



2017

Understanding the Level of Achievement Bilingual Education Fosters in Students

Erica Mallett
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mallett, Erica, "Understanding the Level of Achievement Bilingual Education Fosters in Students" (2017).
Master's Theses. 3691.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3691

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2017 Erica Mallett

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

UNDERSTANDING THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT
BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOSTERS IN STUDENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

BY
ERICA MALLETT
CHICAGO, IL
AUGUST 2017

Copyright by Erica Mallett, 2017
All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	iv
GLOSSARY	v
ABSTRACT	vi
THESIS	1
Two Types of Achievement	3
Background	8
Bilingual Education Globally	8
Bilingual Education in the United States	10
Bilingual Program Models	11
Bilingual Education in Chicago, Illinois	12
Literature Review	14
Bilingual Education Programs in the Late 1970's-1980's	15
Bilingual Education Programs in the 1990's-Early 2000's	18
Present Day Bilingual and Monolingual Programs	22
Research Methods	25
Participant Selection and Data Selection	28
Data Collection and Analysis	29
Interviews	30
Document Analysis	31
Site Selection – School Profile	32
Limitations	32
Findings	33
Document Analysis	34
Interviews	44
Achievement	51
Discussion	52
Conclusion	55
Appendix A: Interview Questions	vii
Reference List	58

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Achievement Definition Table	7
Figure 2. ISAT Proficiency Scores	42

GLOSSARY

Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968

Non-English Proficient (NEP)

Limited English Proficient (LEP)

English Language Learner (ELL)

English as a Second Language (ESL)

Symptom Validity Testing (SVT)

Two Way Immersion (TWI)

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

ABSTRACT

Traditional approaches to examining the effectiveness of bilingual programs typically compare them to monolingual programs and rarely discuss the meaning and complexity of the notion of achievement therein. A vertical case study framework is used to examine this local phenomenon at a bilingual elementary school in Chicago, Illinois across local, national, and global contexts. This vertical case study aims to answer the question; how does a bilingual program define the notion of achievement and work to facilitate that achievement for students? To do this, I conducted interviews and analyzed policy documents to examine how achievement is defined in bilingual education based on the two basic levels of achievement. Through examining the inner workings of a bilingual school as well as analyzing the type of achievement students can demonstrate; we gain a better understanding of what bilingual education can achieve for students. This Thesis describes how bilingual education policy has changed throughout the years, and how national and global definitions of achievement fall short in supporting sound bilingual education policy. I conclude by explaining how national and global contexts have attributed to the disconnect that exists between teacher and administrator definitions of achievement. Furthermore, findings indicate that the lack of supportive legislation influences a lower level of achievement at this bilingual elementary school.

Keywords: dual-language, achievement, student achievement, bilingual education

THESIS: UNDERSTANDING THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT
BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOSTERS IN STUDENTS

As more bilingual schools have been created worldwide, it is important to examine how these schools work within the realm of achievement. A commonly accepted consensus is that bilingual education fosters higher achievement when compared to monolingual education; and that it has the overarching ability to increase one's cultural capital through the exposure and mastery of a second language (Cummins, 1989; Greene, 1997; Krashen, 1996; Parker, Rubalcava & Teruel, 2005; Willig, 1985). Numerous studies have compared an array of bilingual programs with monolingual programs in education, in order to decipher which is better capable of educating English language learners (ELL's) (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009). These studies have often utilized test scores as the main form of student achievement, which exclude components such as school expectations for achievement, as well as teacher and administrator interpretations of achievement in a bilingual school (Carter & Chatfield, 1986; Rossell & Baker, 1996). This study uses a vertical case study (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2014a; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b) to examine this phenomenon. A vertical case study is designed to contextualize a local event within the broader national and global context (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2014a; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b). The vertical case study framework centers on a specific site, in this case a school, and the ways in which history, social constructs, and international and national context

influence the local (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2014a; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b). This vertical case study will thoroughly examine how a bilingual elementary school defines and facilitates achievement among students. The study took place at a school in Chicago, Illinois. With the purpose of gaining a broader understanding of the types of achievement bilingual programs work to foster in students, this study relies on a collaborative collection of data in the form of interviews, policy and document analysis, and student test scores.

Due to the diverse set of analysis in regards to bilingual education, numerous studies have reported conflicting evidence on whether or not it is effective in facilitating high achievement for all students (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Carter & Chatfield, 1986; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009; Rossell & Baker, 1996) . This study utilizes key elements of achievement as defined by the following authors. Both the outcomes and goals of achievement contribute to the type of achievement being sought out, whether it be “academic progress” or “academic success” (Brown & Goldstein, 2013).

Brown and Goldstein (2013) define achievement based on the achievement type, either academic progress or academic success. The type of achievement is directly related to the goals of achievement defined by Senko, Hulleman, and Harackiewicz (2011) as mastery goals and performance goals. Both the type and goals of achievement lead to the achievement outcomes which Cole (1990) considers the achievement of basic skills and facts, and the achievement of higher order skills and advanced knowledge. Together these definitions of achievement form a Level 1 and Level 2 achievement (Figure 1) which will be used to define the achievement the school analyzed in this study facilitates. This will be measured based on the type of achievement

identified in the interview, policy, and document analysis. It is important to note that Coles' definition of achievement although somewhat dated is essential to incorporate with the more recent notions of achievement, as it specifically speaks to the type of skills being acquired which will aid in the identification of different forms of achievement throughout the study.

Two Types of Achievement

There is no one simple definition for educational achievement. It is a complex measure in which multiple components work together. This section is an overview of the definition of achievement utilized in this study. For the purpose of this thesis, I broadly categorize the three main components of achievement as types, goals, and outcomes (Brown & Goldstein, 2013; Cole, 1990; Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011). First, Brown and Goldstein (2013) discuss the component I refer to as 'type' of achievement. Second, Senko et al. (2011) discuss the next component of achievement, which I define as the 'goal'. Lastly, Cole (1990) discusses the final component of achievement that I explain as the 'outcome' of achievement. By combining the type, goal, and outcome and their definitional view, the concept of achievement is made easily identifiable across context.

