for the purpose of triangulation, which helped offset potential threats to validity (Glesne, 1999). Taken together, analysis of these data addressed the study's central research question: What instructional experiences and schooling factors contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles?

The Context of the Study

In the context of this study, long-term English learners were children who have attended schools in the U.S. for more than six years and still required language support services. Although these students comprised a significant portion of the secondary English learner population in the Los Angeles County Schools and the U.S., until recently, minimal research on long-term English learners was available. In this phenomenological study, the researcher explored the characteristics and academic needs of six long-term English learners who attended a comprehensive urban high school in Los Angeles and analyzed the instructional experiences and

schooling factors that have been in place and are both assisting and failing this population of students academically.

English learners or English language learners have been defined as those students for whom there was a report of a primary language other than English on the state-approved Home Language Survey and who, on the basis of the state approved oral language (grades kindergarten through 12) assessment procedures and literacy (grades three through 12 only), have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs (California Department of Education, 2012). In this dissertation, both the term English learner and English language learner describe the population of students on which the study focused.

Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) defined long-term English learners as English learners who are enrolled in any grade six through 12, have been enrolled in schools in the U.S. for more than six years, have remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive years as determined by the CELDT, and have scores far below basic or below basic on the English language arts of the CST. Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) also defined English learners who are at risk of becoming long-term English learners as English learners who are enrolled in any of grades five through 11 in U.S. schools for four years, score at the intermediate level or below on the CELDT, and scored in the fourth year at the below basic or far below basic level on the English language arts section of the CST. As a result, these students also have accumulated major academic deficits along the way. They have developed certain characteristics

that if their educators do not intervene will deny them access to higher education and make them more than likely dropout of school (Olsen, 2010b).

Setting: Prosperity High School

At the time of the research, Prosperity High School was a large urban high school with enrollment of approximately 1700 students in grades nine through 12, located about 15 miles from downtown Los Angeles. Three ethnic groups comprise the student population: 77% Hispanic, 17% Asian, and 6% White. English Learners represented 32.4% of the school's population or 554 students. Out of those 554 English Learners, 400 are long-term English learners.

Participants

Study participants included six 11th-grade long-term English learners from Prosperity High School. The researcher utilized purposeful sampling to select the six 11th graders for the phenomenological study. The Instructional Coach nominated the pool of participants who met the criteria to participate in the study. Merriam (2009) stated that a researcher must first determine what selection criteria are essential in choosing, the people, or site to be studied. The criteria established for purposeful sampling directly reflected the purpose of the study and guided in the identification of information-rich cases (Merriam, 2009).

Data Derived from the Demographic Questionnaire

The participants completed a demographic questionnaire independently prior to their one-on-one interviews with me (See Appendix A). This instrument allowed me to gain initial familiarity with each participant. The demographic questionnaire documented participant-supplied information including gender, age, ethnic origin, socioeconomic status, frequency

English is used at home, other primary languages spoken, and country of birth, as well as information on academic preparation including years in school in the U.S., high school GPA, and ESL coursework taken and family history information, including education preparation of parents or guardians and number of siblings who attend and/or have graduated from college.

Based on the demographic questionnaire responses, all participants were speakers of both the English and Spanish languages (See Table 9). Five of the six participants were born in the U.S. Diana was born in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. Four of the six participants were of Mexican ancestry, while Roberto was Salvadorian, and Jesus has Honduran ancestry.

Students selected their socio-economic status based on their personal knowledge from the following four choices in the demographic questionnaire: low income, lower middle income, upper middle income, or upper income. Five of the six stated that they were in the lower-middle income level, while one claimed to be part of the upper middle-income level. The participants' current academic transcripts identified all six students as qualifying to receive free or reduced meals at Prosperity High School.

Participants' family background in education varied. All six participants have had all their schooling in the U.S. Four out of the six participants recall taking ESL classes. Jose and Miguel stated that they had siblings who graduated from high school and went on to attend college. Roberto stated that one of his siblings had completed college. Two participants, Miguel and Jesus, had parents or guardians who had high school diplomas. Their parents or guardians have also completed some college coursework. Leo stated that his mother was working on completing the requirements to get a high school diploma in adult school.

Table 9

Student Demographic Questionnaire Data

Aspect	Aspects of Demographics and Background by Student					
Student	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana
Gender	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Female
Age	16	16	16	16	16	17
Ancestry	Mexican	Mexican	Mexican	Salvadorian	Honduran	Mexican
Socio Economic	Lower Middle Income	Lower Middle Income	Lower Income	Lower Middle Income	Lower Middle Income	Upper Middle Income
Frequency of English spoken at home	Mostly Other	1/2 English, 1/2 Other	Mostly English	Mostly English	1/2 English 1/2 Other	1/2 English 1/2 Other
Other language spoken	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish	English and Spanish	English and Spanish
Country of birth\	U.S.	U.S.	U.S.	U.S.	U.S.	Mexico
Years of School U.S.	11	11	11	12	11	11
GPA Shared Actual GPA	3.50 1.04	3.00 1.67	2.00 0.85	Don't Know 1.36	2.16 0.76	2.50 1.50
ESL Coursework	Not Sure	No	Yes	Don't Know	Yes	Don't know
Grade ESL courses taken	Blank	None	9, 10, and 11	Blank	Don't Remember	Blank
Siblings attended college	No	No	No	Yes	2	No
Number of siblings who graduated from high school	None	No	None	2	2	0

Table 9 (continued)

Aspect	Aspects of Demographics and Background by Student					
Student	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana
Number of siblings who attend college	None	No	None	1	2	0
Number of siblings who completed college	None	No	None	1	0	0
Number of siblings older and younger and sibling ages	2siblings: 1 older, 1 younger	1 sibling in English-learner school	2 younger siblings	2 older sisters: one about to finish Everest College	2 older siblings	3 younger siblings: ages15, 3, and 1
Parent Educational Level	Both parents did not complete HS	Mom and Dad have HS diplomas. Dad has some college coursework but no degree.	Mom is getting HS diploma in adult school.	Both parents did not complete HS.	Mom has technical training/Certificate but did not graduate HS. Guardian has HS diploma, technical training/certificate, and some college coursework.	Both parents do not have HS diploma.

Note. HS=High School. Sources: Academic transcript analysis, demographic questionnaire, interviews, focus group.

Data Derived from Review of Transcripts and One-on-One Focused Interviews

After transcribing and reviewing material from the interviews, the researcher coded them

for themes. The data that emerged from the interviews yielded in-depth pictures of the students,

their environments, their self-images, and their aspirations.

In the participant profiles from school records, the interviews, and the analysis using

pseudonyms helped to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the students.

Jose

Jose was born in the U.S. to Mexican parents. At the time of his interview, he was 16 years old with two siblings, one older and one younger. A tall, husky, and very respectful young man, Jose had a quiet, shy demeanor so that the researcher needed to repeat the questions several times before he answered. He had a constant smile on his face while he was being interviewed. He stated his socioeconomic status as lower-middle class. He said that he mostly spoke Spanish at home. He had been enrolled in U.S. schools since pre-school. His school experience had been mostly in English with some primary language support as he was transitioning in the early elementary grades. He had been enrolled in SEI or SDAIE program placement. Jose perceived his GPA to be at 3.5, when in reality it was 1.04. He had completed 70 credits for graduation but should have earned between 105 and 160 credits to be on track to complete his credits for graduation. Jose had passed both the ELA and math sections of the CAHSEE. He said that he wanted to be a car mechanic after high school. Neither his older brother nor his parents had graduated from high school. His younger sibling was still in middle school at the time of the study (Jose, Interview One; Transcript Analysis).

Miguel

Miguel was born in the U.S. to Mexican parents. He was 16 years old at the time of data collection and had one younger sibling enrolled in elementary school. Miguel was a tall, slender young man who smiled throughout the interview. He asked the researcher to repeat the questions if he did not understand them the first time. He had a slight stutter, which might have contributed to his struggles with language acquisition. His stated socioeconomic status was lower-middle class. He also stated that he spoke English and Spanish equally at home. His

school experience had been mostly in English with some primary language support as he was transitioning in the early elementary grades. He had been enrolled in SEI or SDAIE program placement. Miguel perceived his GPA to be at 3.0, when in reality it was 1.67. He had completed 105 credits for graduation, which placed him on track to complete his credits for graduation. Miguel had passed both the ELA and math sections of the CAHSEE. He said that he wanted to attend college after high school and eventually become a police officer. Both of his parents graduated from high school, and his father earned some college credits but did not complete a degree (Miguel, Interview One; Transcript Analysis).

Leo

Leo was born in the U.S. to Mexican parents. He was sixteen years old at the time of the study and had two younger siblings. Leo had a constant smile throughout the interviews. He was short in stature with a slender frame. He also wore glasses. He refused to wear the glasses during the interview because he said he did not need them. I noticed he was squinting and pointed that out. Leo said that he loved sports and played on several teams at Prosperity High. His stated socioeconomic status was lower income class. He mostly spoke English at home. He had been enrolled in U.S. schools since pre-school. His school experience had been mostly in English with some primary language support as he was transitioning in the early elementary grades. He had been enrolled in SEI or SDAIE program placement. Leo perceived his GPA to be at 2.0, when in reality it was 0.85. He had completed 75 credits for graduation but should have earned between 105 and 160 credits to be on track to complete his credits for graduation. Leo had passed both the ELA and math sections of the CAHSEE. He said that he wanted to continue his studies after high school, with the aspiration of eventually becoming an English

teacher. Leo stated that his English teacher had really made an impact on him, and he wanted to do the same for other students. He also stated that although his mother had not graduated from high school, she was enrolled in adult school to earn a high school diploma (Leo, Interview One; Transcript Analysis).

Roberto

Roberto was born in the U.S. to Salvadorian parents. He was 16 years old at the time of the study and had two older female siblings. Roberto was of medium stature with a slender frame. Initially, he was very quiet, but after a while, he would not stop sharing personal details. He acknowledged that his lack of academic success might have been because of the family issues at home. During both interviews, Roberto made it a point to say that he was going to stop being absent and come to school regularly so that his grades would improve. His socioeconomic status was lower middle income. He mostly spoke English at home. He had been enrolled in U.S. schools since pre-school. His school experience had been mostly in English with some primary language support as he was transitioning in the early elementary grades. He was enrolled in SEI or SDAIE program placement. Roberto could not recall what his GPA might have been, but according to his school transcript it was 1.36. He had completed 70 credits for graduation but should have earned between 105 and 160 credits to have been on track to complete his credits for graduation. Roberto had passed both the ELA and math sections of the CAHSEE. Roberto said he wanted to attend fire fighter academy after high school. Both of his parents and one of his sisters did not complete high school. Roberto's other sister was about to finish her degree at Everest College (Roberto, Interview One; Transcript Analysis).

Jesus

Jesus was born in the U.S. to Honduran parents. He was sixteen years old at the time of the interview with two older siblings. Jesus was a tall young man with a medium frame who seemed to have a hard time smiling. He seemed to be sad throughout the interviews. He did not share very much about his past when asked about his previous schooling. It was difficult to establish rapport with Jesus during the interview. The researcher had to ask the same question several ways, and Jesus also did not seem to want to talk about his extensive record on behavior issues. His stated socioeconomic status was lower-middle income. Jesus stated that he spoke both Spanish and English equally at home. He had been enrolled in U.S. schools since pre-school. His school experience had been mostly in English with some primary language support as he was transitioning in the early elementary grades. He had been enrolled in SEI or SDAIE program placement. Jesus perceived his GPA to be at 2.16, when in reality it was 0.76. He had completed 60 credits for graduation but should have earned between 105 and 160 credits to be on track to complete his credits for graduation. Jesus had passed the math section of the CAHSEE. He was still working on passing the ELA portion. He said that he wanted to enlist in the Marines after high school. Both of his older siblings had graduated from high school. Jesus stated that his mom had a technical training certificate but had not graduated from high school. He also stated that his guardian had graduated from high school and had a technical training certificate and some college course work.

Jesus had been transferred from Prosperity High School to a continuation school at the end of the first semester because of his low academic progress and because he had been in two fights. Jesus stated that he felt much better academically at the continuation school because he

113

was making up his credits at a faster rate than he would have been at Prosperity. He said that he felt that if he went to summer school and took a couple of Regional Occupational Program (ROP) classes, he might have a chance to get his high school diploma in June next year. He also said that he did miss his friends but that he knew that he was safer at the continuation school since the group of boys with whom he had gotten into a fight stayed at Prosperity High School (Jesus, Interview One; Transcript Analysis).

Diana

Diana, the only female participant in the study, was born in Mexico and brought to the U.S. as a baby. She did not remember at exactly what age. She was 17 years old at the time of the interview and had three younger siblings. Diana was short in stature with a petite frame. It was evident that she loved to talk and share personal details about her life. The researcher did not find it difficult to convince Diana to share personal information or to answer the interview questions. Her stated socioeconomic status was upper-middle income. Diana stated that she spoke both English and Spanish equally at home. She had been enrolled in U.S. schools since pre-school. Her school experience had been mostly in English with some primary language support as she was transitioning in the early elementary grades. She had been enrolled in SEI or SDAIE program placement. Diana perceived her GPA to be at 2.5, when in reality it was 1.5. She had completed 115 credits for graduation, which meant she was on track to complete graduation based on credits, but because she had not passed either the ELA or math section of the CAHSEE, she might not receive her high school diploma until she had met that requirement. Diana said that she wanted to attend college after high school and eventually wanted to become a

chef or a lawyer. She also stated that neither of her parents had graduated from high school (Diana, Interview One; Transcript Analysis).

Instructional Experiences and Schooling Factors that Emerged From the Data

Examining the context created by the academic and transcript data further, the researcher also analyzed data yielded by the observations and focus groups. Through descriptive content analysis, several instructional experiences and schooling factors emerged after analyzing data from academic transcripts, the one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), and focus group:

- Instructional Experience One: Observed lessons were not engaging students in social interaction or learner-centered activities.

- Instructional Experience Two: Explicit instruction was not taking place to assist long-term English learners in gaining proficiency in the English language.

- Schooling Factor One: All six participants were enrolled in SEI programs throughout their schooling history.

- Schooling Factor Two: Participants did not receive adequate information about the reclassification process.

- Schooling Factor Three: Participants had low academic literacy skills and did not know how to navigate high school to succeed academically.

Instructional Experience One: Lessons and Social Interaction

The data in this study showed that observed lessons were not engaging students in social interaction or learner-centered activities. The lessons were teacher centered. This conclusion represented the instructional experience that emerged after analyzing data from the one-on-one

focused interviews, classroom observations using English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), academic transcript analysis and the focus group.

The English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012) asked for an activity description of what the student was doing in five-minute intervals. Two-hour observation periods for each student yielded 24 data activity descriptors per student. The activity descriptors identified what the students were doing at five-minute intervals:

- Academic Speaking,

- Academic Listening one-way or two-way, and

- Student not listening.

Academic speaking was when the student or the adult was communicating using academic language. *Academic listening* was when the student was listening to the teacher, other students, a small group, or the whole class. The *not listening* category included times when the student was reading, writing silently, or off task. Each activity descriptor had sub-categories that specified how the activity was taking place and by whom (See Tables 10 through 12).

Teacher activity. On average, teachers did most of the academic speaking in the classroom (See Table 10). The researcher observed the total of students' specific activities by category, by student, and computed averages by category for all six participants. In the category Academic Speaking, all six participants' highest percentage of time was in the teacher speaking to the student, to a small group of students, or to the whole class: an average of about 48%, ranging from 27% to 54%. For all six participants, minimal time was spent using academic language to address another student, to the teacher, small group, or to the whole class: less than

7%. Out of all six participants, Jose had the highest percentage of time (19%) using academic

language. Leo never used academic language during the observation period.

Table 10

Classroom Observations by Researcher of Percentage of Time Spent in Academic Speaking

Academic Speaking	Percentage of Time by Student							
	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana	Average	Median
By Student								
Student to Student	3	4	0	4	3	0	2.33	
Student to Teacher	3	0	0	0	0	4	1.16	
Student to Small Group	3	0	0	7	0	0	1.66	
Student to Whole Class	10	0	0	0	0	0	1.66	
Total Student Academic Speaking	**19**	**4**	**0**	**11**	**3**	**4**	**6.83**	**4.0**
By Teacher								
Teacher to Student	0	4	0	0	0	0	0.66	
Teacher to Small Group	17	0	0	15	16	8	9.33	
Teacher to Whole Class	10	33	33	11	34	46	27.66	
Total Teacher Academic Speaking	**27**	**37**	**33**	**26**	**50**	**54**	**37.83**	**35.0**
Total Academic Speaking	**46**	**41**	**33**	**37**	**53**	**58**	**44.66**	**43.5**

Note. Derived from researcher's observations and analysis of classroom activities. Observation protocol adapted from "English Learner Shadow Study Protocol," *ELL Shadowing as a Catalyst for Change* (p. 119), by I. Soto, 2012, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. Copyright 2012 by Corwin. Used with permission.

