

A Choice Against: An Analysis of the De-selection of

Dual Language Programs in Arizona

Through a Latino Critical Race Theory Lens

by

Michael Anthony Robert

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Approved October 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Carlos Ovando, Chair

Gustavo Fischman

Teresa McCarty

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2011

ABSTRACT

A hallmark of Arizona schools is the choice of parents in program and school for their child under the Open Enrollment laws. Among the choices for parents at some schools is Dual Language education, a form of enrichment wherein students learn the content of the Arizona State Standards through the medium of their primary language and a second language. The schools of this study use English and Spanish as the two languages. After 13 years of existence, changes in enrollment patterns have been noticed. Some parents whose older children attended Dual Language classes have chosen to dis-enroll their families from the program, so that their younger children are in English Only classes.

At the same time that these trends in enrollment began, so too did strict enactment, enforcement, and monitoring of Arizona's Structured English Immersion program, the Department of Education's response to the voter approved Proposition 203—English for the Children—in November 2000.

This study asks the following research question of de-selecting parents involved with Dual Language programs in Phoenix, Arizona: What are the rationale that influence parents to de-select Dual Language instruction in Arizona public schools in 2010 after having selected Dual Language for their older child(ren)? The study uses a Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) Conceptual Framework to analyze interviews of 10 parents and 2 administrators from Dual Language programs in Phoenix, Arizona.

There are three general findings of the study: 1) Parents sought asymmetrical measures of program design if their children were struggling in one

language more than another, and chose to de-select when these asymmetrical measures were not enacted, 2) the de-selection process was generally not the result of family decision making, but rather reactionary to a situation, and 3) legislative mandates resulted in de-selection of the program. The LatCrit perspective showed most strongly in the third of these, wherein the de-selection was not necessarily a result of parent de-selection of the program, but rather the state's de-selection of willing participants in a language learning option.

The hopes of the study are to hear the voices of parents who have to negotiate language policies and make programmatic choice decisions for their children. I also hope to provide information that Dual Language schools can use to understand the motivations and perspectives of the parents that will enable them to strengthen their programs and advocate for equality in opportunity for enrichment language programs for all children at their schools.

DEDICATION

There are many people to whom this dissertation is dedicated. I must begin with the freedom, love, support, and encouragement given to me by my wife Naomi Robert. We met on my first day employed as a teacher over 17 years ago. We grew together as young teachers, and then something magical happened to you professionally. You became the most confident, self-assured, motivational Montessori teacher, ever. I saw that spark of confidence in you and wanted to share in that. We shared educational journeys together, wherein I have been pleased to be the follower. I have watched you teach hundreds of children, open your own school, tutor adults in English, and raise three little boys, all with grace that inspires me. More than that, I have been loved and nurtured through a long process. I recognize that many nights, a few entire weeks each summer, and completely over the past couple months of writing, I left you to do all that alone. You carried the torch, and now I'm ready to run my leg with it.

To my three young boys, Lionel, Quincy, and Raymond—you were 3, 5, and 7 years old when I started this journey. Now you all have grown up so much. In that time I missed dinner twice a week, quite a few summer camping and fishing trips, and lots of time I would have rather been reading to you or listening to you read to me. Thank you for loving me and carrying me through. Hopefully I have been able to show you a thing or two about perseverance, dedication, and sacrifice along the way. You get your daddy back now!

My mother and father, Lionel and Olga Robert, have done so much for me along my educational journey. My father worked continuously, and then

countless hours of overtime, to put my brother, sisters, and I through the schooling environments they knew would nurture our minds and hearts. My mother was my original teacher. She worked on concepts for the next school year in the summer with me, so that by the time my teachers got around to it, I already knew most of it. Thank you for sending the right message to me about the importance of education all the way along.

To my brother Christopher, you led the way for all of us, and shaped the idea of what a career could be. You were also my support, pleading with mom and dad to let me try some of the things you did not get the chance to do. Now more than 20 years into your teaching career, you are still inspirational to me as to what being a teacher is all about.

To my sister Karen, you took a different path than the rest of us—going off to Stanford, studying abroad in Italy, producing movies, and buying your own business. You showed me what it means to be a trailblazer, take risks, and have ambitions that nothing would stop you in achieving.

To my sister Cynthia, my childhood playmate, I spent the last year or two of college coming in to your classroom to watch you and your best friends teach, and saw pure joy and talent in what you all did. I wanted to be able to do that and enjoy it just as much...maybe even as much as the children who had the joy of being in your classroom. I wrote the first words of this dissertation at your bedside the last night I spent with you. Now, although you aren't here to read these words, I want you to know that I found the ability to write inspired by your courage, strength, and fight.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to acknowledge Dr. Carlos Ovando who has served as the chair of my dissertation committee these past 2 years. I appreciate your guidance and camaraderie over that time. Not only have I gotten to know you as an individual, but also as a professional. I have read your studies and value the role you have played as a beacon in the field of language acquisition studies and multicultural education. Thank you for guiding me through this process.

Dr. Teresa McCarty's class on Qualitative Research Methods is spoken about among my classmates as one of the most formative classes throughout this process. You shared the methods as a teacher and practitioner of qualitative research methods, leading us through our first ventures in the field. Now your guidance has seen me through my first qualitative study. The vast majority of the 20 of us in the program are putting into practice everything you taught us.

The night we all walked into Dr. Gustavo Fischman's class, when we took a break for dinner, we all acknowledged that we were in for a seminar that would be transformative in how we were to approach research. I hope I have been able to present a study in a time, space, and identity that will serve to enhance the field as you have.

And finally, to my cohorts in DELTA VII. For two years solid, for a few nights a week, you literally took the place of my family. We shared meals together, traveled the world together, and studied together. I learned so much from every one of you. Thank you for sharing your many perspectives and leadership skills with me. Let's make change happen for others! AMDG.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 Introduction.....	1
Overview.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Research Question.....	2
Definition of Terms.....	3
Limitations.....	5
Delimitations.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	6
Conceptual Framework.....	7
Asymmetry.....	8
Latino/a Critical Race Theory.....	9
A Historical Background of Bilingual Education and Dual Language Programs in Arizona.....	13
Summary.....	15
2 Review of the Literature.....	19
Introduction.....	19
Descriptions of Dual Language Schools.....	19
Effective Models of Instruction for Language Minority Students.....	21
Criticisms of Dual Language Programs.....	24
Parental Attitudes Toward Dual Language Instruction—A Program of Choice.....	29

CHAPTER	Page
Summary	33
3 Method	35
Introduction.....	35
Role of the Researcher	36
Interviews as the Choice Qualitative Method.....	37
Recruitment.....	39
District/School Participation.....	41
Population, Sites of Interviews, and Duration of Study.....	41
Interview Process	43
Focus Group.....	45
Protection of Confidentiality.....	46
Possible Benefits to the Participants.....	47
Analysis.....	48
Summary	50
4 Findings and Results.....	51
Introduction: Hearing the Voices.....	51
Interviews: Profiles of Parents in Dual Language Schools.....	54
Focus Group—Profiles of Administrative Personnel in Dual Language Programs	67
School and District Profiles	70
Organization.....	73

CHAPTER	Page
Asymmetry Desired: The Parents Need More	76
Asymmetry Constructed: The Silent Influence.....	82
Implications of the Asymmetrical Experience.....	86
Choice as a Family Decision: The Children Struggle to Participate	92
Implications of the Family Decision-Making Process: The Importance of Gathering Information	102
Legislative Mandates y Puertas Cerradas (Closed Doors): De-Selection as a Passive Process.....	109
Implications of Increasingly Restrictive Language Policy on Dual Language Programs in Arizona	121
Summary of Findings.....	127
5 Summary, Reactions, and Recommendations.....	129
Introduction and Organization	129
Conclusions and Reactions	131
Recommendations for Future Research	136
Recommendations for School Administrators	137
Recommendations for Parents	139
Recommendations for Program Design	140
Recommendations for Educational Policymakers	141
Conclusions on the Study.....	144
References.....	147

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	154
2: ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FORMS	163
3: INFORMED CONSENT FORMS AND IRB EXEMPTION	170

Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

Arizona's public schools serve 138,449 students designated as English Language Learners (ELL), which accounts for 14% of all of the state's K-12 school population (Arizona Auditor General, 2008). Many more students in Arizona are designated second language learners when their parents sign waivers permitting them to participate in bilingual programs, such as Dual Language programs. State and federal policies may give parents, and in particular the parents of ELL students, mixed messages about the importance and value of bilingualism. For example, Title VII of the Improving American Schools Act (the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) called for a move toward additive, enrichment models of bilingual education, specifically promoting dual language programs with demonstrated success in the promotion of proficiency in 2 languages (Ovando, Collier, and Combs, 2003).

Yet few years later—California in 1998 with Proposition 227, and Arizona in 2000 with Proposition 203—states passed legislation barring the use of native language instruction without special waivers, calling for English Only educational practices. This was punctuated with the renaming of the Office of Bilingual Education in the US Department of Education as the Office of English Language Acquisition (NCLB, 2002). The era of restrictive language policy in parts of the southwest United States had been ushered in, joined with measures of

accountability, assurance, and monitoring of the instruction of English Language Learners.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the motivation of parents who have chosen both for and against Dual Language programs for their children. Federal and state policies may be difficult for parents to navigate. Therefore schools must consistently frame the conversation to positively share the goals of their programs with their communities. My hopes for this study are three-fold: 1) to hear the voice to a community of parents who have to negotiate language policies on behalf of their children, 2) to help Dual Language schools better understand the motivations and perspectives of some of their potential constituents, and 3) to provide Dual Language schools with the ideas of parents who have responded and reacted to their programs in this politically-charged, openly-hostile time in language policy. Hopefully dual language schools will act with this information to provide greater services meeting the needs of parents as well as assess the quality of their programs so that there is a match between the goals of the program with the implementation models.

Research Question

In this study I worked with select group of parents purposefully sampled to explore answers to the following research question:

What are the rationale that influence parents to de-select Dual Language instruction in Arizona public schools in 2010 after having selected Dual Language for their older child(ren)?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions and clarifications are necessary.

PHLOTE—Any parent who enrolls their child in an Arizona public school has to fill out a PHLOTE survey (Appendix 2) as mandated by the State of Arizona Department of Education—Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS). PHLOTE stands for Primary Home Language Other Than English. Until fall 2009, there were 3 questions on the PHLOTE survey. They are as follows:

1. What is the primary language used in the home regardless of the language spoken by the student?
2. What is the language most often spoken by the student?
3. What is the language that the student first acquired?

The new PHLOTE survey as of July 1, 2009 asks one question—What is the primary language of the student? (Answer with the language used most often by the student) Due to an agreement between the Arizona Department of Education and the US Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, the 3 question PHLOTE survey has been reinstated for the 2011-2012 school year.

AZELLA— If any answers on the PHLOTE survey indicate anything other than English, the student is considered a PHLOTE student, and the child is tested on the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA) to determine their level of English proficiency.

English Language Learner (ELL)—A student who is determined to be non-Proficient in English on the AZELLA test.

Structured English Immersion (SEI)—Model of instruction for English Language Learners in Arizona requiring a minimum of four (4) hours of instruction in English language development divided into the following areas: grammar (60 minutes), vocabulary (60 minutes), reading (60 minutes), and oral conversations and writing (60 minutes).

Language Minority Parent—This study considers any parent of a PHLOTE student to be a language minority parent. Any parent of a non-PHLOTE student is considered in this study to be a language majority parent.

Language Minority Student—Students who have any language other than English as their home or primary language

Dual Language Program—A method for providing content knowledge and language experience through the medium of instruction in two languages (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

De-selection—A term specific to this study, de-selection refers to the choice of a parent of a child who was in a Dual Language program to not select the program for the younger sibling. Specifically, the parent entered into a school with a specialized Dual Language program and made a conscious choice to choose to enter their child, and subsequently their family involvement, into the Dual Language program. With the next child or another younger child, they are choosing not to be in this program, or rather, de-selecting the Dual Language program.

Limitations

This study includes certain limitations that derive from biases I bring to the study. I began my career in education 18 years ago as a Dual Language instructor, providing the English content to my class in mathematics and social studies, and Spanish content to my class and a partner class in language arts and science. I then worked as a teacher for 3 years in a transitional bilingual education model. For 5 years I taught three miles off the Navajo Reservation to a population that was predominantly English Language Learners. And for two years I taught overseas in a classroom with students from 7 different countries and home languages. That is 11 of 12 years of teaching in bilingual, Dual Language, or English as a Second Language environments. I am currently entering my 6th year as a school administrator of schools with Dual Language programs. I have worked at two schools in the study in my educational career.

My move from California to Arizona has also shaped my views on language policy, as I left California after voters approved an English Only proposition, only to watch voters in my new state support the same type of initiative, written by the same the same author. As a school administrator of a school with a significant percentage of English Language Learners, I am affected greatly by the language policies of the voters, state legislature, and the Structured English Immersion Task Force, as I am asked to enforce policy and program designs for English Language Learners that do not support the theories of second language acquisition I have practiced throughout an 18 year career in education,

particularly in multiple experiences in Dual Language schools as a teacher and administrator.

Delimitations

There are also certain delimitations of this study in design. The number of participants and participating schools is small. There are 10 parents and 2 administrators representing 3 schools in metropolitan Phoenix with Dual Language programs. Similar research-studied Dual Language programs are prominent in places such as California, New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, Texas, Massachusetts, and New York, however not many of these places have such stringent language policies and practices as Arizona. In fact, Colorado and Massachusetts successfully fended off restrictive, English Only policies funded and supported by the same writers of the propositions of Arizona and California. Therefore, the nature of some implications of the research may not be applicable or generalize to other Dual Language settings. Nonetheless, the findings may hint at what may be occurring with other dual language programs nationwide.

Significance of the Study

Arizona school law provides all parents living within the state of Arizona with the opportunity to enroll their child in any school district in the state (ARS 15-816.01). This open enrollment law brings a market economy perspective into the discussion of parental selection or de-selection of a school or program within a school. Parental choice of schools or programs affects school enrollment, the driving mechanism behind school funding in the state. Hirschman (1970) addresses the issues of market choice when a consumer experiences potential

dissatisfaction. He addresses three options the consumer can exercise: to exit negotiations with a service provider, to express their voice in an attempt to remediate, or demonstrate continued loyalty toward the service provider.

Hirschman describes the “exit” side of this as an economic principle, whereas the “voice” is seen as political. The expression of discontent is with a hope or expectation to bring about change, thus bringing into play the third dimension—loyalty. Without a hope for change, the market-driven option of “exit” is the simplest and least confrontational option for a parent to choose. Hirschman continues to describe how decentralization efforts in education open that sector to guiding parents more toward utilizing the “voice” option than in regular economic markets. Specifically, a decentralized education system gives voice to the community at a localized level. Change can occur with voice, effort, and action of the community. The very fact that parents are exercising an “exit” strategy speaks to the need for de-selection to be studied.

Conceptual Framework

Conducting interviews using Charmaz’s (2006) steps to grounded theory, I anticipated the data in this study to evolve through questioning from an exploration of topics. These topics encompassed the potential for de-selection from Dual Language programming due to academic, social, political, or legal rationale. The theoretical basis of the questions stems from the conceptual frameworks to be discussed here. Namely I examined the process of de-selection from the lens of asymmetry (an academic framework for understanding de-

selection) and Latino/a Critical Race Theory (a legal perspective for understanding power and privilege).

Asymmetry

Amrein and Peña (2000) explored the issue of asymmetry in Dual Language programs by measuring expressly stated program goals with outcomes. Dual Language programs, for many, are programs of choice. Rather than an entire neighborhood school offering only Dual Language instructional programs, they arise as magnet programs or “schools within a school” or strand instructional options for parents. In such, there are professed goals for students promoted to draw enrollment. Asymmetry occurs when students’ school experiences are not consistent with the stated goals of the language program.

The asymmetrical measures stated by Amrein and Peña (2000) are in relation to the students, materials, and instructional practices of Dual Language instruction. More specifically, the stated vision of the program did not always allocate the same resources to English and Spanish equally. Instructions, conversations, or the expectations for language-specific conversations were dominated by English, even in programs claiming a 50:50 ratio of English to Spanish. Part of Dual Language philosophy stems from maintaining a balance of native English to Spanish speakers. The ideal is an equal 50% split, with the ratio going no higher than 70:30 toward either language group. However in social situations outside and inside the classroom, mixing was not as common as idealized or set in place with balanced ratios.

Latino/a Critical Race Theory

CRT is a form of legal scholarship focused on understanding how the law functions to maintain and preserve white privilege (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Ladson-Billings (2005) argued that CRT can be used to give a voice to people of color in education to explain how legal precedent can sustain the unequal situations in schools. Trucios-Haynes (2001) defines Latino/a CRT (LatCrit) as a means of exploring the legal ramifications of race policy beyond a Black-White limitation to include a broader analysis of race that is also aimed at understanding how race intersects with language, immigration, color, national origin, and gender. Bender and Aoki (2003) define the goal of LatCrit to move beyond the world of legal discourse to one that takes on a social justice agenda, affecting policy and practice. The language and immigration aspects of LatCrit provide a more specific context to CRT as applied to Dual Language studies (Juárez, 2008; Michael-Luna, 2008; Monzó and Rueda, 2009). Monzó and Rueda (2009) assert that although racially based discrimination practices are not permissible legally or acceptable socially, language-based discrimination is. He offers as evidence English Only policies and mandates for performance levels for ELLs to be disaggregated at the same levels as all students without sufficient funding.

LatCrit plays a significant role in examining language policy of the past 15 years in the southwest United States due to the way Latinos social, ethnic, and racial identity has been tied to language (Revilla and Asato, 2002). Johnson and Martinez (2000) argue that bilingual studies have been prohibited in states, in their case looking specifically at California, based on violation of the Equal

Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Rather than make a direct connection of bilingual education to race, however, the authors of California's Proposition 227 and Arizona's 203 attacked the issue of language. Studies of language policy in education, particularly those looking at bilingual studies replaced by English immersion programs, are naturally linked to LatCrit. One historical precedent in the United States to counter such legal practice has been the filing of desegregation suits. Bowman (2010) illustrates the difficulty with this measure since the restrictive language policy environment began in California in 1998. Bowman also illustrates how the issues of desegregation and school finance litigation can be linked, slowing the remedy process down even more so than if the case were just being raised on the grounds of segregation.

Given that LatCrit emerged as an extension of Critical Race Theory, a form of legal scholarship, it is critical that the legal components of language policy in Arizona are studied. LatCrit theorists would begin the argument that the segregative nature of the Structured English Immersion classrooms in Arizona unfairly distribute knowledge to native English speakers, in that through the 4-hour model, student content is limited to the English Language Proficiency Standards. Beyond that limit however, *Castañeda v. Pickard* established a 3-prong test to assure that English Language Learners are adequately being given the content. Among these requirements for schools are that the program design be research-based, that adequate resources are given to allow for program success, and that the program be evaluated for student success. Failure to accomplish one of these prongs would put the schools in question in violation of *Castañeda*, and

create an enacted imbalance of power and access, central to a LatCrit analysis. Through quantitative analysis of the outcomes since the enforcement of Proposition 203 in Arizona, Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, and García (2010) and García, Lawton, and Diniz de Figueiredo (2010) find Arizona's 4-hour Structured English Immersion model to be in violation of the third prong of *Castañeda*. The requirement, still to be acted upon, would be a reanalysis of the model toward one that would yield more positive results for English Language Learners.

Beyond the impact on students is the role that the de-selection of Dual Language classrooms has on families. LatCrit, as theorized by Davila and Aviles de Bradley (2010), allows for language experiences and lived experiences as Latinos in the United States to provide perspective on issues of oppression. The utilization of interviews as a qualitative means of study allows for these stories and "counter narratives" to fill the void of voices in the research that is used to promote restrictive language policy (Solórzano and Yosso, 2002).

The framework of LatCrit forces the researcher to examine issues of schooling from the conceptualization of deficit-based approaches to the impacts of legislative mandates on issues of race, language, and immigration status. The entire idea of the achievement gap with Latino students, Irizarry (2011) contends, begins with a deficit perspective on Latino children, communities, and families that makes assumptions about the corrective measures without examining the racialized schooling contexts in which their achievement has not equaled those of other federally recognized subgroups. Within Dual Language, Latino students

bring families with rich language backgrounds, that upon exclusion or de-selection alter the program greatly, making LatCrit an appropriate lens for examining this phenomenon.

Dual Language settings theoretically allow students to be successful within an additive linguistic framework. Students do not have to give up language or culture; in fact the opposite is an explicit goal of the program—students bring a wealth of linguistic and culturally significant experiences that add to the understandings for themselves and their peers. Carrillo (2009) uses a LatCrit approach to examine the costs of success for many language minority students. In order to reach the goals within the constraints of restrictive language policy-embedded classrooms, students are pushed to levels of English fluency that fit the middle-class, white standard as a new identity. He argues that this “identity performance” is a requirement for many Latino students’ success. Within a LatCrit perspective, it is the legal precedent that sets the culture of language policy and enactment in the schools that forces Latino students to choose an identity, knowing that one of the choices can lead to a schooling definition of success.

Juárez (2008) looks at Dual Language classrooms and programs as having ideals of racial and social equality, using language as a pillar for inclusion, for pushing minority language status higher, and giving as a result the culture of the language minority student greater acceptance. The argument is made however that although there is a leaning toward “equality,” the equality is defined in terms of status of the majority culture and language. The CRT perspective on the Dual

Language programs looks at how even the most socially accepting culture racializes the experiences of language minority students in terms of whiteness.

In the remainder of Chapter 1, I will provide a historical overview of bilingual education in Arizona over the past 20 years. Specifically, I will address the legal precedent for bilingual programs, the change in legislation over the years, the role of Dual Language instruction within the sphere of bilingual programs, and the impact of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) and the Arizona English Language Learner (ELL) Task Force on Dual Language programs.

A Historical Background of Bilingual Education and Dual Language Programs in Arizona

The 5th Circuit Court ruling in the 1981 *Castañeda v. Pickard* case called for students to be guaranteed equal opportunity to education. The courts have argued that English Language Learners (ELLs) are entitled to an educational setting with a methodologically sound program that is evaluated for its effectiveness not only in obtaining fluency in English, but in academic programs as well (Thomas and Collier, 1997). Among the choices available to students are English-only programs, pull-out English as a Second Language (ESL), content-based ESL, transitional bilingual education, one-way dual language programs, and two-way dual language programs (Thomas and Collier, 1997; Ochoa and Rhodes, 2005). The English-only and ESL models offer instruction in English while the bilingual programs offer instruction in the student's native language (L1) and

target language (L2). The difficulty currently with Dual Language programs is holding the discussion about a current *bilingual* program with understandings (or misunderstandings) of approaches with “bilingual education” programs of the past (Cummins, 2005).

Ovando (2003) in a historical look at bilingual education in the United States, examined the future of bilingual studies, which in many states consists of dual language education, and outlines some positive guiding principles. According to Ovando, bilingual education needs to be expanded beyond the framework of language minority students, instead as a means for promoting bilingualism for all, thus a move toward dual language programs. In order to do so, it must be more than the school community that seeks to provide this type of atmosphere separate from the overwhelming feelings of the greater community that supports the schools. Ovando traced bilingual education showing its course throughout the decades, and its unfortunate foray into what he terms a “dismissive period.” Part of the negativity stems from “the politics of resentment toward massive immigration from developing countries in the 1980s and 1990s, especially from Asia and Latin America” (Ovando, 2003, p. 14).

The goals of all these programs are content instructional gains and English fluency. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) calls for high-stakes testing to see that all students are making adequate gains in content knowledge. While looking at all students within a school, NCLB also calls for schools to disaggregate the data and assure that the same content gains are also made for significant cohorts of students. Data is disaggregated by ethnicity as well as special categories (special

education, gifted, low-socioeconomic status, and language minority students). Thomas and Collier (2002) assert that while ELLs may make the minimum academic scores necessary to denote Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) that their native English speaking peers may, an achievement gap exists. They thus argue that the most effective programs be made available to language minority students to close this achievement gap. At the highest level of effectiveness of the English learning options available, is Dual Language instruction.