The first components of achievement are the two different 'types' of achievement Brown and Goldstein (2013) define as academic progress and academic success. Brown and Goldstein (2013) focus on existing discourses of academic achievement in their study on teacher's internal conflicts when defining achievement. The two basic types of achievement they discuss are academic progress that is the demonstrated process of increasing knowledge and skills which is then considered evidence of academic achievement; and academic success which refers to the assertion that mastery of pre-determined mandated standards is seen as a legitimate sign of academic achievement (p. 65). They interviewed 12 undergraduate student teachers enrolled in

elementary education programs. The participants were all females in their early 20's, from a variety of racial backgrounds (Brown & Goldstein, 2013). The teachers were questioned on how they define academic achievement and how they determine if a child has achieved academically. In the interviews, many teachers expressed confusion on what exactly academic achievement entailed (Brown & Goldstein, 2013). There was a divide between how teachers personally viewed academic achievement as fluid and varying from one student to the next (academic progress), and the mandated standards that stem from legislation such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (academic success) (Brown & Goldstein, 2013). The fact highlighted here is that these conceptions of achievement are vastly different and when the desired type of achievement being pursued is not specifically stated, it can cause confusion and lack of understanding. For Brown and Goldstein (2013) the absence of specific and widely accepted terminology for discussing distinctions within academic achievement caused confusion for participants and would in the same way cause confusion for others (Brown & Goldstein, 2013).

The next components of achievement are the 'goals' which are defined as mastery goals and performance goals. The goals of achievement are important in gaining a complete understanding of the ways in which students are expected to achieve. Senko et al. (2011) conducted a comprehensive literature review of achievement goal theory which is distinguished by mastery goals and performance goals. The definition of targets within achievement is representative of what students are expected to do, master certain standards (mastery goals), and out-perform peers (performance goals). Throughout history mastery goals have been preferable as they have been proven to yield more educational benefits (Senko et al., 2011). Mastery goals allow students to find their education interesting (Senko et al., 2011). Whereas to attain a performance goal, one must outperform peers; which can cause unnecessary stress, high anxiety,

self-handicapping, and low achievement (Senko et al., 2011). In more recent history the division between mastery goals and performance goals has become less rigid and allows for interconnections between the two goals to take place. For this reason, the third goal Senko et al. (2011) discuss is multiple goals. There are three basic models for multiple goal theory, namely interactive, additive, and specialized (Senko et al., 2011). The interactive model refers to students who pursue both goals and can have a positive interaction effect on the outcome. The additive models refer to students pursuing both goals which can have a positive effect on the same outcome. Lastly, the specialized model refers to two goals which have unique main effects on different outcomes (Senko et al., 2011). With multiple goal theory, students can adopt both goals and reap the unique benefits of each. This study will focus on the two main constructs of mastery and performance goals, as those are easier to identify from the surface as tenants of achievement. Mastery goals are to develop competency, and performance goals are to demonstrate competency (Senko et al., 2011).

The last and final components of achievement are the outcomes of achievement, which come from the work of Cole (1990) who suggest that achievement is comprised of two forms, the achievement of basic skills and facts, and the achievement of higher order skills and advanced knowledge. The first form of achievement is of basic skills and facts. This achievement outcome is prompted by developments in educational measurement to ensure that the learning of basic skills and facts is taking place in education (Cole, 1990). She notes that facts and skills can be delineated in that facts refer to things people learn, while skills refer to things people learn to do (Cole, 1990). The second form of achievement Cole (1990) discusses is the achievement of higher order skills and advanced knowledge. She divides its explanation into two distinct parts, a conception based on philosophical tradition, and cognitive science approaches. The

conceptualization of these parts is steeped in philosophical traditions of psychological learning theories such as; critical thinking and the replicative and applicative nature of schooling (Cole, 1990). Because of its philosophical heritage, this achievement outcome utilizes both critical thinking and the ability to process complex information (Cole, 1990, p. 4). For example, students not only demonstrate their knowledge on how to correctly complete a math problem, but they can also demonstrate comprehension on how and why the problem is correct. Cole (1990) concludes by suggesting that achievement outcomes in higher order skills and advanced knowledge have procured prominence and that the two outcomes contrast greatly causing grave contrastive ideologies on what classifies as achievement in education.

I combine these components of achievement to form the two levels of achievement utilized in this study (Figure 1.). The first level of achievement includes academic progress, performance goals, and achievement of basic order skills and knowledge; and the second level of achievement includes academic success, mastery goals, and achievement of higher order skills and knowledge. The type of achievement being sought out and fostered by the two bilingual programs will be referred to as a Level 1 or Level 2 form of achievement. Within each level of achievement, we will rely upon the definitions provided by Brown and Goldstein (2013) (academic progress or academic success) which help guide our understanding of what Senko et al. (2011) define as the achievement goal (performance goal or mastery goal), as well as examine the outcomes the achievement produces based on Cole's (1990) definition of the outcomes of achievement (achievement of basic order skills and knowledge or achievement of higher order skills and advanced knowledge).

Figure 1. Achievement Definition Table

Concepts	Achievement Levels	
	Level 1 Achievement	Level 2 Achievement
Type Brown, K. D., Goldstein, K. S. (2013).	Academic Progress	Academic Success
Goal Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). (Note: I am not using one of their forms of achievement because it is outside of the scope of this project)	Performance Goals	Mastery Goals
Outcome Cole, N. (1990).	Achievement of basic skills and facts	Achievement of higher order skills and advanced knowledge

With this we can better understand the notions of achievement presented in the literature here by uncovering the specifics in unspecified terminology. I use these levels of achievement to decipher the types of achievement being discussed throughout. First, I start with the history surrounding bilingual education globally, in the United States, and in Chicago Illinois. Second, I review the literature on bilingual education research and the notion of achievement therein. Third, I describe the methods for this vertical case study in detail, including the data collection and analysis procedures, followed by an overview of the limitations this study may present. Lastly, I present the vertical case study of the two-way dual language bilingual school, followed by a discussion of the level of achievement it fosters in students. I then

conclude with the ways in which the global, national, and local context contribute to that level of achievement the school produces.

Background

The United States endured years of opposition before bilingual education was legitimized as a valid form of instruction through the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968 (Petrzela, 2010). Bilingual education was often viewed as a tool used to make English Language Learners (ELLs) conform to American culture (McGroarty, 1992). Because of the perceived threat bilingual education posed to U.S. nationalism, bilingual education almost ceased completely for quite some time in cities around the country including Chicago, Illinois (McGroarty, 1992). First, I begin with an overview of bilingual education on a global scale, followed by a brief history of bilingual education in the United States. Second, I discuss the history of bilingual education in the specific context of Chicago Illinois including how it has evolved over time.