Student academic listening. On average, students did most academic listening when the

teacher was talking (See Table 11). In the category of Academic Listening one-way or two-way,

Jose, Roberto, and Jesus listened mostly to their teacher. Leo listened to the teacher and to another student only 4% of the time, while Diana did no academic listening.

Table 11

Classroom Observation by Researcher of Percentage of Time Spent in Academic Listening

Academic Listening: One- or Two-Way	Percentage of Time by Student							
	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana	Average	Median
Student listening mostly to Student	0	8	4	0	0	0	2.00	
Student listening mostly to Teacher	27	0	4	15	16	0	10.33	
Student listening mostly to Small Group	3	0	0	4	9	0	2.66	
Student listening mostly to Whole Class	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	
Total Academic Listening	**30**	**8**	**8**	**19**	**25**	**0**	**15.00**	**13.5**

Note. Derived from researcher's observations and analysis of classroom activities. Observation protocol adapted from "English Learner Shadow Study Protocol," *ELL Shadowing as a Catalyst for Change* (p. 119), by I. Soto, 2012, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. Copyright 2012 by Corwin. Used with permission.

Instructional Experience Two: Instruction for Proficiency in English

During the classroom observation periods, explicit instruction did not take place to assist long-term English learners in gaining proficiency in the English language. Students struggled with participation in class and spent much of the time in silent activities.

Class participation. Students struggled with participation in class. Questions the teacher presented to the students were a combination of high and low quality. Some questions were delivered in a rapid succession. Therefore, some students struggled with developing responses since they did not have enough time to think. The teacher did make some attempt to use differentiated strategies to engage all students. However, only some students participated in the discussion.

Silent activities. On average, during 40% of observed class time students were reading or writing silently (See Table 12). Five of the six participants had a higher percentage of time in reading or writing silently than in being off task. On average, these five students spent about 33% of their silent time reading or writing and only about 10% off task. However, Jesus was off task 22% of the time with no time spent reading or writing silently. In all classes during observations for this study, the majority of time the teacher was instructing the whole class in English or walking around monitoring student interaction about the work. The students were seated in pairs or groups, but they did not interact with one another. The teachers did not give the students directions about their roles in their groups.

Table 12

Classroom Observation by Researcher of Percentage of Time Students Were Not Listening

Student Activities when Not Listening	Percentage of Time by Student							
	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana	Average	Median
Reading or writing silently	20	29	42	33	0	42	27.66	
Student is off task	3	21	17	11	22	0	12.33	
Total Student time not listening	**23**	**50**	**59**	**44**	**22**	**42**	**40.00**	**43**

Note. Derived from researcher's observations and analysis of classroom activities. Observation protocol adapted from "English Learner Shadow Study Protocol," *ELL Shadowing as a Catalyst for Change* (p. 119), by I. Soto, 2012, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. Copyright 2012 by Corwin. Used with permission.

Instructions for classroom activities. During observations, explicit visual instructions for classroom activities were missing. The teacher wrote assignments on the board in English. At the beginning of the class, the teachers generally gave a quick reminder of what was due and then left the students on their own to finish their assignments or work in groups. Checking for understanding did take place, either individually or with the whole class, but the teachers did not give explicit instructions regarding what should be discussed in the group or structured

purposeful opportunities to practice academic language. The students continuously asked the teacher to clarify the instructions for the assignment.

Instructional groups. During classroom observations for this study, purposeful and productive instructional groups were not evident. Instructional group structures did not seem to support student learning towards the instructional outcomes of the lesson. Some of the students seemed cognitively engaged and were working purposefully and productively, but others were not. When the teachers asked the students to move into groups, the students did so very slowly, as if this was a new activity and not something that commonly took place. Once in groups, students did not seem to know what their role was in their group. The teacher repeated the instructions for the assignment more than three times to get the students started in the activity.

Social interactions. During classroom observations for this study, social interactions between students were more prevalent than academic talk. Talk from the students was mostly regarding what was going on outside the classroom. A couple of the participants talked about the assignment when the teacher stopped by or was close to their desk monitoring their progress, but when the teacher walked away, the talk turned to once again social topics. The students used either Spanish or non-Academic English during these social conversations.

Schooling Factor One: Enrollment in SEI Programs

Based on the participants' responses from the academic transcripts, one-on-one focus interviews, and the focus group, the majority of the participants' previous and current school experiences had been in English versus their native language Spanish (See Table 13). All six participants were placed in programs, SEI or SDAIE, where English instruction was a priority versus native language instruction. According to their transcripts, the students were never

enrolled in Bilingual Programs in which their native language foundation would have been developed and those learned skills would have transferred into their acquisition of the English language.

Table 13

Kindergarten through Sixth Grade Schooling History

Student	English-learner Program Type	Language Support
Jose	SEI and SDAIE	English Only
Miguel	SEI and SDAIE	English Only
Leo	SEI and SDAIE	English Only
Roberto	SEI and SDAIE	English Only
Jesus	SEI and SDAIE	English Only
Diana	SEI and SDAIE	English Only

Note. Source: Analysis of transcript data by researcher.

English literacy versus native language. During the interviews, participants thought back to their previous school experiences and shared whether they had learned reading and writing more in English or Spanish. All six participants stated that their previous schooling had emphasized English literacy versus their native language, in this case, Spanish. Jose noted that he had not had any Spanish classes. He had only learned Spanish at home when his mother taught him when he was small. There had been no Spanish instruction in school (Jose, Interview One). Leo felt that he learned more in English than in Spanish (Interview One). However, Diana said that she had taken no Spanish classes in elementary or middle school, but had taken Spanish in her freshman year in high school (Interview One).

Percentage of instruction in Spanish. I also asked the participants to think back to elementary and middle school and to try and remember what percentage of time content instruction was in Spanish. Only one of the six participants stated that she took Spanish her

121

freshman year and half the instruction was in her native language (Diana, Interview One). Jose (Interview One), Leo (Interview One), and Roberto (Interview One) all reported that they remembered no instruction in Spanish. Miguel thought that he may have had 0-10% instruction in Spanish (Interview One).

Oral language preference. In addition, participants responded to a question about their language preference. Two of the six participants stated that they had no preference, using both Spanish and English. The other four participants stated that the majority of the time they used English as their primary and preferred means of communication. Roberto and Leo use little Spanish oral language. Roberto reported that he thought he only used Spanish 10% of the time (Interview One), while Leo said he probably spoke Spanish only 20% of the time and English the rest of the time (Interview One). The other participants reported speaking Spanish with their parents. Jose said that he spoke Spanish 30% of the time, and that was to his mother who only spoke Spanish. He said that his father spoke English, and he was comfortable with both languages (Interview One). Like Jose, Miguel reported speaking Spanish to his mother who spoke some English, and additionally to his grandmother. But he also reported speaking English to his father. In total, he felt he spoke Spanish about half of the time (Interview One). Both Jesus and Diana reported speaking Spanish to their mothers. Jesus said he spoke Spanish 45% of the time, usually to his mother (Interview One). Diana, on the other hand, reported speaking a little English to her mother. Her father did not speak English. In total, she felt that she spoke both Spanish and English evenly (Diana, Interview One).

Spanish use in nonacademic setting. The researcher then asked the participants to estimate the percentage of time they used their primary and second languages, respectively.

Based on their responses, they used Spanish mostly to communicate with parents or grandparents at home. Only one of the six participants stated that they spoke Spanish with their friends, the other five spoke only English with them. But with friends who speak Spanish, four out of the six will communicate or try to communicate in Spanish. Roberto and Diana expanded on their estimates:

> I try to speak to them in Spanish but I do not practice my Spanish at home since I hardly speak to them in Spanish and I got use to their Spanish. I always speak to them in English. (Roberto, Interview One)

> I will tell them to speak in English because we're in school, but in the outside we can speak in Spanish. (Diana, Interview One)

All six participants were enrolled in SEI programs, in lieu of bilingual programs, for all of their schooling. This showed that these six long-term English learners were orally proficient in both English and Spanish but felt more comfortable reading and writing in English. Even so, these six participants did not have strong academic literacy skills either in English or their native language. In fact, their transcripts and the students themselves indicated that that English literacy is their primary deficiency in school. These findings offered further support for bilingual education theory, which have argued that first language literacy skills were a key predictor of successful second language acquisition (Baker, 2006; Krashen & McField, 2005; Menken & Kleyn, 2010).

Schooling Factor Two: Information about the Reclassification Process

The data showed that participants did not receive adequate information about the reclassification process. One of the many challenges that Prosperity High School was

encountering was the reclassification of long-term English learners. Reclassification was the process used to determine that an English learner had acquired sufficient English language fluency to perform successfully in core academic subjects. The following questions pertained to the participants' knowledge of the reclassification process and criteria. To know if a student could possibly be reclassified, parents should have known why their children were enrolled in ESL classes, why they took the CELDT annually, what the criteria for reclassification were, and if their child had passed them since the eighth grade.

Enrollment in ESL classes. Participants did not know why they were enrolled in ESL classes. During the one-on-one interviews, the researcher asked the students if they knew why they were enrolled in ESL classes. The majority of the participants did not know why they took those particular courses. Leo made a connection between ESL and Spanish speakers.

> Yes, 'cause *(sic)* they're mostly Spanish speaking people and they do not pass their English class and have to take that test every year to see how their academics are doing every year. (Interview One)

CELDT Test. Participants did not know why they took the CELDT test yearly. When asked if they knew why they took the CELDT every year, their responses varied. Diana did not like the test and thought she had to take it because she spoke two languages (Interview One), while Jesus said he did not know why he had to take it (Interview One). Jose and Roberto both understood that it was a measure of their English proficiency (Jose, Interview One; Roberto, Interview One). Miguel and Leo both understood that the purpose of the test was because they did not speak English well, and Miguel understood that it had to do with placement in the ALD class (Miguel, Interview One; Leo, Interview One).

Although the response from Leo was somewhat correct, none of the respondents mentioned that the purpose of the test was to reclassify them as fluent in the English language. When asked if they knew the criteria to reclassify, they all either responded "no" or "I do not know." Leo said that his mom had talked with his counselor about the reclassification process, but he did not know the criteria himself (Interview One). They also explained what they would do now that they were aware of the reclassification criteria. Diana said that she wanted to take responsibility for her education and for meeting the reclassification criteria. She stated an interest in putting forth the extra effort required to reclassify and graduate from high school (Diana, Focus Group). Miguel also said, "Now that I know, I'm going to put more work into it, try my hardest" (Focus Group), and Roberto said he would focus more this semester (Focus Group).

Record since eighth grade. Analysis of the school transcripts showed that students had not met all aspects of the reclassification criteria in the same semester since the eighth grade (See Table 14). Although some of them met some of the criteria some of the time, they must meet all three criteria during the same academic semester, CELDT, CST, and Fall or Spring GPA, during the same academic to reclassify as English proficient. In regards to GPA, students had two opportunities, Fall and Spring semester, to meet that criteria. If any of the criteria were not met, the student remained an English learner.

Table 14

Students' Reclassification to Fluent English Proficient Criteria Progress,
Grades Eight through Eleven

Grade and Criteria			Student			
	Jose	**Miguel**	**Leo**	**Roberto**	**Jesus**	**Diana**
Grade 8						
CELDT	N	N	**Y**	N	**Y**	N
CST	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Fall	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Spring	N	N	N	N	**Y**	N
Grade 9						
CELDT	N	N	**Y**	N	N	N
CST	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Fall	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Spring	N	N	N	N	N	N
Grade 10						
CELDT	N	N	**Y**	N	**Y**	N
CST	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Fall	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Spring	N	N	N	N	N	N
Grade 11						
CELDT	N	**Y**	**Y**	**Y**	**Y**	N
CST	N	N	N	N	N	N
GPA Fall	N	N	N	N	N	N

Note. Y= Did meet criteria to be reclassified. N=Did not meet criteria to be reclassified. Students must meet all criteria in the same semester to be reclassified. Source: Student transcript analysis.

Leo had met the CELDT portion of the reclassification criteria since the eighth grade, but had not the other criteria. Roberto met the CELDT portion during junior year, and Jesus also met the CELDT portion during eighth, 10th and 11th grades. Jesus met the CELDT criteria and also had a 2.75 GPA in core classes during eighth grade, but did not meet the CST portion of the criteria and so did not reclassify. Those were the only portions of the criteria that had been met by the six participants. The students had not me\et all other portions, therefore they had not been able to reclassify.

The data showed that all six participants lacked information about the reclassification process used to determine whether an English learner has acquired sufficient English language fluency to perform successfully in core academic subjects. Kim (2011) found that after accounting for academic achievement, behavioral issues, background, and district contexts, the longer a student was designated as being a limited-English-proficient student, the higher the incidence of the student dropping out of high school. These findings came from his study of the relationship between English-learner status and school persistence. Consequently, it was imperative for the participants to know and understand their reclassification status and to do everything possible to meet the criteria to reclassify so that they stayed in school and did not drop out.

Schooling Factor Three: Academic Literacy and Knowing How to Succeed Academically

Data from the academic transcript analysis and one-on-one interviews showed how long-term English learners articulated the academic experiences that led to or hindered them in becoming academically successful or being reclassified as English proficient. Data showed that the participants had low academic literacy skills and did not know how to navigate high school to succeed academically. The following paragraphs include data on hindrances to academic success, followed by a discussion of experiences that supported reclassification.

The transcript data analysis in this study was similar to a study on high school course-taking patterns for English learners by Finkelstein et al. (2009). Finkelstein and his colleagues found in their 2009 study that by looking at high school course-taking patterns of English learners, it was possible to determine if they were complying with college entrance requirements, and also, if they were proficient in core areas of the curriculum. In this phenomenological study,

127

the researcher also determined whether their school experiences led to greater academic success or contributed to long-term English learner status.

Students had not received support to succeed in high school. The characteristics and factors for long-term English learner academic success and failure included the students' actual GPAs, their perceived GPAs, credits completed towards graduation, and CASHEE results for English language arts and math (See Table 15). To be a considered part of the junior class at Prosperity High School, a student must have earned between 105 and 160 credits toward the 220 credits needed to graduate. Only Miguel and Diana met that requirement at 105 and 115 credits, which meant that they were the only two participants on track to graduate. The other four participants, with fewer than 105 credits, were considered third year sophomores. These students were struggling to pass the core curriculum classes (See Table 15).

To graduate, students would need to make up the classes they had failed through after-school credit recovery classes or the ROP. They also needed to pass both the ELA and math sections of the CAHSEE. Jose, Miguel, Leo, and Roberto had passed both sections of the CAHSEE. Miguel was on track to graduate with enough credits and passing scores on both sections of the CAHSEE. Although she had 115 credits—enough for junior class standing—Diana still needed to pass both parts of the CAHSEE to be on track to graduate.

Table 15

Students' High School Performance Factors

	Actual GPA	Student Perceived GPA[a]	CREDITS 105 - 160	CAHSEE ELA	CAHSEE MATH	On Track to Graduate
Jose	1.04	3.50	70	Passed	Passed	No
Miguel	1.67	3.00	105	Passed	Passed	Yes
Leo	0.85	2.00	75	Passed	Passed	No
Roberto	1.36	"I don't know my GPA."	70	Passed	Passed	No
Jesus	0.76	2.16	60	Not Passed	Passed	No
Diana	1.50	2.50	115	Not Passed	Not Passed	No

Note. [a] Student perceived GPA was collected by researcher during one-on-one interviews with students. Actual GPA and data about credits, test scores, and progress toward graduation were gathered from researcher's analysis of academic transcripts.

Students were failing most core classes. Transcript data analysis in this study was modeled after Finkelstein's (2009) study on high school course-taking patterns for English learners. Finkelstein et al. (2009) found that by looking at high school course-taking patterns of English learners, researchers could determine whether the student was complying with college entrance requirements and also if he was proficient in core areas of the curriculum. The researcher also determined whether these school experiences had either led to greater academic success or contributed to long-term English learner status.

The six participants in the case study had varying course-taking patterns from the spring semester in the 8th grade to the fall semester of their junior year in high school (See Table 16). Although the classes participants took all met the college requirements, for the most part the they were struggling to complete core curriculum classes with passing grades. As mentioned previously, to be a considered part of the junior class at Prosperity High School, the student must have earned between 105 and 160 credits. Only Miguel and Diana had met that particular

requirement at 105 and 115 credits respectively. With less than 105 credits, the other four

participants were considered third year sophomores.