Propositions in California and Arizona resulted in the eradication of compensatory bilingual education programs, calling for ELLs to be placed in English-only settings for a minimum of 1 year of instruction that would lead to fluency in English (Rolstad, Mahoney, and Glass, 2005). The success or lack thereof of the educational programs implemented for ELLs in each state have been reported in studies promoted by state departments of education as well as numerous educational researchers. With the advent of mandatory Structured English Immersion (SEI) for Arizona's English Language Learners (ELLs), fewer choices exist for the type of program of study toward English competency. Students who do not make full proficiency on Arizona's English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA) are placed in SEI classrooms or parents must sign a letter of refusal for ELL services to enter mainstream classrooms. ELLs have not been able to enter dual language instruction without a signed letter of refusal of English language services until the 2010-2011 school year, where this practice is no longer allowed by the Arizona Department of Education.

Summary

This study is organized into 5 inter-related chapters, connected through the lens of the Conceptual Framework, introduced in Chapter One. Chapter One served the purpose of introducing the rationale for conducting the study. I presented the research question, limitations and delimitations, definitions of essential terms used commonly within the study, and Conceptual Framework that weaves throughout each chapter and unifies the research question, data, and recommendations and policy implications.

Chapter Two will provide a review of the pertinent literature of Dual Language instruction, the positive effects of Dual Language instruction of language minority students, and parent choice of Dual Language programs. It is divided into 4 defined sections. In the first, critical components of Dual Language programs are outlined, describing the different types of Dual Language programs, composition of students, and theoretical basis of language acquisition theory utilized in program design. The second section discusses how Dual Language instruction has been analyzed to be an effective model of instruction for English Language Learners, on its own merits and juxtaposed with other models of language acquisition for English Language Learners. The third section offers criticisms of Dual Language programs, to present a balanced understanding of how Dual Language has been viewed by parents, teachers, administrators, and researchers over the years. And finally, the fourth section delineates the role of parent involvement and choice in the selection of Dual Language as a program of instruction.

Chapter Three will provide a detailed description of the methods used to collect and analyze data in this qualitative study utilizing grounded theory approaches. Chapter Three will explain the method used for selecting members to participate in the study. It will also describe the methods used for collection, transcription, and analysis of the data.

Chapter Four will present an analysis of the data collected for this study. I will begin by introducing the parent and administrative participants for the story and aspects of their personal life history or work history. The data presents the stories and voices of the participants. It is organized into three themes, with each theme carrying delineated implications. The three themes of the data are Desired and Created Asymmetry, Choice as a Family Decision, and Legislative Mandates. The analysis of the data and implications for the schools, families, and students are illuminated by the words of the participants, interwoven into the text of the analysis.

Chapter Five will conclude the study with a summary of the work of the study and future work to be done. That future work is organized into 5 sections: recommendations for future research, recommendations for school administrators, recommendations for parents, recommendations for program design, and recommendations for policy-makers in the field of language policy in Education. The recommendations stem from the conceptual framework of the study, namely asking all those involved in Dual Language education to consider the realms of asymmetry and the effects of legislation on program choice, design, and implementation. With a thorough understanding of the goals of Dual Language

education, hopefully parents in the future can be better informed. That makes it incumbent on schools to inform better. Schools can create better program designs. That calls on administrators and teachers to study the past and create for the future. Finally, children can be better served. That makes it incumbent on policy-makers to be child-centered and cognizant of the residual effects of their words and actions, when researching and creating future policy. The purpose of this study is to inform the stakeholders in Dual Language programs from the words and voices of the parents who have selected and de-selected Dual Language in the past, and who still yearn for positive language and academic environments for their children.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

I have divided the research on Dual Language programs into four main categories: a) general descriptions of Dual Language schools, b) analyses of the benefits of Dual Language education for language minority students, c) criticism of Dual Language programs, and d) attitudes leading parents to choose Dual Language programs for their children.

Descriptions of Dual Language Schools

Dual Language instruction is described in the landmark text by Lindholm-Leary (2001) as a method for providing content knowledge through the medium of instruction in two languages. Although different models exist, there are particular instructional designs that Dual Language programs share. In common among these models is the need to satisfy language learning, content knowledge gains, and cultural acceptance or preservation (Christian, 1996). The consensus of researchers who study Dual Language programming and language acquisition theory is that children should optimally be enrolled in a Dual Language program for a minimum of 4-7 years (Christian, 1996; Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1981, Lindholm-Leary, 2001). A key feature of Dual Language programs is a focus on both bilingualism and biliteracy (Baker, 1996). The two languages are both given equal status as “target languages” for participating students.

The language majority students in American Dual Language programs are English dominant speakers, whose target language is the second language in the

program, most commonly Spanish. The language minority students in American Dual Language programs are ELL students, with English as their target language. These students are integrated throughout the day and receive instruction in both languages. Another feature of successful dual language implementation requires that English and Spanish instruction occur separately in distinct time blocks. Quintanar-Sarellana's (2004) case study examined a school with a 90% instructional time in Spanish to 10% English in the early years. To assure that the language be separated, the teachers switched classrooms so that a Spanish language model was present during Spanish time and an English language model was present during English. While instruction happens in a target language (Spanish for the native English speakers, English for the ELLs), there should be no translation occurring, nor should content need to be repeated for the sake of clarification (Thomas and Collier, 1997). The goal is to have a balanced population, with no more than two-thirds of the classroom population of either language minority or language majority students (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Shannon and Milian, 2002).

The models for Dual Language programs are based on promotion of additive bilingualism. In this belief, those who work toward acquisition of a second language while preserving the first are adding a feature that will improve cognitive functioning as well as promote heritage preservation (Combs et. al., 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Mora, Wink, and Wink, 2001; Ovando, Collier, and Combs, 2003). For language minority students, all of their early thought processes and learning are based in the primary language (L1). With both

knowledge and cognitive processing having occurred in L1, programs that promote L1 maintenance allow for accessing the linguistic backbone to background knowledge that had been built in early development (Ovando, Collier, and Combs, 2003). Many two-way Dual Language programs state as a goal the preservation of L1. This is attractive to many parents of language minority students as an additive way of continuing the link between their children's generation and their parents', allowing for a meaningful relationship through communication (Combs et. al., 2005). Besides the additive nature of bilingualism for the language minority student, all Dual Language students experience a positive experience with linguistic exploration in the Dual Language program. Fitts (2006) explored the usage of both languages by different students to find that Dual Language programs offer the freedom for students to explore language and their place as each language holds equal status within the society of the school.

Effective Models of Instruction for Language Minority Students

One of the principal goals of Dual Language studies and programs is that of the academic gains achieved through two-way immersion. Dual Language study through the literature is presented not only as an academically enriching environment for all students (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Thomas and Collier, 1997), but in particular for language minority students (Alanís and Rodríguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, Lindholm-Leary and Block, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Alanís and Rodríguez (2008) examined the data of 5th grade students within a particular Dual Language school compared to the district and state.

Scores of English language learners was pulled separate from the site aggregate. Data showed the site with the highest of the 4 categories, followed very closely by the ELL students for the 1st two years of analysis, and ELL scores highest in the 3rd year of analysis. The school performance superseded the district and state by more than 15% achievement on the state tests. Academic success of Dual Language was attributed to successful implementation of second language learning strategies used throughout the learning on top of high-rigor academic standards. The language strategies assured not only knowledge, but demanded multiple performance measures.

Lindholm-Leary (2001) looked at academic achievement of Dual Language programs beyond the traditional language arts sphere represented in the majority of Dual Language studies, choosing to examine mathematics, science, and social studies. Language minority students in 50:50 or high ethnic-density 90:10 Dual Language programs scored at or above that of their peers at the state level whereas minority language students in transitional bilingual education programs and English only classes scored below average of their peers in mathematics in the primary language of Spanish. Native Spanish speakers scored significantly higher in all models of Dual Language programs than their English only counterparts in mathematics in English. The differing variable between the instruction in these models was the presence of both native and target language learning in the Dual Language classes as compared to English only.

Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010) conducted their studies cognizant of the literature that points to significant language minority student (identified as

ELLs in their study) achievement through Dual Language education. They sought to see if the same applied to ELLs in Dual Language programs of high density of low-SES, Hispanic schools (schools with Dual language with 99% Hispanic students in poverty). The data not only showed that ELLs in Dual Language outperformed ELLs in mainstream English classes, but that they made the greatest gains in comparison to mainstream ELLs, mainstream English proficient students, Dual Language ELLs, and Dual Language English proficient students. What this showed was that study in Dual Language for ELLs allowed for the greatest opportunity for ELLs to close the achievement gap with their English proficient peers.

Thomas & Collier (1997) conducted long term study which collected achievement data culminating in a quantitative and qualitative study which addressed the most effective programs for both content and language instructional gains for language minority students. Meta-analysis of ELL programs by Rolstad, Mahoney, and Glass (2005) also show that bilingual approaches were superior in ELL education to the proposed SEI classes proposed in both states.

Thomas and Collier's (2002) continued meta-analyses of long-term achievement for language minority students provided critical educational language policy implications as a result of their findings. These policy statements included the following:

- The only programs for language minority students wherein minimum achievement was the 50th percentile in English were Dual Language and bilingual immersion programs.

- Longevity is critical to Dual Language success. Dual Language students outperform their monolingually instructed peers in all academic areas after 4-7 years of instruction.
- Students entering school without any English proficiency will struggle to make academic proficiency in the target language. All long-term studies of ELLs show a minimum of 4 years of primary language instruction necessary for grade level performance.

Criticisms of Dual Language Programs

For all its successes, dual language instruction is not without its challenges. Merely looking at the issue of controversy of Dual Language as a bilingual education program, the arguments could vacillate between the belief that primary language instruction promotes conceptual learning while English language develops (Cummins, 1981; Krashen, 1982) or the belief that primary language instruction has no proven added value (Porter, 1991). However for the sake of this evaluation of the literature, particular focus is being made to the complexities specific to the development or implementation of Dual Language instruction.

Valdés (1997) makes three important arguments speaking directly to the teachers and administrators of Dual Language programs who are acting as policy-makers in the arena of language policy for language minority students and low socio-economic Latino families. Since Spanish is a primary language for the language minority students or a heritage language for the Latino students for whom English may be a primary language, the quality of the Spanish these

students receive is of utmost importance. Because the Spanish language may be altered to the modification of English dominant students, Valdés warns the teachers to take care that the language minority students, for whom Spanish is a primary language, receive high quality and linguistically challenging primary language instruction.

Dual Language programs are also, many times, aimed at bringing in children from outside of the physical community as language, through the overt goals of the program, serves as a medium for cultural and ethnic understanding and awareness. Valdés (1997) warns that there are social interactions that hold meaning, whether positive or negative, in the larger context of society. Dual Language programs, with positive intentions, bring together groups of students with ambitions, but not necessarily strategies to teach students how to form meaningful interactions that their society in general may not promote. Thus although students, teachers, and administrators have positive intention for the program, they may be inviting social interactions into their schools, that they are not aware of or skilled in being able to facilitate. Palmer (2010) and Freeman (2000) highlight issues that occur when Dual Language programs in the inception stages only consider language factors, ignoring race, only to face difficulties when power struggles between groups arise as inequalities become apparent.

Language and power are central to the third point of Valdés (1997). The vocabulary and language used in discussion of Dual Language programs need to be consistent to all ethnic and language groups. However careful consideration was not always noted in discussions with parents about the goals of the program.

Was economic advantage always spoken about with Latino parents as with white parents? Were the successes of native Spanish speakers attaining English fluency as recognized as the white child speaking Spanish? The unspoken messages not only could promote inequality of languages (Palmer, 2010), but could also undermine the intended goals of promoting cultural understanding among groups (Christian, 1996).

Arguments of power and privilege in relation to criticisms of Dual Language instruction are not exclusive to Valdés. Pimentel et. al. (2008) look at the critical issue of who stands to gain the most from Dual Language programs, or in the framework of power and privilege, which groups make the biggest academic and linguistic gains. It also examines issues of power not only among the participants, but also between the languages. Drawing off the research of Valdés (1997), Pimentel et. al. pose the idea that the very nature of enrollment strategies of Dual Language program, in creating linguistic balance (goal of balance of native English and Spanish language speakers) also create racial dynamics that are not accounted for in the research and prepared for in the school construction. Open enrollment laws in Arizona that allow students from the entire metropolitan region to enroll in any school, not limited to the geographic borders of the school or district enrollment area, allow for imbalances in these Dual Language programs. Many times the Spanish speakers are coming to the school from within the areas of the school, as is the case with the schools of this study, whereas many English speakers are coming not only from the immediate school region, but also outlying regions. The Spanish speakers in the program as seen in

the research are often lower socioeconomic students, whereas the English speaking students vary to a higher degree with many coming from quite affluent backgrounds. The racial, social, and economic disparities in the program affect student interactions, language usage, perceptions of the purpose of language, as well as unaccounted for parental dynamics.

Amrein and Peña (2000) point out some of the challenges of Dual Language programs within a contextual framework of asymmetry. They view inequalities in dual language programs, thus giving English greater value and status (clearly not an intentional goal of dual language programs) in instructional, resource, and student asymmetry. Instructional asymmetry was evident in interviews with an English dual language teacher who claimed that students were learning English faster than when he was an ESL teacher. The statement implied that English acquisition was the goal of the program, not equal growth of both English and Spanish. López and Franquíz (2010) note teachers speaking in classrooms about the language (singular) students speak, when they were enrolled in a Dual Language program, when the reference should have been plural in an environment promoting bilingualism. Barse and de Jong (2008) also note that instructional asymmetry can be seen at the secondary level as students see fewer opportunities to hear and use Spanish as English content instruction dominates these programs.

Greater asymmetry was seen in regards to resources in the school. English classrooms had far greater print resources than Spanish classrooms. The shelving in the school resource rooms had five times as many resources in English than in

Spanish. Spanish classrooms had many posters with English/Spanish translations, whereas the English classrooms had only English posters evident, making visibility of English print greater. And the further up in grade level students progresses, the less likely material cognitively and linguistically appropriate was seen.

Looking at the hopeful implications of dual language instruction on society, multicultural understanding is commonly cited as a goal of dual language programs. Yet when students in dual language classrooms had opportunities to freely associate in peer groupings, racial imbalance occurred (Amrein and Peña, 2000). Research shows a necessity for balance of language majority and minority students (Amrein and Peña, 2000; Quintanar-Sarellana, 2004). This was seen in free class time, on the playground, and in formal groupings for instructional purposes. In situations where the English language model students were predominantly African-American, different issues of what is considered English fluency affected this as well (Palmer, 2010; Scanlan and Palmer, 2009).

Finally some students were called on to be “language brokers” for students who had difficulty understanding. These students were fully bilingual in both English and Spanish, and would occasionally translate into Spanish for the language minority students and translate into English for the language majority students. However as Fitts (2006) asserts, not all bilinguals are seen as equally bilingual, and at times those who are bilingual are asked to choose which language is the strongest, in fact denying a students’ true sense of bilingualism. In their free time, the language brokers were witnessed either associating together

as a separate group with significant conversation being made in English, or associating with the monolingual English students. In both instances the language brokers would tend to use English for significant conversations. Fitts also noted the instances in classrooms where the Spanish language classroom was so controlled, that the language usage was strictly monitored, and as a result, Spanish was rarely used for natural language. This again highlights the issues of language and power central to the criticisms of Dual Language programs (Fitts, 2006; Valdés, 1997).

Parental Attitudes Toward Dual Language Instruction—A Program of Choice

Thus far Dual Language instruction has been defined by the additive nature of the program. Across the states where it has been implemented, particularly in Arizona, it is a program of choice. Parents have made decisions about enrollment for their children with an idea of projecting a positive future for their children. Collectively, through examination of the research around choice, parents view Dual Language as an enrichment model of bilingual education and seek to enroll their children in the program (Combs et. al., 2005; Craig, 1996; Dorner, 2010; Giacchino-Baker and Piller, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Parkes, 2008; Shannon and Milian, 2002).

The research concerning parents in Dual Language programs focus on 3 areas: rationale toward choosing the program, rationale for creating or advocating for the program, and overall parental participation. Lindholm-Leary's (2001) studies on Dual Language included multiple measures of parental attitudes toward

bilingualism and choice of the program. Lindholm-Leary disaggregated her survey data by racial/ethnic identity of the parents. Overwhelmingly, European American parents chose academic achievement and future potential as the principal reason for enrollment in the program. Craig (1996) found that exposure to diverse populations and second language acquisition as primary motivators for European American parents as well. In a forced choice survey, Giacchino-Baker and Piller (2006) found that English speaking parents would choose academic success over bilingualism as a motivating factor in choosing Dual Language for their children. Latino parents, on the other hand, chose cultural identity or language/heritage maintenance as their primary motivators (Craig, 1996; Giacchino-Baker and Piller, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Shannon & Milian, 2002). For the Latino parents whose children were classified as language minority students, few ELL programs existed like Dual Language that had primary language maintenance as a primary program goal (Thomas and Collier, 1997). Thus both English-speaking and Spanish-speaking parents have indicated positive rationale toward the goals of Dual Language program. Parkes' (2008) study indicated that the two highest choices for rationale in selecting Dual Language were oral, written, and listening bilingualism and opportunity for global success. However the research shows this consistency in choices with strikingly different reasons across the research, a hypothesis confirmed by the earliest of these studies (Craig, 1996) that has held throughout the 15 years since that study.

After making an initial choice to enroll children in a Dual Language program, many parents remain vigilant in that choice by supporting the program

in times when language policy indicate disfavor toward promoting bilingualism for all. In the years since the passage of Proposition 227 in California and 203 in Arizona, maintaining Dual Language programs has been difficult. In fact Linton and Franklin (2010) report of the efforts of extremely supportive parents as being critical factors in the maintenance of programs in California just after the initiative passed. Similarly, Combs et. al. (2005) found similar efforts by parents in Arizona necessary for the maintenance of Dual Language. Once English Only policies in Arizona through the Structured English Immersion (SEI) law were in place, surveys indicated that parents were in favor of Dual Language over SEI. Primarily, students who exited the SEI classrooms were performing lower academically in both languages. Parents and staff indicated that they felt SEI was offering an inferior educational program to students than Dual Language, thus promoting more parents to work actively to seek refusal of ELL services and enroll and support Dual Language programs (Combs et. al., 2005). In this same time period as bilingual programs were ending due to restrictive language laws, parents, teachers, and administrators were working actively to reestablishing and converting previously transitional bilingual programs to Dual Language (Dorner, 2010). Peña (1998) studies parents and school personnel in a transition of a K-8 school from transitional bilingual to Dual Language, noting that parental dissatisfaction in the process led, unfortunately, to decline of participation in the program. However in the face of similar legislation pending in Colorado, surveyed parents demonstrated their commitment to Dual Language, bilingualism,

and the additive bilingual educational options they had previously worked to create (Shannon and Milian, 2002).

In the literature in support of parental attitudes about Dual Language programs, Alanís and Rodriguez (2008) cite parental participation as a primary feature of the success in the maintenance of Dual Language programs. Dorner (2010) listed parental participation as high with immigrant parents once they saw that the goals of the program were being accomplished. Primary among these goals was cultural and heritage language preservation. As immigrant parents saw their children helping them with communication juxtaposed with seeing others in the community thrive with high bilingual communication skills, they believed the program was helping their children achieve what the program promised. The resulting participation and support from the family was in belief in their actions assisting their children achieve goals in a global society and communicate with the older generations. Lindholm-Leary (2001) reported high levels of parental participation among both English and non-English speaking parents. Her quantitative analysis of disaggregated data by socioeconomic status, education level, ethnicity, and other factors provided greater detail. Although all groups of parents stated strong agreement with the importance of parental involvement, Spanish-speaking Hispanic parents agreed with the forced-choice statement to the greatest level. Another demographic group that showed considerable agreement was highly educated parents (some college education or more). Participation in school activities and assisting in the classroom were the two greatest measures of parental involvement through her survey.

Among the researchers who have conducted serious work revolving around parental motivation, attitudes, participation in, and support for Dual Language programs, one consistent recommendation is for further studies on motivations of parents. The common thread is that the motivations are always with the group who think positively of the program. Even if they find parents with negative statements or complaints about how the program could be better, they were still active participants in Dual Language. The articles confirm positive experiences by maintaining a focus on the current participants in the program. A gap in the research is with those who are dissatisfied with Dual Language instruction to the extent of removing their children from the program, or who had older children in the program but choose another mainstream program for the younger children. There is a clear lack of research on the parents who are dissatisfied. These parents who are dissatisfied are equally motivated; their motivation is to dis-enroll or not enroll the next round of children in their families in these Dual Language programs. The purposes of this study are to hear the voices of these parents, learn the sources of dissatisfaction, and provide these ideas with schools who hope to continue their Dual Language programs and would value the perspectives of these parents to plan their outreach or amelioration of dissatisfaction that may exist in the programs they promote.

Summary

In Chapter Two, I have presented four critical areas of the research conducted on Dual Language programs that have the greatest impact on this study: a general description of Dual Language programs, the positive impact of

Dual Language studies on language minority students, criticisms of Dual Language programs, and rationale of parents in choosing Dual Language programs. Of particular importance is the relationship between the final area of the research, choice, and the phenomenon of de-selection as defined and analyzed in this study.

Chapter 3

Method

Introduction

The intention of this study was to purposefully select participants (Creswell, 2009) that would best assist me in collecting data as to how to understand the phenomenon of de-selection of Dual Language programs from one older child to a younger child. Using a grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006), I constructed an understanding of the thought processes and motivations of these parents as to why they made the decisions about their child's education. Dual Language enrollment is an example of parental choice, just as much as Dual Language de-selection. The literature is ripe with stories and studies to illustrate the motivations as to why parents exercise their right of choice in selecting the program. It contains stories that tell of how students are able to be successful in language restrictive environments.

Solórzano and Yosso (2002) offer Critical Race Methodology as a way to offer the first person narrative stories of People of Color to "counter" the subtractive, deficit-grounded perspectives that serve as the research basis behind the restrictive language policies in particular states. This study hopes to give voice to the parents who are choosing to exercise the right to de-select from the same program either with a single child or the passage from one older child to a younger. Similarly, Chapman (2007) argues that the methodological approach of presenting a full life picture of subjects of a study through interviews partnered with a Critical Race Theory framework allows an understanding of the topic being

discussed in the context of the subject as a racialized individual having to navigate a difficult racial, political, and linguistic playing field.

Role of the Researcher

As a researcher, I have chosen to study this aspect of Dual Language programs as a former teacher and current administrator in Dual Language. I have personally experienced this phenomenon of seeing families de-select as well as spoken with other administrators who have witnessed the same. In an effort to bring a sense of understanding to how we can work with our community of families and teachers on sustaining long-lasting positive relationships true to the established goals and vision of our Dual Language programs, I hope this study can inform schools on the thought processes of parents in selecting or de-selecting Dual Language programs. After having begun my career as a Dual Language teacher 18 years ago and having taught in different settings for language minority students (Dual Language, transitional bilingual education, mainstream English with ESL instruction, community college grammar and writing for English language learners), I hold a particular interest in gaining understanding to any ways of thinking that can bring further understanding to schools and parents on how to promote positive, additive methods of language instruction and inform policy makers of these methods.

Of the 3 schools selected for the study, I have worked at 2 of the schools as an administrator, although not had a personal relationship with the parents of the school I worked at 5 years ago for a short period of time. Because the parents who have de-selected these Dual Language programs within a greater school

community did not choose an exit strategy outside of the original school setting, I assumed a positive experience with the school as a whole and did not experience a power or adversarial relationship which would affect parental input.

Interviews as the Choice Qualitative Method

The schools chosen for this study are all schools with Dual Language as a choice program. The programs exist as a school-within-a-school—they are housed in traditional elementary schools with mainstream English and Structured English Immersion classrooms as mandated by Arizona State Statute. Within the walls of these traditional schools are opportunities for further language learning in the Dual Language program. Parents are not automatically placed in the Dual Language program. They are informed of the program and choose to enroll specifically in Dual Language classes, having to fill out separate matriculation forms, sign waivers of verification of English language fluency of their children, and meet with administrators of the program to learn of their expectations and responsibilities in the program. Many studies of Dual Language programs and parent choice have been conducted over the years, many times relying on quantitative methods to understand parents selection rationale. Among the studies earlier identified in the review of the literature were many quantitative studies using surveys to understand and numerically quantify parent choice for Dual Language programs. Many of the surveys included forced choice questions, quantifying how many parents selected particular responses, giving some space for attestation in open questions parents could choose to answer.