Bilingual Education Globally

Second language acquisition became a common topic in the 20th century when as the World Bank (1997) reports the question became, “What can schools do to help the child move from the language they use in their home to the language necessary to gain access to the world's knowledge and to integrate within the global economy?” (p. 1). The motivations for second language acquisition and bilingualism vary for a number of reasons including; equity, student learning, national and political goals, national identity, and building a bilingual nation (World Bank, 1997; Tucker, 1998; Garcia, 2011). Each countries' specific motivation for second language acquisition and bilingualism differed as did their policies (Tucker, 1998; World Bank, 1997). For example, the Philippines was given a language policy survey in 1967 and 1968, and as a result policymakers created a policy in which both English and Filipino were used as a

medium of instruction (Tucker, 1998, P. 11). In cases where Filipino was not the home language, a multilingual approach was taken with the home language, Filipino, and English (Tucker, 1998). The small European country of Luxembourg adopted a trilingual education system using Luxemburger, French, and German (Tucker, 1998). The motivations for this policy were to facilitate national identity and pride in Luxembourg and to develop proficiency in two languages of economic importance (Tucker, 1998). Canada is considered a bilingual country where French and English are the official languages (World Bank, 1997). Past tensions between the French speakers of Quebec and English speakers have led to current federal legislation which guarantees the equality of the two languages in federal institutions (World Bank, 1997). Though most countrys' policies are vastly different, many of them share the commonality of including the English language, and it was during this time in the 20th century that English began to take its place as what many consider the global language of our time (Crystal, 1999; Crystal, 2003; Kennedy, 2012; Nunan, 2003).

Grimes (1992) reports that there are 6,000 languages spoken across the world. Yet, English has become the global language of the 21st century as it is most often associated with power, economic growth, and opportunity (Crystal, 2003). Thus, most countries provide bilingual, multilingual, and foreign language education classes in English (Crystal, 1999; Tucker, 1998; World Bank, 1997). The power associated with the English language started with the strength of the British Empire and was carried over into the 21st century by American economic power (Crystal, 2003). Though currently knowing English offers the benefit of global communication it is also associated with certain dangers including, linguistic power, linguistic complacency, and linguistic death (Crystal, 2004; Mélitz, 2007; Schulzke, 2014). As bilingual

education continues to evolve in the 21st century, English as a global language remains an important part of that conversation.

Bilingual Education in the United States

The U.S. has had bilingual education throughout the 19th and 20th centuries (Blanton, 2006; McGroarty, 1992; Petrzela, 2010). As Americans began to feel somewhat threatened by their immigrant counterparts, they began to initiate policies such as English-only education to preserve “American” English in 1889 (Blanton, 2006). Some American citizens found it to be a simple expression of nativism. While Blanton (2006) believed it to be a conformity attempt driven by the Anglo-American.

English dominant language policies perpetuated a massive divide between Non-English proficient (NEP), limited English proficient (LEP), and English-only student performance. The new English-only curriculum proved to be difficult for immigrant children. It took most immigrant students two years to reach comprehension at a first grade level; and Spanish-speaking students, in particular, had a 50 percent dropout rate, were flooding special education classrooms, and were multiple levels behind Anglo-American children in education (Blanton, 2006; Guadalupe, 2004; Guadalupe & Donato, 2010; Guadalupe & Valencia, 1998). As more and more immigrant students, particularly in the Mexican-American and Spanish speaking communities were failing in the education system, the U.S. government began to take notice. It was not until the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 that bilingual education was recognized as a federal responsibility (Petrzela, 2010). Discrediting prior English-only education policies enforcing the sink or swim method, the BEA advocated for bilingual language learning for NEP and LEP students. After the 1960’s professional educators recognized the role of bilingual education in the U.S. and it was still considered a valid form of instruction. It became so

prevalent that most states began to offer licensure in bilingual education as well as an English as a second language certification (McGroarty, 1992). Rennie (1993) provides us with an overview of the variety of programs created to facilitate instruction for ELL students which are designated as both English as a second language (ESL) and bilingual programs.

Bilingual programs (as described in the subsequent section) in the U.S. continued to increase throughout the 20th century, as did the debates surrounding them. At the center of these discussions the pressure for immigrant students to learn in English-only classrooms remained. McGroarty (1992) reports that the ongoing debates on bilingual education were not centered on curricular or pedagogical practices that ensure optimal education for students, but instead stemmed from social pressures for academic achievement and assimilation to the mainstream culture through English. For many Americans, bilingual instruction was viewed as a mechanism through which equal opportunity in education could be achieved despite the lack of qualified teachers and proper materials (McGroarty, 1992). During the 1980's education funding declined, and spending for the BEA dropped by 47 percent while spending for all other educational programs (programs not specified) declined by 8 percent respectively (Lyons, 1990; McGroarty, 1992). Although there were even more students eligible for BEA support, the funds were not there to support them (McGroarty, 1992). As federal support for the BEA declined, fewer and fewer children could benefit from the programs the BEA supported.

Bilingual Education Program Models

This study is designed to focus on bilingual program implementation, therefore it is important to provide an overview of the types of bilingual programs that exist. Bilingual programs are intended to use students' first/home language in addition to their second language in the classroom. The program types include; Early-exit, Late-exit, and two-way (dual language),

or two-way (immersion) (Rennie, 1993; Roberts, 1995). The Early-exit program begins with primary instruction in the students' first language which is phased out rapidly by the end of the first or second grade. Students' then receive all instruction in their second language (Rennie, 1993; Roberts, 1995). Late-exit programs provide a longer wave of bilingual instruction. Students are in the program throughout elementary school and continue to receive instruction in their first language upon entering middle school until they reach the fluent second language proficient level (Rennie, 1993). The last bilingual program Rennie (1993) describes is the Two-way (dual language), or Two-way (immersion) bilingual program which groups students with the same mother tongue together. There is a 50/50 balance of both mother tongue instruction and second language instruction in the classroom (Rennie, 1993).

With the variety of program options provided for the ELL/bilingual population in the United States, it appears the development of these students is being made a priority. Research has shown that it is important to support home language instruction to promote student achievement at the highest level possible (Blanton, 2006; Sakash, 2005). However, the type of achievement being facilitated by these bilingual programs is not explicitly stated. Next, I explore the experiences of bilingual learners in Chicago, IL noting both how they have endured and overcome much resistance, as well as what progress is yet to be made.