Table 16

Students' A through G Course-Taking Patterns:
Course Grades by School Grades Eight through Eleven

Course	Students' Courses Taken and Course Grades					
	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana
English						
Grade 8						
English Language Arts	C	A+	B	C-	F	F
Reading 8		C+	D	NM		CR
Grade 9						
English 1	D+, F	C-, B-	C, F	F, F	F, F	C, F
Reading	A-, B					B-, B
Reading Laboratory	A-, B					B-, B
Grade 10						
English 2	D, F	C-, C	D-, C-	B-, F	D-, F	D, C-
Grade 11						
English 3	D+	C	D-	B+	B	F
Mathematics						
Grade 8						
Algebra Readiness	F	F		C-	A-	D-
Algebra 8			F			
Math Skills				NM		NM
Grade 9						
Algebra 1	F, F	F, F	D+, F	F, F	F, F	F, F
Math Skills	D-, F					
Math Laboratory	D, F	D-, F	D+, F			
Grade 10						
Algebra 1	F, F	D, C	F, F	F, F	F, F	F, F
CAHSEE Math	F, F	F, D		C-, B	C+, F	F, D-
Grade 11						
Int. Math.	F		F	F		D
Geometry		F			F	

Table 16 (continued)

Course	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana
Social Science						
Grade 8						
History 8	B-	C	F	F	F	D
Grade 9						
Grade 10						
World History	C, D	D+, F	F, F	C, F	F, F	C, D
Grade 11						
U.S. History	D-	D+	C	C+	B-	F
Science						
Grade 8						
Science 8	C-	F	F+	D-	A-	B
Grade 9						
Biology 1				C, D		
Grade 10						
Biology 1	D-, D-		F, C-			D, D
Earth Science					F, F	
Grade 11						
Earth Science	D			C		F
Chemistry	D				C	
Foreign Language						
Grade 9						
Spanish						F, D+
Grade 11						
Chinese						F
Spanish 1		D+				
Arts						
Grade 8						
Art					A	
Grade 9						
Art	B				C-, D-	
Grade 10						
Cultural Arts			D-, D-			
Grade 11						
Graphic Arts	B-			A+	F	

Table 16 (continued)

Course	Students' Courses Taken and Course Grades					
	Jose	Miguel	Leo	Roberto	Jesus	Diana
Electives						
Grade 9						
FCS Technology				F	F, F	D+
Business Technology		D-		F		D
ALD 1		B, B	B-, D-		F, F	
PAWS			NM			
CERA				B-, C-		
Grade 10						
ALD2	C, F	C-, A	D, D	C+, F	C+, F	C-, C+
ATH				A		
Grade 11						
ALD 3	D+	F	B+	A+	B-	D
Woodworking	C	C		A		
CASHEE Preparation						A-
Media ROP			C-			
Physical Education						
Grade 8						
Physical Education	B	F	F-	C-	D	F
Grade 9						
Physical Education 9	B-, D-	B-, C+	D, F	D, B	C, F	B-, C+
Health		D	D+. D+			
Grade 10						
Weight Training	F, F		C+, C-	B, N	C, C-	
Body Conditioning						B+, A-
Team Sports		A, B+				
Grade 11						
Weight Training			A-			
Health				B-		
Team Sports					A	
Study Hall						
Grade 9	NM	NM				
GPA	1.04	1.67	0.85	1.36		1.50
Credits Completed	70	105	75	70		115

Note. Course grades are listed in sequence by semester. For example, B, C means the student received a B the fall semester and a C the spring semester. NM=No mark (Grade) was given. Source: Researcher analysis of student academic records.

Middle school success related to high school success. Success in middle school did not translate into success in high school. During the one-on-one interviews, participants talked about academic experiences that had helped or hindered their academic success. Based on the

participants' academic transcripts, they were more successful academically during middle school than in high school. To what did they attribute this success in middle school? Jose (Interview Two) and Jesus (Interview Two) both thought the classes were easier in middle school. Jesus also remembered that he had only one teacher, but also admitted that he did not remember the middle school classes well. Miguel said that he had been trying really hard to pass and his English teacher gave him special work. However, in math he remembered that he did not do well and attributed it to his own laziness (Interview Two). Diana gave a very candid response to what happened in her middle school experience and what she felt teachers should do so that students improve academically. She said:

> I didn't like Middle School. I would get bullied a lot and . . . the teacher would not help you with the work. The teachers would waste their time on other students versus you. Let's say a student was talking a lot, she would waste more time on that than on students who want to learn. She would spend more time on discipline than instruction. I passed science versus English because I understood it much better. (Diana, Interview Two)

Failed classes. Participants failed both their favorite and least favorite classes. During the interviews, the students frequently mentioned that they passed or were doing well in their favorite classes. All of the students were quite candid when asked to share characteristics of their favorite classes and why they were favorites:

> My favorite class is English 'cause [*sic*] I understand what they are teaching me. I like presenting things in class. I also like that we got to work in groups because we can help each other. I like collaboration. I also like to work independently when I know the material. (Jose, Focus Group)

133

My favorite class is math seventh grade because I really got along with my teacher. I

also got along with the teacher because he always made me laugh, and always joked with

us but I really liked how he taught us. We would work in pairs or by ourselves. The

people in your rows would also help you out. (Miguel, Focus Group)

I like that in ELA [because] we can work in pairs. She comes to us and checks on us. I

like that in some classes we collaborate. (Roberto, Focus Group)

My favorite class is PE because it was easy. I like the exercise and that they told me to

never give up. Ninth-grade English is also my favorite class because of the projects she

would give us. I sat in front of the class and the teacher assistant or the teacher would

help me. We also worked in groups and I liked that. (Diana, Focus Group)

The students identified working in groups, having a variety of instruction techniques, and liking

their teachers and getting help from them as the characteristics of their favorite classes.

Participants also candidly described the characteristics of their least favorite class and

reasons why they did not like the class:

Math is my least favorite class because I get some of it but I don't understand other parts.

In math you did not work in groups and you only worked out of a notebook. Like if its

things I don't, I ask the teacher and he helps me but sometimes when I do it again I really

don't get it. I need more practice to get the math problem. In my current math class, the

teacher gives enough practice. (Jose, Focus Group)

My least favorite class is Geometry this year. I understand most of the things but the

teacher teaches different. He's strict but I don't get how he teaches. Teacher also lets us

work independently but sometimes we work in pairs. I like working with my partner

because it helps me understand that problems even more. My relationship with this current teacher is not as positive as with seventh grade math teacher. (Miguel, Focus Group)

Math is my least favorite class because some math teachers do not teach because they focus on other things that is not math. (Leo, Focus Group)

Tenth grade math was my least favorite because I didn't like the teacher and the students that were in the class. The problems were too hard. Sometimes the teacher would give us work but would not help up. The teacher would get frustrated when we would ask questions. I also did not like it because we could only work by ourselves and not in pairs or in a group. He was very strict. (Diana, Focus Group)

Four of the students cited mathematics classes as their least favorites. Generally, they felt frustrated when they did not understand the work felt that the teacher could not help them. Some noted the lack of opportunity to work with others in their mathematics classes.

Knowledge of passing or failing. Participants knew why they were passing and failing their classes. Students explained what they felt contributed to their success or lack of success in their current and previous high school courses and what they felt they could do to improve in the upcoming semester:

I don't like math. I don't know what adults can do to help me get a better grade in math. I can put more work into it and listen more. I can ask for help afterschool, like tutoring. (Miguel, Interview Three)

I'm going to work on getting my math and English up. In 10th grade, I did well because the teacher taught us how to analyze things. In Bio, I didn't learn a lot. I didn't pay

135

attention to what she was teaching us. I need to turn in my plaque to get an A in wood. I need to focus more in school and pay attention to what the teacher is teaching. I need to stop falling asleep in class. I am doing my homework. I just don't understand math. (Leo, Interview Two)

Miguel and Leo seemed to realize that their own actions were in part responsible for their failures, and they outlined how they could improve. Roberto also recognized that he was in part responsible for his failures, but did not seem to really know what he could do to change. He said,

I like the way the teacher teaches. The way he made it clear for me and I paid attention. I also did not have that many friends in there. I didn't talk to anyone so I paid attention a lot. It was enrolled in CASHEE math so it wasn't a lot of algebra. Sometimes in my English classes, in 9th and 10th grade, I was messing around a lot. In math I never tried. In my freshman year, I had a lot of friends in the class and I messed around a lot. I made the teacher not like me. In 10th grade, I tried but then the teacher didn't really teach. He focused on football since he is the coach. I have that same teacher again, so I'm not really trying. I don't know how my grade is going to be but I stopped coming because of personal problems. I try to ignore the problems to focus on school. (Roberto, Interview Three)

CAHSEE success. One area where the majority of the participants have had success was in passing the CAHSEE. Five out of the six have passed the math section and four of the six have also passed the ELA section. Jose, Leo, and Roberto seemed to really appreciate the

preparation classes because they seemed to give them confidence and strategies to succeed. They said,

> I like that they showed me what I needed to pass the test. I took CAHSEE prep in math.
> They would give me worksheets of what was going to be on the test and that was enough.
> (Jose, Interview One)

> For math, I don't remember what I did to pass that section. For English, I had CAHSEE
> prep and the teacher told us what to do. So what I basically did was I read the question
> and I went back to the story to get the answer. For the essay, I did it on someone who
> meant a lot to me, my dad. I just wrote how he had an impact on me. (Leo, Interview
> One)

> I don't know, I just knew some stuff and I passed it. I like English more. (Roberto,
> Interview One)

On the other hand, Jesus recognized that when he paid attention to the test, he had the skills to pass. He said, "I passed the Math. The first time I just guessed because I was bored. The second time I paid more attention. I did not go to tutoring" (Jesus, Interview One).

> Diana had not passed either section of the CAHSEE. She described her plan to pass both sections next time she took the exam:

> I know what the CASHEE is for, the California High School Exit Exam. If you don't
> pass it you don't get to graduate. You don't get your diploma. You will not walk to get
> your diploma. I'm still trying to pass the test. I didn't pass it. The next test is in March
> so I'm going to see if I can pass it. To pass it, I'm paying more attention and I'm taking
> my time in English. I'm focusing more in English than last time. I already know that I'm

10 points to passing the English so I'm focusing on that. No one is helping me on

campus. There is no tutoring. You just stay after school and do your work. They do not

help you. (Diana, Interview One)

Need for assistance. Only two of the participants articulated something that adults could

do to help them pass their classes and be more academically successful. However, for the most

part the participants did not have suggestions of what adults could do to help them. Jose and

Diana pointed out specifics they felt would help them to be successful. Jose thought that it

would help him if class assignments would count toward their final grades more related to tests

(Jose, Interview Three). Diana had several suggestions including more tutoring and less

sustained silent reading:

> Have tutoring after school. Give us more time in class, instead of SSR. Instead of SSR,
>
> we should do more classwork. SSR is reading. We have 15 minutes of reading and
>
> instead of reading we can do classwork. I don't like SSR because we don't even read. I
>
> just look at the magazine and daydream. (Diana, Interview Three)

Reading their academic record. Participants needed assistance in reading their

academic records. Participants looked at their school transcript and credits for graduation and

attempted to explain a little about what they saw. The students seemed to have a good idea of

what they needed to graduate, but not of realistic strategies they might use to move toward

graduation.

> I'm not sure how many credits I need to graduate. I can raise them by getting ROP
>
> [Regional Occupational Program] classes. I can also stop failing my classes so that I can
>
> raise my credits. (Jose, Interview One)

138

I know how many credits you need to graduate. I need to pass all my classes. I need to pass my final or go to summer school. (Miguel, Interview One)

I need 220 credits to graduate. I can get more credits by joining sports and signing up to ROP. I don't know who to go to if I need help, well I can go to my teachers and my counselors. (Leo, Interview One)

I need a 2.0. I don't know how many credits I need to graduate. Right now I'm thinking about coming to school a little more and doing all of my work. Tomorrow I'm going to sign up for ROP so that I can get more credits. (Roberto, Interview One)

I also need to pass the ELA section to graduate. I'm not sure how many credits I need to graduate. I'm going to stop slacking off. (Jesus, Interview One)

I need 200, no 220 credits to graduate. If I keep trying, I will graduate. I'm studying harder for my finals and turning in my work in time. (Diana, Interview One)

In response to the question about their GPAs, most participants responded by giving a higher GPA than that reported in their academic transcripts. The researcher asked them why their perceived GPAs were different from their actual GPAs and also if anyone had shared their GPA with them before and where they need to go to get this information. Their responses showed a general lack of knowledge about their GPAs:

I did not know what my GPA was. I can get it from my counselor. (Jose, Interview Two)

I know how to calculate my GPA. I can go to my counselor to get my GPA. (Miguel, Interview Two)

I do not know what my GPA is. I do not know why I gave you that number. I can ask

my teachers. My GPA is bad. I can get my math and English up. (Leo, Interview Two)

I don't know my GPA. It's not that you can help me, but it's just that I don't really come

to school. For second semester, I've told myself that I want to improve and because I

want to graduate I need come to school more often. (Roberto, Interview Two)

I do not know what my GPA is. I need to do better to raise my GPA. I need to pass my

classes. I also need to do my work. I do not like to do my HW because it frustrates me.

(Jesus, Interview Two)

I have bad grades [and] that's why I have that GPA. I didn't know my GPA [and] that's

why I gave you that higher GPA. (Diana, Interview Two)

Although students did not know their actual GPAs, they seemed sure that their grades were not

good. In their conversations, they skipped immediately to potential strategies to raise their GPAs

because they perceived that they needed higher grades to graduate.

A through G requirements. A through G requirements are the high school courses

required to assure a general education for graduates. They include two years of history or social

science, four years of English, three years of mathematics, two years of laboratory sciences, two

years of foreign languages, one year of visual or performing arts, and one elective (University of

California, n.d.). The researcher asked students about the classes in which they were enrolled

and whether they knew what the A through G requirements were. All six participants knew that

they were enrolled in those classes because they were required to pass them to graduate. Jose,

Leo, and Roberto knew what the A through G requirements were and that they needed to pass

140

them to get into the University of California and California State University systems. They

responded with varying degrees of clarity, all recognizing that they needed to take those classes:

> Those are the ones I need to pass. Because last year, I really didn't turn in [homework].
>
> The A through G requirements to go to college and to graduate. (Jose, Interview Two)
>
> Math because I haven't passed it. English because I have to take it because it's part of my
>
> education. My history I'm taking because I need to complete my A through G [courses].
>
> I know what the A through G [courses] are. My Math, English, two electives, two years
>
> of foreign language, my health class, and science two years. (Leo, Interview Two)
>
> I'm taking my classes because I am behind credits. I am taking them to graduate and A
>
> through G. A through G [courses] are good so that you can go to college. (Roberto,
>
> Interview Two)

Although Miguel and Diana did not know specifically what the A through G

requirements were, they knew that there were required courses that they had to pass in order to

graduate:

> I need help with my English. I'm taking all my classes for my Junior year. English Three
>
> and Geometry. I'm taking them to graduate and to go to next level. I do not know what
>
> the A through G requirements are. (Miguel, Interview Two)
>
> I need them for my GPA and I need them to improve my CASHEE. The A through G is
>
> a 2.5 GPA. I don't know what the A through G is for. (Diana, Interview Two)

Graduation prospects. Participants knew that they were not meeting the criteria to

graduate. When asked if they were on track to graduate, all six students gave reasons as to why

or why not they were succeeding towards graduation. Only two of the six participants were on track to graduate. Miguel and Diana responded:

Yes, I am on track to graduate from high school. (Miguel, Interview One)

If I'm getting the help from the people that I'm supposed to get help from and do something for myself, yes. (Diana, Interview One)

However, four knew they were not on track to graduation and suggested strategies to make up the deficiencies:

A little, I'm not at the credits where I need to be up. I am short credits. I am trying to pass all my classes this year and taking as many classes to make up my credits. And I have programs that will help me. Migrant Education program is helping me and I am going to try and take sports this year. I want to participate more this year. (Leo, Interview One)

I am not on track to graduate from high school. I am not on track because I failed most of my classes. I won't be doing my A through G [courses] but just my classes to graduate. (Roberto, Interview One)

I do not feel I'm on track to graduate because I am behind credits because of my freshman year. I failed almost all of them. I am enrolling in ROP to get credits. (Jesus, Interview One)

Not right now because I am 20 credits short. (Jose, Interview One)

Summary of Key Findings

Five main instructional experiences and schooling factors emerged from the data I analyzed:

- Instructional Experience One: Observed lessons were not engaging students in social interaction or learner centered.

- Instructional Experience Two: Explicit instruction was not taking place to assist long-term English learners in gaining proficiency in the English language.

- Schooling Factor One: All six participants were enrolled in SEI programs all their schooling history.

- Schooling Factor Two: Participants did not receive adequate information about the reclassification process.