The literature is rich with explanations of why parents choose Dual Language programs. The idea of de-selection is a unique study with 2 events that deserve understanding—choice for the program upon enrollment of the older children and choice against with the younger. Each of these is a phenomenon that helps to tell a complete story. The interview was selected as a qualitative method to understand and make meaning from these experiences. Seidman (2006) speaks of the stories individuals have as emanating from their stream of consciousness with a beginning, middle, and end. Inherent in the story is a reflection through which the story is embedded within a context. From the onset, the purposefully selected parents of this study do not necessarily classify themselves as “de-selectors,” but rather as parents who are exercising a choice for their child’s education.

The act of matriculation is the only observable part of this process evident from the school point of view. One of the rationales for this study was to give the administrator or program director of Dual Language programs an understanding of why parents of children who were in dual language choose not to enroll their younger children in the program. The act of the interview allows us to put a context behind the action or behavior. Whereas other qualitative means of gathering data such as observation allow meaning of situations to be made by the researcher by recording observable behaviors, the behaviors of interest here are not those of action but rather processing. The only way to understand how an individual is processing a decision they will make is to ask them questions about the event. Seidman’s interviewing technique allows for the understandings to

emerge from background information about participants, their descriptions or reconstructions of events, and their reflections on the process.

Recruitment

Similar to Solórzano and Delgado Bernal's (2001) qualitative study using a Critical Race Theory and LatCrit conceptual framework to examine resistance narratives, I used individual and focus group interviews to provide the counter-narratives to the subtractive, deficit-slanted research in this of Dual Language studies, limited by restrictive language policy in the state of Arizona. The nature of the study is on a group of parents that have had children participate in Dual Language programs in the past, have younger children still in the school, and have chosen to have these younger children not participate in the Dual Language program. This requires a particular recruitment strategy of keeping in mind the type of program and special considerations about the parents involved. The first major consideration is the schools that will be involved in the study. There are varying modes of delivery of instruction in two languages in Phoenix. The first of these are Dual Language programs as described in the introduction of this study. The second are Foreign Language Immersion (FLI) programs. The common feature is the inclusion of two languages for instruction, however the composition of these programs (socio-economic status of the families, limited numbers of language minority students) differs considerably from the Dual Language schools. Also FLI schools choose particular subjects and designate the language they are taught in, whereas Dual Language schools teach all subject areas in both languages. The decision to separate these schools is purposeful when looking at

exit or loyalty issues in parent decision-making. I have chosen 3 Dual Language programs in the greater Phoenix, Arizona urban area for inclusion in this study.

The second major consideration is that not all Dual Language parents are being targeted as potential interview subjects for this study. The phenomenon identified as ‘de-selection’ for the purposes of this study is a small subsection of the overall school population. The identifying criterion is finite: current parent in the school with children in mainstream classroom, former children were in Dual Language program, all children have attended the school. I worked with the administrators of the schools to identify parents who meet the criteria. I then invited them to an introductory meeting to explain the purpose of the study and seek informed consent to participate in the study. Once establishing this relationship, I gathered contact information on the families and scheduled the interviews.

An administrator or program director from each Dual Language program was also interviewed in a focus group for their perspective in the enrollment patterns, recruitment strategies for families, and parental involvement activities. The administrator or program director selected from each site was someone with historical knowledge of the program for a duration of 3 years or longer. Both of the administrators selected in the story were chosen based on their history as both teachers and administrators in the Dual Language program and upon recommendation from the district Superintendents.

District/School Participation

There are few Dual Language programs in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. The programs chosen have all been in operation for more than 10 years. They are as follows (all school and district names are pseudonyms): Washington/Lincoln Schools in the Desert Sands Elementary School District (DSESD) are sister schools that share a large campus with Kindergarten-3rd grade students at Washington and 4th-6th grade students at Lincoln. Students enter the Dual Language program in Kindergarten at Washington and continue through Dual Language through the 6th grade at Lincoln. The two schools each have separate administration. DSESD is in the North Central part of the city of Phoenix.

Grant School is in the Canyon Vista Elementary School District (CVESD). This school is a Kindergarten-8th grade school, with student enrollment in the Dual Language program from Kindergarten-6th grade. CVESD is in the southeastern part of the city of Phoenix.

Population, Sites of Interviews, and Duration of Study

The target population of the parent group was no smaller than 6 parents, and no larger than 11. I targeted 4-6 parents from each site, with no fewer than 4 at each site. The schools selected represent geographic variation in the city, variations in racial composition of schools, and pull from the extents of the Phoenix metropolitan area, due to Arizona's Open Enrollment law. CVESD

draws students from the metropolitan Phoenix area, particularly from the east. DSESD draws from the western metropolitan area.

The site of the interviews with the parents was selected by the parents in the study based on their comfort level. I was comfortable to conduct all interviews in the participants' homes, however if they were more comfortable within a school setting, that was arranged with the school and district of the participants. The forum for administrators or program directors was agreed upon by the participants, in the home district of the investigator of the study. All interviews were conducted in the language of comfort for the parents. All questions for the interview were prepared in English and Spanish in advance. As a fluent speaker of Spanish, I conducted all the interviews alone.

The interviews all occurred within the months of January through March 2011. The administrator/program director panels occurred in two sessions to begin and end the study. Each of the parent interviews was approximately 1 hour in length. I utilized Seidman's (2006) three interview process to first establish a relationship with the parent/s, gather details about their experiences in the Dual Language program and those which may have led to their de-selection of the same program, and finally to reflect on the process they utilized in making their informed decisions and the rationales for these decisions. The first and second interviews were conducted on the same day, with a clear indication of a transition from background to experiential questioning, however the third interview in which the participant is asked to be more reflective on the process was saved for a separate time. The intention was to conduct all three interviews within a period of

1-2 weeks. Upon conclusion of the preliminary identification of themes, I met with the parents or administrators at a later time for a member check on analysis and interpretation of ideas.

Interview Process

Seidman (2006) gives a meaning to each of the three interviews that needs to be respected, thus the call for separate days for the interviews. Seidman refers to the first interview in the process as a Focused Life History. In the first interview, I will be asking participants to focus on aspects of their life that led to the event (participation in Dual Language program). Among the concerns in the first interview are the participants' experiences with second languages growing up in life, their language learning experiences in school, their choice in school, and choosing dual language programs for their older children. Although the focus of this study is on de-selection of Dual Language programs, the first interview only took them up to the point of choosing a schooling program for their children. It gave the context to the educative experiences for their children.

The second interview is referred to by Seidman as the Details of the Experience. This second interview focused on the event of de-selection. The stage for this discussion was set with questions from expectations of the program, their children's experiences and their experiences as parents with the program, and the decision to place their younger children in a different program than the older children.

The third interview centered around what Seidman calls their Reflection on the Experience of those decisions. How did they come to make the decision to

deselect, with whom did they consult in making this decision, and how do they feel about the decision now or if they had to make an enrollment decision for future children?

Rossmann and Rallis (2003) call the types of interviews I conducted standardized open-ended interviews. They are open ended because the nature of the questions is based on inquiry into the rationale of the parents in the study. Also, I am open to follow-up questions that lend themselves to a particular phenomenon that I would like to gain more information about. The basic questions for each parent are the same, however the inquiry nature of the interview is that their answers may construct the need for more follow-up, probing, or clarification. The standardization of questions allows for generalizations about the information given by the parents. I conducted the interviews over multiple sites in varying physical and demographic areas of the city. If there are commonalities, perhaps the nature of the experiences of parents in dual language instruction in the city or region are common or being affected by the same external forces. The lack of commonality may address internal concerns about the educational experience at one particular site. What I sought to understand was if there were common experiences linked to the common phenomenon of de-selection of dual language. Multiple sites as data points add to triangulation of results. Asking the standard base of questions provided for a beginning common understanding of being able to interpret the data in a meaningful way.

Grounded theory construction (Charmaz, 2006) calls for simultaneous analysis of the data while continuing to interview other subjects. This could lead to either snowball sampling or a modification of the questions of the interview. Given that standardized questioning as a base for understanding the data is a priority for the study, modification of the questions may prompted a secondary interview with some participants.

Each of the interviews conducted was recorded using a digital recorder. The files were electronically submitted to a transcription company called Transcription Star. Upon receipt of text documents of the transcriptions, I reviewed the text and was able to fill in any instances wherein the company labeled and included in parentheses what was identified as inaudible text. The audio recordings of interviews with parents included both English and Spanish recordings, both of which were transcribed by Transcription Star. Although capable of both English and Spanish transcription, it was necessary for me to review significantly more labeled inaudible portions of the Spanish transcriptions than English.

Focus Group

Program planning and implementation as well as analysis of the benefits and effectiveness of the program are simultaneous events that are occurring constantly in any educational program. The entire time parents are in the context of interpreting their children's experiences within a program, those responsible for the program are continuing in the modes of implementation and planning. It is

important for me as a school administrator writing for a hopeful benefit of schools, to include those responsible for programmatic implementation in the study. The focus group consisted of school personnel responsible for the overall Dual Language program at each site to gain their perspective on school enrollment patterns, parent choice, and family recruitment and retention, and parental involvement efforts over the course of time to parallel with the parents' experiences.

The questions of the focus group began with each person giving a historical perspective of their DL program and how they individually were responsible for the continued growth of that program. Further questioning asked the participants to explore patterns of enrollment throughout the years and their school's response to enrollment. They were asked to consider the legal considerations (open enrollment, SEI program, propositions) and how that affected recruitment or retention strategies for their programs. Finally, they were asked to consider how they have responded to parents throughout the years, from program inception to the present.

Protection of Confidentiality

All individual participants, schools, or districts, were protected from being identified by using pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. The schools and districts already listed have been given a pseudonym, as were the individuals representing the schools and each parent.

Possible Benefits to the Participants

There are two distinct participant groups in this study: the parents of the students who were in the Dual Language program and the administrative representatives of the schools and districts. The district personnel will most likely see a direct benefit to both their participation in the study and the benefits of the study being conducted. Because they are all experienced administrators in these programs, they have a long-term commitment to Dual Language instruction and will see the knowledge gained from the parents as beneficial to gaining access to parent mentality in exercising their choice that can either support or detract from the program.

The parents of the students who have attended these schools are being given an opportunity to express concerns or feelings that they have had about the Dual Language program that they may not have felt comfortable expressing earlier. This study began framing the concept of choice around Hirschman's (1970) ideas of utilizing exit, voice, or loyalty. They have had the opportunity to utilize exit. Their active pursuit was one that brought their child out of the program. For one reason or another they did not utilize the option of exercising their voice. Now they are being given a second chance to express this voice in the form of participation in this study. At this point in the study, we are not assured that the choice to exit was a negative statement against the Dual Language programs at the schools. What we do know is that their younger children were not put into the program. At one point the families held hope in the future of their

children in making the active choice toward Dual Language programming. This was an opportunity for them to participate in a forum that will allow Dual Language schools to improve their programs to meet the needs of the children, families, and communities. It may also prove to be a means to the family of gaining further understanding of their process in making selection in the past and to re-examine their earlier choice.

Analysis

As Charmaz (2006) explains, the coding system is the means through which collected data produces themes that allow for understanding. The first step is to transcribe the interviews and begin either line-by-line or incident-by-incident coding. Quite literally it is naming each line or incident in an interview—naming the data rather than interpreting through preconceived categories. This initial coding is what keeps the grounded theoretical approach connected to the actual data and deriving analysis from what the participant says rather than from a set of ideas and categorizing the data. Charmaz encourages analysis of the data as received. Through this coding, repeated themes may emerge or ways of understanding and classifying what the participant has to say can affect future interviews.

For this study, instead of coding each line in the interview, I was able to code either by paragraph or speaker. The written text of transcription contains back-and-forth dialogue between speakers, allowing for me to code a speaker's response in paragraph form. At times where there were large portions of text not

separated by paragraph or by another question asked by the interviewer, line-by-line or section was done.

The second phase of focused coding allows the described events of the initial codes to be analyzed for frequency or importance in understanding the research question. It is in this phase that a conceptual understanding of the participant's experience takes shape. Although the study was being conducted within a stated conceptual framework, this is merely the framework under which the researcher approached the field of knowledge. The participant may have a different understanding of the phenomenon, thus the grounded theorist must be willing to accept this understanding as the direction from which true participatory analysis arises. This focused coding is what narrowed many initial themes identified into the three themes of the findings of the study.

Once themes have been established from the combined first and second interviews with a participant through initial and focused coding, certain validity strategies can be employed when returning for the reflective interview. One check for validity as mentioned by Creswell (2009) is a member check to assure that the thematic findings of the research reflect the perspectives of the participants. This can also be a means of opening the reflective process with the participant and allowing for a positive sense of closure to the interviewing process to occur (Charmaz, 2006; Seidman, 2006). Triangulation of the data from the different data sources (parent-to-parent and parent-to-administrator) can also serve to validate the emergent themes to reflect a thorough and accurate analysis of the data.

Once the themes were identified, I re-read the interviews, highlighting potential usable quotes for Chapter Four with a different color for each theme. I then created charts and was able to physically cut-and-arrange the quotes on the chart paper. Once an outline for each section of Chapter Four was created, I was able to re-arrange the quotes to shape the construction of the theme as it would be presented in the writing.

Summary

The qualitative interviewing process provides an opportunity for research to be gathered and analyzed simultaneously. In this study, I was able to identify a purposefully selected group of individuals to give their input and insights on a recent phenomenon with Dual Language program enrollment in metropolitan Phoenix. With the assistance of the honest contributions of these parents and administrators, three strong themes emerged that provided a better understanding of why parents have engaged in the process of de-selection of Dual Language programming. In the Chapter Four, I will present the themes through the voices of the participants, followed by implications of the findings.

Chapter 4

Findings and Results

Introduction: Hearing the Voices

Voice cannot be given to a community. To presume so is to first assume that the community had no voice. Parents in schools have always had a voice—the manner in which they used it has varied. Parents communicate with one another, sharing their beliefs about whom they think are the better teachers, inviting their friends from social groups to join the school, speaking about the different program options, and sharing their children’s growths, aspirations, struggles, and desires with their teachers or administrators. But this research stems from a newly recognized phenomenon of parents whose older children were participants in Dual Language programs choosing not to enroll their younger siblings in the program. That voice may have been spoken among families and friends, but it has not yet been heard in the research. The research on language policy, particularly with Dual Language programs, is growing, and parent attitudes and choices have been recorded. With changing administrations politically at the state and federal levels, the climate for research on language policy may never have been richer, and these parents are responding to these changes.

The goal of this study is to influence schools, policy-makers, and educational constituents in their design of programs and policy that affect language learners, regardless of the primary language, but in particular English

Language Learners. Chapter 4 of this study aims to bring the voices of the participants in this program to the surface, to affect change.

As documented in the research (Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005; Parkes, 2008; Shannon & Milian, 2002), parents who choose Dual Language programs do not all fit the same profile. Similarly, this study that examines parents who have selected Dual Language and are now de-selecting the program for various reasons, also contains a myriad of profiles. Understanding the parents and their experiences early in life with language learning opportunities provides a lens for the reader, researcher, and most importantly for the parent in deconstructing their decision-making process. The Seidman (2006) interview format provides this lens in the following ways: 1) The preliminary interview is used as an opportunity to establish rapport with the subject interviewed, 2) The preliminary interview creates the atmosphere in which the secondary (probing) interview will occur, and 3) The preliminary interview opens the subject up to the idea that their decision-making could be influenced by prior life experiences that they may not have considered when discussing their parental choices.

The parents in this study represent 3 schools, varying ages, socio-economic background, languages spoken, family size, and personal experiences with language. The unifying factor, however, is their choice to have enrolled their older children in a DL program and similarly not-enrolled their younger children in DL. The very fact that this pertinent decision to this study comes from great variety leads to the necessity for understanding who the individuals were in

making these choices. Before we can understand why these parents have made one of the most important decisions they will make as parents of school-age children (school and program matriculation), we must honor the history they brought forward with them into this decision-making process.

Interviews: Profiles of Parents in Dual Language Schools

For this study 10 families from the 3 schools were chosen to participate in the 3 interview series. The Washington and Lincoln schools are part of the same neighborhood community, with Washington serving students through 3rd grade, and Lincoln serving the students through 6th grade. Grant School, still within the greater Phoenix metropolitan area, but a distinctly different community nearly 10 miles away, serves students in Kindergarten through 8th grade, with the Dual Language program extending only as far as the 6th grade. I sought nearly equal representation of families to be selected from each of the school communities—6 from Washington/Lincoln, 4 from Grant. When the contact was made with the families formally inviting them and scheduling the interview, I notified them that both parents were welcome to participate in the interviews. In all 10 households, the mother of the house answered the phone. 3 of the mothers indicated that they would attend with their husbands. In the end, only 1 couple participated in the interviews. Dolores, Yésica, Cintia, María Elena, Veronica, and Rosario represent the Washington/Lincoln community. Dulce, San Juana, Blanca, and Hector and Marta represent Grant.

Dolores is a parent of children at both Washington and Lincoln Schools Dual Language program. With five children ages 19, 15, 12, 9, and 4, she was originally exposed to the Dual Language Program with her 3rd child upon enrolling in Washington School. A child herself of a 1-parent home, Dolores was exposed to multiple languages in her household with her English-only-speaking mother and English and Spanish-speaking grandmother. Her father came from a

trilingual home (English, Spanish, and Romanian), but did not live in the home with her. She established a relationship with him as an adult and he has shared the importance of knowing many languages with her, urging and encouraging Dolores to enroll her children in language-learning programs in school. Dolores' great-grandmother on her mother's side spoke nothing but Spanish to her mother, but living in the United States, her mother became an English speaker, eventually *understanding* Spanish but not being able to communicate. According to Dolores, "...she understood but she never spoke, so she didn't speak it to me growing up either. So I got cheated."

Dolores' mother's academic goals for her were to become a performing artist. She sent Dolores to a school with a strong fine arts program, where she succeeded in both academics and the arts. A recurring idea for her mother was language, with her telling Dolores that she wanted her to learn Spanish so she could be able to communicate with others in her extended family in a way she was never able to. The two people that could have facilitated that language learning were her bilingual grandmother and father. With her father living outside the house, despite his desire for his children to know Spanish, he was unable to provide that modeling. Her grandmother worked as much as her mother, so in the time that they had together, she "...just didn't have the patience to do Spanish. It would be after work and everyone would need to get stuff done, so we spoke English. It was easier." Eventually Dolores' mother learned Spanish as an adult (age 25), but Dolores was already out of the house. Her mother's second husband is a Spanish-only speaker, facilitating that language-learning

experience. In trying to understand the decisions her family members made regarding speaking English or Spanish in the home, she made a corollary to her husband's experience.

My husband, his mom and dad were Spanish speakers and he didn't learn 'til today. He speaks Spanish because at where he worked he learned, but that's just in the last 7 years. He understands it and everything and I still haven't gotten on because I don't have to really speak Spanish, but I wish I did because so many of the girls at work speak Spanish. My dad really gets on us because my husband can speak some and he says we should be talking any bit we know to the kids. He's right because it's useful as they get older.

Dolores answers spoke significantly to her personal experiences with language and effects she hoped and still hopes she can have on her children's for their future.

Yésica was born and raised in central Phoenix where she lived with her mother, grandmother, uncle, two sisters, and one brother. Yésica is the oldest of her siblings, being 3 and 5 years older than her sisters and 18 years older than her brother (by a different father). The family moved many times in her academic career, naming 5 different elementary (K-8) schools. Although she and all of her siblings were all born in the United States, Yésica's uncle was the only English speaker in the household in her younger years. Speaking only Spanish before entering kindergarten, Yésica struggled in her early school years, feeling intense

pressure to perform in English, at times being singled out and put in embarrassing situations. Speaking about her 2nd grade teacher, Yésica shared the following:

But in grade 2, the teacher, she was like, I don't know...she was mean to me or what, but she is just, you know, put me in the spot every time like, 'Go to the center of the class!', and, you know, 'Read this!', and stuff like that. And I couldn't because I didn't know English and didn't have anyone that could help me. So I had to learn, like, forcefully. They made me re-do English because I had no English.

Yésica tried to speak English at that point with her uncle but had difficulty finding the time to do so because he worked 2 jobs. Eventually she picked it up in that second year of 2nd grade as her sister entered kindergarten. With a second in the family learning English at school, Yésica and her younger sister began speaking English at home, sneaking in English TV stations when mom or grandmother left the room, and teaching the third sister before her school days. Eventually from the exposure, her mother and grandmother began to learn English as well.

Surprisingly, Yésica was initially disappointed at her mother's understanding of English as she shared, "...we were trying to do our, you know, little quiet English thing, but we couldn't now because my mom understood what we were talking about and couldn't have our little talk between us, you know, the sisters."

Although there were no bilingual education classes at her schools, many of her teachers were Spanish speakers who were able to converse with her mother in

her primary language at conferences. She began to develop a sense of confusion of what her home language meant.

Like the 2nd grade teacher...she spoke Spanish, but I don't know why, you know, she was like, 'We are in United States. You need to speak English.' I don't know if she was like, racist or something, but she just kept telling me 'English, English, English' and with her [her mother] she just spoke Spanish.

She has wanted to provide the native language opportunity for her children, but not surprisingly, has wavered as she witnessed their language learning experiences. Of her 4 children, her first and third have been in Dual Language programs, while the second and youngest have not.

Cintia lived with her mother and siblings in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. Her father lived with her for parts of the year and traveled to Casa Grande, Arizona for work throughout the year. He had legal residency in the United States and was able to learn some English for work purposes. In her household, however, was pure Spanish. She and her siblings studied in all Spanish-speaking classes in Mexico. Because Nogales is a border town (sharing a name with its US border city Nogales, Arizona), crossing between the United States and Mexico 20 years ago in her childhood was a common activity for visiting of relatives in the States as well as for shopping. She was exposed to English but neither she nor her mother felt the necessity to learn or similarly learn any English at the time since all business could be conducted in Spanish.

Although she had a father who traveled into the United States for work, Cintia never imagined a life as an adult outside of Mexico. In her elementary school days, all of her interactions in school and home were in Spanish. It was not until her days in middle and high school where she took an hour of English classes a day. These classes were not motivating for her and she put little effort into them. She did ask her father for assistance with the homework, but did not participate orally in class.

Cintia has 7 children, the three oldest of whom participated in the Dual Language program, the next three of whom did not, and the youngest is not of school age. Cintia lives outside of either of the districts in the study with Dual Language programs. She sought a school that provided language learning opportunities for her children as a proud Spanish speaker living in an English-speaking country.

Pues mis esperanzas eran que ellos tuvieran un mejor desarrollo en su idioma...pues que hablaron, como yo vengo de raíces hispanas, que ellos supieran bien el idioma español como también el idioma inglés para que no tuvieran ningún problema en la escuela, ni en su vida. (Well, my hopes were that they had a better development in their language...well that they spoke, since I am of Hispanic roots, that they knew Spanish and English well so that they had no problems in school or life.)

Maria Elena lived on a ranch outside of Victoria de Durango, in the Mexican state of Durango, with her mother, stepfather, 5 sisters, and 6 brothers.

The closest school housed approximately 50 children in grades 1 through 6. If one were to attend school above 6th grade, it would be necessary to move into the city. Maria Elena's parents never attended school and did not feel that it was important for their lifestyle as ranchers to go to school. It was her grandfather that fought for the children to be freed of household responsibilities during the daytime in those early years to be able to attend school. As the 3rd oldest of the siblings she recounts how in the early years of her and one brother and one sister who were older were attending school that her mother, despite never having attended school, would insist on them doing their homework well and assist them.