Bilingual Education in Chicago, Illinois

Similarly, to the United States as a whole Chicago, Illinois has experienced much opposition to bilingual education throughout the 19th and 20th centuries which has significantly impacted the policies of today. In the early 1800's German instruction was common in the Chicagoland area, and by the late 19th century Germans were joined by Polish and Slavic immigrant groups who also taught students in their native languages (Sakash, 2005). Throughout

the late 1800's leading into the 1900's the spike in the Italian, Greek, and Jewish communities in the Chicagoland area was not well received (Sakash, 2005). Thus, the Americanization movement flooded through Chicago including the push for English-only instruction in schools. The Edwards Law was passed in 1889 and required all parochial and public schools in Illinois to teach in English. The use of bilingual education programs began to decline, and in 1923 there was another English -only law enforced continuing the push for Americanization (Sakash, 2005).

Bilingual education was almost nonexistent until the BEA of 1968. Throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, bilingual education again grew in Chicago primarily to support Spanish-speaking students (Sakash, 2005). So much in fact that in 1973, state legislation was passed which required districts to provide TBE programs whenever there were 20 or more Limited English Proficient (LEP) students who speak the same language enrolled in one school. There was also the Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI) which was utilized in schools with fewer than 20 students of whom spoke the same language (Illinois State Board of Education, 1998). TPI programs can include several induction options for students; including instruction in ESL, tutors or aides in the classroom, and native language resources (Illinois State Board of Education, 2005). Per the 1997 Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report there were 133,815 LEP students served by either TBE or TPI programs, 103,250 of which were Spanish speakers (as cited in Illinois State Board of Education, 1998).

With the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 TBE and TPI programs in Illinois received additional funding (the exact amount is unspecified) under Title III also known as Language Instruction for LEP and Immigrant Students (Illinois State Board of Education, 2005). As part of the mandate of NCLB, school districts were required to identify potential LEP students via a home language survey given to indicate the languages the student

may speak as well as languages spoken in the home. Districts were then required to assess non-English speaking students to determine if they had met the LEP requirements under NCLB, including a one-year exemption from reading content, administering the reading content assessment to students who have been in the U.S. for at least three years, a requirement to develop linguistically appropriate academic assessments, etc (Batt, Kim, & Sunderman, 2005; Illinois State Board of Education, 2005). Sakash and Chou (2007) mention that in 2004 14.1 percent of Chicago Public School (CPS) students identified as LEP and 4 out of 5 of those students were Spanish speakers. With the continued growth of Spanish speakers in CPS the demand for Spanish-speaking teachers was at an all-time high (Sakash & Chou, 2007).

A similar situation occurred in the early 1990's and there was a shortage of certified bilingual/ESL teachers in CPS (Sakash & Chou, 2007). The Illinois State Board of Education responded by introducing Type 29 provisional certification. To qualify for Type 29 one had to have a Baccalaureate degree and pass a language proficiency test. Type 29 holders were also given 6 years to obtain a teaching certificate as well as full bilingual/ESL approval (Sakash & Chou, 2007). However, many Type 29 holders did not complete the six-year requirement, and the bilingual/ESL teacher shortage continued well into the 2000's (Sakash & Chou, 2007). Bilingual education has a long and complicated history in the United States, and the question of what they can achieve for students remains.

Literature Review

The way that achievement is measured, defined, and reviewed is often not made clear in research, thus the goal of this study is to provide a clear measurement for achievement with regards to bilingual education (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009). The different components of achievement

are not often explicitly stated, therefore much will be gleaned from the research based on the tenants and ultimately levels of achievement previously discussed (Brown & Goldstein 2011; Cole 1990; Senko et al., 2013). Bilingual program studies (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009) often use test scores to measure achievement and disregard non-measurable components of achievement such as; teacher and administrator motivations and expectations and a bilingual schools' definition, goal, and expectation in relation to achievement. This study seeks to fill this gap in the literature by providing a clearer definition of the level of achievement one bilingual school aims to facilitate for students. Unpacking the literature is key to better understanding the missing links between bilingual education and achievement. The next sections provide an overview of the history of bilingual educational research, as well as the notions of achievement therein. The examples here will come from literature and studies that have taken place in the United States.

Bilingual Education Programs in the Late 1970's-1980's

At the end of the 1970's bilingual education had become a popular topic of discussion in the United States. After the BEA had passed, more and more researchers became interested in the effectiveness of bilingual programs i.e. how students in bilingual programs achieve. Moore and Parr (1978) were among those researchers, and they conducted a study analyzing the effectiveness (achievement level) of bilingual programs for students. In the study, 150 students were considered LEP, and 77 were English dominant (Moore & Parr, 1978). The students were in elementary school, and the grade levels ranged from kindergarten to the second grade. To test the effectiveness of bilingual programs, the students received instruction in four different types of classes (Moore & Parr, 1978). The forms of instruction included; maintenance classes with dual language instruction in English and Spanish, transitional classes where Spanish

was used only if needed to understand English, minimal classes with no more than twenty minutes of instruction was provided in Spanish, and non-bilingual classes where no Spanish instruction was provided (Moore & Parr, 1978). The study takes place over a full academic year, a pretest was provided in the fall, and a post-test was given in the spring (Moore & Parr, 1978). Overall the results of the tests indicate that students in the non-bilingual classes score higher than those in the three types of bilingual programs (Moore & Parr, 1978). The researchers recognize that their study is limited due to the non-random assignment. Nevertheless, they believe their results are valid in indicating that bilingual programs prove to be an insufficient form of educating students based on the test score results.

Though test scores are a valid form of assessment, it is not clear what the pre or post-test examine for Moore and Parr (1978). Without knowing what the tests were examining, we cannot know if academic progress or success were the focus. It is unclear if the study conducted by Moore and Parr (1978) was centered on program ability to measure the outcomes of achievement of core competencies and knowledge or higher order skills and advanced knowledge (Cole, 1990). If bilingual program evaluations do not differentiate between the two, the ways in which they do or do not facilitate achievement among students becomes unclear. For this reason, a key component of the study being proposed here will focus on differentiating between the two achievement levels (Level 1: Academic progress, Performance goals, and Achievement of basic skills facts; Level 2: Academic Success, Mastery goals, and Achievement of higher order skills and advanced knowledge).