- Schooling Factor Three: Participants had low academic literacy skills and did not know how to navigate high school to succeed academically.

Conclusion

Chapter Four included presentation of the data collected for the study from a demographic questionnaire, academic transcript analysis, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations, and focus group identifying the school factors and instructional experiences that contributed to long-term English learner status of the Latino students in the study. The participants also characterized why they were not being successful in reclassifying as English proficient and what led to or hindered them from becoming academically successful. They were able to compare why they had success in middle school and why they struggled in high school. The participants were also very open to sharing the classroom practices that they believed would lead them to be academically successful.

Chapter Five includes a discussion of the findings, their significance, and implications of the research. It also includes recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze the instructional experiences and schooling factors that contributed to long-term English learner status for six students in an urban comprehensive high school in Los Angeles. The findings suggested several instructional experiences and schooling factors which contributed to long-term English learner status for these students. It is important to understand and address these issues to enhance the educational experience of students whose native language in not English. This chapter includes a summary of the study, analysis of the instructional experiences and schooling factors identified that contribute to the long-term English learner status for thee students, an assessment of the significance of the findings, and recommendations for practice and further research.

Summary of the Study

Subjects of the study were 11th-grade long-term English learners from Prosperity High School. The six participants met the state definition of long-term English learner status. Assembly Bill 2193 (2012) defined long-term English learners as English learners who:

- Were enrolled in any grade six to 12,

- Have been enrolled in schools in the U.S. for more than six years,

- Have remained in the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive years as determined by the CELDT and scores, and

- Have fallen in the far below basic or below basic categories on the English Language

  Arts section of the CST, which measures ability at speaking and listening as well as

  reading comprehension and writing.

The purposeful sampling used in this study included five males, and one female whose native language was Spanish. Before participating in the study, parents and students signed and returned the required consent forms. The research incorporated multiple methods of data collection in the phenomenological study for the purpose of triangulation. A demographic questionnaire, academic transcript analysis, one-on-one focused interviews, classroom observations using the English Learner Shadow Study Protocol (Soto, 2012), and a focus group provided a variety of data for analysis and triangulation. Data analysis was based largely on the descriptive content analysis methodology. The researcher examined the quantitative and qualitative data collected with the aim of summarizing the informational contents of these data with respect to the research question, and ultimately suggesting strategies to improve the English language proficiency of students similar to the study participants.

Children of Proposition 227 (1998)

Laws that govern language instruction for language-minority students have frequently changed depending on the educational philosophies of those elected to the legislative bodies. As history has shown, both federal and the state governments generally have not supported linguistic minorities' development of their first language. Often despite educational research to the contrary, legislative policies have led to a subtractive schooling effect for our students, marginalizing the students' culture and language while not completely incorporating them into the English-speaking culture or helping them achieve proficiency in English. The situation has

resulted in students whose whole educational experience has been in the limbo of being English learners, never quite reaching the proficiency required for academic success.

The six long-term English learners from this study were children of California Proposition 227 (1998). Caught between opposing views of how best to incorporate English into the education of children whose native language was not English, they lived the consequences of the language policies that were voted into law in 1998 with passage of Proposition 227 which virtually eliminated bilingual education, and established sheltered or SEI programs (Baker, 2011; Crawford, 2004; Orellana et al., 1999; Quezada et al., 1999). The provisions behind Proposition 227 (1998) required schools to teach students with limited English proficiency only in English with material designed to help the students to acquire the English language.

Many researchers did not agree with the idea that eliminating bilingual education was the best and quickest way to serve children whose native language was not English. Hakuta et al. (2000) stated that rapid acquisition of English through sheltered English programs lasting no more than one year, as Proposition 227 (1998) suggested, were highly unrealistic. Rather, they found that oral proficiency took three to five years to develop, and academic English proficiency took four to seven years. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) found that it took from four to eight years for a student to become proficient in the English language. Although they had been in U.S. schools for their entire educational careers, the students in this study demonstrated the characteristics Olsen (2010b) presented of long-term English learners that could be attributed to the policies put in place by Proposition 227 (1998):

- Long-Term English Learners were able to function in social situations in both their home language and in English;

- Long-Term English learners had weak academic language, and gaps in reading and writing skills;

- The majority of Long-Term English learners remained at Intermediate levels of English Proficiency or below; and

- Long-Term English learners who reach higher levels of English proficiency did not attain adequate enough academic language to be reclassified.

I undertook this study because I had long been a proponent of bilingual education who believed in bilingualism and supported helping children acquire strong academic proficiency in two languages. I believed that and with the passage of Proposition 227 (1998), students like the participants did not have a chance to succeed. I began to believe that it was important and morally imperative to help second language learners acquire advanced proficiency in English. To do this, primary causes of individual children's lack of language acquisition had to be identified and subsequently addressed.

Research Question

The qualitative phenomenological study sought to answer the question: What instructional experiences and schooling factors contributed to long-term English learner status of Latino students at an urban high school in Los Angeles?

Critical Sociocultural Theory: Power, Agency, and Identity

The researcher analyzed the finding on long-term English learners through the lens of Critical Sociocultural Theory (Moje & Lewis, 2007). Critical sociocultural perspectives might be the only available tools for demonstrating how youth's opportunities to learn are both supported and constrained by everyday interactions of students and teachers and by the systems

and structures that shape the institution of schooling (Moje & Lewis, 2007). Also, Critical Sociocultural Theory was the most appropriate framework for this study because Critical Sociocultural Theory was developed by language and literacy researchers to extend traditional sociocultural theory to account for how both learning and teaching influence and are influenced by power relations (Handsfield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2007). The critical sociocultural approach "supports students in negotiating multiple expectations for social and academic language use and the power relationships that they imply" (Handsfield, 2012, p. 44).

Critical Sociocultural Theory research provided methods of for rigorous analysis of how power was produced in everyday interactions and of how large-scale power differentials served to frame the possibilities for people's everyday interactions (Moje & Lewis, 2007). Moje and Lewis (2007) also stated that the overall purpose of critical social cultural theorists was to ask what people learned in this activity and what their opportunities were to learn or to teach given a theoretical stance that learning and literacy is shaped by identity, power and agency.

In the environment in which these students functioned, to have had language ability in Spanish was seen as a negative factor. Diana, who said she spoke Spanish about half of the time—mostly at home to her family—seemed to feel this acutely. When asked about why she took the CELDT test, she replied, "Because I speak two languages. I do not like that test" (Diana, Interview One). It seemed clear that she thought the test was some sort of a punishment for her use of Spanish. She further said about speaking with her parents in school, "I tell them to speak English because we are in school, but on the outside we can speak in Spanish" (Diana, Interview One). The very term "reclassification" seems to say, "You have to become something else, join another class, to be acceptable to the education system." In the U.S., a thorough,

functional understanding of English has been necessary. To empower students, we should do everything possible to facilitate their acquisition English. We should celebrate "acquisition of English" instead of "reclassification." However, we also should celebrate when students are functionally bilingual. A swift perusal of jobs available, not only in Los Angeles, but in the District of Columbia, Denver, and Detroit showed that not only were bilingual applicants favored in the selection process for some positions, but they were often paid a bonus for their language skills in those positions. Positions available specifically for bilingual applicants in October, 2014 through www.monster.com were in a broad range of fields– manufacturing, sales, hospitality, healthcare, counseling, education, strategic planning, consulting, clerical, technical, banking, driving, heavy equipment operation, research, human resources, management, and legal. Many required at least some college, but many were also open to high school graduates; the primary initial qualification was that the candidate must be bilingual. There has been and will continue to be personal esteem and economic value in these students maintaining their bilingual abilities. It is imperative that this be communicated to them and to their families.

Discussion of the Findings

This section contains a summary of the study findings and evidence triangulated with the literature review to strengthen and support the significance of the conclusions. First, the findings are linked to specific research on the topics (See Table 17). Second, the findings are discussed and analyzed from the ground up, beginning with the basic conduct and content of specific classroom lessons. Following discussion of the observed lessons, the elements of the academic careers of the students are addressed: consistent SEI programs, inadequate information on the reclassification process, and lack of academic skills and ability to navigate the system for

success. In these sections, some general suggestions for further research and for remediation are

also suggested.

Table 17

Connecting the Findings with Evidence from Data Findings and Empirical Literature

Instructional Experience/ Schooling Factor	Evidence from Data Findings	Connections to Empirical Literature
Instructional Experience One: Observed lessons were not engaging students in social interaction.	Teacher did most of the academic speaking.	Instruction that many English learners received was, for the most part, fragmented and disempowering (Freeman & Freeman, 1998).
	Only two participants had double digits (Roberto 11% and Jose 19%) percentage of time using academic language. The rest of the participants ranged from 0% to 4% of their class time practicing academic language.	Opportunities to extend oral English language skills are critical for English learners (Goldenberg, 2006).
Instructional Experience Two: Observed lessons were not learner centered.	Participants did not participate in classroom activities.	Lessons should be learner centered and should engage students in social interaction (Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002).
	Five of the participants spent 33% of their time reading or writing silently.	Essential element of academic language included explicit teaching of the register of academic oral language, which included teaching the distinction between social language and academic language (Kinsella, 2007).
	One participant spent 22% of his time off task.	
	Explicit visual instructions form classroom activities were missing.	
	Purposeful instructional groups were not evident.	
	Social conversations were more prevalent than academic talk.	

Table 17 (continued)

Instructional Experience/ Schooling Factor	Evidence from Data Findings	Connections to Empirical Literature
Schooling Factor One: All six participants were enrolled in SEI Programs all their schooling history.	Per participants' academic transcripts, all six students were enrolled in SEI Programs the majority of their schooling career.	. . . the typical high school ESL or bilingual education program was not designed for emergent bilinguals such as long-term English learners with limited native literacy skills (Menken, Klyne, & Chase, 2012).
	Previous schooling emphasized English versus native language.	Policy makers and conservative educators arrogantly dismiss empirical evidence supporting bilingual education (Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari, 2003).
	Participants received very little instruction in native language, Spanish.	First-language literacy skills were a key predictor of successful second-language acquisition (Baker, 2011).
Schooling Factor Two: Students did not receive adequate information about the reclassification process.	Participants did not know why they were enrolled in ESL classes. Participants did not know why they took the CELDT yearly.	After accounting for academic achievement, behavioral issues, background and district contexts, the longer a student was designated as having low English proficiency, the higher the incidence of the student dropping out of high school (Kim, 2011).
	Since the eighth grade, participants have not met the criteria to reclassify.	Parent involvement and engagement were shown to be an effective practice for academic achievement. Both parent involvement and engagement support students by strengthening and assisting school programs and activities (Ferlazzo, 2009).

Table 17 (continued)

Instructional Experience/ Schooling Factor	Evidence from Data Findings	Connections to Empirical Literature
Schooling Factor Three: Participants had low academic literacy skills and did not know how to navigate high school to succeed academically.	Participants did not receive support to succeed in high school. Students were failing most core classes.	The overall performance of long-term English learners in school reflects their limited academic literacy skills, which are demanded in of the courses they take (Menken & Klyne, 2010).
	Middle school success did not translate to high school success.	Schools encompassed subtractive assimilative policies and practices that were designed to deprived students of their culture and language (Valenzuela, 1999).
	Participants did not know why they were failing or passing their classes.	Habits of non-engagement were learned behaviors (Olsen, 2010b).
	Participants struggled in reading their academic record. Participants were not meeting all the requirements to graduate.	Getting students on track early in high school by ensuring access to college preparatory coursework in English and math was critical to keeping them on track to fulfilling college entrance requirements (Finkelstein, Huang, & Fong, 2009).

Instructional Experience One: Lessons and Social Interaction

Freeman and Freeman (1998) presented seven effective principles for successful practice for English learners. Authors have explained that the instruction that many English learners received was, for the most part, fragmented and disempowering (Brisk 1998; Cummins 1996; Flores 1982; Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997; Valdés 1996). They felt that a new approach was required so that English learners could succeed beyond high school and into college. Freeman and Freeman (1998) presented seven principles to reverse the trend of failure explaining that if teachers used the principles in their daily lessons versus common sense assumptions, they would help all their students succeed:

- Principle One: Learning proceeds from whole to part.

- Principle Two: Lessons should be learner centered.

- Principle Three: Lessons should have meaning and purpose for students now.

152

- Principle Four: Lessons should engage students in social interaction.

- Principle Five: Lessons should develop both oral and written language.

- Principle Six: Lessons should support students' first language and cultures.

- Principle Seven: Lessons should show faith in the learner to expand students'

  potential. (Freeman & Freeman, 1998).

The data from the classroom observations in this study revealed that the lessons were much as the authors noted above described—fragmented and disempowering. The observed lessons seemed not to be engaging students in social interaction or learner centered. In the observed ALD and English classes, teachers did most of the academic speaking, and often had to repeat directions multiple times. In the category Academic Speaking, all six participants' highest percentage of time was in the teacher speaking to the student. Minimal time was spent with students using academic language—less than 7%. On average, students did most academic listening when the teacher was teacher was talking. However, Jose indicated that the teachers did not have to be the only ones that talked in class. He said, "My favorite class is English . . . I like presenting things in class" (Interview One). He and the others would have benefitted and possibly welcomed more opportunity to speak formally in class.

Whether or not students have to take the CELDT test to show their English proficiency, academic speaking and listening skills are necessary for school, social, and business success. The research did not address the experiences of the English speakers in the observed classes. However, upon close observation, the principles listed above by Freeman and Freeman (1998) for teaching children whose primary language is not English are appropriate principles for successful teaching in any situation. All students no matter their age, academic background, or

primary language need to have organized, learner-centered, engaging lessons that present

attainable challenges, meet their needs, and are geared to their abilities. All students should have

lessons that support them where they are socially and academically and acknowledge individual

differences in background, language, and culture. Students gave examples of teacher behaviors

that they felt helped them learn: worksheets to pass the test (Jose, Interview One), extra work to

get better (Miguel, Interview One), work in pairs with check for understanding (Roberto,

Interview One), "he made it clear for me and I paid attention" (Roberto, Interview One), projects

(Diana, Interview One), learning how to analyze in math (Leo, Interview One), and "they told

me never to give up" (Diana, Interview One). Diana and Roberto also gave very specific

examples of teacher behaviors that had not helped them learn, and the consequences:

> Diana: She would spend more time on discipline than on instruction. Let's say a student
>
> was talking. She would waste more time on that than on students who want to learn.
>
> (Interview One)
>
> Roberto: The teacher didn't really teach. He focused on football since he is the coach. I
>
> have the same teacher again, so I am not really trying. (Interview One)
>
> Diana: [I did not like] 10th grade math….Sometimes the teacher would give us work but
>
> would not help us. The teacher would get frustrated when we would ask questions.
>
> (Interview One)

Lacking bilingual education, what elements can help teachers support long-term English

learners in the classroom? In engaging and reaching every student in the class, teachers should

be aware of the degree to which students understand what is being said and can participate in the

academic conversation. Simple language and repetition are the basis of the scaffolding necessary

to help long-term English learners understand and participate in classroom discussions. However, allowing ample time for students to engage in academic speaking and limiting the amount of teacher talk are requisite parts of that practice. Research has shown that collaboration is engaging, and the social interaction involved helps students make meaning from and communicate with language and symbols (Prawat, 1996). This helps in development of both oral and written language. The students in this study, particularly appreciated working in groups. Jose noted, "I also like that we got to work in groups because we can help each other" (Interview One). One positive aspect of working in groups was getting help, but the sense of empowerment when a student can help another student was very important.

Teachers, particularly those whose mission it is to help long-term English learners become proficient in English should be supported in continuously learning and using a variety of good educational practices that support engaging, learner-centered lessons that give students ample opportunity to practice both oral and written language.

Instructional Experience Two: Instruction for Proficiency in English

Soto (2012) stated that English learners must be given ample opportunities to use extended stretches of language in order to become proficient academically in reading and writing in English. Goldenberg (2006) also suggested that "opportunities to extend oral English language skills are critical for EL [English learners] students" (p. 35). Similarly, Kinsella (2007) recognized that an essential element of academic language itself was the explicit teaching of the register of academic oral language, which included teaching the distinctions between social language–basic vocabulary, grammar, and form and function of language–and academic language–content area vocabulary and syntax in context to reading and writing. Soto (2012) also

clarified that there were several components according to Kinsella (2007), including vocabulary development, syntax, grammar, and register.