Mi mamá no podía leer ni una frase completa pero me acuerdo cuando yo estaba en primer año, mi mamá nos enseñaba hacer las letras más derechitas y a juntar las letras que no estuvieran tan separadas como ella miraba a los libros y nos podía enseñar cómo hacerlas para que se vean así como estos libros. (My mom couldn't read a complete sentence, but I remember in first grade, my mom taught us how to make the letters straighter and connect the letters so they weren't far apart. She looked at books and could teach us to make the letters like they looked in those books.)

Even though initially her mother did not support the idea of the children attending school, Maria Elena smiles as she recounts this event of her mother helping and supporting her efforts in school. As the older children advanced in school, eventually terming out upon completing the local equivalent of graduation in the 6th grade, that job of assisting the younger ones with their learning fell to Maria

Elena and her older sister (the oldest brother struggled in school and did not provide this type of help in the home to the siblings). Eventually the family did move to the city so that the younger children were able to go to secondary school, although not in time for Maria Elena. The younger ones were able to learn some English in their higher level classes, but she never learned it.

When she heard of the Dual Language program, she was excited as it would be her way of giving her kids “*un pedacito de México* (a little bit of Mexico).” She has 6 children, the two oldest (13, 10) who have studied in Dual Language. Her 8 and 7 year old children are not in the program, and she hopes for her 3 and 2 year olds to be in the program when they are of school age.

Veronica has born and raised in Sonora, Mexico with her 3 sisters, mother, father, and grandmother. She spoke only Spanish in her home and schooling experiences, still speaking only Spanish, but wanting her children to speak fluent English. Like Cintia, Veronica traveled with her family across the border to the United States many times in her youth for visitation and shopping excursions, but, again like Cintia, did not have a need for English in these visits to the United States. She reports that even now, although more difficult living here full-time as opposed to shorter visits, she is able to conduct the majority of her business at school, in stores, and with agencies (doctors, Motor Vehicle Division, post office, etc.) in Spanish. With 2 children now, she enrolled the older of her daughters in the Dual Language program for a very short period. That daughter was moved into an English-only classroom within the first month of the school year, and she did not attempt to enroll her second child into the program.

Rosario is the only parent in the study who makes claim to being completely bilingual. She chose to interview in Spanish because, as she explained,

El español es mi primer idioma. Es el idioma de mi familia, que hablo con mi esposo, con mis padres, y con mis niños. Porque ésta es una entrevista en que me preguntas de emociones, es mejor expresarlas en español. (Spanish is my first language. It's the language of my family, that I speak with my husband, with my parents, with my children. Because this is an interview where you are asking me about my emotions, it's better to express them in Spanish.)

Rosario has two children, both boys, the first of whom was in the Dual Language program, with the second in English Only. She is also the only Spanish speaker who made a decision against enrolling in Dual Language solely because of the expressed difficulties of her older child. Rosario was born and raised in the United States, but continues in her adult life as she did in her childhood travelling to Mexico many times each year to visit family. For her the Dual Language program was instrumental in maintaining the primary language to the level that would allow her children to communicate beyond their childhood years and to maintain a complete level of fluency.

Dulce was born in Los Angeles, California, but moved to Sonoyta, Sonora, Mexico with her mother, father, brother, and two sisters. Her mother came from a family of 14 in a time when money was asked for nearly everything

in the school, so her mother was one of the siblings that at the time the family did not have the money to send to school. Some of her aunts and uncles received an education, while others did not. Because of this, Dulce's mother and father put a large emphasis on education and the success of their children in school. She puts the same effort into her family. She has had 3 boys and one girl of her own, but her husband came into their marriage with 3 boys from a previous marriage. All of her children have attended Grant School in the past or currently, where there has been a Dual Language program.

Dulce attended school through the 9th grade in Mexico, never studying Spanish nor learning any English in all her travels into the United States. She is very proud of her children's development in school and ability to converse, read, and write in English and Spanish and in the beginning says it is all due to the Dual Language program. It is later in the interview that we learned a few things about the enrollment status of each of her children and the factors that contribute to their language abilities.

San Juana is the 9th of 10 children (8 boys and 2 girls) who lived with her mother and father in one of the municipalities of Durango, Mexico. Her father had a dream that she may become a teacher, so he allowed her to go live with an acquaintance of her mother in the city to attend school after 6th grade. Although the 9th in birth order, San Juana is the first to attend school beyond the 6th grade. She struggled with her English classes in the big city, owing much of it to the fact that those in the cities may be more exposed to English, perhaps even in school by her estimation, but she and any others that moved in from the ranching

communities were exposed to nothing but Spanish. She felt as if she fell behind her peers in understanding English.

San Juana moved to the United States just over 11 years ago, just prior to the birth of her first daughter. She has 3 children—two girls ages 11 and 10, and one boy age 5. She moved to the United States with high ambitions for her children, and with the belief that they needed to learn English to succeed in this country. She also wanted the children to be connected to the home country of her relatives, where the children would have to visit many times, so she sought a program where both English and Spanish could be learned.

Blanca lived with her mother, father, and one brother in San Luis, Sonora, Mexico where she attended school from kindergarten through 6th grade, continued in secondary school, and finished three years of technical school. Although she is the highest educated of all the parent participants in this study, she was not supported in her schooling by her mother and father. They questioned her attending school, because when she was there, she was not producing for the household. It was her aunts and grandmother who gave her the support to go to school. Her liberation from the pressures of working on the ranch and leaving school behind came as her parents received papers to travel across the border for work purposes. They would leave at 4:00 in the morning and not return until 6:30 in the evening. That left her in charge of her younger brother, to care for. In those early days, she would rise, prepare food for herself and brother, take him to her grandmother's house, and leave for school, only to pick him up after school,

prepare dinner, and care for him until her parents arrived. Her grandmother decided to step in and create a more permanent and supportive situation for her.

Entonces mi abuela dijo, 'Yo voy a hacerme cargo de ellos mientras ustedes están trabajando.' Entonces fue eso que ellos, desde tercero o cuarto grado, que mi abuela empezó a tener participación allí con nosotros en la escuela y decidieron mis papás dejarme en la casa de mi abuela. (So my grandmother said, "I'm going to take charge of them while you are working. So it was that they, since third or fourth grade, that my grandmother began to participate with us in school, and my parents decided to leave me at my grandmother's house.)

From that point forward, Blanca was able to dedicate herself fully to her studies with the full support of her primary caregiver, allowing her to advance as far as she did academically.

Blanca has 3 children whom she hopes to help advance academically, and she sees language as the key to their success. As a result she has made different decisions for each of them in relation to their school enrollment.

Hector and Marta are the only couple that participated in these interviews, with Hector being the only male participant. Hector is from Chihuahua, where he lived with his mother, father, grandmother, and 3 siblings. He attended school through the 6th grade, not having positive memories or experiences. He wishes for a better experience for his own children than what he had. Marta is soft-spoken and deferential to her husband until the baby begins crying and he takes

the baby out of my office. Then Marta begins to open up with her story. She is one of 7 children who lived with her mother and grandmother while her father was off working in Texas in the United States. Her schooling experience was one of pure Spanish, while English was a language only heard when they traveled across the border. As the middle child, she feels that she had a better experience with school than her older sisters and brother, because they were able to assist her with her work. Neither of her parents attended school all the way through completion of the 6th grade, so they did not assist the older siblings with their homework, however by the time Marta began school, they had advanced enough to provide her with that assistance necessary to feel successful in school.

Due to her proximity to the border and the opportunities her father had north of the border, Marta thinks very highly of being bilingual and is very happy to have a situation where her children can learn both English and Spanish. Of the 3, two have been in the Dual Language program, while the youngest has not been able to. She hopes in the future he may be able to change into the Dual Language classes.

Focus Group—Profiles of Administrative Personnel in Dual Language Programs

The research in this study looks at de-selection from the vantage point of two essential decision-making groups in the school environment—parents and administrators. One member at either the school or district level with significant administrative experience with the Dual Language program contributed to this research in the form of a focus group. Each administrator was able to trace the beginning of their work with the Dual Language program, in both cases as teachers, and the progress toward oversight and administrative duties with the program. Selection of the administrators for the focus group came through my conversations or requests to the Superintendents of prospective districts for participation in the study for permission to interview administrative personnel over Dual Language with historical knowledge of the program. Specifically, I requested anyone in administration at the school or district level with a minimum (if possible) of 10 years history working within the Dual Language programs within the district. The combined experience of the two administrators in this study is 22 years, 10 years in one district, 12 in the other.

Grace is the current Language Acquisition Specialist in the Desert Sands Elementary School District (DSESD). DSESD consists of 6 schools, in which currently 2 schools house Dual Language programs. Her experience spans 10 years since the beginning of her employment with the district and program. Grace came to DSESD as a teacher in the upper grades of McKinley Elementary School's Dual Language program, which no longer exists in the school. Her

current assignment as Language Acquisition Specialist is in the district office of DSESD, working with programs for English Language Learners (ELLs). She has been given district-level coordinating responsibilities with the Dual Language program due to her years of experience within the program as a teacher and the involvement of ELLs in Dual Language, especially considering the historical perspective of ELLs within the program.

The teaching experience has served a critical role of her work as a liaison between the teachers and the district Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction. Grace has been able to provide professional development, regular support to Dual Language Lead Teachers at each of the schools, modeling in classrooms of effective language acquisition strategies, and with the district's most current comprehensive reform effort, evaluation of Dual Language Spanish teachers. She currently describes her role as "trying to figure out how to improve the program, and to ensure that the program is successful in its implementation, in its evaluation, and in its enrollment."

Monica has more than 20 years experience with the Canyon Vista Elementary School District as a teacher and administrator. She has been involved with the Dual Language program for 12 years, also beginning as a teacher within the program. She describes her involvement within Dual Language as having taken the form of many roles. Monica traced the inception of Dual Language in CVESD back to a federal grant written by the district in 1997 for innovative methods of serving ELL students. The grant written for the program began with a group of teachers, of which she was a member, taking an entire year researching

what would be the best model for serving ELLs. The answer in the research at the time, which this study shows has only grown stronger, was Dual Language. The program began with 1 English model teacher and 1 Spanish model teacher. In successive years, she would be asked to serve as a Spanish teacher in the program, which she did for many years.

As she began to serve in an administrative capacity for the district, she was asked to oversee compliance with the federal guidelines of the grant. As the political climate within Arizona with language policy became more restrictive, her role began to include compliance of instruction for ELLs with Arizona state law. Eventually she became an Assistant Principal at Grant Elementary School. She currently serves as a Teacher on Special Assignment, conducting the same administrative responsibilities as the now non-existent Assistant Principal role at the school.

School and District Profiles

The Desert Sands Elementary School District, a small elementary (kindergarten through 8th grade) school district in Central Phoenix, serves just over 3,000 students. With 5 schools, DSESD consists of one K-3rd grade school (Washington Elementary), one 4th-6th grade school (Lincoln Elementary), two K-6th grade schools, and a middle school serving 7th and 8th grade students. The district began a Dual Language Program in the district at one of the K-6 schools, eventually spreading to the Washington/Lincoln schools. In recent years, the middle school has offered Dual Language options for particular courses at 7th and 8th grades. No longer existing in the K-6 school, Dual Language is an option for DSESD students in kindergarten through 8th grades.

Washington Elementary School serves approximately 650 students in grades pre-K through 3rd grade. Each grade level from kindergarten through 3rd grade consists of 6 classes, with 2 serving students in the Dual Language program. One of the Dual Language classrooms is an English language and print environment, while the other is an environment for Spanish. The remaining grades serve students in English-only environments, some particularly serving English Language Learners in Arizona's Structured English Immersion (SEI) Model. Data from the most recent School Report Card (Arizona Department of Education, 2008) show 36%, or 243 of the listed 674 students, as English Language Learners. According to the same report, roughly 60% of the student population is Hispanic, 15% Caucasian, 12% African American, 10% Native American, and 3% Asian. The predominant home languages of the school

community are English and Spanish, with approximately 40% of all students' households being Spanish-speaking.

Neighboring Lincoln Elementary School houses approximately 450 students in grades 4-6. Lincoln also consists of 5 or 6 classes at each grade level, with 2 designated for Dual Language (with separate English and Spanish learning environments), and the remaining classrooms housing either Mainstream or SEI English-only classrooms. Having nearly identical ethnic composition as its sister school Washington, 83 of the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Report Card listed 456 students, or 18% of the student population, are English Language Learners. The most significant difference between the two schools demographically from the ADE School Report Card, is the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, coming from the same community. ADE reports Washington's low socio-economic students ratio at approximately 75%, whereas Lincoln's is listed at approximately 60%.

The Canyon Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) services 8318 students in 14 elementary schools. As an elementary school district in Arizona, they serve preschool and kindergarten through 8th grades, with 11 schools being configured preK-8th, and 3 schools pre-K-8th, with transition plans to 8th grade in each school community. According to the district website (http://www.CVESD.k12.az.us/district/signature_schools), each school has developed a "signature" or thematic approach, giving parental choice within the district community and nearby city boundaries (to assure school confidentiality, the cited website has initials of the pseudonym assigned). The district also has

developed a partnership with a nearby university to create a college lab-school, in a charter operating under an Intergovernmental Agreement with the district, serving students from kindergarten through 9th grade. Sitting central in the artistic and industrial heart of Phoenix, CVESD covers areas of great poverty and also houses many of the city's historic neighborhoods. This diverse economic surrounding does not reflect the district's listed poverty levels, with more than 95% of students district-wide classified as economically disadvantaged (Arizona Department of Education, 2008).

According to ADE's most recently posted School Report Card, Grant Elementary School holds 772 students in kindergarten through 8th grades, with 18.5%, or 144 English Language Learners. Grant's Dual Language program runs in kindergarten through 6th grade with one or two classes at each grade level. Students in the remaining 2 or 3 classes at each grade level are served in the district's Quality Language Development (QLD) classrooms, which is the district's model for servicing the English Language Learners in the same classroom as other fluent English proficient students, but addressing both the Arizona State Standards and English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards. The Dual Language classrooms are taught by one bilingual teacher, who teaches 50% of the instructional day in English and 50% of the day in Spanish. This model has changed over the years with the school population, demand for the program, researched-based shift in philosophy on Dual Language program design, and administration change.

Organization

Chapter 4 is divided into three principal themes that emerged from analysis of the transcribed interviews with the parents and administrators of the Dual Language schools of the study. From the onset, the ideas of Asymmetry and Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) were perspectives from the literature that may have presented themselves in the interviews. However using Charmaz's (2006) framework of Grounded Theory, the transcribed interviews were analyzed in the process of collection, allowing for alteration of questions in the interviews based on emergent themes. In the end three themes became evident—Desired and Created Asymmetry, Choice as a Family Decision, and Legislative Action, paralleling two of the original aspects of the Conceptual Framework (Asymmetry and LatCrit). Each section of Chapter 4 is introduced with a theme followed by implications.

The first theme—Desired and Created Asymmetry—explores Amrein and Peña's (2000) analysis of Dual Language study and criticism, in that programmatic goals and expectations do not always yield matching results. Amrein and Peña look at Asymmetry being a result of school factors, however the interviews with parents revealed that many of the parents *sought out* asymmetrical implementation as they watched their students struggle academically or linguistically. At the same time, teacher perceptions of these struggles created conversations that led to parental change, whether the teachers intended for these changes to occur or not. The power dynamic of English vs. Spanish, an

unfortunate dualism, emerged from this, as warned in the literature that may occur by Pimentel et. al. (2008).

The second theme is that of Choice as a Family Decision. There is much to be read in the literature about parent choice. Even in the literature review of this study, the concept of parental choice within Dual Language programs is examined. One area that the parents in this study revealed, and that will serve as a recommended area in Chapter 5 of future study, is that the children in the program that are struggling know so, and may have foretold those struggles initially, but were not involved in the decision-making process. Parents movingly used their children's words to personify these struggles, and some of the feelings that the children had about involvement in the Dual Language program. The parents reveal that their decision to dis-enroll them and carry that decision forward with the younger children, is to honor the struggles in the program that their children feel they cannot overcome, and subsequently that the parents fear their younger children may experience.

The final theme is one of significance to social justice, because it is at the heart of the concept of de-selection—the impact of Legislative Action on the enrollment of children in Dual Language programs. There are parents in this study who never wanted their children out of Dual Language. Their older children had the option of enrolling, they sought out to enroll their younger children in the program but were denied that opportunity, and they still have ambition of enrolling their youngest children in the program in the future. This theme holds such significance because it is the one influence outside of the home-

school connection that is influencing the enrollment decision of a family. The impact on the school is tremendous, as the original goals of the program, while still on paper, do not—cannot—legally exist. Asymmetry is then created from the outside in, a factor Amrein and Peña never had the opportunity to examine. The impact on the child is tremendous, making the examination of this issue an urgent social justice endeavor. The study then takes on what Rossman and Rallis (2003) would refer to as an emancipatory use. The goal of this study on policy-makers and administrators would be to use the voices of these parents to urge for change in language policy that would have great societal impact. Denial of English Language Learners to Dual Language programs in Arizona denies students opportunities to learn, creates greater rifts in achievement (not just in status, but also in growth measures), and can affect the relationships within a family, as evidenced by the voices of the participants.

Asymmetry Desired: The Parents Need More

“Todo era bien en español, pero faltaba el tiempo que necesitaba en inglés.” (Everything was fine in Spanish, but he didn’t spend the time he needed in English.) -Marta

As students enter into the Dual Language program, they enter an unsigned contract with the school. Schools in Arizona publish compacts wherein the responsibilities of all parties involved in the educational process are delineated. These compacts contain “I will” statements—“I will complete all assignments on time (student);” “I will present all information presented in the Arizona State Standards (teacher);” “I will provide a quiet work environment for my child to complete homework assignments (parents)”—and are signed by students, teachers, and parents. Within this framework, the teacher is agreeing to provide instruction based on what the school states the goals of the programs are. Common to the schools in the study are the Dual Language guiding principles of achieving bilingualism and biliteracy within an accepting, multicultural environment. The program models of each of the schools in the study are a 50-50 configuration of English to Spanish instruction in the principal academic areas of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. With the exceptions of the special area classes of music, art, and physical education, students are expected to hear instruction 50% of the time in English and 50% of the time in Spanish. Parents, students, and teachers enter the school year with this understanding firmly in place. Amrein and Peña (2000) refer to this balance being misaligned as asymmetrical to the established goals. However, the

framework of asymmetry as presented by Amrein and Peña (2000) assumes that it is the school that is creating the asymmetrical situation.

Student success is the ultimate parameter, but for schools in Arizona, where the accountability measures have pejorative societal implications, Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) becomes a prime determinant of success. Arizona schools are currently subject to labels from the federal government under No Child Left Behind's Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) status and AZ LEARNS, a state identifier of schools as underperforming, performing, performing plus, highly performing, or excelling. Adding to the social stigma of labels is the State of Arizona House of Representatives Bill 2732 entitled "Move on When Reading," that mandates promotion to 4th grade only when students demonstrate proficiency in reading on AIMS beginning in 2013 (Arizona HB 2732). Dual language schools define success in terms of 2 languages, but ultimately are judged by their performance in English on the AIMS test. Knowing that these measures are in place, parents and school representatives are highly sensitive to the levels of success experienced by students, and work to assure the highest levels of time on academic task.

The pressures are particularly felt at 2 of the 3 schools in the study. Based on the Spring 2011 AIMS test, Washington and Grant both did not make AYP according to the federal accountability standards, while Lincoln did make AYP (Arizona Department of Education, AYP Determination, 2011). Washington is in 1st year Warning status, whereas Grant is in Corrective Action (Arizona Department of Education, School Improvement Status, 2011). Washington and

Grant both hold AZ LEARNS labels of Performing, while Lincoln holds a label of Performing Plus (Arizona Department of Education, Achievement Profiles for all Schools, 2010), according to the most current data. The achievement data for Lincoln has remained steady for a few years, maintaining the federal achievement of AYP and a Performing Plus state label. Washington has alternated years over the past four, with statements of Yes and No for the federal mandate, with 2010 being a successful year for the school, particularly for English Language Learners, all the while maintaining the Performing state label. Grant has not achieved the federal level for many years, placing them in the status of Corrective Action, while maintaining the Performing state label the entire time. According to Monica and Grace, the school and district administrators interviewed in the study, all 3 schools used to administer the Aprenda Test, a norm-referenced yearly examination in Spanish. Also according to both administrators, the schools have not focused on these Spanish assessment measures in the more recent years as they are no longer required for their expired grants, and the school and district accountability foci have been on the AIMS test that determine their federal and state accountability profiles.

Parents are pleased, however, with the focus on the achievement of their children. Across all the parents interviewed, they express being satisfied with the level of information provided by the teachers that assist them in making decisions for their children's education. All three schools provide benchmark information on their children's progress toward the standards, using benchmark tests that communicate progress in the same language as the AIMS test (Falls Far Below

the Standard, Approaches the Standard, Meets the Standard, Exceeds the Standard—FAME). They also use standards-based report cards with the FAME designations to report trimester progress. As the reports come to parents, they are judging their children's levels of success and determining what course of action would help them be more successful. For some of the dual language parents, they have equated time in English with student success.

From the opening quote from Marta, it became apparent through the interviews that some parents were looking at their children's lack of success as a result of not having enough time in English. Yesica also shared a similar sentiment when she shared the following:

She was having so much trouble and I just wish she could stay in the English class for a little longer so she could learn it all. Then she'd go to the Spanish and it was so hard for her. And then in the Spanish week she would get the Spanish homework, and, like, how would that help her when she was falling behind in her reading? I mean she wasn't doing good enough in English and didn't like the Spanish, so I wanted her to just get the English homework all the time so she could just get better in that.

Yesica, an English speaker, also expressed discontent with the Spanish homework because she was not able to provide the assistance necessary for the completion of the homework, since her daughter was struggling with Spanish, in particular. She wanted more opportunity for her daughter in English, ultimately leading her to

pull her from the Dual Language program and enroll her in a Mainstream English class so she could have “the English all the time.”

The focus appeared to be on English reading more than anything else in the academic realm, with parents calling for asymmetry in instructional practice, primarily in wanting more than the program-mandated 50% in English. Hector acknowledges his willingness to compromise the mandates and goals of the program when he says, “*Sus calificaciones en matemáticas no estaban bajando tanto como las de lectura. Si podemos hacer el cambio sólo para la lectura, lo hago.*” (His math grades weren’t falling as much as his reading grades. If we can make the change just for reading, I’ll do it.)

Although still a strong proponent of Dual Language opportunities, María Elena spoke of the desire to see more English than Spanish.

...pues en inglés como usan mucho vocabulario y en español...pues en la casa se habla de muchas cosas pero no tienes language como lo que hace en la escuela, entonces en la casa hablamos much pero no, no muchas relacionado con lo que son tareas. Ellos pueden hablarte bien el español pero no comprenden muchas palabras. Pues, están hablando y resolviendo problemas de matemáticas fácil, sin ningún problema, pero necesitan más en inglés de lectura. (...well in English they are using a lot of vocabulary and in Spanish...well at home they speak a lot but not using as much school language, so at home we speak a lot, but not related to their homework. They speak Spanish well, but don’t

understand a lot of words. Well, they speak and solve math problems easily, without problem, but they need more reading in English.)

The general theme of asymmetry as outlined by Amrein and Peña (2000), consists of instructional, resource, and student assignment asymmetry. This level of wanting more English than Spanish from the parents extends into both the instructional and resource categories. It is a desire for instructional asymmetry based on the feeling that more English than Spanish would assist their children in their learning. It also represents a desire for resource asymmetry as the parents are hopeful for more material to be sent home in English than in Spanish. The schools were strong to their theoretical models by not allowing for this asymmetry to exist, at the very least in the ways that the parents are asking for, in their program. When the parents were not presented with the balance of English to Spanish that they felt would assist their children in succeeding academically to the standards, they de-selected the Dual Language program for either the first child in Dual and maintaining this for the family, or allowing the oldest to continue in the program, yet changing the enrollment decision for the younger children in the family. Surprisingly, however, all the parents who expressed this desire for more English for their children and made the change from Dual Language also expressed that they wish for Spanish and English for their younger children, but are afraid they will not succeed academically.