Studies such as those conducted by Garcia and Otheguy (1985), and Carter and Chatfield (1986) continued to focus on the idea of what makes an effective bilingual school. Dissimilarly to Moore and Parr (1978) they include a more in-depth analysis around the

effectiveness of bilingual schools that did not focus solely on academic success, and the findings indicate the ways in which bilingual programs do prove to be successful for students (Brown & Goldstein, 2013). Garcia and Otheguy (1985) conducted an ethnographic study of bilingual private schools in Dade County Miami. These schools were educating both ELL students and monolingual English speakers very well, and the bilingual model the program used was mostly English with a strong Spanish component (Garcia & Otheguy, 1985). Through interviews with teachers, parents, and administrators, and general observations, the authors found that the success of the programs was centered on cultural and social value centered on both languages (Garcia & Otheguy, 1985). Academic progress within the first level of achievement appears to be the form of achievement discussed here, although they used the phrasing of academic success. It was clear that it was not academic success regarding the definition provided by Brown and Goldstein (2013), but academic success by way of academic progress. Students were progressing at their pace, and not achieving full mastery of academic standards (Brown & Goldstein, 2013).

For Garcia and Otheguy (1985) academic success was not grounded in test scores, but in the environment schools cultivate for their students while also providing sound academic practices, and enforcing strict hiring policies to get the best possible bilingual teachers. The research conducted by Carter and Chatfield (1986) tells a similar story as they examine the research questions “Does bilingual program effectiveness promote LEP success or does the effective school environment do so? Or are positive student outcomes produced by the interplay of both?” (p. 201). Their study analyzed previous research on the effectiveness of bilingual education in three schools. One in the East Los Angeles barrio, another in a rural agriculture community in South California, and the last school they identify directly as J. Calvin Lauderbach Community Middle School in Chula Vista California (Carter & Chatfield, 1986). The previous

study conducted on these schools sought to examine a school climate that promotes positive outcomes and characteristics crucial to development. Characteristics include school environment, strong academic orientation, positive leadership, and high expectations and morale (Carter & Chatfield, 1986). They continued the study with Lauderbach being aware of the present situation there (Carter & Chatfield, 1986). The School served one of the poorest populations in California and about half of the population was Hispanic (Carter & Chatfield, 1986). The findings on the effectiveness of the school were derived from standardized test scores and an analysis done on school climate (Carter & Chatfield, 1986). In the end, school climate was seen to be positive and inclusive, which created a foundation conducive to high levels of academic achievement (Carter & Chatfield, 1986). Assuming the term effectiveness is a direct reference to achievement, that notion of achievement then stems from the second level of achievement which includes academic success, as it is centered on the performance of mandated standards.

Bilingual Education Programs in the 1990's-Early 2000's

Rossell and Baker (1996) continued with research on the effectiveness (achievement level) of bilingual education, based on how students achieved. Although, at this time bilingual instruction was the preferred form of instruction for LEP students, the question of whether or not bilingual education truly worked well for LEP students persisted (Rossell & Baker, 1996).

Rossell and Baker (1996) were inclined to update comprehensive reviews conducted by Baker and Kanter (1981; 1983a; 1983b) to further evaluate bilingual program research. Rossell and Baker (1996) focused on, “the effect of alternative programs for non-English speaking children on school performance” (p. 12) in Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) (similar to the Late Exit program discussed in the background section). The criteria for studies being reviewed by Rossell and Baker (1996) were as follows: they were required to have an experimental control

group design, incorporate non-random assignment and comparison groups on factors that influence achievement or statistically controlled for them, contain comparison groups from similar backgrounds, utilize outcome measures that included; normal curve equivalents, raw scores, scale scores, or percentiles, and lastly the studies were required to be free from any additional educational treatments (Rossell & Baker, 1996).

Overall the researchers identified 72 methodologically acceptable studies that were evaluated, and the findings suggests that most reports were methodologically unsound. Subsequently, the findings gathered from the studies evaluated were unreliable, making it difficult to generalize them based solely on the author's conclusions (Rossell & Baker, 1996). Rossell and Baker (1996) reported that the studies presented many inconsistencies due to the lack of accounting for the variations that existed in the programs they were studying. To rectify this issue, they suggest that school districts keep a record of data that corresponds to the programs they employ for LEP students; which would, in turn, allow social scientists to better analyze the variations within the programs under analysis (Rossell & Baker, 1996). Overall there were a few studies that found TBE to be more efficient for LEP students, however, most studies found TBE to be either no different or worse than other forms of instruction for LEP students. The types of instruction included were submersion, ESL, structured immersion, and maintenance programs (Rossell & Baker, 1996). If these programs are failing students, it is important to know the ways in which they are failing. However, that cannot be fully understood when the notion of achievement is not clearly stated or allowed to be discovered through the school's academic plan and expressed goal of achievement.

Rossell and Baker (1996) posit that the adverse findings are a direct result of the belief researchers have adopted in regards to bilingual education. Some researchers agree with the

claim that there is a facilitating effect from the first language to the second, which is why they favor bilingual education (Rossell & Baker, 1996). While others feel as if the best way to learn English and comprehend subject matter in English is to maximize instruction in English (Rossell & Baker, 1996). These are the two dominant points of view on bilingual education, and the reasons research on the topic has been so conflicting. This study is an example of one of the many examinations of past research on bilingual education (Baker & Kanter, 1981, 1991a, 1991b; Willig, 1985; Zappert & Cruz, 1977). The topic was popular among researchers given the inconsistent findings on the effectiveness of bilingual programs (Rossell & Baker, 1996). Due to the lack of evidence, Rossell and Baker (1996) believe that we can only make a hypothesis in regards to what bilingual education can achieve for students, as there is not enough reliable and coherent evidence upon which to make solid conclusions.

Researchers conducting studies on bilingual education are failing to account for variations within the program being examined, and centering research on their beliefs regarding its use. It is clear from this information that they are not providing clear definitions around the type, goal, or outcomes of achievement the programs facilitate. This further complicates the reliability and validity of their findings. The study I conducted eliminates many of the inconsistencies of the past. This study was designed to analyze the notion of achievement bilingual schools use to define their program; and the ways in which that achievement is interpreted by administrators, teachers, and realized academically. For if one is operating within clear definitions and designing research centered on a variety of data, uncompromised findings can be obtained which will allow for more reliable and valid research.

Before Rossell and Baker (1996) released their research, it is important to note that a study on the overall evaluation of TBE programs had been published five years earlier. Royer,

Carlo, Carlisle, and Furman (1991) conducted a similar study examining the validity of the Sentence Verification Technique (SVT) used to measure progress in TBE programs. They believe that fully understanding when a child is ready to move to the next level is contingent upon using a valid and reliable assessment (Royer et al., 1991). The SVT was developed to measure reading and listening comprehension, and to examine if the SVT is a reliable form of assessment, Royer et al. (1991) used a Spanish-English version to test 117 fifth graders in western Massachusetts. Before each test, teachers rated each student based on their reading and listening comprehension skill level in each language (Royer et al., 1991). The validity of the tests was assessed in two ways. The first way to test validity was based on the variation on the SVT English tests performance by TBE steps (Royer et al., 1991). Advancement within the TBE program is based on evaluations by school personnel, therefore tests results should support the level school personnel identify for students (Royer et al., 1991). The second way in which validity was tested was to check if teacher judgments of student comprehension aligned with SVT tests results (Royer et al., 1991).