August and Shanahan (2006) stated that the ultimate goal of literacy instruction was to build students' comprehension and writing skills. Regrettably, what has happened with language-minority students has been quite different. August and Shanahan (2006) stated that most of the available studies that compared the comprehension development of language-minority students with their native-speaking peers had indicated that the reading comprehension performance of language-minority students fell well below that of their native-speaking peers (Aarts & Verhoeven, 1999; Droop & Verhoeven, 1998; Hacquebord, 1994; Verhoeven, 1990/2000; Lindsey et al., 2003; Hutchinson et al., 2003). The research on how best to teach literacy to English learners has not been thorough or specific enough to create a detailed, research-based plan for such instruction. August and Shanahan (2006) argued that it was possible to derive some useful guidelines for the design of such instruction from the systematic analysis of the existing research. August and Shanahan (2006) devised eight basic guidelines for effective literacy instruction of English learners:

- Guideline One: Effective instruction for English learners emphasizes essential components of literacy.

- Guideline Two: Effective instruction for English learners is similar to effective instruction for native speakers.

- Guideline Three: Effective literacy curriculum and instruction for English learners must be adjusted to meet their needs.

- Guideline Four: Effective literacy instruction for English learners is comprehensible and multidimensional.

- Guideline Five: Effective literacy instruction for English learners develops oral proficiency.

- Guideline Six: Effective literacy instruction for English learners is differentiated.

- Guideline Seven: Effective literacy instruction for English learners requires well-prepared teachers.

- Guideline Eight: Effective literacy instruction for English learners is respectful of home language.

Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) shared that ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English language. With explicit instruction, the teacher would present or explain language elements to the students and then would provide opportunities for them to practice. Also, the teacher would engage the students in tasks containing many examples of a particular form or rule on which they were working. The student would then understand the element of language that was being taught explicitly by the teacher. This explicit instruction with practice would be important in many types of classes, especially for long-term English learners. Jose expressed his appreciation for explicit instruction and practice when he said, "I ask the teacher and he helps me. . . . I need more practice to get the math problem. . . . In my current math class, the teacher gives enough practice" (Interview One).

Menken and Kleyn (2010) stated that although literacy was more commonly incorporated into elementary instruction, research indicated that literacy needed to be explicitly instructed to long-term English learners at the secondary level as well (Callahan, 2006). Meltzer and Hamann

(2005) suggested infusing literacy instructions across content area subjects. Menken and Kleyn (2010) stated that high schools needed to prepare to teach long-term English learners very explicitly the academic literacy skills they needed, rather than simply assuming the students arrived in high school with literacy skills that have already been developed.

The data from the classroom observations in this study revealed that explicit instruction did not take place to assist long-term English learners in gaining proficiency in the English language, or even to support those whose native language was English. In all classes during observations for this study, the majority of time the teacher was instructing the whole class in English or walking around monitoring student interaction about the work. At the beginning of the class, the teachers generally gave a quick reminder of what was due and then left the students on their own to finish their assignments. On average, during 40% of observed class time students were reading or writing silently and not developing oral proficiency. In addition, silent reading might not even have been developing reading skills. Diana commented that she did not like sustained silent reading and generally just looked at the pictures in a magazine during that time (Interview One).

During times that there was discussion, it did not seem to be structured to help the students acquire skills in the English language. Questions the teacher presented to the students were a combination of high and low quality often delivered in a rapid succession. Therefore some students struggled with developing responses since they did not have enough time to think, limiting the number of students who actually participated in the discussion. The simple techniques of allowing "think time" and asking the questions in different ways to address the needs of different students that would be good practice in any classroom seemed to be lacking in

the experience of these students. The students continuously asked the teacher to clarify the instructions for the assignment, and the teacher made some attempt to use differentiated strategies to engage all students. Checking for understanding took place, either individually or with the whole class.

The gathered data also showed that purposeful and productive instructional groups were not evident. The classrooms seemed to be arranged for student interaction and language practice. The students were seated in pairs or groups, but they did not interact with one another. Instructional group structures did not seem to support student learning towards the instructional outcomes of the lesson. Some of the students seemed cognitively engaged and were working purposefully and productively, but others were not. However, it seemed that the opportunity to practice English-language skills was lost because the teachers did not give explicit instructions regarding what should be discussed in the group or structure purposeful opportunities to practice academic language.

When the teachers asked the students to move into groups, the students did so very slowly, as if this was a new activity and not something that commonly took place. Once in groups, students did not seem to know what their role was in their group. It is possible that the students were not accustomed to working in groups, but that the groups were structured because the researcher was there as an observer and the teachers were attempting to use a technique that is touted as educationally effective but with which they were not comfortable. Group work is inherently a bit noisy and messy. Teachers who are used to quiet, "disciplined" classrooms have to be assisted in opening up opportunities for students to practice oral language skills in groups

combined with explicit instruction in English to support the progress of long-term English learners.

Regardless of what the researcher observed in the classrooms, it was obvious from the interviews that the students had done some of their work in groups and that they felt that group work helped them. Every student commented about some positive aspect of group work. Roberto's comment was typical when he noted that he liked collaboration (Interview One), and Miguel noted that the other people in his row would help him out (Interview One). Therefore, it was possible that students engaged in more academic talk during their school experience than happened in the classrooms while I was observing.

Explicit visual instructions for classroom activities were also missing, both in observations and in student comments about their classes. The teacher in the observation class wrote assignments on the board in English. She relied on the students comprehending only through reading and listening (audio modes), not through touching or seeing pictures. Research showed that it was valuable to use multiple modes to learn and communicate (Oldakowski, 2014). In his literature classroom, Oldakowski (2014) demonstrated that use of multiple modes enhanced skills because it allowed individuals to transfer knowledge from one modality to another. The result of his multi-modal assignments was increased proficiency in oral and written assignments over time. In my study, the valuable opportunity to provide a visual scaffold for long-term English learners, as well as the others in the classes, was lost in the observed classes for lack of use of visual aids. Again, using multi-modal techniques was something in which both teachers and students need skills and practice as part of the regular classroom experience.

As discussed in the previous section, lessons were not sufficiently engaging to keep students on task. The data from observations revealed that social conversations about things going on out of the classroom were more prevalent than academic talk. Some participants talked about the assignment when the teacher was close by monitoring their progress. However, when the teacher walked away, the talk turned to once again social topics. The students used either Spanish or non-Academic English during these social conversations. The study did not include the degree to which this behavior was common to both English learners and English speakers in the class. However, as in the section above, teachers should be supported in creating innovative methods and engaging lessons, which meet the students where they are socially and culturally in all classrooms.

Teachers need support and possibly explicit instruction to put into place August and Shanahan's (2006) eight guidelines. Instructional techniques emphasizing correct English usage adjusted to the specific needs of the learners require practice and awareness of the students. As the demographics of the U.S. classroom change, legislation and policies should anticipate the needs of teachers for additional learning in this area.

Schooling Factor One: Enrollment in SEI Programs

Bilingual education theory argued that first-language literacy skills were a key predictor of successful second-language acquisition (Baker, 2006; Collier, 1987; Krashen & McField, 2005; Menken & Kleyn, 2010). Therefore, it would seem that the federal and state governments must minimally provide strong academic support for the acquisition of English. Macedo et al. (2003) believed that bilingual education was necessary and stated, "Policy makers and conservative educators arrogantly dismiss the empirical evidence supporting bilingual education"

(p. 8). However, legislation has historically supported emersion language programs that were supposed to quickly bring students to proficient levels of English.

Menke, Klyne & Chase (2012) stated that to make the matter even worse, the typical high school ESL or bilingual program was not designed for emergent bilinguals such as long-term English learners with limited native language literacy skills (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2000). Menke et al. (2012) also stated that most high school programs were designed to meet the needs of emergent bilinguals who arrive in U.S. high schools with adequate prior schooling and native language literacy skills, which for the most part, the long-term English learners in this study like long-term English learners in general did not have either adequate prior schooling or native language literacy skills (Freeman et al., 2002; García, 1999).

All six participants were enrolled in SEI program throughout their schooling history. Based on the participants' responses from the interviews and their academic transcripts, the majority of their school experiences were in English versus their native language Spanish. Throughout their school careers, they attended ESL programs, in lieu of bilingual programs. These six long-term English learners were orally proficient in both English and Spanish but felt more comfortable reading and writing in English. They did not have strong academic literacy skills in English or in their native language. In fact, their transcripts demonstrated and the students themselves shared that that English literacy was their primary deficiency in school. Leo's comment was typical of the students' feeling about their lack of English proficiency: "'Cause I am not a very well English speaker" (Interview One).

This study has raised as many questions as it has answered. It did not include examination of students whose characteristics were similar and who had begun school in SEI

162

programs, but who had successfully acquired the English language. As much as researchers would like to convince lawmakers that bilingual education should be approved and funded, we have to face the reality of today's children. For those who have been successful, what experiences facilitated their learning that did not reach the six participants in this study and other long-term English learners? Were these experiences teacher- or school- or district-specific? Are there opportunities to learn from successful SEI teachers or programs? What is good teaching for students who enter elementary school speaking languages other than English? How is it related to good teaching for all students? How can the educational system help all students take advantage of their strengths, including the strength of being potentially bilingual because of their native language? Given legislation, what methods and training do teachers need to help these students learn English but without the subtractive effects of negating the value of their native language development and cultural experiences?

Finkelstein et al. (2009) also stated that these findings suggested that getting students on track early in high school (i.e., during the ninth grade) by ensuring access to college preparatory coursework in English and mathematics was critical to keeping them on track to fulfilling college entrance requirements. Finkelstein et al. (2009) stated that academic supports should be put in place that would allow English learners to meet such requirements by high school graduation. Finkelstein et al. (2009) stated that the findings in this study suggested that students have a better chance of completing the California State University entrance requirements if they were identified early as being English learners. The fact that English learners who were identified late were only about 39% as likely as English-language learners identified early to complete

California State University entrance requirements suggested that early identification was highly important (Finkelstein et al., 2009).

Most educational experts have acknowledged the huge difference between teaching and learning for elementary and secondary students, and for students with strong academic backgrounds and students whose academic skills are not well developed. It has become essential that the same differentiations be made in language instruction so that the needs of students without strong literacy skills in their native languages can be taught with the same success as SEI programs may have had with students who build English proficiency based on previous proficiency in another language. So, it is essential to design secondary school programs for long-term English learners based on learning and teaching models that are specific to their situation, and it is equally essential to train teachers in all subjects to help them succeed. Student comments in the previous section showed that they appreciated and did well in classes where the teachers explained and answered questions, checked for individual learning, allowed practice in class, and encouraged collaborative work. The students indicated that they knew when they were learning material and appreciated time well spent in class. Equally, they did not appreciate nor respond positively to time they felt was wasted and not related to their learning. Diana, for example, particularly thought sustained silent reading was a waste of time and expressed a desire for more focused classwork instead (Interview One).

Menken and Kleyn (2010) stated, "The overall performance of long-term English learners in schools reflects their limited academic literacy skills, which are demanded in of the courses they take" (p. 412). Menken and Klyen (2010) also stated that another reason this poor performance was a concern was because students who failed their classes were also unlikely to

meet the high school graduation requirements and more likely to leave school. Menken and Kleyn (2010) documented how the experiences of long-term English learners in U.S. elementary and middle schools have been subtractive, and therefore contributed to their limited academic literacy skills, which then negatively impacted their overall academic performance. Valenzuela (1999) analyzed subtractive schooling and found that school subtracts resources from students two ways: "First it dismisses their definition of education which is not only thoroughly grounded in Mexican culture, but also approximates the optimal definition of education advanced by Noddings (1984) and other caring theorists" (p. 6). The second way was that schools encompassed subtractive assimilative policies and practices that were designed to deprive Mexican students of their culture and language (Valenzuela, 1999).

In the final analysis, we must not lose sight of the ultimate goal: students who begin their education in the U.S. should not have to reach high school without good proficiency in English and remain captive in SEI programs. Ultimately, the goal should be to have instruction in elementary schools sufficient so that the entire category of long-term English learners can be eliminated. It would be far better to identify these children and accommodate their needs early than to continue unproductive SEI courses throughout their school careers the end of which might very well be dropping out because of low English proficiency.

Schooling Factor Two: Information about the Reclassification Process

Kim (2011) found that after accounting for academic achievement, behavioral issues, background and district contexts, the longer a student was designated as having low English proficiency, the higher the incidence of the student dropping out of high school. These findings came from his study on the relationship between English learner status and school persistence.

165

Consequently it was imperative for the participants to know what their reclassification status was and to do everything possible to meet the criteria to reclassify so that they would stay in school and not drop out. Parent engagement has been shown to be imperative in the reclassification process since parents should be notified and be part of the process so their students can succeed academically.

The data showed that all of the participants lacked sufficient information about the reclassification process used to determine whether an English learner has acquired sufficient English language fluency to perform successfully in core academic subjects. Leo did admit that his counselor had gone over the reclassification criteria with his mother, but did not indicate that information had been passed wholly to him (Focus Group). Participants did not know why they took the CELDT or why they were enrolled in ESL classes. During one-on-one focus interviews or during the focus group, none of the respondents mentioned that the purpose of the CELDT or the ESL classes was to reclassify them as fluent in the English language, although they did know that the test was related to their lack of English proficiency. Even after the researcher explained the reclassification criteria to the group, Roberto said, "I do not know what I would do differently now that I know the reclassification criteria" (Focus Group).

To be successfully reclassified as fluent English proficient, students must meet all three criteria during the same academic semester—passing CELDT, CST, and gaining sufficient Fall or Spring GPA, during the same academic to reclassify as English proficient. Analysis of the school transcripts showed that students had not met all aspects of the reclassification criteria in the same semester since the eighth grade. One curious issue that should be investigated further relative to this list of criteria may be related to gender. Several of the males in the study had

166

passed some of the necessary standardized testing, but consistently failed their classwork and had very low GPAs and insufficient credits to be on track to graduate. However, Diana who was the only female in the study, had sufficient credits to be on track to graduate and one of the highest GPAs, but had failed to pass either of the standardized tests. This situation points directly to the possibility that there is a difference between females and males as to how they navigate the system. Certainly, a much larger sample should be studied to determine if there is any inherent inequity in the system based on gender.

Student comments relative to their GPAs, credits, and test scores showed a general lack of information about their importance. The students did seem to have a general idea that if they were not on track to graduate. Although the generally overestimated their GPAs, the four who did not have enough credits to be on track to graduate knew that they were behind. In discussion with the researcher, they suggested strategies for catching up. Leo's statement about his graduation strategy was typical: "I am trying to pass all my classes this year and taking as many classes [as possible] to make up my credits" (Focus Group).

It is imperative that someone at the school site take charge of making sure long-term English learners know the criteria to reclassify and succeed academically so that they have the opportunity to graduate and continue with their education if they choose to. At worst, this lack of information indicated lack of concern from teachers and counselors. At best, it indicated breaks in the communication system between parents, teachers, and students, as was illustrated by Leo's comment above. To break this cycle of failure, it has become important to identify the discontinuities in communication that facilitates students going through their school careers without sufficient information about their possibilities and avenues for success, reasons for tests

and specific classes, and the results of their behaviors. Since children typically have a short-term view of what is happening in their schooling, it is critical to involve parents throughout their school careers in obtaining the best possible educations for their students.

Parent involvement and engagement were shown to be an effective practice for academic achievement by Ferlazzo (2009). The purpose of parent involvement was to support students by strengthening and assisting school programs and priorities. In addition, parent engagement, supported students by developing parent relationships, strengthening families, and helping families develop more English skills and self-confidence so they could feel more energized and capable of working to improve their local communities (Ferlazzo, 2009). The literature I reviewed showed that there was a strong relationship between English learner academic achievement and parent involvement and engagement in the school. If the parent knew what was happening at the school site with their students, then the student would have a better chance to succeed since there would be accountability from all stakeholders.

Ultimately, it is a combination of parent involvement and school activity that can help these students open opportunities for their futures. In addition to engaging parents early, schools also should provide classes that explicitly teach study skills and guidance about how to succeed in high school and college. Some students cannot obtain these skill sets at home, therefore it has become our duty as their educators to make sure they have access to them before they get to college and drop out.

Schooling Factor Three: Academic Literacy and Knowing How to Succeed Academically

In our society, it is not enough just to have the credits to graduate from high school. To best serve their own interests, most students should have sufficient education and academic

credentials to enter—and successfully complete—college or to successfully participate in a trade or other career. Finkelstein et al. (2009) found that approximately 8% of English learners and 20% of non-English learners finished high school having taken the necessary set of required courses to be minimally eligible to attend the California State University (CSU) system. Lack of the necessary fundamental background also can hinder students who could be successful in the trades, or in careers in retail, public safety, or health that do not require college education, but do require basic academic skills and discipline to achieve a good general education. Finkelstein et al. (2009) stated that the reasons this pattern occurred were numerous and pointed to the combination of early preparation for rigorous coursework and additional educational options for English learners in the schools they attended. Valdés (2004) reported that because of poor performance on standardized assessments, English learners were placed in remedial courses and judged to be unable to participate in more advanced college preparatory classes. These actions have been reinforced by expectations and misinformation: Antonio and Bersola (2004) noted that students in high school—both English learners and non-English language learners—often were surprised to learn that the low-level courses they had taken did not count as college preparatory credits.