Asymmetry Constructed: The Silent Influence

As expressed earlier, however, the pressures toward student expectation on assessments of the standards did not rest solely with the parents. Teachers at the school also demonstrated that the children should be progressing at a higher level. Although the compacts and mission statements described earlier clarified the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders in the educational setting of the school, the conversations of the stakeholders do not necessarily reflect them. Some of the teachers, from the words of the parents interviewed in this study, encouraged parents to seek something else based on the academic performance of the children. Both schools boast of higher performance on benchmark assessments and state and federal accountability measures in the Dual Language classrooms than in the Mainstream or Structured English Immersion classrooms at the school. In such, the expected academic performance of the students in the Dual Language program is held at a high level. Whether consciously held beliefs or not, parents indicate that the teachers in the Dual Language classrooms express the lack of academic progress within the scope of their children's participation in a program that gives 50% of its instructional academic time in English, the language of assessment.

Some of the input received from teachers was interpreted as a recommendation for one language over the Dual Language program, whereas other quotes from parents reflect a direct recommendation. Along the lines of interpretive recommendation was the following offering:

...pues tenían dificultades al principio. Yo estaba pensando en quizás ponerlas en programa con sólo un idioma. Las maestras me llamaron para decirme tan difícil que era para ellas, y pensé y pensé en quitarlas. (...well they had difficulty from the beginning. I thought about perhaps putting them in a program with only one language. The teachers were calling me to tell me how difficult it was for them, and I thought and thought about taking them out.) -
María Elena

At other times the recommendations to the parents was more direct.

...lo que pasa es que hay mucha comunicación con los maestros. Me dijeron de que tanto que batallaba la primera con aprender el inglés y con la lectura en inglés, que quizás sería mejor poner el otro en clases de puro inglés...sí, porque a la primera le faltaba bastante tiempo para estudiar el inglés. (...what happens is that there is a lot of communication with the teachers. They told me that with as much as the first one struggled with English and with reading in English, that maybe it would be better to put the other one in English only classes...yes, because the first one didn't have enough time studying English.) -Dulce

The teachers had significant impact on the parents of these students who were struggling with one language or another. The greater impact seemed to be on the parents of English Language Learners, because they were already facing significant pressure for their children to learn English. For the native English

speakers, it was the academic focus that was in question. For the native Spanish speaker, it was academics plus the future of their child succeeding in a country where they *needed* command of the English language.

The parents who speak Spanish at home are put in a position of compromised sentiments. They are the ones who maintain the Spanish language at home, not only for the academic success of their children in the Spanish component of the Dual Language program, but because it is part of their family and communication with relatives (not to mention the critical communication between parent and child). They see the students struggle in school and out of their desires to see them do well in school seek what is to them a more balanced linguistic experience. Their thoughts tell them that if they could only have a little more English in school, we will give them plenty of the Spanish at home. When they are unable to receive this from the school program, they seek to balance the situation by reversing the decision for Dual Language instruction. The Spanish-speaking parent, it appears, does not have a choice, if they want their child to have more English language experience.

This contrasts heavily with the English-speaking parent who has chosen the Dual Language program solely as an enrichment program for their child. Spanish opportunities seemed like a good idea at one point, and as Dolores tells us she does “regret taking [my] son out,” but also is quick to note that “once he got more English, he did real good.” When presented with the choice as a juxtaposition—acquisition of a second language or academic success in school—this parent chooses the academic success, even though the primary goal she had

for her children was to learn a second language. Abandoning the program with one child comes much more quickly, because they know that in the end, the second language was an additional advantage they were giving that their child did not have to have. The Spanish-speaking parent tended to struggle with the program and the option of moving out of the program for longer, mainly out of knowing the cultural benefit to the family that their child was receiving from the Dual Language program.

Implications of the Asymmetrical Experience

The concept of asymmetry as presented by Amrein and Peña (2000) presents itself at these schools in a few ways. First, there is the desired asymmetry of implementation of the instruction, which lies at the heart of any model, mainly because the percentages of language separation in Dual Language programs is a key identifier of the philosophical basis of the school or program. When there are recommendations that come from parents, whether implied as felt by María Elena, or the direct recommendation Dulce experienced, parents take action that can lead to student placement asymmetry. Unfortunately that student placement asymmetry leads to some beliefs of the teachers that Pimentel et. al. (2008) offered as a criticism of Dual Language programs. Pimentel et. al. (2008), Valdez (1997), and Amrein and Peña (2000) all place power of English over Spanish as a central theme to the decision-making of these parents. Clearly, Dual Language is a program that offers as a goal the equality of languages, so it is a trend to caution against when prevalent in programs, particularly when parents are making decisions to move their families out of participation in the Dual Language program.

Most of the parents interviewed would most likely not admit to English having a power over Spanish through their decisions initially to place their children in Dual Language classes, and particularly in light of the fact that many of them discuss wanting their very youngest ones still in preschool programs now to participate in Dual Language when they come of age, as a result of our conversations. However their actions, and the actions of some of the

recommending teachers speaks volumes about where they recognize the role of English in the school system and society as a whole.

Conceptual Agreement / Actualized Discontent The parents who have accepted for their children to enter into the Dual Language program have agreed conceptually with a few tenets of the program. First they have agreed to have their children participate in English for 50% of the time and Spanish for 50% of the time. Secondly, they have agreed that their children are going to spend equal time working toward literacy in both English and Spanish. And finally, yet not clearly articulated, the parents are agreeing that their children will spend multiple years in the program. Monica and Grace, our two administrators in the study, both clearly spoke about the research of second language acquisition and the time needed. The research of the literature review concurs with the time expectation of the administrators of 4-7 years for the native English speakers to fully acquire Spanish and equally so for the native Spanish speakers to fully acquire English (Christian, 1996; Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1981, Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Although parents have agreed to these tenets through enrolling their children in the Dual Language programs, as they saw their children struggle, they sought to make changes. Simply stated, these parents were sold conceptually on Dual Language, but feared there would not be enough time for their children in English to master the skills necessary for them to succeed. Barse and de Jong (2008) spoke of the instructional asymmetry in older grades, particularly the secondary setting, as greater content was presented in English. This is precisely the type of instructional setting these parents are requesting in part. The

interesting note is that they are seeking it at the lower grades. They are most interested in their child's progress in English reading, not surprising at all given the context of the instructional accountability measures and the time given in conferencing and reporting progress academically to this content area. As students struggle with the area of literacy in the early years, parents are hoping they can spend more time in English language arts until their children demonstrate a working knowledge of English reading and writing—what they perceive as the hallmarks of success in school.

Their perceptions come to them from the greatest influence on parents in the educational setting—the teachers. Parents entrust the schools with their children, often times for more hours than they spend with them. Therefore when the school communicates directly the progress, or lack thereof, of their child, laden with sentiments about what they feel could or would assist the child in their academic progress, parents take such statements as recommendations for action on their part. These statements by the teachers at times have implications on the philosophy of the program they are involved with.

Implied Elitism When teachers make statements about inclusion or exclusion of particular students within or from the Dual Language program, they are often communicating ideas that are contradictory to the vision of Dual Language, and ripe with misconceptions about language acquisition that lead researchers to warn that the lofty goals of Dual Language are often left unaccomplished.

Schools place students in Dual Language programs according to widely held beliefs in the literature about the ideal mix of language abilities. Amrein and Pena (2000) described the ideal as consisting of no more than 70% of students from one primary language group, with an ideal ratio of 33% native Spanish speakers, 33% native English speakers, and 33% fully bilingual students. The recommended mix of students is purely linguistically-based. Academic achievement as a criterion for inclusion or exclusion from Dual Language admittance is not part of the literature. Yet the statements made to parents about their children's struggles, and the implicit recommendations something can be done about their struggles from outside of placement in the program, is problematic. There are strong enrollment rationale from white, English-speaking parents for a Dual Language program that is academically enriching and provide the opportunity for attainment of an outside goal (employment opportunity, often). Similarly, all the schools in the study cited higher academic achievement in their Dual Language program than in the other programs in the school. The very notion that students who were not succeeding academically, particularly in English literacy, may be encouraged to consider placement in English Only classrooms speaks to the elitism discussed in Pimentel et. al. (2008).

Howard, Sugerma, and Christian (2003) address student enrollment, noting that in Dual Language programs, enrollment decisions were made revolved around language background, however the native Spanish-speaking students tended to be from lower socio-economic status, whereas their white, English-speaking counterparts tended to hail from more affluent neighborhoods, often

from outside the enrollment areas. When recommendations about placement outside of the initial placement occur based on academic achievement, and changes occur, the balance of the classrooms can be altered, speaking volumes about the power of English on the program and achievement. In an environment where academic excellence is expected, the very nature of setting the expectation that students enrolled in the program must accomplish at a defined academic level speaks tremendously to who will continue in the program through its entirety. With the expected high achievement and unintended elitism of the program, the number of students who begin and end the program is called into question. Considering that many of the parents interviewed, in fact, moved children out of the program before the federal testing requirement of 3rd grade, the achievement statistics as a comparison to other programs within the school are called into question.

When students enroll in a Dual Language program, particularly language minority students, they are embarking in a program with an additive philosophical basis. If the program begins to show signs of student enrollment asymmetry based on a perceived elitism of the program, who gains from this on an individual level? Students being encouraged or discouraged to enroll may have an effect on the achievement scores of the program, but at a great toll on the program. The implied elitism and power of English over Spanish has already been discussed. Further implications are the inner-school dynamics. If this is a program within a school (as is the case with the schools in this study), what feelings are created among teachers in various programs, or among families participating or not

participating in the program, or worst yet, within families with one or more students participating and others not?

Choice as a Family Decision: The Children Struggle to Participate

I couldn't do it to him....It was hard for him to learn both at once. -

Dolores

Pareció que estaba sufriendo en aprender las dos, pero intenté motivarlo. Siempre le dije, 'Tu lo puedes hacer mijo.' Pero no quería. (It seemed like he was suffering learning both [languages], but I tried to motivate him. I always told him, 'You can do it, mijo.' But he didn't want to.) -Rosario

In determining the motivations behind the parents in enrolling their children in particular programs, I began the 3 interview process with an interview of Focused Life History that allowed me to establish a rapport with the parents, while also gleaning important information about their history as a language learner that may have affected the decisions they made for their children (see Appendix 1). Clearly the parents are the biggest factor in school choice, however this is even greater in the Dual Language programs in this study. One of the primary reasons parental choice is as central to the study is that Dual Language cannot be a school placement—parents must choose Dual Language. Second, the parents demonstrate this choice by signing a waiver that permits their child to receive bilingual instruction, a requirement in the state of Arizona. This waiver (Appendix 2) gives the school information as to the child's qualification for the program. A third requirement of the state is that the parent must sign the waiver on school grounds—it cannot be sent home and returned to school at a later time. These are all assurances by the state that parents choosing to enroll in bilingual

programs are aware of the qualifications necessary for their child's participation, and that they go through the efforts necessary to choose this program.

Parents are not on the fringes of the schooling experience for their children, particularly when it is a program of choice. They are full participants, with personal previous experiences and aspirations for their own children that fuel the decision-making before and during their time in school. The parents of this study bring a wealth of experience from their lives as language learners, crossing borders, both literal and figurative, with lives intersecting an English- and Spanish-speaking world. Among the parents in this study is a monolingual English mother, whose bilingual father did not live in the house growing up, and now as an adult is critical of her depriving her children of a bilingual education. There are two monolingual Spanish mothers whose families lived on the Mexican side of the US-Mexico border who traveled across the border constantly, living an English-Spanish divide, while only needing Spanish in either country to survive. There is also a Spanish monolingual mother who sees her son who has only been in English Only schooling losing communication with her son, and who feels isolated on the family return trips to Mexico. Needless to say, the impact of their personal experiences has shaped their decisions that relate to language learning for their children. This theme of Choice as a Family Decision examines those experiences as well as those of the children who may or may not have been part of the decision-making process of their language experience, sometimes continuing the family drama of negotiating what impact language will make on their life and learning experiences.

Dolores' life experiences are shaped by language. She lived with her monolingual English-speaking mother, her trilingual father absent from the home. Dolores' mother remarried once Dolores had left the house, this time a Spanish monolingual gentleman, with whom they had another daughter, the same age as Dolores' oldest son. Dolores' mother had learned Spanish once Dolores turned 17 through exposure, and later classes, through work. When the time came for enrolling the children in school, Washington was the school of choice, particularly for the Dual Language program. The experiences of the two step-siblings in their language learning could not have been more divergent. Jimena, the younger sister of Dolores thrived, in particular because she lived in a bilingual home. Her step-brother Gabriel, Dolores' son, experienced great difficulty.

He wasn't doing too good and he would cry, 'Mom, it's too hard....' I couldn't do it to him....So I decided to take him out because I thought maybe it would be easier for him to study one and not the other....In grade 1 he asked me to take him out because it was too hard for him. He said, 'Mom, I don't want to do it no more. I can't do it....' I thought that maybe he could stick it out and he said, 'No mama. Please! I don't want to do this no more. It's too hard for me.' -Dolores

Dolores had a few rationalizations in this example. The first was that she would ask him to stick it out. She admits that she was driven to keep him in based on the success that his step-sister was having. But other experiences influenced her decision to keep Gabriel in for as long as she could. When asked

about her oldest son, Dolores recounted his feelings about Spanish, particularly when others spoke Spanish to or around him:

He chooses not to speak it. 'I don't need to speak Spanish,' he says. He is stubborn. 'I don't need to speak Spanish if they are speaking to me. They need to speak in English.

Her own schooling experience is in stark contrast to her oldest son's, as she took a sympathetic approach to language learners.

...I remember one of the girls was not speaking no English. I befriended her and was trying to help her. It was really hard. I remember the girls crying because they didn't...they didn't know what they were doing, you know, they couldn't speak no English at all. I can't imagine if I went into a whole Spanish speaking class for the whole day. But I guess I would have caught on.

In one account Dolores remembers students from her school days struggling learning a new language and cannot comprehend the difficulty of the situation, but at the same time rationalizes the experience as something they could catch onto with time and determination.

While having personal experience with language learners, an oldest son who does not appreciate the language of his heritage, and a younger son who cannot handle the struggle of learning the language, Dolores vacillates back and forth between statements encouraging perseverance in language learning and sticking to the language that comes easier, as she had to do. But while she struggles with the language question, her father, who had the opportunity to give

her the gift of bilingualism and the speaking aspect of her culture, but was not present to do so, still influences her language decisions in the present, now that he is part of her adult life.

My father is still on me today, why I should know Spanish....He still talks to me today that I need to learn and he still says it today that my kids should. I should be speaking Spanish to them so they can learn and not have to do it in school. They wouldn't have such a hard time now.

In this, Dolores' father exonerates himself from the responsibility of teaching his children, while instilling guilt in Dolores into believing that she is doing her children a disservice with Spanish.

Dolores' language learning trials with Gabriel do not end her struggle with the subject. Her youngest, Daniel, is in preschool, and she is faced with the same decision again. "We don't know what to do," Dolores laments. "I don't want to have him have any difficulties like Gabriel did." So for her children, still, Dolores remains unsure. But when speaking in general, Dolores' sentiments and hopes for bilingualism, as she truly hopes for herself, are clear:

Spanish is a good thing to know. I mean, everywhere you go they speak Spanish. It's also good for them to learn about their culture. To parents coming in, I'd tell them to choose Dual Language. I'd say it will be hard in the beginning, but eventually, they will catch on. It might take a while, but it will be easier. Because like I said, my sister and my son started at the same time, and I remember

having a difficulty in the beginning, too, but she stayed and my son didn't, and she's unbelievable!

Yésica has similar experiences in witnessing her children in Dual Language classes struggling. She wants a bilingual life for her children, seeing the opportunities it can present, but is not patient with struggles in Spanish, in particular given the weight she puts on English.

I really want them to learn both languages. I mean, my first language was Spanish, but English is the key for you to help you move on....When I heard about the Dual Language, I'm like, 'Wow!' you know. They need that to write and speak both languages. So I tried to deal with my first daughter, but she got confused.

The idea of perseverance is not part of the equation for Yésica. She wants to see her children succeed, as well as not experience hardship. She too, has not been consistent with the application of her beliefs in providing this bilingual learning experience for her children.

My oldest, she got confused, but now she wants to go back into Dual Language. But I'm not going to...my son, he was never there because I was afraid that he was going to be the same thing as my daughter....and then my third one, he kept asking me, 'I want to, I want to...' and I'm like, 'Are you sure?' and he was like, 'Yes.' So I did it because he wanted to....and then my youngest one, I don't know about her. She understands Spanish, but she can't speak it.

She can't speak Spanish so I don't [trails off and does not complete thought]....

Yésica has received input from 2 of her 4 children stating that they want to be in the Dual Language program. 1 of these 2 gets to experience the program, while the other, who initially struggled and was taken out, does not. The other 2 were not presented the option or brought into a conversation with their parents or siblings approaching the subject. It took the second generating the conversation with Yésica to bring him into the program. Yésica still remains confused and unsure about her decisions, but not to the extent to take action to change the direction of her decisions.

With me, it's like, I regret not giving the chance for my other kids. I was impatient. I didn't just...you know....I just felt bad that my other ones didn't have that chance that he did, you know, to learn, to learn that well. I don't know. I made a mistake and I feel bad. I really do feel bad because they are missing out....My son used to tell her, 'Yeah, come on. It will be fun....' But now she wants to, you know, go to Dual Language, and I'm like, 'Well, it's not too late to switch her to that class. I mean she was brilliant in grade 2, so she could still make it.' I'm just afraid they are going to get confused and get behind in their learning. That is my concern.

Rosario entered into the Dual Language compact with the expressed intent of having her children achieve a level of bilingualism she has. She communicated the desire for her children to be able to fully experience their culture by being able

to fully speak, read, and write the Spanish language. She knew they would progress with English because, “*las escuelas son de inglés, y sé que con tiempo van a progresar en inglés*” (schools are for English, and I know that with time they will progress in English). Rosario’s experience with her older child, however, was that he did not maintain as high of a level of performance in English, and, like Dolores, did not have the patience to see if it would develop over time.

Hablamos las dos en la casa. Miran la tele y las caricaturas en inglés y español. Tenemos amigos que vienen a visitarnos que hablan las dos. Pensé que podía mantener un nivel de lograr en los áreas académicos, pero no. Tuve que cambiarlo. (We speak both [languages] at home. They watch TV and watch cartoons in English and Spanish. We have friends that come visit us that speak both. I thought he could maintain a level of achieving in his academics, but no. I had to change him.) -Rosario

Rosario made the change for her older son in 2nd grade, and never enrolled her younger son in the program. This decision is particularly strong among English-speaking parents who interviewed for the study and among those identified who had older students in Dual Language classes and not their younger ones. Rosario is the only Spanish speaker who identified this as a reason for not enrolling in the program with younger children.

The opposite sentiment is more common among the Spanish-speaking parents as expressed by Cintia in the following:

...mis esperanzas eran que ellos tuvieran un mejor desarrollo que en su idioma, pues que hablaran, como yo vengo de raíces hispanas, que ellos supieran bien el idioma del español como también el inglés para que no tuvieran ningún problema en lectura o escritura, fue mi interés. Para que no se les dificulte en leer alguna carta o algún libro...pues me gustó ese programa y por eso decidí que mis hijos participaran. (...my hopes were that they had a strong development in their language, that they spoke, since I am of Hispanic roots, that they knew well Spanish and also English so that they had no problem with reading or writing, was my interest. So that they had no difficulty reading a letter or book...well I liked this program and that's why I decided that my children participate.)

When looking at the matter of families taking a role together in discussing language development and enrollment in programs, it became further evident that some families not only did not have these discussions, but were even unclear in which program their children were enrolled in.

Conversation with San Juana about the enrollment status of her 3 girls led her to state that all 3 were in Dual Language. When I reminded her of the topic of my study and why I had asked her to participate, she simply responded, “*Aaah, se me confundí.*” (Aaah, I got confused.) I asked her to name her children's teachers. Once she did, I realized that one of the teacher's named was one of the teachers of the Structured English Immersion program (designated classroom

utilizing the 4 hour English immersion model as mandated by the Arizona Department of Education). At that point I stopped the interview to check on the classroom assignments. After speaking briefly with the program administrator and Focus Group participant Monica, I was able to verify, in fact, that the teacher of the second child was indeed an English Only teacher.

When I returned to speak with San Juana, she had the following to say:

Lo que pasa es que hubo un error cuando la apuntaron. A Estefanía me la matricularon en el de inglés, en el de sólo un idioma pues ya todo se quedó así. (What happened is that there was an error when they assigned her. They enrolled Estefanía in the English one, in the one with only one language, and so it stayed that way.)

The story behind the enrollment issue is one that will be discussed during the third theme of this chapter. This, however, is exemplary of a family that is unaware of the rationale behind placement in programs at the school and the fact that they are not discussing what is happening at school.

This theme looks not only at the struggles of students in their language classes, but their voice in the decision. It examines that motivating factors leading parents to make decisions about their child's learning and the root of these factors. It begs the question--At what age should a child be an active and equal partner in deciding on their learning environment? The next section delineates the implications behind this question.

Implications of the Family Decision-Making Process: The Importance of Gathering Information

With accountability measures holding such importance in a high-stakes environment in education over the past 10 years, schools have become expert at using data to inform decisions responding to student performance. The stakes are not just high for schools, but also for the participants in the schooling process, namely the students. For the youngest students, in particular those who were in kindergarten for the 2010-2011 school year, the 2010 Arizona House of Representatives Bill 2732 could lead to retention if they are not proficient in reading on AIMS in 3rd grade. For older students, including all of the children whose parents participated in this study, high school graduation is dependent as well on success on these accountability measures. In order for parents and families to make the decisions necessary to support their students to assure their academic success, they need accurate, timely, and supportive information.

Once that information is gathered, participants can come together to make the necessary decisions, particularly keeping in mind the needs of the learner. One of the best judges of the success of the child is indeed the child himself. I have shared the voices of parents, who in turn shared the voices of their children. It is evident from these voices that children as young as 5 and 6—kindergartners and 1st graders—are communicating their feelings about how they are experiencing learning. We—parents, teachers, administrators—need to have open ears to recognize that our aspirations for students may not always match the learning styles, abilities, or interests of these children. Ultimately, adults are

charged with making these important decisions for children. Including them in the conversation and working toward an ideal of families communicating and sharing information is the hope that often can lead to putting children in situations wherein they can feel and experience the greatest levels of success.

This section of implications on the theme will cover two areas: the importance of the school in providing accurate, research-based information on students' difficulties in relation to language acquisition theory, and the role of children in making program placement decisions.

Providing Student Performance Balanced with Research-based

Theory The field of research used to validate Dual Language studies originates from the field of second language acquisition. The parents in this study have indicated that their conversations with teachers have guided them in making decisions that at times have led to removing their children from the Dual Language classroom. Pimentel et. al. (2008) address the dangers of allowing student performance to drive placement in the Dual Language classroom as it perpetuates the belief that only the brightest students *belong* in the Dual Language classrooms, fostering an air of elitism in the program. When teachers make recommendations, whether directly advising parents to remove their child from the program, or indirectly speak to the parent about the difficulties their child may be having 'keeping up' with the others, they need to keep second language acquisition theory—mainly the transference of knowledge from one language to the other and the time necessary for acquisition of the cognitive linguistic skills—in mind.

Long held as a principal theory of second language acquisition, and used in the models for language learning classrooms over the past 30 years is the idea of the common underlying principle (CUP) (Cummins, 1981). Simply stated, the learning that is occurring in the Spanish classroom of a dual language setting is not just having an effect on what the student has learned about Spanish. Cummins would say that the literacy learning in the Spanish classroom is having a direct influence on the learning of literacy in English and in Spanish (2007). The cognitive academic work occurring at the time is literacy, not just Spanish. Therefore although the words, pronunciation, and perhaps vocabulary are distinct, the concept of literacy is not. Literacy is transferred from the Spanish context into an English context. Thomas and Collier (2002) found that the literacy skills in the primary language of the Spanish-speaking students was in fact predictive of their success in English academic performance.