Overall findings indicate that tests scores vary through the advancement of the program and with teacher judgment, however, the researchers still find SVT to be a valid form of assessment for three reasons (Royer et al., 1991). Firstly, they believe the SVT is useful because it incorporates local decision making, which they find to be an important aspect of a successful assessment process (Royer et al., 1991). Secondly, they find that the test does account for transitional gains in linguistic and subject matter skills (Royer et al., 1991). Lastly, they find it beneficial to assess student competencies using both test scores and well-informed observations made by teachers (Royer et al., 1991). The SVT assessment is an example of the notion of achievement centered on academic progress within the first level of achievement as it is based

upon individual progression in acquiring knowledge and skills. Achievement is unique to the person and the ways in which they are improving academically (Brown & Goldstein, 2013). The goal is the second level of achievement including mastery of content which is self-led, and the outcomes are based on the criteria the student has chosen to follow.

The study conducted by Royer et al. (1991) is different from any other study presented here in that it analyzes a form of assessment that does not equate student achievement to test scores or academic success as defined by Brown and Goldstein (2013), but by academic progress. In doing so, it broadens the concept of student performance and thus achievement. This in turn makes achievement fully representative of a students' skill set. Though this study does not reference achievement directly, it is a step in the right direction at accurately examining how students are achieving in bilingual education. Though TBE is still practiced in education, research today has moved beyond TBE instruction to incorporating more of a dual language approach.

Present Day Bilingual and Monolingual Programs

Present day research is often centered on dual language instruction. DePalma (2010) mentions the current belief that dual language instruction has academic and social benefits for dual language Spanish speakers (DePalma, 2010). That belief has circulated throughout the world as fluency in the English language is believed to be necessary to participate in the global economy, and bilingual programs that include English grow globally. To examine this phenomenon in the United States DePalma (2010) conducted an ethnographic study of a dual language two-way immersion (TWI) (Spanish-English) program in a kindergarten classroom.

DePalma (2010) analyzed the linguistic development that takes place, as well as the teachers' role regarding language development in the classroom through student and teacher

interviews and classroom observations. She thoughtfully studied one bilingual classroom and the findings indicate that implementing a TWI program is not a simple task, and that it is contingent on true knowledge and understanding of teaching and learning philosophies upon which the model was constructed (DePalma, 2010). For DePalma (2010), the instructor needs to assess students' needs continually, and tailor the program to meet them effectively. This may require the teacher to challenge the optimistic theory of the TWI 50/50 model and implement instruction proportionately based on student needs (DePalma, 2010). She ends with these three main recommendations; administrators need to truly support the minority language in the classroom design, teachers should plan how to foster learning in both languages while recognizing the minority language as valued, and lastly that the need to speak the minority language must be artificially created both inside and outside of the classroom (DePalma, 2010). DePalma (2010) provides us with an overview of how a dual language program is interpreted in practice. If it is viewed as a valued form of instruction the question remains, is it more effective at educating students than a monolingual program in terms of achievement.

Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, and Blanco (2007) conducted another important study comparing a dual language and monolingual program. The experimental study compared how a TWI dual language program and a monolingual English immersion program are beneficial to children learning in preschool education. Eighty-five families agreed to participate in the TWI program while only 62 families agreed to the English immersion program (Barnett et al., 2007). Once the participants were confirmed they were placed into their perspective classrooms. The TWI program operated on a bi-weekly schedule with the students alternating between English and Spanish instruction (Barnett et al., 2007). Each classroom was equipped with a licensed teacher and a teaching assistant with a Child Development Associate credential to work with a

maximum of 15 children in a classroom (Barnett et al., 2007). The students were tested in the fall and spring semester of the 2003-2004 school year, using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Test de Vocabulario en Imagenes Peabody) and the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Revised (Bateria Psico-Educativa Revisada de Woodcock-Muñoz-Revisada) (Barnett et al., 2007).

Based on both classroom observations and student test results (from the two tests listed above), the results indicate that TWI programs better-supported student learning when compared to the English immersion program (Barnett et al., 2007). All students progressed in English language vocabulary, literacy, and mathematics. However, the TWI program supported gains in Spanish language literacy without hindering any gains in English (Barnett et al., 2007). The tests analyze individual progression, therefore the achievement being analyzed here is that of academic progression, a tenant of the first level of achievement (Brown & Goldstein, 2013). The goal of achievement was a performance goal as student performance was being compared between the two different classrooms (Senko et al., 2011). The outcomes are again unclear as the criteria for the tests were not provided.

Bilingual education has been adopted as the preferred form of instruction not only for ELLs in the United States but also for monolingual students, and in numerous countries around the world. The notion of achievement continues to be exempt from bilingual program analysis, however one cannot assume the definition of achievement is a shared consensus. It is beneficial to assess this phenomenon and examine how a bilingual school both explicitly and implicitly defines and facilitates achievement for students. In the following section I detail the research methods I used to examine this phenomenon.

Research Methods

Bilingual education policies in Chicago, Illinois have changed over the years. However, it is not clear what evidence has guided their policy decisions nor how effective these programs truly are. The literature regarding bilingual schools has been contradictory. For example, some programs have proven to operate effectively and produce achievement (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009; Rossell & Baker, 1996) while others have not. The common thread among research regarding these types of programs is that there is no universal definition of achievement. In order to speak to the level a program is able to achieve for its students, the notion of achievement must first be defined. By utilizing the three definitions of different aspects of achievement (type, goal, and outcome) discussed earlier to form the 2 basic levels of achievement (Brown & Goldstein, 2013; Cole, 1990; Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011), it then becomes easily identifiable. Once the definition of achievement a bilingual program facilitates is clear, the level of achievement it produces for students can be identified. The research questions that seek to address this phenomenon are as follows:

1. What are the ways in which bilingual educators and school administrators define achievement for students?
2. What type of evidence do educators/schools use to measure achievement?