Finkelstein et al. (2009) also stated that course-taking patterns that began before high school as a result of poor performance on assessments and remedial coursework may have continued in the ninth grade with limited completion patterns of a single couplet of courses such as one year of English coupled with one year of mathematics. By the time English learners in his study reached the age to have completed high school, more than 92% would not be able to matriculate to a four-year state college in California without remediation.

The six long-term English learners in this study had low academic literacy skills and did not know how to navigate high school to succeed academically. In fact, their transcripts showed and the students themselves shared that English literacy was their primary deficiency in school. Miguel, for example, shared that he knew the purpose of the ALD class was to improve his English (Interview One). The cumulative GPA for all six participants in this phenomenological study was very low, ranging from 1.67 to 0.76, with total credits insufficient to meet graduation requirements for four of them. The students in this study acknowledged that some of their academic problems came from their own lack of engagement, even to the extent of not attending classes. Leo vowed to stop falling asleep in class (Interview One), while Roberto said, "Right now, I am thinking about coming to school a little more and doing all of my work" (Interview One). All of the participants commented that they realized they had a responsibility to be more attentive and engaged in their classes. Diana, whose goal was to graduate, expressed her sense of responsibility most articulately:

> Actually, I don't think it's the school that has to push [me to do] well. It's me. I need to put more of myself to succeed. It's not the school's fault. It's my life. It's my future. (Interview One)

This response showed a growing sense of responsibility, but how might their experiences have been different if their early education had been more engaging, and if the criteria for reclassification had been communicated in a positive way and accomplished so that they could have taken a more robust group of classes in high school?

In *Reparable Harm*, Olsen (2010b) stated that habits of non-engagement were learned behaviors. It is not surprising that students without command of the language of the classroom

170

became come reluctant to participate. Over the years, non-participation for these students became a habit. They had goals to be successful but did not know how to acquire these academic objectives. They were satisfied with what they had and did not ask for more. The students I interviewed did know that they needed to improve their academic skills but did not seem to know how to acquire these skill sets necessary to succeed academically, nor from whom they could receive help. Typically, Leo commented, "I don't know who to go to if I need help, well I can go to my teachers and my counselors" (Interview One). The responses from the one-on-one interview showed that the students recognized some of the factors that were holding them back but they did not seem to know how to overcome these academic barriers.

The irony of these findings is that the participants want to succeed academically, but they all have acquired habits of non-engagement throughout their schooling careers because of the lack academic literacy skills. It was likely that the participants would continue participating in academia but would pursue careers in the trades or other career after high school if, indeed, their backgrounds were sufficient for them to gain admission to trade school or apprentice programs. Without the basic skills of a good secondary education, success in opportunities in academia, the trades, or commerce might be limited. Their academic literacy deficiencies were too great to amend in the short time period allotted before their scheduled graduation dates. If the participants were to enroll in college classes, they would be placed in remedial classes where their frustration probably would increase and they would probably eventually drop out of college.

Again, this study has left questions to be addressed in future studies. Specific to these students, did some actually take on the challenge of graduation as they suggested they might and

succeed at that effort? If so, what did they do after graduation? What was the impact of the "wake-up call" that the discussions around this study had on the study participants? How might that inform further efforts to reach students at risk of not graduating in the future?

Implications

Findings in this study have important implications for improving school experiences of U.S. students whose primary language is not English, and ultimately to improve their life experiences and contributions to the overall society. Teachers and administrators should be aware of the research on how non-English speakers can best be helped to succeed in school experiences as well as in becoming proficient in English. Schools should create more opportunities for students to develop skills in their primary language in order to help them become more proficient in English. Schools should celebrate success in reclassification as readily as they celebrate success in other academic areas, and they should celebrate bilingualism as the children learn language at home. Policy makers should base their decisions on what research shows about how non-English speakers can best become proficient in English and succeed in school.

School Implications

Schools should improve how they offer long-term English learners the opportunity to develop their native language to be successful in developing bilingualism. The Menken and Kleyn (2010) study also found that it is "important for schools to offer students consistent opportunities in school to develop their native language as well as English" (p. 412). The six participants in the case study had not been able to experience the academic benefits that can come when native languages are developed in schools (Cummins, 1996; García 2009; Menken &

Kleyn, 2010), since most of their schooling experiences were in SEI programs instead of

bilingual programs. Consequently, they did not have a strong native language academic literacy

foundation to count on as support as they acquired the English language. Their schooling had

largely been subtractive, with English taught and developed instead of their native language

(Menken & Kleyn, 2010). This research has suggested to me several ideas that schools might

consider to reverse the subtractive schooling long-term English have been experiencing:

- Offer native language classes for long-term English learners.

- Provide counselors specifically for long-term English learners.

- Create school-wide college awareness events (i.e., College Fairs, Financial Aid Workshops) where long-term English learners are the focus.

- Have presentations regarding college in long-term English learner classes.

- Have informational meeting for parents regarding what it means to be a long-term English learner and how they can play a role in helping their child's education and future.

- Develop a plan for students who meet the definition of being "at risk" of becoming long-term English learners.

- Conduct inquiries (data analysis, student interviews/focus groups, classroom observations and cum record reviews) to develop deeper understanding of long-term English learners.

- Provide secondary counselors with professional development in appropriate placement of long-term English learners.

- Monitor student schedules and class schedules to ensure English learners have access to the full curriculum.

All stakeholders at schools with large populations of long-term English learners should do a better job communicating the importance of the CELDT and the reclassification process to all English learners and their parents. Awareness is key for long-term English learners who need to reclassify so they can have access to academic classes in high school and beyond. This can be done by school stakeholders thinking creatively in regard to creating awareness to the reclassification process. To increase awareness of the reclassification process for all members of the school community, there are many steps schools can take:

- Create a school-wide advertising campaign about the reclassification process. Post reclassification criteria posters in classrooms and hallways.

- Use a display case to show the school's reclassification goals for the year and show current progress. Update as students reclassify.

- Present school-wide announcements and assemblies celebrating students who have reclassified.

- Hold five-minute reclassification presentations/updates during all meetings such as faculty, Instructional Cabinet, department, and parent meetings.

- Meet with students one-on-one and share CST, CELDT and English grade data. Students will hear the same message from all stakeholders (administrator, Bilingual Coordinator, counselor and teacher) about the importance of reclassification.

- Present reclassification data to all teachers. Each teacher would receive reclassification data for all their students.

- Develop Action Plans by teachers to assist long-term English learners reclassify. Action Plans would be submitted to the administrator and bilingual coordinator who monitor student and teacher progress.

- Meet with long-term English learners' parents review the reclassification criteria and the importance of reclassification.

- Create a newsletter to communicate long-term English learner information to all stakeholders.

All of these sample ideas would send the message to all stakeholders that the reclassification of long-term English learners is as important and has the same value as the other educational mandates such as success on the CST and the CAHSEE the school community has to address yearly. Currently, the perception in schools is that reclassification of English learners is the Bilingual Coordinators' mandate and no one else's. That perception should change for the benefit of the students and their academic future and success.

Policy Implications

Ideally, legislators should pass laws that support bilingual education versus the English-only education that Proposition 227 (1998) mandated. In August 2014, Senate Bill 1174, California Education for a Global Economy Initiative, passed both the Senate and the Assembly. If the citizens of California vote positively on the initiative in November 2016, the bill will amend portions of Proposition 227 (1998) which limits the language of public school instruction to English. Currently, public schools are not able to teach in any language except English, unless parents have gone through a cumbersome waiver process of which many are unaware. More

legislation just like Senate Bill 1174 should be passed so English learners' academic needs can be met.

Personal Implications

My personal reasons for undertaking this study were to develop effective approaches and solutions to help long-term English learners have options to continue their academic career, either to go college or to be successful at a trade, to reduce high school dropouts, and to continue to find ways to improve the educational system for long-term English learners. As an administrator at an urban high school with long-term English learners, I have the opportunity to put some of the ideas generated by the theorists into practice. I will strive to be forthcoming in making sure all stakeholders (students, parents, teachers, etc.,) improve their knowledge about long-term English learners. Finally, I will start a school-wide campaign celebrating the successful acquisition of English proficiency by long-term English learners.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study highlight the need for additional research in the areas of academic achievement for long-term English learners. I recommend the following areas for additional research:

- A case study on long-term English learners who reclassified and enrolled in a four-year university and the educational factors that helped them succeed;

- A case study on the connections between parent involvement and improved academic achievement for long-term English learners;

- A longitudinal study of English learners throughout their school careers, identifying the differences between the experiences of those who became proficient in English and those who remained as long-term English learners;

- A case study on the academic achievement of long-term English learners with special needs and the factors that helped them succeed academically;

- Research on factors that contribute to academic achievement for long-term English learners with special needs; and

- A case study comparing high school completion rates of students enrolled in Bilingual Education program versus SEI program.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the instructional experiences and the schooling factors that led to greater academic success or contributed to long-term English learner status for the six student participants from an urban comprehensive high school in Los Angeles. The findings from the study showed that the instructional experiences and schooling factors of the students who comprised the phenomenological study did contribute to their long-term English learner status. The findings also suggested additional research that should be done to determine how best to engage and inform these students and their parents about their opportunities and responsibilities, to train teachers to address their specific issues, and to enlighten legislators and the general public about the value and necessity of appropriate education for students whose native language is not English.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Questionnaire

Part 1: Demographics

Please indicate the response that best describes you.

1. Gender: (Circle One)   Male   Female

2. Age: _____

3. What is your ancestry or ethnic origin? (For example: Mexican or Salvadorian)

_____

4. How would you describe the socioeconomic status of your family? (Circle One)

>   Low Income

>   Lower Middle Income

>   Upper Middle Income

>   Upper Income

5. How frequently do you speak a language other than English at home? (Circle One)

>   English Only   Mostly English   ½ English ½ Other

>   Mostly Other   Other Only

5b. What is that language? _____

6. What county were you born in? _____

Part 2: Academic Preparation

1. How many years have you attended school in the United States?

2. What is your cumulative high school GPA? _____

3. Have you taken ESL coursework in the public school system? (Circle One) Yes   No

3b. Which grade? _____

Part 3: Family History

1. Mark the response that best describes your parents' or legal guardians' highest educational attainment.

	Mother	Father	Guardian
a. Did not complete high school			
b. High School Diploma			
c. Technical training/certificate			
d. Some college coursework, but does not have a degree			
e. Associate's Degree			
f. Bachelor's Degree			
g. Master's Degree or higher			
h. Unknown			

Please specify:

2. Have any of your siblings attended college? (Circle One) Yes   No

2b. How many of your siblings have graduated from high school? _____

2c. How many siblings are attending college? _____

2d. How many siblings have completed college? _____

APPENDIX B

One-on-One Focus Interview Questions

Initial Interview Questions

1. What was your most interesting learning experience today? Is there something you learned about that you want to know more about?

2. In general, how do you feel about your classes? Are they easy, difficult? Are you challenged or bored?

3. How do you think you learn best? (listening to the teacher, reading, discussing, etc.)

4. Of the adults here at school, is there someone that you think knows you well, understands you as a person or as a learner? If so, who? Why do you think so? How were you able to make a connection with that person?

5. In the schools you have attended, have you learned reading and writing more in English or Spanish?

6. If you had to think back to your whole education, what percentage of time would you say was in Spanish?

7. Which subject do you think is the least meaningful? Why?

8. What grade did you receive in your ESL classes?

9. Do you know why you are taking the classes you are enrolled in?

10. What language do you speak with your friends?

11. What language do you speak with your friends that speak Spanish?

12. How much would you say, percentage wise, that you speak Spanish vs. English?

13. How often do you meet with your counselor and talk about / your academic progress?

14. What are your plans after you graduate from high school?

15. Do you feel that you are on track to graduate from high school?

16. Do you feel that you are on track to go to college after you graduate from high school?

17. I feel the Prosperity High School (elementary, middle and high school) have helped me succeed in learning English?

18. Do you know how students end up taking ESL (English as a Second Language) classes?

19. What are the reasons why you take the CELDT every year?

20. What is the process to reclassify from the English Learner Program?

21. What do your parents tell you about school? How involved are your parents (or any other family members) in your schooling?

22. If you could send a message to your principal and teachers about your experience learning English, what would you tell them?

Follow-up Interview Questions

1. During our first interview you stated that your GPA was _____, but your actual GPA is _____. Why do you think your perceived GPA is different from your actual GPA? Has anyone shared your GPA with you before? Where would you go to find out information about your GPA?

2. Looking at your school transcript, can you explain a little about what you see?

3. Can you explain a little bit about what happened during that semester/course/

4. What are some of the reasons you think you passed these classes but not these?

5. Where there any out of school experiences that might have influenced you during these times?

6. What do you feel contributed to your success or lack of success in this course?

7. What do you feel you can do to improve your grades in the upcoming semester?

8. What do you feel the school can do to help you improve your grades in the upcoming semester? Who might you be able to ask?

9. Have you seen these reclassification criteria before? This is your progress towards reclassification and it seems as if you may not have yet met the criteria to reclassify. Has anyone talked to you about the criteria before?

10. Do you know what you need to do to reclassify?

11. Now that you have seen the criteria, what do you areas do you think you might need to work on? What would be some steps?

12. Who do you think might help you?

APPENDIX C

Classroom Observations: English Learner Shadow Study Protocol

English Learner Shadow Study Observation Form				

Student:_____   School:_____   ELD Level:_____

Gender:_____   Grade Level:_____   Years in US Schools:_____   Years in district:_____

Time	Specific Student Activity/Location of student 5 minute intervals	Academic Speaking (check one)	Academic Listening 1-way or 2-way (check one)	Student is not listening (check one)	Comments
		☐ Student to Student- *1* ☐ Student To Teacher-*2* ☐ Student to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student to Whole Class-*4* ☐ Teacher to Student-*5* ☐ Teacher to Small Group- *6* ☐ Teacher to Whole Class- *7*	1 way or two way ☐ Student listening mostly to Student- *1* ☐ Student listening mostly to Teacher-*2* ☐ Student listening mostly to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student listening to mostly Whole Class-*4*	☐ Reading or writing silently-1 ☐ Student is off task-2	
		☐ Student to Student- *1* ☐ Student To Teacher-*2* ☐ Student to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student to Whole Class-*4* ☐ Teacher to Student-*5* ☐ Teacher to Small Group- *6* ☐ Teacher to Whole Class- *7*	1 way or two way ☐ Student listening mostly to Student- *1* ☐ Student listening mostly to Teacher-*2* ☐ Student listening mostly to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student listening to mostly Whole Class-*4*	☐ Reading or writing silently-1 ☐ Student is off task-2	
		☐ Student to Student- *1* ☐ Student To Teacher-*2* ☐ Student to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student to Whole Class-*4* ☐ Teacher to Student-*5* ☐ Teacher to Small Group- *6* ☐ Teacher to Whole Class- *7*	1 way or two way ☐ Student listening mostly to Student- *1* ☐ Student listening mostly to Teacher-*2* ☐ Student listening mostly to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student listening to mostly Whole Class-*4*	☐ Reading or writing silently-1 ☐ Student is off task-2	
		☐ Student to Student- *1* ☐ Student To Teacher-*2* ☐ Student to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student to Whole Class-*4* ☐ Teacher to Student-*5* ☐ Teacher to Small Group- *6* ☐ Teacher to Whole Class- *7*	1 way or two way ☐ Student listening mostly to Student- *1* ☐ Student listening mostly to Teacher-*2* ☐ Student listening mostly to Small Group-*3* ☐ Student listening to mostly Whole Class-*4*	☐ Reading or writing silently-1 ☐ Student is off task-2	

(Soto, 2012)

Note. Adapted from *ELL Shadowing as a Catalyst for Change*, by I. Soto, 2012, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. Copyright by Corwin. Used with permission.

APPENDIX D

Academic Transcript Analysis

GR	ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRAM	LANGUAGE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT – CELDT	CST	RETENTION	GPA	TEACHER COMMENTS
K						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						

APPENDIX E

Focus Group Questions

1. Looking at your Fall report card, can you explain a little about what you see?

2. Can you explain a little bit about what happened during this past semester or course?

3. What are some of the reasons you think you passed these classes but not these?

4. Where there any out of school experiences that might have influenced you during these times?

5. What do you feel contributed to your success or lack of success in this course?

6. What do you feel you can do to improve your grades in this current semester?

7. What are you doing differently this semester from last to improve your grades?

8. If you are not doing anything differently, why is that?

9. What do you feel the school can do to help you improve your grades during this semester? Who might you be able to ask?