This has a direct impact on the information provided by parents in this study. Note the commonality in message, whether directly stated or implied, of the following quotes:

The teacher, I went to her. She said, 'It's going to be a little hard in the beginning because he doesn't know nothing.' But she kept calling again and saying what trouble he was having. He stayed for a little bit longer but after the reports kept coming, I didn't want to do it anymore. It was hard for me and hard for him. -

Dolores

...porque vieron que ella estaba batallando más para el español, nos dijeron mejor ponerla en puro inglés. (...because they saw that she was struggling more with Spanish, they said to put her in English only.) -San Juana

Es que me dicen que ella es muy seria, ella es muy tranquila y éste, pero está avanzando un poco, y ya empezamos a ver las notas y todo eso y no estaba haciendo en el nivel que debe ser.... (They told me she is very serious and calm and all this, but she's slowly progressing, and we started seeing the notes and all this, and she's not doing it at the level where she should be....) -Blanca

These quotes all hold significance, because in many cases the quotes were followed by accounts of moving students from Dual Language to English Only, or deciding to put the younger siblings in English Only instead of Dual Language. The teachers may not have directly told the mothers to make these moves, but the information the teachers gave about academic progress was linked to program placement by the parent.

In following with theoretical approaches (Cummins 1981, 2007; Krashen, 1982; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003), the relationship between academic progress and language acquisition should have transferred over language. More succinctly, the teachers' knowledge about second language acquisition theory should have prompted them to counsel parents on the student ability to still learn academic content in one language (Spanish) and have that translate into academic success in the other (English), or vice versa with the language transference. The

inability of the teachers to communicate, or worse yet, the prompting perhaps of teachers to recommend programmatic change based on academic struggles was not consistent with the theoretical approaches on which their programs were developed. The maintenance of Dual Language in presentation to the parents, as one wherein students must be academically high performing to access the gains of the program are consistent with the warnings of elitism (Pimentel et. al., 2008) discussed earlier.

The Role of Children in Program Choice Parents are given the charge of raising their children, providing for the current needs and seeing to their future needs. Chief among this charge is making decisions about their schooling. The decision for Dual Language, and further when they are entered into the program, is one that is fully a choice, unlike just enrolling in the neighborhood school. It is also one that asks for a cognitive demand on the child. While the parent plays the primary role in making this decision, the child can be involved in the process. I have learned through the course of the interviews in this study that the children have certainly provided significant at the time of exit from the program, if any of the parents addressed taking the older children out of Dual Language, yet not spoke of involving the oldest in the conversation upon entry. There are examples stated by the parents when prompted about conversations about program enrollment when one child was in Dual Language and the younger was not, that the younger child was too young to understand. Yet instances also arose, wherein conversations in the home prompted rethinking Dual Language enrollment such as the following:

...right now she wants to go to that class really bad. She actually tells my son to teach her Spanish, like, 'How do you say this in Spanish?'....she really wants to be with my son's teacher next year. -Yésica

Es que me ha comentado que quiere hacer dos idiomas, pero porque de las quejas y problemas que tuvo su hermano...no sé.

(It's that he's told me that he wants to do Dual Language, but because of the complaints and problems his brother had...I don't know.) -Rosario

Although not as direct, the desire is implied in the following:

...me dice, 'Mami, que dice allí?' No sabe todavía leer el español. Entonces sí le está afectando, y es cuando me estoy dando cuenta de que he estado hacienda mal no ponerlos igual que mis otros hijos desde el principio. (...she asks me, 'Mommy, what does it say there?' She still cannot read Spanish. So, yes it's affecting her, and that's when I realize that I've been doing wrong not putting them equal like my other kids from the beginning.) -Cintia

Upon entry to school we ask children to put their name to many things that conceptually may be above them: signing classroom agreement to follow rules and expectations, signing the school compact along with their teachers and parents, signing an Acceptable Use agreement for school technology. When we ask students to engage in such, we give them child-friendly language to match their experiences with the expectation for follow-through with the principles they

are agreeing to. The same can be applied to enrollment in programs of choice such as a Dual Language program. Certainly the child may not understand the difficulties they may face as they encounter accountability to second language literacy skills within a couple years. But they can enter the situation cognizant at their level that they are entering a commitment, and be asked to and reminded of this commitment on an annual basis, or frequently at home.

Although not a requirement of such programs, it is a recommendation that could pay positive dividends when difficulties arise, reaching back in the child's memory to a time when they recognized that they were entering into a situation that they agreed to work their hardest toward. A couple of the parents have been quoted as speaking to the idea of perseverance of their children. Perseverance is not the behavior of the parent, but rather the child. They can only persevere in that in which they fully engaged.

Legislative Mandates y Puertas Cerradas (Closed Doors): De-Selection as a Passive Process

No pueden quitarnos esa oportunidad de que los niños sean bilingües. Yo pienso que no nada más para el bien de nosotros sino para el bien de la ciudad, del estado, del país... (They can't take this opportunity that the children are bilingual. I think not just for our good, but for the good of the city, of the state, of the country...) -Cintia

The sentiments and voices of this final section of the study are those of the native Spanish speakers—children and parents. These are the students classified by the state of Arizona as English Language Learners, who are denied the opportunity to participate in Dual Language programs. The older siblings of some of these younger ones denied entry came to Dual Language either just before or just after the Proposition 203 in Arizona, declaring English Only the law of the land and the practice in the schools. How that law would be enacted and enforced was a gradual conversation that has become more restrictive as the years have passed. The older siblings themselves were English Language Learners, but they are also the students who the program was designed for. Federal grants looking to fund innovative and research-based approaches to providing the best instructional practices for the academic gain of English Language Learners brought the 3 schools in this study to Dual Language, after years of transitional bilingual education programs. But now restrictive state legislation was changing the nature and method of delivery of instruction for this population of students.

In Chapter Five I will make recommendations based on the claim that these restrictive laws serve the purpose of maintaining white power and privilege, and in return attempts for ownership of the Spanish language as a commodity in the market of economic opportunity. But the basis behind that claim, that serves as a Conceptual Framework to the study as a whole and most pertinent to this part of Chapter Four is the lens of Critical Race Theory (CRT). CRT originated as a form of legal scholarship focused on how the law can function to protect white power and privilege (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Ladson-Billings (2005) continued the study on CRT to explain how legal precedents, as I will argue is the case in Arizona with Proposition 203, to sustain an unequal situation in schools, in this case the preservation of the achievement gap between English Language Learners and white students.

CRT in its inception was mainly used within a Black-White dichotomy, so researchers who sought to generalize CRT principles to other cases of legal justification for racial stratification outside of this Black-White realm identified various branches of CRT. Trucios-Haynes (2001) defines Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) as a means of exploring the legal ramifications of race policy to include a broader analysis of race that includes the intersection of race with language, color, immigration, gender, and national origin. The language and immigration aspects of LatCrit provide a more specific context to CRT as applied to Dual Language studies (Juárez, 2008; Michael-Luna, 2008; Monzó and Rueda, 2009).

Two important findings came through this theme. The first is that some of the parents are simply confused with the changes in the law, the way the law is applied, or the notifications from the school about program choice or what their rights or responsibilities may be. Often they are acting based on recommendations or requests from the school, be those agents of information teachers, administrators, or office personnel. In a time when there has been so much change and a new requirement or limitation just about every year, they are overwhelmed, and just trust the school to make the best placement or judgment, and if they question it in their mind, it does not come forward to school personnel. The second finding is implicit with LatCrit—legally the parents cannot make the choice for Dual Language. The state has made that decision for them. So in respect to the defined terms of the study, the parent is not de-selecting Dual Language; the state is de-selecting their family from participation based on language status. I will share the voices of the parents and administrators on how the legal ramifications affect enrollment in the Dual Language classes in relation to English Language Learners.

Conversation with Dulce leads me to the conclusion that there are so many changes that for some parents, it is too much to keep up with. The interview with Dulce lead me as the interviewer to stop the conversation to check group assignments with the administrators of the program, just so I could know which teachers indeed were Dual Language teachers and which were SEI teachers. Upon the conclusion, it was apparent that some of Dulce's children were in SEI

and some were in Dual Language, but not the way she described. One that she felt was in Dual Language was, in fact, in SEI, and vice versa.

Se me olvidó. [risas] Para los nombres tengo muy mala memoria. Pero para los que dije, son de clases de dos idiomas, y los demás de puro inglés. (I forgot. [laughs] I have a bad memory for names. But for the one's I said, they have Dual Language classes, and the rest are in English Only.) -Dulce

San Juana had her own opinions of why there were now so many SEI classes, and not as many Dual Language classes.

Es que hay maestros de dos idiomas, pero cuando van a las conferencias y ven que les preocupan como se va con los niños, hay que haber otra clase de puro inglés. Así, pienso, es como mi hija está en clases de inglés. (There are Dual Language teachers, but when you go to conferences and you see that there are preoccupied with how the students are doing, there needs to be more classes of English. That's how, I think, my daughter is in English classes.)

Grace, the administrator with the Desert Sands Elementary School District (DSESD) described just one change in the law regarding how English Language Learners used to qualify for the Dual Language program and the impact in the following way:

So the Federal Government has a clause, and I believe it's Title III, if I'm remembering correctly, that parents can refuse English

Language Learner services and essentially what that does is allow the parent to pull their child out of that status....essentially the parents have a right to choose a language program for their child as well....We essentially decided, well if they refuse services, they are not an ELL at the time. They got pulled out of that status....Parents were choosing the dual language program for the child when they decided to withdraw from ELL status....The State Department of Education got wind of our use of that clause and then the State Department, although not through any formal directive, said that we could not use the letter in that way.

Monica, the administrative participant from Canyon Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) added her school's use of this form (Appendix 2):

...we got a directive from the state that we were not able to use it to place students in the Dual Language program and that they can only go into the Mainstream program...in our case, you know, it's probably 120-150 students that we used it for.

Considering that the schools had placed significant numbers of students into the Dual Language classes using this refusal letter, and suddenly were given directives from the State Department of Education to cease usage of the refusal letter in this way, it is not surprising that the parents are unable to keep track of how their child could before and cannot now qualify for the program.

Monica also shared the confusion with parents, surprisingly, based on the success of the program at the school for over 10 years.

...parents come to Grant specifically so that their child can be in the Dual Language program and they think that every classroom is a Dual Language class. So they come and they enroll the child, you know, without realizing that they had specifically to say, 'I want my child in the Dual Language program....' Actually I took this from Washington, you know, where there are signs that say, 'Ask about our Dual language program,' so we're being as clear as possible....A student, it was a fourth grade student, the parents were having their second conference with the teacher in March, so now it's just like they've gone from August to March and they didn't realize their child was not in the Dual Language program.

The schools are looking to explicitly market their programs to the parents, provide them with information about their programs, inform parents of their rights, but also their responsibilities, with enrolling their children in the programs, and keep track of the legal requirements for placing students in the programs and the paperwork that is monitored.

Monica and Grace, as administrators of Dual Language programs also demonstrate how differently they interpreted another stipulation on qualification for the program. Monica describes how s PHLOTE student would qualify for Dual Language:

Students who are Spanish speakers, or any other language...in their language survey...take the AZELLA language proficiency

assessment. Then if the student is not proficient, then they don't qualify.

Grace quickly adds the following:

We do it differently....if they're proficient only in the oral subtest on the AZELLA they may qualify.

Monica continues to add a caveat for kindergarten enrollment purposes:

Because the state only requires a half day kindergarten, for kindergarten students, the second part of the day at Grant is considered enrichment, and so we choose to pay that through other funds, so the students can receive the full kind of 50/50 model.

The focus group nature of this session allows for a back-and-forth dialogue about ways students can qualify as eligible to participate in Dual Language programs, consisting of sophisticated interpretations of clauses in federal laws or using state documents that allow for certain exceptions. The parents are simply informed by the school that their child either does or does not qualify for Dual Language, and their child is placed in, or just 1 or 2 years later, using the same criteria, denied entry into, the program. Parents find it increasingly difficult to navigate the ever-changing laws or stipulations of these laws. That is the case before considering the LatCrit elements of why English Language Learners are precluded from enrolling in Dual Language in the first place.

The parents of the English Language Learners in this study have spoken as to why they made the decision to not enroll, or as I have presented, that the state assisted them in making such a decision.

Decidimos ponerla, pero le hicieron un examen a la niña de kinder...le hizo un examen cuando ella empezó el kinder y ella no pasó la prueba. (We decided to put her in, but they gave her a test in kindergarten...she took a test when she started kindergarten and she didn't pass the test.) -Cintia

This was surprising for Cintia since she had 3 children who had been in the program before, and spoke even less English than the one she was trying to enroll. María Elena told us the exact same account.

Lo que pasa es que yo sí quería ponerlo en dos idiomas pero él no pasó el examen. Mis hijas mayores lo pasaron y tengo la otra niña que es más pequeña que él. Ella pasó el examen y él se quedó en este. No pudo agarrar dos idiomas. (What happened is that I wanted to put him in Dual Language but he didn't pass the test. My older girls passed it and I have the other girl who is younger than him. She passed the test and he remained in this. He couldn't go in Dual Language.)

The rationale all of these language minority parents have given is the same as María Elena expressed when she said, “*Quería que se abrieran las dos puertas. Quería que fueran bilingües.*” (I wanted both doors opened. I wanted them to be bilingual.) But as the title of this section states, the legislative mandate closed those doors.

One of the frightening doors that is being closed is that of communication within the families. The older students who were allowed to participate in Dual

Language are enjoying the fruits of their labor. They will get together as siblings and communicate, code-switching throughout their conversations, in both English and Spanish. The younger generation that is being withheld Spanish in school is seeing that their Spanish skills are diminishing. Children naturally prefer to spend their time in the presence of other children. These younger ones who are in English Only classes and are communicating with other children only in English are not getting the opportunities to maintain their Spanish as well. When they do come into contact with Spanish in the family, they are significantly behind where they would be expected to be. For a family of Spanish-speaking parents who promoted their children reaping the benefits of bilingualism and promoted the use of both languages for their children, seeing a child tending toward English only can create fear and worry about the future for that child within their family structure.

Nosotros en la casa solamente hablamos español y mi niño, él que está en un sólo idioma, a él no entiende todo lo que nosotros decimos y esa era mi gran preocupación. Cuando estamos aquí, sólo va a hablar inglés y de repente si nos vamos a México cualquiera cosa que pase, ellos no van a poder comunicarse con la gente y eso era algo que a mi me preocupaba. (At home we only speak Spanish and my son, the one that is in just one language, he doesn't understand everything we say, and this is my biggest concern. When we are here, he will only speak English and if we suddenly go to Mexico, whatever happens, they won't be able to

communicate with the people and that has concerned me.) -María
Elena

Sadly, she elaborated on the home communication later.

...él habla muy poquito con sus hermanos en español. Conmigo es con quién más habla español y si él me dice algo en inglés yo le digo, 'Yo no te entiendo,' y vuelve a repetirme hasta que él...si él no sabe lo que quiere decir, va y le pregunta a una de sus hermanas y luego ya viene y me dice, 'quiero decir esto en español.' (...he speaks very little Spanish with his siblings. He mainly speaks Spanish with me, and if he tells me something in English I tell him, 'I don't understand,' and he repeats it to me until he...if he doesn't know what to say, he goes and asks one of his sisters and later comes to me and says , 'I want to tell you in Spanish.')

She would like to be more a part of his education but realizes her limits in what she can do.

...se le facilitaría un poco más porque si él no entiende, yo podría ayudarlo. (...it would help him a little better because if he didn't understand, I could help him.)

María Elena is fearful of what may very well come to be in a few years, as she continues to not know any English, and he not spend any time speaking Spanish, academically or socially. She notes that already, when they return on trips to

Mexico, he feels lonely because he can't communicate with the neighborhood children and cannot wait to return to Arizona.

The accounts of Cintia and María Elena voicing the words and struggles of their children in maintaining Spanish equate to the experiences presented by Revilla and Asato (2002) when interviewing students themselves. In particular is their account of 'Christian' who defined his identity more in terms of English mastery and fluency once he had attained that status to distinguish himself from his more Spanish-dominant peers. The social implication of programmatic moves toward English Only compounded with a social agenda in the political campaigns bringing forth such referenda take a psychological hold on the psyche of the young Latinos who see their language and culture under attack and respond by leaning toward the bias toward the English dominance, at a young age. This is a great fear of the parents of this study as they see their children taking similar stances, while at the same time being precluded from the opportunity to maintain that language and culture in an additive and accepting multicultural education context. Revilla and Asato (2002) describe this phenomenon within the children as having, "internalized the political meanings" of not only the Propositions and legal mandates, but also the societal framework for prejudice and discrimination, evident in the news, in their schools, and in their communities.

Of the 10 families that participated in this study, 8 have children in the program who are identified as English Language Learners, identified through the PHLOTE Home Language Survey. In 1 of the 8 English Language learner households, the mother is completely bilingual, yet the predominant language

spoken with the children and in the home is Spanish, preventing the children from classifying as English proficient. The LatCrit perspective is indicative of a strong influence of legislative impact on language. This part of Chapter 4 clearly speaks to the English Language learner predicament with opportunity to participate equally in programs of enrichment that other students who are English proficient can, fitting the LatCrit perspective of an intersection of race and language affecting issues of power and privilege between Spanish-dominant Latinos and English proficient students, the majority of whom are white. One question of how this addresses questions of race is that the test is given to PHLOTE students. A question of the AZELLA test is the potential for over-identification of ELLs based on what could be determined to be age-inappropriate language expectations. In other words, if all students into the school were given the AZELLA test, how many non-PHLOTE students would classify as non-English proficient? This will be further addressed in Chapter Five.

The legislative impact on the Dual Language program is directly related to enrollment, specifically on English Language Learners. Specifically, English Language Learners, through legislative mandates through Propositions and, in Arizona, actualized through the policies enacted by the Structured English Immersion Task Force, are prevented from enrolling in language enrichment opportunities such as Dual Language programs. There are multiple implications of this legislation on what will happen for these families, children, and the schools they attend. The following section details these implications.

Implications of Increasingly Restrictive Language Policy on Dual Language Programs in Arizona

The implications of language policy on Dual Language programs have worked to create an imbalance of the program by intended goal in each of the schools of the study. This final section of analysis in Chapter Four will address the following areas: 1) The loss of original program focus, 2) The stated original goal of preservation of primary language can no longer be communicated, 3) The inability of parents to keep up with legislative demands on school programs, and 4) The preclusion of most English Language Learners from the most effective research-based plan of education for English language development.

The historical knowledge of the evolution of the Dual Language programs in the study by the administrators in the focus group provided an understanding of why each program began, and how they attempt to still address those original foci. Grace from DSESD described the inception in the following way:

...it was developed initially for our ELL population. What they did was they spent time researching what is the best program for English Language Learners because DSESD had a very large ELL population. I think they were close to 50% at that time...This was an attempt to be a little more bit targeted in the type of instruction that they were going to be receiving...The majority of the bilingual students in the classroom were also identified ELLs. The idea, actually, was to have 33% of the kids monolingual Spanish, 33% monolingual English, and 33% bilingual...the compliance factor

that came into effect...challenged our ability to be able to place more ELLs in the classroom.

Grace from CVESD described it slightly different.

...it was kind of how to better serve our ELLs and we didn't have all the restrictions and requirements...we started looking at internationally the value that is placed in language and multiple languages and how we can get more students to be multi or dual, have at least two languages and so not just looking at ELLs but also how do we include more students....

So one program directly targeted English Language Learners while the other looked strongly at the impact of this model of bilingualism in school on ELLs while focusing on the international focus of attainment of more than one language. The schools now are not able to speak directly to the issue of using bilingual studies as a means of addressing the cognitive or linguistic gains of ELLs since the state of Arizona requires the placement of all students not identified as Proficient on the AZELLA to be in an SEI classroom. DSESD stipulates, as Grace states with Arizona Department of Education understanding, that the placement of oral Proficient (but perhaps overall Intermediate) ELLs upon recommendation of academic success and progress toward academic objectives is permissible. Given that the mandates of how to implement language policies in Arizona have become more restrictive, it would not be surprising to see changes away from that recommendation. The schools in DSESD have witnessed the placement of ELLs in Dual Language dwindle from open enrollment, to those

whose parents request refusal of ELL services, to oral Proficient students.

Smaller numbers in the current climate would not be a surprise.

Implied in school goals, and directly communicated from the parents of this study and in the research, maintenance of the primary language (for the native Spanish speakers) is an important premise of Dual Language studies. Highlighted particularly in the earlier accounts with María Elena and Cintia, the home language maintenance is particularly difficult with half of the children in the family profiting from a bilingual schooling experience and bringing and using that bilingualism at home, and the younger half of the children now in English Only classrooms. The parents can always orally maintain the language, but the older children have had the benefits of the full cultural experience of attaining literacy skills in Spanish and using those skills at home. One child in particular is struggling not only with his primary language, but in maintaining a sense of identity with his Mexican relatives or acquaintances when he travels south to Mexico.

The preservation of primary language, while a positive ambition for parents to partner with Dual Language schools on, is a difficult endeavor for Arizona public schools to take on in light of language and immigration policy when parents are feeling skeptical about the future of their program's existence given the current climate of fear and mistrust.

...no los debemos quitar ese programa. Hay tanta preocupación en la posibilidad de que quieren quitar el programa. Lo que he escuchado es que no quieren que se hable español, que el primer

idioma de las escuelas es inglés. Algunos padres están preocupados por el programa de lo que hemos escuchado en las noticias que no quieren que se use el lenguaje español en las escuelas. (...we can't let them take away this program. There is a lot of worry about the possibility that they want to take away the program. What I've heard is that they don't want Spanish spoken, that English is the first language of the schools. Some parents are worried about the program from what we've heard on the news that they don't want Spanish spoken in schools.) -Cintia

Some parents have clearly chosen to take their younger children out of Dual Language programming, while for others, the legal mandates preclude their children's inclusion in the program. Either way, confusion abounds in how students qualify for the program, how it is being implemented, and what information parents should have so that they can make decisions for their children, and subsequently, for their families. Pimentel et. al. (2008) discusses the approach with Dual Language being piloted in the state of Texas, with a pilot program being run, researched, and monitored at the state level. Given the climate of Arizona's heritage and language policy currently, it is clear that English Language Learners would be eliminated in all ways without exception from Dual Language program were there to be a state-driven implementation. The potential for a State Department of Education – University School of Education partnership in this study and monitoring is a recommendation that will be discussed in Chapter Five.

As presented in the review of the literature on the research on Dual Language effectiveness (Alanís and Rodríguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, Lindholm-Leary and Block, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 1997), the program is clearly quantifiably strong in effectiveness for language minority students. The greatest implication of effect of legal mandate on English Language Learners is the denial of access to the program that will help them linguistically and academically achieve at the highest levels.

Grace addressed both the area of academic and linguistic achievement of English Language Learners in the Dual Language program.

We do see higher academic achievement for our 3rd through 6th grade ELL students. We also see higher rates of reclassification for our ELLs in Dual Language than in the SEI classes.

Grace and Monica were able to share both AIMS comparative data of Dual Language achievement to the rest of the school achievement as being higher over multiple years. The state accountability measures for labeling schools changed with the 2010-2011 school year, with current labels still embargoed at the writing of this dissertation. However the measure no longer just addresses status on proficiency on the AIMS data, but rather now considers growth measures, specifically 25% of the measure is on overall growth and 25% on the growth of the lowest quarter of students. It will be important to track the growth data for English Language Learners overall in the state, but also specifically in a program such as the Washington and Lincoln schools where some English Language Learners are part of the Dual Language program. This as well, to be discussed in

Chapter Five, could be part of a State Department of Education – University partnership in a study to see what the best models of instruction for English Language Learners in the state can be. That, of course, is under the assumption that the State Department of Education is interested in a research-based and localized answer to the question.

The inability of parents to access what they may know to be the best language and academic learning program for their child leaves parents feeling powerless, particularly given that the policies are mounting against them to promote this feeling of powerlessness. The question of access denied leaves another side to be addressed—who is being given that access? For these parents, the answer is meaningless. It is disempowering just knowing that the tool of access being given to others is their primary language. This stark reality is what makes the policy recommendations of this study a social justice imperative.