The research questions presented above have been developed to examine how the notion of achievement within bilingual education is defined and subsequently envisioned by both teachers and administrators in Chicago, Illinois. The first objective of this study is to examine the ways in which a bilingual institution defines their goals in terms of achievement. The second objective is centered on the ways in which teachers and administrators measure that

achievement. By using a vertical case study it provides the researcher with the diverse set of tools needed to analyze different data strands that contribute to the understanding of achievement (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006). A vertical case study is designed to contextualize a local event within the broader national and global context. It is also centered on a specific site, and the ways in which history, social constructs, and international and national context influences the local (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006). It is designed in such a way that understanding something at the micro-level is dependent on understanding it the meso and macro-level (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2014).

The breadth of bilingual education research is far and wide, but the depth is often missing. Many studies (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009; Rossell & Baker, 1996) rely on the analysis of a specific bilingual program within its' local context, which is only a part of what attributes to the outcome. For this reason, far too often bilingual program research becomes repetitive with little to no new information gained from a single level analysis. By utilizing a vertical case study to examine a school, it allowed the researcher to go beyond the surface of the school context to examine the global and national context that influences decisions made about bilingual education (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2014). Thus, providing a multilevel analysis that included both a depth and breadth of information. Utilizing the vertical case study in this Thesis analysis, is an important step in furthering the depth of research on bilingual education. A vertical case study is a unique way of conducting a careful analysis of a single site. Vavrus and Bartlett (2006) define a vertical case study, stating;

The vertical case study should be grounded in a principal site – e.g., a school, community, an institution, or a government ministry – and should fully attend to the ways

in which historical trends, social structures, and national and international forces shape local processes at this site. (p. 96)

First a site was chosen, and then it was situated within the surrounding context at the local, national, and international level. The goal was to carefully explore how changes in national and international discourses and policies impact school level decisions made locally (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b). I found this approach useful for this study as it allows one to look beyond the surface and see the many connections that can be made on the local, national, and international level to inform the analysis. Notably, when examining a topic such as bilingual education involving the global perspective is helpful. Bilingual education is not unique to the United States, it is a program model used to educate students worldwide for different educational, social, and cultural reasons (World Bank, 1997).

With this in mind a vertical case study was chosen as the framework for this study as it lends itself to the complete understanding of the definition of achievement at a single site. I first used the vertical case study to examine the beliefs and definitions of achievement on a global level, followed by the national, and local level analysis. This was done in the subsequent document analysis section where I further explain how these materials were examined. In the document analysis, I describe different definitions of achievement and how they are similar or dissimilar across context. Comparison of the selected documents reveals multidimensional layers from which common themes emerge. These themes are then used to interpret interviews with administrators and teachers, providing context for why certain policies, feelings, and circumstances exist.

This vertical case study allows for a clear definition of achievement to be obtained. Whereas the studies mentioned above do not provide a definition of the achievement they reference. Furthermore, when only making horizontal/national level comparisons one risks

missing key elements of a single phenomenon. By narrowing my focus and broadening the strands of analysis with the vertical case study it provides me with concise definitions, an explicit understanding of how this bilingual program facilitates achievement for students, and an explanation as to how the broader context influences the local.

Participant Selection and Data Selection

One dual language bilingual elementary school in Chicago, Illinois was identified as a participating institution in this study. This school was chosen because it is one of few dual language schools in Chicago that offer continuous instruction in Spanish and English; and as this was originally designed as a comparative case study this school was also chosen because it was most similar to the school in Costa Rica in terms of practice and language instruction. Using purposeful sampling meaning that there are criteria in place for case selection in order to choose a case where one can gain rich information, the school met three specific criteria to be a desired institution for this study (Merriam, 2009). For this study to be rich with information the following list the criteria I used in deciding which school to use. First, the school had to utilize some variation of the two-way dual language program defined above in their elementary school. Secondly, the chosen school had to have data readily available which reports the demographics (location, racial makeup, ELL vs non-ELL population) of the school. Thirdly, in line with demographics, they also had to provide index scores calculated from the tests the school has employed over the last five years. If the school did not meet the criteria listed above, it would not have been considered for this study. Many of the studies listed throughout this Thesis, used similar criteria when examining bilingual programs, however they did not utilize the vertical case study methodology, nor did they provide a clear explanation of the type of achievement that existed in each program, therefore they do not include the in-depth picture presented here on

bilingual education (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009; Rossell & Baker, 1996).

Once the school was identified, and I was not limited in my selection based on what the school board, administrators, and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) permit; three elementary bilingual school teachers were interviewed on a volunteer basis. Convenience sampling was used to choose the interview participants (Merriam, 2009). Merriam (2009) describes convenience sampling as, "...you select based on time, money, location, availability of site respondents and so on" (p. 79). Having no previous connection to the school, and needing a variety of experiences and perspectives this would be the most efficient way to get participants. With permission from the principal I emailed several teachers at the school with information about the study, and majority of them responded eager to participate and volunteer their time. The first three teachers to respond to the email were the chosen participants. Initially the number was three to be comparative to the number of teachers that could participate at the school in Costa Rica. Once this was no longer a comparative study, the number remained at three so there would be no discrepancies by collecting data at the site at two different time points. If the number of volunteer teachers was less than three, then I was prepared to work with that number of teachers. If no teachers volunteered to participate, then I would have started the process of identifying another school. The school also allowed both the principal and vice principal to be interviewed and they each agreed to participate.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data for this study was collected from interviews, and policy and document analysis. Five semi-structured interviews took place over the course of a two-week period at the bilingual school site, and a document analysis was conducted throughout the start and completion of the

study (Merriam, 2009). The interviews were conducted to answer the leading questions, “What are the ways in which bilingual educators and school administrators define achievement for students?” and “What type of evidence do educators/schools use to measure achievement?”.

While the document analysis was done to provide context for teacher and administrator responses. It provides us with evidence on how the social, cultural, and political processes have influenced the definition of achievement at this school (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b). Both interviews and document analysis were conducted using vertical case study methodology (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2014a; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b). Below is a detailed overview of the data that was collected and includes; who and what the data were derived from, how it was collected and analyzed, and the frequency of collection and analysis. The vertical case study requires that three levels of information be analyzed.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted once with both teachers and administrators throughout the first and second week of fieldwork. The interview questions are designed to get an idea of how teachers and administrators define achievement, and the ways in which that achievement is realized in a bilingual classroom. I conducted semi-structured interviews with each participant individually for 20-30 minutes (Merriam, 2009). Semi-structured interviews consist of an interview guide with less structured and flexible questions, where the wording and order of questions is not predetermined (Merriam, 2009). Though I did use a list of predetermined questions, the order often changed based on the direction conversations took organically and the questions were flexibly worded. I then adapted the interview protocol utilized by Lehmann (1998). Interviews were audio-taped and then transcribed in order to categorize and code

information into specific schemes. Through reading and re-reading the transcriptions, I began to identify subcategories that arose based on repeated ideas, words, and concepts throughout, in reference to: definitions of achievement, achievement related to self, and achievement related to bilingual education. Statements were then grouped into common themes, and later analyzed. A content analysis was conducted to adequately analyze the interviews through the process of coding and categorization. A content analysis is defined as, "...a systematic procedure for describing the content of communications" (Merriam, 2009, p. 152). Subsequently, common codes began to emerge from the interview text, and after being identified, allowed me to uncover common conceptions about achievement in bilingual programs among teachers and administrators. Interview questions were semi-structured open-ended questions, and a list of questions utilized for both teachers and administrators are provided below (Lehmann, 1998).