10. Which grade or school semester has been your most successful? Why is that?

11. Which grade or school semester has been your worst? Why is that?

12. Do you feel that the academic services you have received are well matched to your specific educational needs? If not, why? If yes, why?

13. Describe the characteristics of your favorite class. Why is this class your favorite?

14. Describe the characteristics of your least favorite class. Why is this your least favorite class?

15. If you could go back in time and do all your schooling again, what would you like the schools to do differently? What would you keep the same?

APPENDIX F

CONSENT FORMS

Parent/Guardian Informed Consent Form (English)

Loyola Marymount University

Date: August 1, 2013

Long-Term English Learners and Their Struggles to Succeed.

1) I hereby authorize Rafael Gaeta to include my child/ward in the following research study: Long Term English Learners and Their Struggles to Succeed.

2) My child/ward has been asked to participate on a research project which the research will explore further the topic of Long-Term English learners, with the purpose of bringing to light the instructional factors that block and hinder reclassification for LTELs and to give schools practical guidelines to improve LTEL reclassification.

3) It has been explained to me that the reason for my child/ward inclusion in this project is that I am a student who is an English Language Learner. Being part of this group will remain confidential and my teachers will not know about my responses to these questions.

4) I understand that if my child/ward is a subject, he/she will participate on two individual interviews with the researcher and my answers will remain anonymous.

5) The investigator(s) will explain the purpose to my child/ward before the interviews and will debrief with him/her, if requested, after the interview.

6) I understand that if my child/ward is a subject, the investigators will conduct observations in his/her classes.

7) I understand that if my child/ward, the investigator will get access to school records, i.e. transcripts.

8) I understand that my child/ward will be videotaped, audiotaped and/or photographed in the process of these research procedures. It has been explained to me that these tapes will be used for teaching and/or research purposes only and that my identity will not be disclosed. I have been assured that the tapes will be destroyed after their use in this research project is completed. I understand that I have the right to review the tapes made as part of the study to determine whether they should be edited or erased in whole or in part.

9) I understand that the study described above may involve the following risks and/or discomforts: my child/ward may get tired from answering the interview questions, however, the interviews are scheduled for only 60 minutes max so realistically you will not be that tired from the survey.

10) I also understand that the possible benefits of the study are to help teachers and school staff understands the instructional factors that block and hinder reclassification of LTELs. My child's/ward's responses may help teachers become better teachers in the long run.

11) I understand that Rafael Gaeta can be reached at (310) 625-1834 and will answer any questions I may have at any time concerning details of the procedures performed as part of this study.

12) If the study design or the use of the information is to be changed, I will be so informed and my consent reobtained.

13) I understand that my child/ward has the right to refuse to participate in, or to withdraw from this research at any time without prejudice to (e.g., my future medical care at LMU.)

14) I understand that circumstances may arise which might cause the investigator to terminate my child/ward from participating before the completion of the study.

15) I understand that no information that identifies my child/ward will be released without my separate consent except as specifically required by law.

16) I understand that my child/ward has the right to refuse to answer any question that he/she may not wish to answer.

17) I understand that in the event of research related injury to my child/ward, compensation and medical treatment are not provided by Loyola Marymount University.

18) I understand that if I have any further questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may contact David Hardy, Ph.D., Chair, Institutional Review Board, 1 LMU Drive, Suite 3000, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles CA 90045-2659 (310) 258-5465, david.hardy@lmu.edu.

19) In signing this consent form, I acknowledge receipt of a copy of the form, and a copy of the "Subject's Bill of Rights".

20) I give permission to Rafael Gaeta to access my child's/ward's transcripts, conduct observations and give my child/ward a questionnaire to complete.

Subject is a minor (age_____), or is unable to sign because _____

_____.

Mother/Father/Guardian _____ **Date _____**

Parent/Guardian Informed Consent Form (Spanish)

Fecha de Preparacion: Agosto 1, 2013

Loyola Marymount University

Estudiantes de inglés a largo plazo y sus luchas para tener éxito

1) Por la presente autorizo a Rafael Gaeta para incluirme a mi hijo/a/pupilo en el estudio de investigación: Estudiantes de inglés a largo plazo y sus luchas para tener éxito.

2) Se le ha pedido participar a mi hijo/a/pupilo en un proyecto de investigación que está diseñado para estudiantes de inglés a largo plazo, con el fin de sacar a la luz los factores educativos que bloquean e impiden su reclasificación y dar a escuelas prácticas para mejorar la reclasificación de estos estudiantes y que durará aproximadamente dos semanas.

3) Se me ha explicado la razón de inclusión a mi hijo/a/pupilo en este proyecto es que el/ella es un estudiante que está aprendiendo el idioma inglés. Formar parte de este grupo se mantendrá confidencial y mis profesores no estarán al tanto de mis respuestas de estas preguntas.

4) Entiendo que si mi hijo/a/pupilo es un sujeto, el/ella va a participar en dos entrevistas individuales con el investigador y las respuestas serán anónimas.

5) El investigador va a explicar a mi hijo/a/pupilo el propósito antes de las entrevistas y procesar el proceso con el/ella, si así lo solicito, después de la entrevista.

6) Entiendo que si mi hijo/a/pupilo es un sujeto, los investigadores van a realizar observaciones en sus clases.

7) Entiendo que si mi hijo/a/pupilo es un sujeto, el investigador tendrá acceso a los registros escolares de el/ella.

8) Entiendo que mi hijo/a/pupilo va hacer grabado en video, grabadora y / ó fotografiado/a en el proceso de estos procedimientos de la investigación. Se me ha explicado que estas cintas se utilizaran para la enseñanza y / ó para la investigación y que la identidad mi hijo/a/pupilo no se revelara. Se me ha asegurado que las cintas serán destruidas después de su uso cuando este proyecto de investigación termine. Entiendo que tengo el derecho de revisar las cintas hechas en el marco del estudio para determinar si deben ser editadas ó borradas en su totalidad ó en parte.

9) Entiendo que el estudio antedicho, puede implicar los siguientes riesgos y / ó molestias a mi hijo/a/pupilo: El/Ella puede cansarse de contestar las preguntas de la entrevista, sin embargo, las entrevistas están programadas por sólo 60 minutos como máximo.

10) También entiendo que los beneficios posibles del estudio pueden ser para ayudar a los maestros y el personal escolar para comprender los factores educativos que bloquean e impiden la reclasificación de LTEL. Sus respuestas pueden ayudar a los maestros a ser mejores maestros en el largo plazo.

11) Yo entiendo que a Rafael Gaeta se le puede llamar al (310) 625-1834, el responderá cualquier pregunta que pudiera tener en cualquier momento sobre los detalles de los procedimientos realizados en este estudio.

12) Si el diseño del estudio ó el uso de la información se va a cambiar, voy a estar informado/a y mi consentimiento tiene que ser obtenido de nuevo.

13) Yo entiendo que mi hijo/a/pupilo tiene el derecho de negarse a participar o retirarse de esta investigación en cualquier momento y sin perjuicio de nada(por ejemplo, mi cuidado médico en LMU).

14) Yo entiendo que pueden ocurrir circunstancias que podrían provocar que el investigador termine la participación de mi hijo/a/pupilo antes del fin del estudio.

15) Yo entiendo que no hay información que identifique mi hijo/a/pupilo o que se presentara sin mi consentimiento separado, con la excepción de lo que la ley especifica.

16) Yo entiendo que mi hijo/a/pupilo tiene el derecho de negarse a contestar cualquiera pregunta que no desee responder.

17) Yo entiendo que caso de lesiones a mi hijo/a/pupilo relacionadas con la investigación, la indemnización y el tratamiento medico no son previdos por la Universidad Loyola Marymount.

18) Yo entiendo que si tengo alguna duda, comentario, o preocupacin sobre el estudio ó el proceso de consentimiento informado, puedo contactar a David Hardy, Ph.D. Presidente, Junta de Revision lnstitucional, 1 LMU Drive, Suite 3000, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles CA 90045 (310) 258-5465, david.hardy@lmu.edu.

19) Al firmar este formulario de consentimiento, acuso de haber recibo una copia del formulario, y una copia de la "Declaracion de los Derechos del Sujeto de Investigación Experimental".

20) Yo le doy permiso a Rafael Gaeta acceder registros escolares de mi hijo/a/pupilo, realizar observaciones y que le de un cuestionario a mi hijo/a/pupilo para completar.

El sujeto es un menor de edad (la edad_____), o no puede firmar porque

_____.

Madre/Padre/Guardían _____ **Fecha** _____

Student Informed Consent Form (English)

Loyola Marymount University

Date: August 1, 2013

Long-Term English Learners and Their Struggles to Succeed.

1)   I authorize Rafael Gaeta to include me in the following research study: Long Term English Learners and Their Struggles to Succeed.

2)   I have been asked to participate on a research project which the research will explore further the topic of Long-Term English learners, with the purpose of bringing to light the instructional factors that block and hinder reclassification for LTELs and to give schools practical guidelines to improve LTEL reclassification.

3)   It has been explained to me that the reason for my participation in this project is that I am a students who is an English Language Learner. Being part of this group will remain confidential and my teachers will not know about my responses to these questions.

4)   I understand that if I am a subject, I will participate on two individual interviews with the researcher and my answers will remain anonymous.

5)   The investigator(s) will explain the purpose before the interviews and will debrief with me, if requested, after the interview.

6)   I understand that if I am a subject, the investigators will conduct observations in my classes.

7)   I understand that if I am a subject, the investigator will get access to school records, i.e. transcripts.

8)   I understand that I will be videotaped, audiotaped and/or photographed in the process of these research procedures. It has been explained to me that these tapes will be used for teaching and/or research purposes only and that my identity will not be disclosed. I have been assured that the tapes will be destroyed after their use in this research project is completed. I understand that I have the right to review the tapes made as part of the study to determine whether they should be edited or erased in whole or in part.

9)   I understand that the study described above may involve the following risks and/or discomforts: You may get tired from answering the interview questions, however, the interviews are scheduled for only 30 minutes max so realistically you will not be that tired from the survey.

10)   I also understand that the possible benefits of the study are to help teachers and school staff understands the instructional factors that block and hinder reclassification of LTELs. Your responses may help teachers become better teachers in the long run.

11) I understand that Rafael Gaeta can be reached at (310) 625-1834 and will answer any questions I may have at any time concerning details of the procedures performed as part of this study.

12) If the study design or the use of the information is to be changed, I will be so informed and my consent reobtained.

13) I understand that I have the right to refuse to participate in, or to withdraw from this research at any time without prejudice to (e.g., my future medical care at LMU.)

14) I understand that circumstances may take place which might cause the investigator to terminate my participation before the completion of the study.

15) I understand that no information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent except as specifically required by law.

16) I understand that I have the right to refuse to answer any question that I may not wish to answer.

17) I understand that in the event of research related injury, compensation and medical treatment are not provided by Loyola Marymount University.

18) I understand that if I have any further questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may contact David Hardy, Ph.D., Chair, Institutional Review Board, 1 LMU Drive, Suite 3000, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles CA 90045-2659 (310) 258-5465, david.hardy@lmu.edu.

19) In signing this consent form, I acknowledge receipt of a copy of the form, and a copy of the "Subject's Bill of Rights".

Subject's Signature _____ Date _____

Witness _____ Date _____

Student Consent Form (Spanish)

Fecha de Preparacion: Agosto 1, 2013

Loyola Marymount University

Estudiantes de inglés a largo plazo y sus luchas para tener éxito

1) Autorizo a Rafael Gaeta para incluirme en el estudio de investigación: Estudiantes de inglés a largo plazo y sus luchas para tener éxito.

2) Se me ha pedido participar en un proyecto de investigación que está diseñado para estudiantes de inglés a largo plazo, con el fin de sacar a la luz los factores educativos que bloquean e impiden su reclasificación y dar a escuelas prácticas para mejorar la reclasificación de estos estudiantes y que durará aproximadamente dos semanas.

3) Se me ha explicado que la razón de mi inclusión en este proyecto es que yo soy un estudiante que está aprendiendo el idioma inglés. Formar parte de este grupo se mantendrá confidencial y mis profesores no estarán al tanto de mis respuestas de estas preguntas.

4) Entiendo que si soy un sujeto, que voy a participar en dos entrevistas individuales con el investigador y mis respuestas serán anónimas.

5) El investigador va a explicar el propósito antes de las entrevistas y procesar el proceso conmigo, si así lo solicito, después de la entrevista.

6) Entiendo que si soy un sujeto, los investigadores van a realizar observaciones en mis clases.

7) Entiendo que si soy un sujeto, el investigador tendrá acceso a los registros escolares.

8) Entiendo que se me va a grabar en video, grabadas y / ó fotografiado/a en el proceso de estos procedimientos de investigación. Se me ha explicado que estas cintas se utilizaran para la enseñanza y / ó para la investigación y que mi identidad no se revelara. Se me ha asegurado que las cintas serán destruidas después de su uso cuando este proyecto de investigación termine. Entiendo que tengo el derecho de revisar las cintas hechas en el marco del estudio para determinar si deben ser editadas ó borradas en su totalidad ó en parte.

9) Entiendo que el estudio antedicho, puede implicar los siguientes riesgos y / ó molestias: Usted puede cansarse de contestar las preguntas de la entrevista, sin embargo, las entrevistas están programadas por sólo 60 minutos como máximo.

10) También entiendo que los beneficios posibles del estudio pueden ser para ayudar a los maestros y el personal escolar a comprender los factores educativos que bloquean e impiden la reclasificación de LTEL. Sus respuestas pueden ayudar a los maestros a ser mejores maestros en el largo plazo.

11) Yo entiendo que puedo llamar a Rafael Gaeta al (310) 625-1834 y el responderá cualquier pregunta que pudiera tener en cualquier momento sobre los detalles de los procedimientos realizados en este estudio.

12) Si el diseño del estudio ó el uso de la información se va a cambiar, voy a estar informado/a y mi consentimiento tiene que ser obtenido de nuevo.

13) Yo entiendo que tengo el derecho a negarme a participar o retirarme de esta investigación en cualquier momento y sin perjuicio de (por ejemplo, mi cuidado médico en LMU).

14) Yo entiendo que pueden ocurrir circunstancias que podrían provocar que el investigador termine mi participación antes del fin del estudio.

15) Yo entiendo que no hay información que me identifique o que se presentara sin mi consentimiento separado, con la excepción de lo que la ley especifica.

16) Yo entiendo que tengo el derecho a negarme a contestar cualquiera pregunta que no deseo responder.

17) Yo entiendo que caso de lesiones relacionadas con la investigación, la indemnización y el tratamiento medico no son previdos por la Universidad Loyola Marymount.

18) Yo entiendo que si tengo alguna duda,comentario, o preocupacin sobre el estudio ó el proceso de consentimiento informado, puedo contactar a David Hardy, Ph.D. Presidente, Junta de Revision lnstitucional, 1 LMU Drive, Suite 3000, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles CA 90045 (310) 258-5465, david.hardy@lmu.edu.

19) Al firmar este formulario de consentimiento, acuso de haber recibo una copia del formulario, y una copia de la "Declaracion de los Derechos del Sujeto de Investigación Experimental".

Firma del sujeto _____ Fecha _____

Testigo _____ Fecha _____

REFERENCES

Aarts, R., & Verhoeven, L. (1999, September). Literacy attainment in a second language submersion context. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 20*(3), 377-393.

Asembly Bill 815—Instructional Programs: State Seal of Biliteracy, Cal. Education Code § 51460-51464 (2012).

Assembly Bill 2193—Long-Term English Learners Definition, Cal. Education Code § 313.1 – 313.2 (2012).

Abedi, J., & Dietel, R. (2004, Winter). *Challenges in the No Child Left Behind Act for English language learners.* (CRESST Policy Brief). 1-6, doi. 10.1177/003172170408501015

Adams, D., Astone, B., Nunez-Wormack, E., & Smodlaka, I. (1994). Predicting the academic achievement of Puerto Rican and Mexican-American ninth-grade students. *The Urban Review, 26*(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1007/BF02354854

Akrofi, A. K., Janisch, C., Lewis, K., & Zebidi, A. (2012). Second grade ESL literacy success in a U.S. mainstream classroom. *Teachers' role in second language learning: Classroom applications of sociocultural theory.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2007, February). *Urgent but overlooked: The literacy crisis among adolescent English language learners.* (Issue Brief), Washington, DC.

Altheide, D. (2008). Ethnographic content analysis. In L. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 288-289). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n149

Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. (1970). *Bilingual schooling in the United States* (2 Volumes). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Laboratory.

Antonio, A., & Bersola, S. (2004). Working toward K-16 coherence in California. In M. Kirst & A. Venezia (Eds.), *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education* (pp. 24-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aspiazu, G. G., Bauer, S. C., & Spillett, M. D. (1998). Improving the academic performance of Hispanic youth: A community education model. *Bilingual Research Journal, 22*(2, 3 & 4), 127-147. doi: 10.1080/15235882.1998

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. doi: 10.1080/10862960903340165

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2010). *Effective English literacy instruction for English learners. Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bialystok, E. (1997). The structure of age: In search of barriers to second language acquisition. *Second Language Research, 13*(2), 116-137.