Summary of Findings

In Chapter Four I presented the stories and experiences of 10 parents from 3 school communities who had their older children in Dual Language programs and made a decision (or had a decision made for them) to de-select Dual Language for the younger sibling/s. I also presented the perspective of 2 school or district administrators with oversight of these programs. Through a qualitative analysis of their transcribed interviews, 3 main themes presented themselves. The first of these is that there is a Desired or Created Assymetry between the program design and implementation. The second theme presented is how Choice of the program was or was not a Family Decision. The final theme presented is the impact of Legislative Mandates on English Language Learners that affects Dual Language classrooms and instruction, primarily in the form of enrollment patterns.

Each of these themes was presented paralleled with the voices of the affected or affecting parties in the discussion. The voices or findings were consistent, and presented as such, with the pertinent literature in the field of Dual Language study in respect to language minority students. The findings were also examined through the Conceptual Framework of Latino Critical Race Theory and Asymmetry. Using this Conceptual Framework, implications of each of these themes was presented to unify the voices to an impact beyond the decision-making process. This study extends beyond the period of interview for these families. They will live with the consequences of their decisions, cognizant that

these decisions greatly affect the academic and linguistic success of their children throughout their educational careers.

After a thorough analysis of the qualitative data through the lens of Latino Critical Race Theory, I will present my summary of the findings and reactions to the voices of the parents and administrators who graciously offered their time and experiences to this study. I will then present recommendations to school administrators, families, and policy makers regarding Dual Language enrollment, particularly in relation to English Language Learners.

Chapter Five

Summary, Reactions, and Recommendations

“Teaching Spanish to white kids is all the rage – even in Mexican-bashing Arizona.” (Spanish Dip, *Phoenix New Times*, August 4, 2011).

Introduction and Organization

In the previous four chapters I have provided a background to the issue of de-selection of Dual Language programs by parents of students in Phoenix metropolitan schools. The literature has shown reasons for parental choice, stemming from enrichment opportunities to academic achievement, particularly for English Language Learners. The parents in this study may have shared some of those experiences, yet have engaged in a process defined as de-selection. The Conceptual Framework for the study was two-fold. The first of these was one of Asymmetry, or as defined in the study, a Desired or Created Asymmetry. The second was Latino Critical Race Theory, a field of study examining power and privilege in relation to issues significant to Latinos, in this case language. Using these frameworks as the lens for analysis, I have studied 3 schools, interviewing 10 parents who have de-selected Dual Language and 2 administrators at the school or district level with oversight over these 3 schools. Using qualitative research methods and analyses, the parents have shared their experiences, centralized around three themes—Desired or Created Asymmetry, Choice as a

Family Decision, and the Impact of Legislative Mandate on enrollment of Dual Language programs. After presenting each of these themes, I discussed the implications they had on the Dual Language programs of the study.

In Chapter 5 I will provide my conclusions and reactions to the study and recommendations to affected stakeholders. In the first section on conclusions and reactions, I will discuss the following three themes—commodifying Spanish, the impact of the AZELLA test on Dual Language, and the tremendous impact of the denial of entry into Dual Language for English Language Learners. This impact is on the lack of opportunity to experience an enrichment program, less opportunity for academic content through inclusion in the SEI program, and significantly less academic growth, particularly in mathematics.

Although I have a reaction to the study I have been engaged in for over a year, as Rossman and Rallis (2003) suggest is one of the rationale for qualitative studies, I have taken an emancipatory approach to this dissertation, with a social justice intention. That social justice end can be acted upon by numerous stakeholders in Dual Language settings, or in the field of second language acquisition in regards to English Language Learners. For those for whom the study was conducted and this research was written come recommendations for actions they may be able to take to positively affect the school communities who are able to provide this resource. The recommendations will be extended to five educational stakeholders: recommendations for future research, recommendations for school administrators, recommendations for parents, recommendations for

program design, and recommendations for policy-makers in the field of language policy in Education.

Conclusions and Reactions

In this section I will present three conclusions about the study, considering the research, the Conceptual Frameworks, and the analysis of the data. The first of these is the commodification of language. The second is the relevance and reliability of the measure for identifying second language learners. The third is the access to educational opportunity and growth for second language learners in language policy-restrictive environments like Arizona.

Language is a means of communication that connects us with others. Consider the power of language as theorized by Maria Montessori (1949/1988) in the following:

So it happens that a language is a kind of wall which encloses a given human company, and separates it from all others. And this, perhaps, is why 'the word' has always had a mystical value for man's mind; it is something that unites men even more closely than nationality. Words are bonds between men, and the language they use develops and ramifies according to the needs of their minds. Language, we may say, grows with human thought. (pp. 98-99)

Language is something available to all—everyone has an equal opportunity to access it. That is, until it is given exclusionary status. When that occurs, language is transformed from a free resource to a transferred commodity. This is why the field of language policy is so critical. When open and inclusive forms of

policy are focused on helping all gain access to this resource, language maintains neutrality. However when language policy becomes restrictive, language truly attains a value that sets one group in a position of power, deciding who can have access to this commodity and who cannot.

What is most frightening about the language policy of determining that only those with English fluency can have access to other languages in the schooling context is that the true owners of the language and culture historically are being left out of the equation. The state, through direct action of giving practice directives and limitations to policy, are trying to take ownership of the Spanish language from native Spanish speakers and transfer it to the English proficient population, who in many respects are affluent and white. This reality is at the heart of LatCrit—when legislative action seeks to maintain positions of power and privilege of non-Latinos over Latinos. In a time of intense furor about immigration policy in Arizona, language policy is just as restrictive. It appears that a transference of power and privilege of access to Spanish is using language as a tool of opportunity against the new majority (Latinos) that is needing to be limited through these policies. Language policy is chief among the Civil Rights struggles of this generation, and should matter to any disenfranchised group as well as to all who are working for issues of social justice. As the quote from Montessori tells us, language is a human creation and protection of access to language is an issue for humanity to work toward.

The PHLOTE Home Language Survey is a tool that identifies families exposed to a second language in the home. A child who has the influence of

languages other than English in the home is then given the AZELLA test that determines whether or not they will be classified as an English Language Learner. When that label serves to identify students who may need more resources or provides direction to differentiated learning strategies teachers may employ when working with them, it is easy to see a meaningful purpose to the instrument. However when this label then forces the child to be put in a segregated environment and denied access to other learning opportunities, there is an issue with Civil Rights, and a social justice imperative.

Does, however, the AZELLA over-identify students who may not have difficulties with fluency, but rather language development? The only students that are given the AZELLA test are those who have a home influence of a language other than English. I would almost guarantee, however, that there are students with no other language influence that would not pass the AZELLA. If we tested everyone on the AZELLA, would we then find non-PHLOTEs identified as English Language Learners? The answer, resoundingly, is yes. The policy decision to test for the purpose of identifying can have positive effects. But what then are the consequences of being identified? Because of the restrictive and segregative nature of language policy in Arizona, the AZELLA is a form of language profiling, with the same negative effect and social scourge of racial profiling.

The enrollment trends in the schools of the study are clear, and will be not a trend, but rather a reality of future Dual Language or Foreign Language Immersion programs created in Arizona. English Language Learners are

excluded from full participation in Dual Language programs in the state and will continue to be. The consequences of this language profiling begin with exclusion from programming. But when we examine the effect on achievement, it becomes criminal.

English Language Learners who can no longer be enrolled in Dual Language classrooms must now be placed in SEI classrooms. Even the language of the prior sentence speaks to the restrictiveness of this policy – enrolled = active or a choice, placed = passive or a decision made by another for someone. Now that these English Language Learners are in SEI classrooms, what does that mean for their future?

- *There is less opportunity for academic content.* The model in the SEI classroom in Arizona (Arizona English Language Learner Task Force, 2008) requires that 4 hours of instruction per day be spent teaching reading, vocabulary, grammar, writing, and oral conversations. During these 4 hours, the standards used are taken from the “Arizona K-12 English Language Learner Proficiency Standards and the related Discrete Skills Inventory” (p. 5). The learning standards are not taken from the Arizona State Standards for English Language Arts, but rather these English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards. Also, with 4 hours of instruction mandated to be on the ELP Standards, there is less time given in mathematics, science, and social studies, since these subjects are prohibited from being embedded as content during English Language Development blocks in the SEI model.

- *There is less opportunity for status proficiency on AIMS.* We have just seen how there is less opportunity for academic content, yet these English Language Learners are still expected to reach proficiency on Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), the annual test to determine student academic achievement and used to hold schools accountable to federal and state expectations. No Child Left Behind (2002) still calls for students in significant sub-groups, including English Language Learners, to achieve at the same Annual Measurable Objectives as all other learners, however without the same full access to the Arizona State Standards all other students have.
- *There is less opportunity for growth as measured by AIMS.* Value-added growth data will now be a minimum of 50% of the calculation as the determinant of school labels in Arizona. Moves to value-added growth acknowledge the faultiness in expecting all students to reach the same benchmarks at the same time, when they are not beginning at the same point. Value-added growth expectations call for students to make at least one year of growth after one year of instruction, and can measure this growth given multiple points of data and growth-range expectations for any given status point for a determined period of instruction. How reliable will value-added growth measures be, however, when students are not given one year of instruction on the standards (replacing English Language Arts Standards with ELP Standards), yet assessed on those standards, nonetheless?

The policy implications of using status or growth measures for a language sub-group that does not have full access to the standards is tremendous. Without Civil Rights protection under the Equal Protection Clause, language minority students will continue to see an achievement gap.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study contributes to the body of research on parental choice with regard to Dual Language studies, within the Conceptual Framework of Latino Critical Race Theory. Due to the delimitations of the study, and the exclusion of particular stakeholders, the work of researchers contributing to this field is far from complete. My recommendations for further research are the following:

- *Broaden the scope of the study:* With more Dual Language programs in other parts of the southwestern United States, the study of de-selection is likely broader than metropolitan Phoenix. Generalizations can be made with a broader group in a study. Given the nature of the restrictive language policy of Arizona, aspects of this study may not be able to be replicated, or perhaps even the idea of de-selection, primarily in respect to English Language Learners, may not apply in other areas. However, there are places, California in particular, with Dual Language programs and restrictive language policies that may allow for a broader research group.
- *Include the voice of the teachers:* The first theme of the findings of Chapter Four—Desired or Created Asymmetry—would have been a wonderful opportunity to hear the voice of the teachers. Parents were interviewed and spoke about what teachers said to them, however I was

unable to triangulate that data directly with teachers. I did hear corroborating accounts from other parents and administrators, however hearing the words from teachers would provide another perspective from which to examine this phenomenon.

- *Quantify the impact on English Language Learners through growth data:* Accountability measures in the state of Arizona will no longer just include status measures (measure of student performance against a standard or Annual Measurable Objective), but also include value-added growth indicators. In Dual Language programs where there are some English Language Learners, such as the Washington/Lincoln schools of the study (oral proficient), or in less policy restrictive states, measure the growth data of English Language Learners in Dual Language against English Language Learners in English immersion programs.

Recommendations for School Administrators

As a school administrator of a Dual Language program, this study was enlightening as to the perceptions of parents who were enrolled in my school programs, as one who creates localized policy, and as one who is responsible for the communication of program goals and restrictions. The administrators who participated in the study were able to share some of their experiences with both teachers and parents, challenges they have, and creativity in hurdling some of the greatest obstacles over the past 13-15 years with their programs. Given this forum for addressing school needs as presented by the parents and administrators,

my recommendations for school administrators of Dual Language programs would include the following:

- *Become involved in or create a learning consortium:* Professional Learning Communities are able to create change by joining experience, study, and further practice. Within the city of Phoenix there are at least 4 full Dual Language schools, with 4-6 Foreign Language Immersion programs in existence and more in the developmental stages. Sharing ideas, resources, successes, and failures will strengthen each school individually as well as create an organization that can lobby for political change.
- *Re-evaluate program goals and program design:* The program you created most likely has changed with time. There are legal constructs that certainly change the way business is done. Conduct a needs assessment with your teachers, students, and parents to assure that your program design meets your outcomes.
- *Annually educate parents of language learners:* Hold a meeting at both the beginning and end of each school year to inform the parent community of Dual Language and English Language Learners (especially recent Reclassified Year 1 Proficient students) of their language learning options. Many of those Year 1 Reclassified students may have wanted to enroll in Dual Language a year or two ago and are now fully eligible. This is a prime opportunity to augment the number of bilingual participants in the program. The parents of students who are in the SEI class should know

and be informed that their child is qualified to participate upon reclassification, as an incentive and also to serve as a reminder that admission is not dependent on entry from kindergarten (if that, indeed, is a value that your program shares).

- *Heed the cautions of research:* Dual Language education is an enriching experience, promotes elevated levels of cognition and brain function in both hemispheres, and is the best long-range option of English language acquisition for English Language Learners presented in research (Alanís and Rodríguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, Lindholm-Leary and Block, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 1997). As Pimentel et. al. (2008) warn, however, as more schools look to Dual Language models, there are pitfalls. It should not be looked to as what Pimentel et. al. (2008) warned as a ‘universal cure to the achievement gap’ that will solve all problems (p. 202). In fact without careful examination and planning, more social problems can be created. Look at the studies with staff members (Valdés, 1997; Amrein and and Peña, 2000; Freeman, 2000; Fitts, 2006, Bearse and de Jong, 2008; Pimentel et. al., 2008; Palmer, 2010) and plan for success and avoiding these pitfalls.

Recommendations for Parents

The parents in this study struggled with keeping abreast of the changes in policy, how policy was being enacted, how their child qualified for programs within the schools, and why their older children qualify for one program and their younger ones do not. The parents appear resolved to the fact that they are in the

dark on this dependency on the school for answers. My recommendations for parents are as follows:

- *Form a Dual Language parent group:* One way parents get the attention and time of administrators is in unison toward a cause. When a group of parents then has the ear of the administrator, questions can be asked, perhaps on an individual situation, that the group can learn from. But more important than the time or audience of the administrator is the power of the collective over the individual. An idea in the mind of one person can often remain just an idea, but when shared with others with a shared goal and interest, it can grow into a movement.
- *Advocate for change:* Out of fear stemming from racial discord, profiling, or legal documentation status, many parents are not comfortable advocating for change at a community level. The school is the one place within the community parents feel safest. It is incumbent on administrators to foster this sense of security for parents, but the parent's responsibility to act within it.

Recommendations for Program Design

DSESD and CVESD both took an entire year to study program models, create goals and plans, recruit teachers, and educate a community before implementation. Since then, each school or district program has experienced major changes at the hands of increasingly restrictive external language policy. Each school or district program has also refined and reconfigured their program

multiple times. The rationale for this stems from a practice of both groups to be shared along with additional recommendations for program design.

- *Assure strong instructional leadership:* Strong, effective leaders know that a policy of shared leadership will yield great results, as the burden, tasks, and responsibilities, as well as the rewards, victories, and clearing of hurdles will be shared. A member of the school's instructional leadership team (principal, assistant principal, instructional coach, collaborative peer teacher, or master teacher) should be well experienced with, trained in, or familiar with second language acquisition theory matched to Dual Language guiding principles.
- *Assure annual review:* Goals should always be set based on collected data. The best way for a school to collect both quantitative and qualitative data on program effectiveness is through a needs assessment that is conducted, analyzed, and addressed annually.
- *Use research as a guide:* There are significant studies that have experimented with program design among varied racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Although not an assurance of success or failure to your individual endeavor, generalized results can be taken into account when designing or re-examining program configurations.

Recommendations for Educational Policymakers

Policymakers hold an important responsibility in the educational world, as their actions create consequences that result in everyday teaching and learning outcomes. Policies with positively stated objectives, such as No Child Left

Behind, can easily end with punitive accountability measures, narrowing curricular foci, and instructional practices that focus more on outcomes than critical thinking, metacognition, and developing schema. In the United States as a whole, but particularly in Arizona, policymakers would be well served to consider the constituents they are serving in the through the following recommendations:

- *Consider relevant, widely-accepted research in the field before creating policy:* The research base for Arizona's 4-hour SEI Model used by the SEI Task Force is based on a 2-hour model in California, which is still in stark contrast to the generally accepted field of language acquisition theory. Interestingly enough, Spanish immersion programs are highly popular among white, affluent families. Consider if instead of using language learning-specific strategies that fostered scaffolding learning objectives with content objectives, the teachers considered speaking all day, every day in Spanish to your child, holding them accountable to all measures in that target language, and within 1 year expecting fluency before granting access to a full curriculum. Policymakers would be outraged by that possibility, yet have made it a reality for a generation of English Language Learners.
- *Work with experts in the field of theory and practice:* Policymakers, in the political arena, are charged with making decisions and writing legislation. They should look to multiple theorists and practitioners, with localized interests and experiences. The universities are where those who are conducting studies to broaden the field of study. The schools are where

those theories are being practiced. Policymakers should look to utilize all the resources of knowledge from within the community to assist them in constructing future legislation. In the course of this study, I was forced to consider the possibilities of convergent and divergent theories in presenting the literature related to the field, and in fact it was one of the theories cautioning about Dual Language practice that served as one of the two Conceptual Frameworks of the study. Different ways of thinking provide further clarity and open eyes and minds to multiple perspectives, which appears to be a missing trait in policy decision-making.

- *Consider the effects of the policy, not just the objectives:* As mentioned before, effects can be detrimental, despite positive thinking. In the field of language policy, English Only proponents claim that fluency in English is the best determinant of future success for children in the United States, so a policy that helps students get there faster is the best approach. When stated in such ways, there is positive intent. But we have seen the social and educational consequences of such restrictive policy. These effects could be and were foreseen. Policymakers chose not to act based on such potential, but rather looking at the positively stated outcome.

LatCrit as a Lens for Dual Language De-selection

The field of Latino/a Critical Race Theory was chosen as a conceptual framework for this study in the assertion that legal precedent in creating restrictive language policy in the state of Arizona maintains an institutionalized

segregation of English Language Learners and precludes them from primary language instruction that could serve as an enriching means of connecting language learning with academic content. Pérez Huber's (2011) research calls for an end to restrictive language policy in California, which served as the model for Arizona's policies. In its place, she calls for "asset-based" replacements, the types of which Dual Language studies allow, using primary language as a tool holding content and meaning that would allow easier transfer of knowledge through a second language as well as allowing Latino students to serve as language models.

The LatCrit perspective that cannot be lost is clearly that enactment of restrictive language policy has been a racially institutionalized means of segregation of students by language resulting in further achievement gaps. Gándara and Orfield (2010) remind us not only of the widening achievement gap for English Language Learners, but particularly juxtaposed with states like California and Arizona that are beacons of English-only, to states such as Texas and New Mexico, where bilingual programs are offered. I hope for the evolution of the understandings of the value of bilingualism in the way Espinoza-Herold (2003) advocates for bilingual education as a value to the community, not just a particular group within that community.

Conclusions on the Study

As a proponent of positive learning experiences for second language learners, I see value to obtaining fluency, but also see the process as critical to the learner. I have successfully learned a second language (Spanish) to a point of

fluency. It has positively impacted my work opportunities, my travel experiences, and my exposure to a different way of processing. I have also spent a year trying to learn a third (Japanese) that could have had the same impact. That year was ripe with opportunity, but filled with pressure to perform, when I, as a learner, still needed to be in a silent period around those close to me so I could make my mistakes in what I considered a safe environment. I approach the field of language learning as a full, active participant, who has felt the thrill of victory and the agony of defeat. As a practitioner in the field of education within a language-learning context, I feel theoretically and empathetically compelled to consider the learner of language first in the learning experience. This is the problem with language policy in Arizona today. Too many decisions are made from a framework of deciding what can happen to others rather than for others.

Words in the title of my study may make it appear to be a negative study about Dual Language program—“choice against” and “de-selection.” The truth of the matter, as we have learned from the voices of the parents, is not that just parents have made a choice against Dual Language or that they have de-selected the program. These families face the reality that policies have chosen against their families and de-selected them as participants. The saddest part is that their language, their culture, their identity is being used as the commodity in this transaction, and being given as an enrichment opportunity for others.

It is my sincere hope that this study can add to the field of study on language policy and Dual Language education in a way that will impact and

influence policymakers toward more open, accepting measures so that language can be a token of appreciation and understanding, available to all.

References

- Alanis, I., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(4), 305-319.
- Amrein, A., & Peña, R.A. (2000). Asymmetry in dual-language practice: Assessing imbalance in a program promoting equality. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(8). Available: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n8.html>.
- Arizona Auditor General. (2008). *Baseline study of Arizona's English language learner programs and data: Fiscal year 2007*. Available: http://www.azauditor.gov/Reports/School_Districts/Statewide/2008_April/ELL_Baseline_Report.pdf.
- Arizona Department of Education. (2010). *Achievement profiles for all schools*. Available: <http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/azlearns.asp>.
- Arizona Department of Education. (2011). *AYP determinations for all schools*. Available: <http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/aypdeterminations.asp>.
- Arizona Department of Education. (2011). *School improvement status*. Available: <http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/aypdeterminations.asp>.
- Arizona English Language Learners Task Force. (2008). *Structured English immersion models of the Arizona English Language Learners Task Force*. Available: <http://www.ade.az.gov/ELLTaskForce/2008/SEIModels05-14-08.pdf>.
- Arizona House of Representatives (2010). *House Bill 2732*. Available: <http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/hb2732s.pdf>.
- Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 15. (2007). *West's Arizona Education Code—2007-2008*. Thomson West.
- Baker, C. (1996). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bearse, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2008). Cultural and linguistic investment: Adolescents in a secondary two-way immersion program. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(3), 325-340.
- Bender, S. W., and Aoki, K. (2003). Seekin' the cause: Social justice movements and the LatCrit community. *Oregon Law Review*, 81(3), 595-627.

- Bowman, K. L. (2010). Pursuing educational opportunities for Latino/a students. *North Carolina Law Review*, 18, 911-991.
- Carrillo, A. L. (2009). The costs of success: Mexican American performance identity performance within culturally coded classrooms and educational achievement. *Review of Law and Social Justice*, 18(3), 641-676.
- Castañeda v. Pickard*, 648 F. 2d 989 (5th Cir. 1981).
- Chapman, T. K. (2007). Interrogating classroom relationships and events: Using portraiture and critical race theory in education research. *Educational Researcher*, 36(3), 156-162.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Christian, D. (1996). Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(1), 66-76.
- Combs, M. C., Evans, C., Fletcher, T., Parra, E., & Jiménez, A. (2005). Bilingualism for the children: Implementing a dual-language program in and English-only state. *Educational Policy*, 19(5), 701-726.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*, 3-49. Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, dissemination, and Assessment Center.
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 585-592.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Davila, E., and Aviles de Bradley, A. (2010). Examining education for Latinas/os in Chicago: A CRT/LatCrit approach. *Educational Foundations*, 24(1-2), 39-58.

- Dorner, L. M. (2010). English and Spanish ‘para un futuro’—or just English? Immigrant family perspectives on two-way immersion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(3), 303-323.
- Espinoza-Herold, M. (2003). *Issues in Latino education: Race, school culture, and the politics of academic success*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 337-365.
- Freeman, R. (2000). Contextual challenges to dual-language education: A case study of a developing middle school program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 202-229.
- Gándara, P., and Orfield, G. (2010). A return to the “Mexican room:” The segregation of Arizona’s English learners. *The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, UCLA*, 1-20. Retrieved from <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/language-minority-students/a-return-to-the-mexican-room-the-segregation-of-arizonas-english-learners-1/gandara-return-mexican-room-2010.pdf>. on October 31, 2011.
- García, E. E., Lawton, K., & Diniz de Figueiredo, E. H. (2010). The education of English language learners in Arizona: A legacy of persisting achievement gaps in a restrictive language policy climate. *The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, UCLA*, 1-16. Retrieved from <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/language-minority-students/the-education-of-english-language-learners-in-arizona-a-legacy-of-persisting-achievement-gaps-in-a-restrictive-language-policy-climate/garcia-az-ell-gaps-2010.pdf>. on October 31, 2011.
- Giacchino-Baker, R., & Piller, B. (2006). Parental motivation, attitudes, support, and commitment in a southern californian two-way immersion program. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 5(1), 5-28.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003). *Trends in two way immersion education: A review of the research*. Baltimore: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.
- Irizarry, J. G. (2011). *Buscando la libertad: Latino youths in search of freedom in school*. *Democracy & Education*, 19(1), 1-10.

- Johnson, K. R., and Martinez, G. A. (2000). Discrimination by proxy: The case of Proposition 227 and the ban on bilingual education. *33 University of California Davis Law Review* 753.
- Juarez, B. G. (2008). The politics of race in two languages: An empirical qualitative study. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 11(3), 231-249.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43-60.
- Linton, A. & Franklin, R. C. (2010). Bilingualism for the children: Dual-Language programs under restrictive language policies. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.) *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 175-194). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lopez, M. M., & Franquiz, M. E. (2009). "We teach reading this way because it is the model we've adopted": Asymmetries in language and literacy policies in a two-way immersion programme. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(2), 175-200.
- Mahoney, K., MacSwan, J., Haladnya, T., & García, D. (2010). *Castañeda's* third prong: Evaluating the achievement of Arizona's English learners under restrictive language policy. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.) *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 50-64). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Michael-Luna, S. (2008). "Todos somos blancos"/We are all white: Constructing racial identities through texts. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 7(3-4), 272-293.
- Montessori, M. (1988). *The Absorbent Mind*. (C. A. Claremont, Trans.) Oxford, England: Clio Press Ltd. (Original work published Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1949).

- Monzo, L. D., & Rueda, R. (2009). Passing for English fluent: Latino immigrant children masking language proficiency. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 40(1), 20-40.
- Mora, J. K., Wink, J., & Wink, D. (2001). Dueling models of dual language instruction: A critical review of the literature and program implementation guide. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(4), 435-460.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Ochoa, S. H., & Rhodes, R. L. (2005). Assisting parents of bilingual students to achieve equity in public schools. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 16(1&2), 75-94.
- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-24.
- Ovando, C., Collier, V., & Combs, M. C. (2003). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. 3rd ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Palmer, D. (2007). A dual immersion strand programme in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an English-dominant context. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), 752-768.
- Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language "strand" program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 94-114.
- Parkes, J. (2008). Who chooses dual language education for their children and why. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(6), 635-660.
- Peña, R. A. (1998). A case study of parental involvement in a conversion from transitional to dual language instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22(2-4), 237-259.
- Pérez Huber, L. (2011). English dominance as racist nativist microaggressions: The need to reframe restrictive language policies for California's Latina/o students. *Policy Reports and Research Briefs, Center for Latino Policy Research, Institute for the Study of Social Change* (pgs. 1-6), UC Berkeley.
- Pimentel, C., Soto, L. D., Pimentel, O., & Urrieta, Jr., L. (2008). The dual language dualism: ¿Quiénes ganan? *TABE Journal*, 10(1), 200-223.

- Porter, R. P. (1991). Language choice for latino students. *Public Interest*, (105), 48-60.
- Quintanar-Sarellana, R. (2004). *¡Si se puede!* Academic excellence and bilingual competency in a K-8 two-way dual immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 3(2), 87-102.
- Revilla, A. T., and Asato, J. (2002). The implementation of Proposition 227 in California schools: A critical analysis of the effect on teacher beliefs and classroom practices. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 108-118.
- Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K. S., & Glass, G. V., (2005). Weighing the evidence: A meta-analysis of bilingual education in Arizona. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 43-67.
- Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 41(5), 391-415.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shannon, S. M., & Milian, M. (2002). Parents choose dual language programs in Colorado: A survey. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(3), 681-696.
- Silverman, A. (2011). Spanish Dip. *Phoenix New Times*, 42(31), 14-27.
- Solórzano, D. G., and Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a Critical Race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36(3), 308-342).
- Solórzano, D. G., and Yosso, T. J. (2002) Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23-44.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Trucios-Haynes, E. (2001). Why "race matters:" LatCrit theory and Latina/o racial identity. *La raza law journal*, 12(1), 1-42.
- United States Congress. (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Public Law 107 110. 107th Cong. Pp. 14252095.
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391-429.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Parent Interview Questions—Session 1 (English)

Interview 1: Focused Life History

- What language(s) was(were) spoken in your house as you grew up?
- Where did you attend school?
- What do you feel your parents' goals were for you in school?
- What were the languages you studied in elementary school? Describe your experience as a student with learning language.
- What were your experiences in school with the critical aspects of language: reading, writing, listening, and speaking the language?
- How were your parents able to assist you with language learning for school work?
- Describe your parents' communication with teachers in the school.
- As you looked to enroll your children in school and were presented with the option of Dual Language, what were your hopes in enrolling them in the program?

Parent Interview Questions—Session 2 (English)

Interview 2: Dual Language Experience Details

- Describe the experience your children had when they began in the Dual Language program?
- What were observations your children made about learning in the Dual Language program? How does that compare to observations you made about their experience in Dual Language?
- As you considered your younger child's enrollment, you chose to not enroll in Dual Language. What led to that decision?
- As you look back on making that decision, were there any events outside of the school in the community, city, or state that affected it? Describe it(them).

Parent Interview Questions—Session 3 (English)

Interview 3: Reflection on De-selection

- What are observations your child(ren) are making about learning in the Mainstream English program? How does that compare to observations you are making about their experience in Mainstream English?
- Have any of your views changed about language learning now that your younger children are not in Dual Language?
- Are there any factors that could lead you toward re-enrollment in Dual Language programs for your younger children? What changes would need to occur?
- Is there anything more I should know about your experiences or your child's experiences that led you to choose not to enroll your younger child(ren) in Dual Language?

Parent Interview Questions—Session 1 (Spanish)

Interview 1: Focused Life History

- ¿Qué idioma habló en su casa mientras que Ud. creció para arriba?
- ¿Dónde atendió a la escuela?
- ¿Qué siente que las metas de sus padres eran para Ud. en escuela?
- ¿Cuáles eran las idiomas que Ud. estudió en escuela primaria? Describa su experiencia como estudiante con aprender idiomas.
- Cuáles eran sus experiencias en escuela con los aspectos críticos de estudiar idiomas: ¿lectura, escritura, escuchando, y hablando el idioma?
- ¿Cómo podían sus padres asistirle con el aprendizaje de idiomas para el trabajo de la escuela?
- Describa la comunicación de sus padres con los profesores en la escuela.
- Cuando Ud. anticipaba matricular a sus niños en escuela y fue presentado con la opción del programa de doble idioma, ¿cuáles eran sus esperanzas en matricularlos en el programa?

Parent Interview Questions—Session 2 (Spanish)

Interview 2: Dual Language Experience Details

- Describa la experiencia que sus niños tenían cuando comenzaron en el programa de doble idioma.
- ¿Cuáles eran las observaciones sus niños hicieron sobre aprender en el programa de doble idioma? ¿Cómo eso compara a las observaciones que usted hizo sobre su experiencia en doble idioma?
- Mientras usted consideraba su inscripción de un niño más joven, usted eligió no matricular en doble idioma. ¿Qué condujo a esa decisión?
- Al reflejar en tomar esa decisión, ¿había acontecimientos fuera de la escuela en la comunidad, ciudad, o estado que la había afectado? Describalo.

Parent Interview Questions—Session 3 (Spanish)

Interview 3: Reflection on De-selection

- ¿Cuáles son las observaciones su niño(s) están haciendo sobre aprender en el programa de puro inglés? ¿Cómo eso compara a las observaciones que usted está haciendo sobre su experiencia en puro inglés?
- ¿Cualesquiera de sus opiniones han cambiado sobre el aprendizaje de idiomas ahora que sus niños más jóvenes no están en doble idioma?
- ¿Hay factores que podrían conducirlo hacia la re-inscripción en el programa de doble idioma para sus niños más jóvenes? ¿Qué cambios necesitarían ocurrir?
- ¿Hay cualquier cosa más que debo saber sobre sus experiencias o las experiencias de su niño eso le condujeron a elegir no matricular a su niño más joven en doble idioma?

Focus Group Questions

- What is your current role in the school?
- Describe the model used in your school/district dual language program.
- What is the demographic enrollment in your DL program?
- How long have you been at your school/district, specifically in relation to the DL program?
- Describe the evolution of your role with the dual language program at your school over the years.
- As parents enter the program, they are given information about the legal aspects of being part of a language program other than English in Arizona. What is some of the important information all parents must know as they express interest in their child being in dual language?
- Do parents typically ask questions when given this information? What information is asked?
- 5 years ago, what would you have identified as the most successful aspects of your program?
- What do you feel are the most successful aspects of your program currently?
- What may have contributed to the change in the successful aspects of your program during that time?
- Over the past 5 years, there has been significant change in language policy in the state of Arizona. Describe the effects of that on your program.

- What are the key roles that administrators play in the enrollment of students in language programs in the school/district?
- What strategies do you employ to attract parents to your school for the DL program, retain parents at the school, and encourage parent participation in the process of schooling (beyond extra-curriculars or community programs)?
- What are the rationale parents have given you over the years as to why they initially join the DL program or why some may have chosen to leave?
- What enrollment trends have you noticed over the years?
- What can you attribute some of the trends to?

APPENDIX B

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FORMS



State of Arizona
 Department of Education
 Office of English Language Acquisition Services

**Primary Home Language Other Than English (PHLOTE)
 Home Language Survey**
 (Effective April 4, 2011)

These questions are in compliance with Arizona Administrative Code, R7-2-306(P)(1), (2)(a-c).

Responses to these statements will be used to determine whether the student will be assessed for English Language Proficiency.

1. What is the primary language used in the home regardless of the language spoken by the student? _____
2. What is the language most often spoken by the student? _____
3. What is the language that the student first acquired? _____

Student Name _____ Student ID _____

Date of Birth _____ SAIS ID _____

Parent/Guardian Signature _____ Date _____

District or Charter _____

School _____

Please provide a copy of the Home Language Survey to the ELL Coordinator/Main Contact on site.

In SAIS, please indicate the student's home or primary language.

1535 West Jefferson Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 • 602-542-0753 • www.azed.gov/oelas



Estado de Arizona
Departamento de Educación
Servicios de Aprendizaje del Inglés

Idioma Principal en el Hogar excluyendo el inglés (PHI.OTE)
Encuesta sobre el Idioma en el Hogar
(Efectivo el 4 de abril de 2011)

Preguntas en conformidad con R7-2-306(B)(1), (2)(a-e) del Reglamento de la Junta Directiva.

Las respuestas que proporcione a las preguntas siguientes serán usadas para determinar si se evaluará la competencia en el idioma inglés de su hijo(a).

1. ¿Cuál idioma se habla principalmente en su hogar sin considerar el idioma que habla el estudiante? _____
2. ¿Cuál idioma habla el estudiante con mayor frecuencia? _____
3. ¿Cuál fue el primer idioma que aprendió el estudiante? _____

Nombre del estudiante _____ Núm. de identificación _____

Fecha de nacimiento _____ Núm. de SAIS _____

Firma del padre o tutor _____ Fecha _____

Distrito o Charter _____

Escuela _____

Please provide a copy of the Home Language Survey to the ELL Coordinator/Main Contact on site.

In SAIS, please indicate the student's home or primary language.

1535 West Jefferson Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 • 602-542-0753 • www.azed.gov/oclis

Parental Waiver Application

This form is used by parents to request an alternative to English Language Education, as specified in A.R.S. §15-753. Parents or legal guardians of an English learner must complete this application annually per A.R.S. §15-752.

District Name _____		School Name _____		SAIS ID# _____
Parent/Guardian Last Name _____		First Name _____		
Child's Last Name _____		First Name _____		Middle Initial _____
Address _____				
City _____		State AZ	Zip Code _____	
Native Language of Student _____		School year for which the waiver is requested _____		Grade _____

- I have personally visited my child's school.
- I have been provided with a full description of the educational materials to be used in the different educational program choices and all the educational opportunities available to my child.
- I am applying for a waiver to remove my child from an English language or Sheltered English Immersion classroom placement.

Reason for waiver request (to be verified by school district): The student has met at least one (1) of the three (3) circumstances for which a parental exception waiver may be applied (A.R.S. §15-753). At least one of the following circumstances must be checked:

- Waiver 1 (A.R.S. §15-753B.1) My child already knows English:** the child already possesses good English language skills, as measured by oral evaluation or standardized tests of English vocabulary comprehension, reading, and writing, in which the child scores approximately at or above the state average for his/her grade level or at or above the 5th grade average, whichever is lower; or,
- Waiver 2 (A.R.S. §15-753B.2) My child is 10 years or older:** it is the informed belief of the school principal and educational staff that an alternate course of educational study would be better suited to the child's overall educational progress and rapid acquisition of basic English language skills as documented by the analysis of individual student needs; or,
- Waiver 3 (A.R.S. §15-753B.3) My child has special individual needs:** the child already has been placed for a period of not less than thirty calendar days during this school year in an English language classroom and it is subsequently the informed belief of the school principal and educational staff that the child has such special and individual physical or psychological needs, above and beyond the student's lack of English proficiency, that an alternate course of educational study would be better suited to the student's overall educational development and rapid acquisition of English. A written description of no less than 250 words documenting these special individual needs for the specific child must be provided and permanently added to the child's official school records and the waiver application must contain the original authorizing signatures of both the school principal and the local superintendent of schools.

I understand that I must apply for this waiver on an annual basis. I was fully informed of my right to refuse to agree to this waiver.

Signature of Parent/ Legal Guardian _____

Date _____

Signature of School Principal _____

Date _____

Signature of Superintendent (Required Only for Waiver #3) _____

Date _____

<input type="checkbox"/> Application Granted
<input type="checkbox"/> Application Rejected

► LEA: The signed and completed form with test results or basis for determination shall be kept on file by the LEA.

Solicitud de Exención presentada por los Padres de Familia

El presente formulario es utilizado por los padres de familia para solicitar una alternativa a la Educación en el Idioma del Inglés, tal como queda especificado en § 15-753 A.R.S. (Leyes Revisadas de Arizona). Los padres de familia o tutores legales de un estudiante de idioma inglés deben llenar el presente formulario cada año, en virtud de lo dispuesto en § 15-752 A.R.S.

Nombre del distrito escolar _____

Nombre del estudiante _____

Número de identidad SALS _____

Apellido del padre de familia/Tutor		
Apellido del estudiante		
Dominio		
Ciudad	Estado AZ	Código Postal
Lengua materna del estudiante	Años escolares respecto a esta solicitud de exención	Grado escolar

- He visitado personalmente la escuela de mi hijo(a).
- So no ha proporcionado una descripción completa de los materiales didácticos que serán utilizados en las diversas alternativas de programas educativos y de todas las oportunidades educativas a las que puede tener acceso mi hijo(a).
- Estoy solicitando una exención para retirar a mi hijo(a) de un aula en Idioma Inglés o un aula de Inmersión Protegida en Idioma Inglés.

Motivo de la solicitud de exención (debe ser verificado por el distrito escolar): El estudiante ha cumplido a lo menos una (1) de las tres (3) circunstancias en virtud de las cuales los padres de familia pueden solicitar una exención de exolusion (§ 15-753 A.R.S.). Debe marcarse a lo menos una de las siguientes circunstancias:

- Exención 1 (§ 15-753B.1 A.R.S.) Mi hijo(a) ya sabe inglés:** el estudiante ya posee un buen nivel de conocimiento del idioma inglés, cuando es medido por una evaluación oral o por las pruebas estandarizadas de comprensión del vocabulario en inglés, lectura y escritura, en las que el estudiante obtenga aproximadamente la calificación del promedio establecido, o una calificación más alta del promedio establecido, para su nivel escolar; o el promedio correspondiente al quinto (5to) grado, o una calificación más alta del mismo, optándose por el que resulte más bajo;
- Exención 2 (§ 15-753B.2 A.R.S.) Mi hijo(a) tiene 10 años o es mayor de 10 años:** la opinión autorizada del director de la escuela y del personal educativo es que un programa alternativo de estudios educativos sería más adecuado para el progreso educativo global del estudiante y de su rápida adquisición de conocimientos básicos del idioma inglés, tal como queda documentado por el análisis de las necesidades individuales del estudiante; o,
- Exención 3 (§ 15-753B.3 A.R.S.) Mi hijo(a) tiene necesidades individuales especiales:** el estudiante ya ha sido asignado, por un período de no menos de treinta días del calendario durante el año escolar, en un aula del idioma inglés, y como consecuencia de esto, la opinión autorizada del director de la escuela y del personal educativo indica que el estudiante tiene necesidades físicas o psicológicas especiales o individuales, más grandes que la falta de competencia en el idioma inglés, de manera que un programa alternativo de estudios educativos sería más adecuado para el desarrollo educativo global del estudiante y de su rápida adquisición del idioma inglés. Debe proporcionarse una descripción, por escrito, de no menos de 250 palabras que documente estas necesidades individuales especiales para el estudiante en particular, la misma que deberá ser permanentemente incluida con los expedientes escolares oficiales del estudiante, y la solicitud de exención debe contener las firmas autorizadoras originales tanto del director de la escuela como del superintendente escolar local.

Comprendo que debo solicitar esta exención cada año. He sido informado en detalle sobre mi derecho a negarme a aceptar la presente exención.

Firma del padre de familia/Tutor legal _____

Fecha _____

Firma del Director de la escuela _____

Fecha _____

Firma del Superintendente (requerida solo para la exención #3)

Fecha _____

• LRA: El formulario firmado y completado con los resultados de las pruebas o la base de la determinación será conservado en archivo por LRA.

Solicitud Aceptada

Solicitud Negada



State of Arizona
Department of Education
 Office of English Language Acquisition Services

Parent Request for Student Withdrawal from an English Language Learner Program

Student Name _____ SAIS ID _____
 Last Name First Name M.I.

Student ID _____ Current School _____ Grade _____

As the parent or legal guardian of the above named student, I am exercising my right to request that my student be removed from his/her designated English Language Learner program (Structured English Immersion or Bilingual Education). I have discussed any alternative educational options with my student's teacher and/or principal and I am requesting that the student be placed in a mainstream, non-English Language Learner classroom. It is my belief that this course of instruction is better suited for my student's needs and therefore, I consent to a mainstream classroom placement. While your child has been withdrawn from English language services, his/her progress in English language acquisition will continue to be monitored and assessed with the language assessment (AZELLA) until he/she scores proficient.

Parent or Legal Guardian Signature _____ Date _____

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Current *Arizona English Language Learner Assessment* Proficiency Levels:

Oral _____ Reading _____ Total Writing _____ Composite _____
 (Listening/Speaking)

By signing, I acknowledge that I have discussed the alternative educational options with the parent/legal guardian and I agree to place the student according to the parent/legal guardian's wishes.

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

As provided by the No Child Left Behind Act [P.L. 107-110, Title III, Sec. 3302, (8) (A) (i and ii)].

(Revised: July 2010)

1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #31, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 • 602-542-0753 • www.azed.gov/oelus



Estado de Arizona
 Departamento de Educación
 Servicios de Aprendizaje del Inglés

Tom Horne
 Superintendente de
 Enseñanza Pública

**Solicitud de los padres para retirar a su hijo(a) de un programa
 para estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés**

Nombre del estudiante: _____ Núm. SAIS _____
Apellido paterno Primer nombre Inicial
 (segundo nombre)

Núm. de identificación: _____ Escuela actual _____ Grado _____

Como padre o tutor legal del estudiante cuyo nombre se indica arriba, estoy ejerciendo mi derecho a solicitar que mi hijo(a) sea retirado de la asignación *estudiante que está aprendiendo inglés*. He revisado todas las opciones educativas posibles con el maestro(a) o director de la escuela y solicito que mi hijo(a) sea ubicado en el salón de enseñanza especial según la recomendación del equipo de educación especial. Considero que esta es la opción de enseñanza más adecuada para los requerimientos de mi hijo(a) y, por consiguiente, consiento en que sea retirado de la asignación *estudiante que está aprendiendo inglés*.

Firma del padre o tutor legal _____ Fecha _____

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Current Arizona English Language Learner Assessment Scores:

Oral _____ Reading _____ Writing _____

By signing, I acknowledge that I have discussed the alternative educational options with the parent/legal guardian and I agree to place the student according to the parent/legal guardian's wishes.

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

As provided by the No Child Left Act [P.L. 107-110, Title III, Sec. 3302, (8) (A) (i and ii)].

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORMS AND IRB EXEMPTION

A Choice Against: An Analysis of the De-selection of Dual Language Programs in Arizona through a Latino Critical Race Theory Lens

February 7, 2011

Dear Potential Participants:

I am a doctoral student under the direction of Dr. Carlos in the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to examine the motivation of parents who have chosen both for and against Dual Language programs for their children.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve one group interview of approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be audio taped and the data gathered will be used in analysis of these issues for practitioners in dual language studies. These tapes will be erased at the completion of the study. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty.

Although there may be no direct benefit to you, the possible benefit of your participation includes the opportunity to share your experiences as parents of dual language students that could strengthen school's abilities to meet the needs of families enrolling in similar programs. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

All individual participants, schools, or districts will be protected from being identified by using pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications, but your name will not be used. Due to the nature of the interview complete confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

I would like to audiotape this interview. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be taped; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know. All data collected will be kept with the Co-Investigator during the study. Data will be retained until completion of the study in May 2010. Audio recordings will be deleted upon completion.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at the following:

Dr. Carlos Ovando, Principal Investigator
carlos.ovando@asu.edu 480-965-3121

Michael Robert, Co-Investigator
marober1@asu.edu 602-391-0939

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Una opción en contra: Un Análisis de la De-selección de los programas de dos idiomas en Arizona a través de la perspectiva de la Teoría Crítico Latino Raza

07 de febrero 2011

Estimados posibles participantes en entrevistas de disertación:

Soy un estudiante de doctorado bajo la dirección del Dr. Carlos Ovando en la Dirección de Liderazgo Educativo y Estudios de Políticas en la Universidad Estatal de Arizona. Estoy realizando un proyecto que estudia la motivación de los padres que están a favor y en contra de programas de dos idiomas para sus hijos.

Estoy invitándolos a participar en dos entrevistas de aproximadamente 60 minutos cada una. Las entrevistas serán grabadas y los datos recogidos serán utilizados en el análisis de estas cuestiones para los profesionales en estudios de dos idiomas. Las entrevistas grabadas serán borradas al finalizar el estudio. Usted tiene el derecho de no contestar cualquier pregunta y parar la entrevista en cualquier momento.

Su participación en este estudio es voluntaria. Si usted decide no participar o retirarse del estudio en cualquier momento, no habrá penalización.

Aunque haya un beneficio directo para usted, el posible beneficio de su participación consiste en la oportunidad de compartir sus experiencias como padres de estudiantes bilingües que puedan fortalecer la capacidad de la escuela para satisfacer las necesidades de las familias que se inscriben en programas similares. No hay riesgos previsible o molestias en cuanto a su participación.

Se utilizarán seudónimos durante todo el estudio para proteger el anonimato de todos los participantes, las escuelas y distritos escolares. Sus respuestas serán anónimas. Los resultados de este estudio pueden ser utilizados en los informes, presentaciones o publicaciones, pero su nombre no se utilizará.

Me gustaría grabar esta entrevista. La entrevista no será grabada sin su permiso. Por favor, hágame saber si usted no desea que la entrevista sea grabada. También podrá cambiar de opinión después de que comience la entrevista. Todos los datos recibidos los tendrá el co-investigador en el estudio. Los datos se conservarán hasta la finalización del estudio en mayo de 2010. Las grabaciones serán eliminadas al finalizar.

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta sobre esta investigación, no dude en comunicarse con el equipo de investigación:

Dr. Carlos Ovando, Investigador Principal
carlos.ovando.asu.edu @ 480-965-3121
Michael Robert, Co-Investigador
marober1@asu.edu 602-391-0939

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como sujeto / participante en esta investigación, o si usted siente que ha sido colocado en situación de riesgo, puede

comunicarse con el Presidente Consejo de Revisión Institucional de Sujetos Humano a través de la Oficina de ASU de Integridad de la Investigación y Ascguramiento , al (480) 965 a 6.788. Por favor, hágame saber si usted desca ser parte del estudio.

To: Carlos Ovando
EDB

From: Mark Roosa, Chair *SM*
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 02/18/2011

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 02/18/2011

IRB Protocol #: 1101005943

Study Title: A Choice Against: An Analysis of De-Selection of Dual Language Programs in Arizona Through a Latino Critical Race Theory Lens

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2).

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.