Bilingual Education Act of 1968, Pub. L. No. 90-247, § 81 Stat. 783 (1968).

Bilingual Education Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-380, § 88 Stat. 503 (1974).

Bilingual Education Act of 1978, Pub. L. No. 95-561, § 92 Stat. 2268 (1978).

Bilingual Education Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-511, § 98 Stat. 2379 (1984).

Bilingual Education Act of 1988, Pub. L. No. 100-297, § 102 Stat. 274 (1988).

Bilingual Education Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-382, (1994).

Brinton, D., Snow, M., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based language instruction*. New York, NY: Newbury House.

Brisk, M. (1989). *Bilingual Education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, R. M. (1990). *Gustavo Gutierrez: An introduction to liberation theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Brown v. Board of Educ., 347 USC § 483 (1954).

Bruner, J. (1975). From communication to language: A psychological perspective. *Cognition*, *3*, 255-287.

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk*. New York: Norton.

Bruner, J., & Sherwood, V. (1975). Peekaboo and the learning of rule structures. In J. S. Bruner, A. Jolly, and K. Sylva (Eds.), *Play: Its Role in Development and Evolution* (pp. 277-285). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Bucholtz, M., Liang, A. C., & Sutton, L. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Reinventing identities*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Calderon, M. E., & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2011). *Preventing long-term ELs: Transforming schools to meet core standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

California Department of Education—English Learner Glossary of Terms. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov

Callahan, R. (2006). The intersection of accountability and language: Can reading intervention replace English language development? *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*, 1-21.

Castaneda v. Pickard, 648 F. 2d (5th Cir. 1981) (1981).

Castro Feinberg, R. (2002). *Bilingual education: A reference handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Chacone-Moscone Bilingual Education Act—Bicultural Education Act of 1976, Cal. Education Code § 52160 – 57178 (1976).

Clay, M. (1989). Concepts about print in English and other languages. *The Reading Teacher, 42*, 268-276.

Cline, Z., & Necochea, J. (2003). Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE): More than just good instruction. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(1), 18-24.

Collier, J. F., & Beeman, M. M. (2000). The effects of language instruction on the reading and writing achievement of first-grade Hispanic children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *4*(4), 331-353. doi: 10.1207/S1532799XSSR0404_5

Collier, V. P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(4), 617-641.

Collins, J., & Blot, R. (2003). *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, J. (1987, April). Bilingual education: Language, learning, and politics. *Education Week*, 19-50.

Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice.* Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J. (1995). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom.* Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students.* Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association of Bilingual Education.

De Jong, E. J. (2004). After exit: Academic achievement patterns of former English language learners. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, *12*(50) 1-21.

Dixon-Krauss, L. (1995). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Droop, M., & Verhoeven, L. (1998). Background knowledge, linguistic complexity, and second-language reading comprehension. *Journal of Literacy Research, 30*(2), 253-71.

Duran, B. J., & Weffer, R. E. (1992). Immigrants' aspirations, high school process, and academic outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(1), 163-181. doi: 10.3102/00028312029001163

Dutro, S., & Kinsella, K. (2010). English language development: Issues and implementation at grades six through twelve. *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Dutro, S., & Levy, E. (2008). *A focused approach to constructing meaning: Explicit language for secondary content instruction.* San Marcos, CA: E. L. Achieve.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (1999). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2003). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-10, § 79 Stat. 27 (1965).

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107-115.

English Language Education for Children in Public Schools—Proposition 203, Ari. Education Code § 3.1 (2000).

English Language Education for Immigrant Children—Proposition 227, Cal. Education Code § 300-340 (1998).

Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. (93-380), 88 Stat. 514. Sec. 204 (f) (1974).

Escamilla, K. (1994). *Descubriendo la lectura*: An early intervention literacy program in Spanish. *Literacy, Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Literacy*, *1*(1), 57-70.

Faltis, C. J. (1993). Critical issues in the use of sheltered content teaching in high school bilingual programs. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *69*(1), 136-151. doi:10.1080/01619569309538755

Faltis, C., & Hudelson, S. (1998). *Bilingual education in elementary and secondary school communities.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ferlazzo, L. (2009). Family literacy, English language learners, and parent engagement. *Library Media Connections*, *28*(1), 20-21.

Finkelstein, N., Huang, M., & Fong, A. (2009). *High school course-taking patterns for English language learners: A case study.* Washington, DC: WestEd.

Flores, B. (1982). *Language Interface or Influence: Toward a Theory of Hispanic bilingualism*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Foresight enriched Research Infrastructure Impact Assessment Methodology (FenRIAM). (2012). [Website]. Retrieved from http://www.fenriam.eu

Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews.* (D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Francis, D., Lesaux, N., & August, D. (2006). Language instruction for language minority learners. In D. L. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 365-414). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (1998). *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freeman, Y. S., Freeman, D. E., & Mercuri, S. (2002). *Closing the achievement gap: How to reach limited-formal-schooling and long-term English learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fritzen, A. (2011). Teaching as sheltering: A metaphorical analysis of sheltered instruction for English language learners. *Curriculum Inquiry, 41*(2), 185-211. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00548.x

Gándara, P., & Baca, G. (2008). NCLB and California's English language learners: The perfect storm. *Language Policy, 7*, 201-216.

Gándara, P., & Orfield, G. (2010). A return to the "Mexican room": The segregation of Arizona's English learners. *The Civil Rights Project.* Retrieved from http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu

García, E. E. (2002). Bilingualism and schooling in the United States. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 155/156*, 1-96.

García, G. E., Pearson, P. D., Taylor, B. M., Bauer, E. B., & Stahl, K. A. D. (2011). Socio-constructivist and political views on teachers' implementation of two types of reading comprehension approaches in low-income schools. *Theory into Practice, 50*(2), 149-156.

García, O. (1999). Educating high school Latino students with little formal schooling. In C. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school.* (pp. 61-82). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2001, December). *Reading in "new times."* Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Genesee, F. (1999). *Program alternatives for linguistically diverse students (Educational Practice Report No. 1).* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* New York, NY: Longman.

Goldenberg, C. (2006, July 26). Improving achievement for English learners: What research tells us. *Education Week,* 34-36.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities and classrooms.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.). *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 5-21). White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Gutiérrez, K., & Larson, J. (1994). Language borders: Recitation as hegemonic discourse. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 3,* 22-36.

Hacquebord H. (1994). L2-reading in the content areas: Texas comprehension in secondary education in the Netherlands. *Journal of Research in Reading, 17*(2), 83-98.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* (Policy Report 2000-1). Santa Barbara, CA: The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Handsfield, L. J. (2012). Mediating learning and negotiating curricular ideologies in a fourth grade bilingual classroom. *Teachers' role in second language learning: Classroom applications of sociocultural theory.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Hansen-Thomas, H. (2008). Sheltered instruction: Best practices for ELLs in the mainstream. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 44*(4), 165-169.

Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *48*(2), 152-162.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hutchinson, J. M., Whitley, H. E., Smith, C. D., & Connors, L. (2003). The developmental progression of comprehension-related skills in children learning EAL. *Journal of Research of Reading, 26.* 19-32.

Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, 8 USC § 1158 (1965).

Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, 20 USC § 6301 et seq. (1994).

Jones, R. H., & Norris, S. (2005). Introducing practice. In S. Norris & R. H. Jones (Eds.), *Discourse in action: Introducing mediated discourse analysis.* (pp. 97-99) London: Routledge.

Keyes v. School District, 576 F. Supp 1503, (United States District Court for the District of Colorado, 1983).

Kim, J. (2011). *Relationships among and between ELL status, demographic characteristics, enrollment history, and school persistence.* (CRESST Report 810). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Kinsella, K. (2007). *Bolstering academic language and reading comprehension.* Powerpoint presentation at the Academic Language Development Workshop, Mountain View School, El Monte, CA. Retrieved from http://www.sccoe.k12.ca.us

Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kloss, H. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition.* McHenry, IL: Center of Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Language teaching methodology series. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London, UK: Longman.

Krashen, S. D. & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California.* Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Krashen, S. D. & McField, G. (2005). What works? Reviewing the lasts evidence on bilingual education. *Language Learner, 1*(2), 7-10, 34.

Krueger, R. A. (2008). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 USC § 563 (1974).

Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity: An International Journal, 3,* 149-164.

Lesaux, N., & Geva, E. (2006). Synthesis: Development of literacy in language-minority students. In D. L. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 53-74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1990). *The foundations of dual language instruction.* White Plains, New York: Longman.

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lichtman, M. (2010). *Qualitative research in education: A users' guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lindsey, K. A., Manis, F. R., & Bailey, C. E. (2003). Predictions of first-grade reading in Spanish speaking English-language learners. *Journal of Educational Psychology 95,* 482-494.

Linquanti, R. (1999). *Fostering academic success for English learners: What do we know?* San Francisco, CA: WestEd. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interianguage talk and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(2), 208-228. doi:10.2307/3586827

Lyons, J. J. (1990). The past and future directions of Federal bilingual-education policy. In C. B. Cazden & C. E. Snow (Eds.). *Annals of the American academy of political and social science, Vol. 508.* (pp. 119-134). London: Sage.

Lyons, J. (1992). *Legal responsibilities of education agencies serving national origin language minority students* (2nd ed.). Chevy Chase, MD: Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.

Macedo, D., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Mackey, W. F. (1978). The importance of bilingual education models. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown university roundtable: International Dimensions of Education.* (pp. 35-47). Washington, DC: Georgetown Publications.

Macnaghten, P., & Myers, G. (2004). Focus groups. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 65-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interpretive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCarty, T. L. (2004). Dangerous difference: A critical-historical analysis of language education policies in the United States. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 71-96). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

McLaughlin, W. (1984). *Second-language acquisition in childhood: Vol. 1. Preschool children* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Meltzer, J., & Hamman, E. (2005). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescents: English language learners through content-area learning.* Providence, RI: Brown University, Education Alliance.

Menken, K. (2000). What are the critical issues in wide-scale assessment of English language learners? (NCBE Issue Brief No. 6,). 1–8. Washington, DC: NCBE.

Menken, K. (2006). Teaching to the test: How No Child Left Behind impacts language policy, curriculum, and instruction for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, *30*(2), 521-546.

Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Menken, K. (2010). NCLB and English language learners: Challenges and consequences, *Theory into Practice, 49*(2), 121-128.

Menken, K. (2013a). Emergent bilingual students in secondary school: Along the academic language and literacy continuum. *Language Teaching, 46,* 438-476. doi:10.1017/S0261444813000281

Menken, K. (2013b). Restrictive language education policies and emergent bilingual youth: A perfect storm with imperfect outcomes. *Theory in Practice, 52*:3, 50-168. doi:10.1080/00405841.2013.804307

Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling experience on secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(4), 399-417.

Menken, K., Kleyn, T. & Chase, N. (2012). Spotlight on "long-term English language learners": Characteristics and prior schooling experiences of an invisible population. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *6*, 121-142. doi:10.1080/19313152.2012.665822

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., & Kendall, P. L. (1990). *The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 USC § 390 (1923).

Miguel, G. S. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education in the United States 1960-2001.* Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Miramontes, O. B., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. (1997). *Restructuring Schools for Linguistic Diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Moje, E. B., & Lewis, C. (2007). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Defense and Education Act of 1958, 20 USC §§ 402 – 602 (1958).

Nationality Act of 1906, 34 USC §§ 2169 (1906).

No Child Left Behind Act, 20 USC 70 § 6301 et seq. (2001).

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Oldakowski, T. (2014). A multimodal assignment that enriches literacy learning. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 9,* 70-77. doi:10.1080/0969594032000085767

Olsen, L. (2010a). Changing course for long-term English learners. *Leadership, 40*(2), 30-33.

Olsen, L. (2010b). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long-term English learners.* Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.

Orellana, M. F., Ek, L., & Hernandez, A. (1999). Bilingual education in an immigrant community: Proposition 227 in California. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2*(2), 114-130.

Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(1), 1-24.

Perlmann, J. (1990). Historical legacies: 1840-1920. In C. B. Cazden & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education.* (pp. 27-37) London: Sage.

Pinnell, G. (1990). Success for low achievers through reading recovery. *Educational Leadership*, *48*(1), 17-21.

Plyler v. Doe, 457 US 202 (1982).

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41–60). New York: Plenum. In Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Prawat, R. S. (1996). Constructivisms, modern and postmodern. *Educational Psychologist*, *31*(3/4), 215-225. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep3103&4_6

Quezada, M., Wiley, T. G., & Ramirez, J. D. (1999). How the reform agenda shortchanged English learners. *Educational Leadership, 57*(4), 57-61.

Ramírez, D., Yuen, S., & Ramey, D. (1990). *Executive summary, final report: Longitudinal study of structural English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual programs for language minority children.* (Contract No. 300-87-0156). San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Rosborough, A. (2012). Teachers and students' use of gestures as a meaning-making affordance for second language learning. *Teachers' role in second language learning: Classroom applications of sociocultural theory.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Rosen, N. G., & Sasser, L. (1997). Sheltered English: Modifying content delivery for second language learners. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content based classroom: Perspectives in integrating language and content* (pp. 35-45). White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Ruiz de Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools.* (Urban Institute Report). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Rumberger, R., & Tran, L. (2008). *Investigating state, district, and school variability in the English learner student achievement gap.* (Final report to IES.) University of California, Santa Barbara: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Rumberger, R., & Tran, L. (2010). State language policies, school language practices, and the English learner student achievement gap. *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (2010). Research to guide English language development. *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Scarcella, R. (2003). *Accelerating academic English: A focus on the English learner student.* Oakland, CA: Regent of the University of California.

Schlossman, S. (1983). Is there an American tradition of bilingual education? *American Journal of Education, 91*, 139-186.

Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language policy and identity policy in the United States.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Schram, T. H. (2003). *Conceptualizing qualitative inquiry.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Senate Bill 1174—Bill Text. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.legiscan.com

Short, D. J. (1991). *How to integrate language and content instruction: A training manual.* ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED359780.

Short, D. J. (1993). Assessing integrated language and content instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 627-656.

Short, D. J. (1994). Expanding middle school horizons: Integrating language, culture, and social studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(3), 581-608.

Short, D. J. (1999). Integrating language and content for effective sheltered instruction programs. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilinguals, & ESL in the secondary school*, (pp. 105-137). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sinclair, R. L., & Ghory, W. J. (1987). *Becoming marginal. Success or failure? Learning and language minority student.* New York, NY: Newbury House Publishers.

Sobul, D. (1995). *Specially designed academic instruction in English.* ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 391357.

Solórzano, R. (2008). High stakes testing: Issues, implications, and remedies for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research, 78*, 260-329.

Soto, I. (2012). *ELL shadowing as a catalyst for change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Soto-Hinman, I. & Hetzel, J. (2009). *The Literacy Gaps.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Spolsky, B. (2011). *Does the United States need language policy?* Washington, DC: Center of Applied Linguistics.

Stewart, D. W., Shamdasani, P. N., & Rook, D. W. (2006). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stewner-Manzanares, G. (1988). The Bilingual Education Act: Twenty years later. *The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education*, *6*, 1-11.

Stritikus, T. (2001). From personal to political: Proposition 227, literacy instruction, and the individual qualities of teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *4*(5), 291-309.

Tong, T., Lara-Alecio, R., Irby, B., Mathes, P., & Kwok, O. (2008). Accelerating early academic oral English development in transitional bilingual and structured English immersion programs. *American Research Journal, 45*(4), 1011-1044. doi:10.3102/0002831208320790

University of California. (n.d.). A-G subject requirements. Retrieved from www.ucop.edu

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con Respeto: Bridging the distance between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Valdés, G., Kibler, A., & Walqui, A. (2014, March). *Changes in the expertise of ESL professionals: Knowledge and action in an era of new standards.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.

Valenzuela, A. (1999) *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and politics of caring.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Verhoeven, L. T. (1990). Acquisition of reading in a second language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *25*(2), 91-114.

Verhoeven, L. T. (2000). Components in early second language reading and spelling. *Scientific Studies of Reading. 4*(4), 313-30.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *9*(2), 159-180. doi:10.1080/13670050608668639

Whitlock-Robles, J. (2010). Participatory leadership for English learner student success. *Leadership*, 26-29.

Wiley, T. G. (2002). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the U.S. context. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 89-107). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yoon, B. (2012). The teacher's cultural inclusivity and English language learners' participation in language and literacy activities. *Teachers' role in second language learning: Classroom applications of sociocultural theory* (pp. 155-170). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.