Document Analysis

The last portion of data that was collected and analyzed were documents. Documents included; global reports on bilingual education, Chicago, Illinois bilingual education policy, the school website, curriculum plans, grade reports, test scores, and other documents relevant to the demonstration of student achievement. Documents were divided into the following categories; global, national, and local. They included information on the following levels; school mission, school background, school policy, global reports on bilingual education, state legislation and policy, federal legislation and policy, and grade reports and test scores. I then move from category construction to data analysis and interpretation to understand how achievement is; defined globally, being supported by legislation, and being realized by students. Here I repeated the content analysis process to understand the communication of meaning throughout these documents (Merriam, 2009). Documents were coded based on how they referenced achievement

using the three emerging themes of equity, inclusion, and empowerment from the global documents analysis. These themes were then built upon using the national and local context. Lastly, they were expanded upon in reference to achievement.

Site Selection – School profile

This study took place at a bilingual elementary school in Chicago, Illinois. It was started by two people who wanted their children to experience a multilingual and multicultural education (school website). They brought their idea to the State Board of Education, and the board decided to start the dual language bilingual Spanish and English preschool in 1975 (school website). It started off small and in 1977 the board decided to add a kindergarten class. As the school grew it eventually moved to its own site in 1983. The school now provides bilingual education in English and Spanish to pre-K through 8th grade students. Their mission remains “...to promote educational excellence through bilingual and multicultural education” (school website). The goal is to foster an accepting environment that is accepting of all students and their cultural background while striving for excellence and high achievement (school website). Though the school experienced success early on and even in recent past, the last few years have proven difficult due to low test scores, administrator turnover, and miscommunication between teachers and administrators. This has all attributed to the lack of consensus on what achievement means for students and how teachers and administrators define achievement in the school.

Limitations

There are potential limitations to this study. First, this was originally presented as a comparative case study with two bilingual schools, one in San José, Costa Rica and one in Chicago, Illinois. Due to the difficulty of collecting data in Costa Rica, it was repositioned as a vertical case study of one school in Chicago, Illinois. Though not a comparative case study this

study is important in that it will take an in depth look at achievement as it is defined in the specific context of one school. In addition, by analyzing students at such a young age one might question how this can truly measure their achievement as it is apt to change as students get older. However, second language acquisition is proven most effective when introduced at a young age, so this project will be able to track students' second language acquisition as well as their achievement in school.

Another limitation this study presents is that it is quite possible for anyone to find literature surrounding this issue that speaks in favor of the viewpoint he or she might hold. For this reason it is difficult to come across unbiased studies in the United States on the topic of the ways in which bilingual education fosters achievement. This study avoids this bias behavior by seeking to analyze one bilingual school. Moreover, the findings will be extracted from the testimonies and experiences of teachers and administrators themselves, along with the curriculum, test scores, and discourse used to explain the mission. There is no overarching agenda that seeks to elevate itself above the findings presented here. There is no hypothesis by which this project is driven, it is designed to lend itself to the themes and codes that surface out of the vertical case study analysis.

Findings

In this vertical case study, I start by analyzing global, national, and local documents that reference bilingual education. Then I use themes that emerged from the document analysis to inform interview analysis findings and provide evidence for the views and beliefs teachers and administrators hold. The interview data speaks directly to the research questions presented above while the document analysis provides context and supporting evidence. Both the document and interview analysis reveal which level of achievement the school produces.

Document Analysis

The document analysis was used to build context around teacher and administrator responses as well as provide an answer to the question, “What type of evidence do educators/schools use to measure achievement”? For the document analysis I performed a content analysis which I describe above. I read through 102 pages of documents, noting anything that referenced equity, inclusion, empowerment, scores, tests, levels, grades; or that signified how one would know if students were doing well, passing, or proficient in bilingual education (Merriam, 2009). Upon doing this, three themes quickly emerged in reference to achievement, which are; equity, inclusion, and empowerment. I examine how these concepts relate to achievement. I will first discuss them within the global context followed by the national and local context.

Currently in the 21st century, multilingual and bilingual education on a global scale are viewed as an effort in equity, inclusion, and empowerment (Baker & Jones, 1998; UNESCO, 2003). As more immigrant families enter countries where the dominant language differs from their home language the definitions of education, equity, and inclusion have broadened to include language among race and social class (NABE, 2011). More equity, inclusion, and empowerment in education leads to higher levels of achievement for students and can help narrow the achievement gap between ELL’s, bilingual students, and monolingual English speakers (Baker & Jones, 1998; Banks, 2008; NABE, 2011). Home language instruction helps facilitate second language acquisition and learning; moreover, supporting the bilingual brain can lead to better working memory and problem solving skills (Petitto, 2009, p. 195). In an education position paper UNESCO states that we must consider the specific learning needs of these

students in relation to the language or languages spoken at home and at school. They go on to say,

The choice of language in the education system, confers a power and prestige through its use in formal instruction. Not only is there a symbolic aspect, referring to status and visibility, but also a conceptual aspect referring to shared values and worldview expressed through and in that language. (UNESCO, 2003, p. 14)

Using student's home language in formal instruction is also a way to empower them and their families in a country and climate where that has not always been the case. Students who do not speak the dominant language are being accounted for globally and efforts in creating programs to adequately include these students in education have slowly increased in the U.S. since the enactment of the BEA (Sakash, 2005; Wilson, 2011). Spanish to English bilingual programs are the most common programs offered in the U.S. as Spanish speakers make up the largest percentage of the immigrant population, and it has been estimated that by the year 2050 more than half of our school system will be comprised of Latino students (Fry & Gonzales, 2008; Wilson, 2011). As more have become aware of this fact, Spanish to English Early and Late exit programs have grown, while dual language bilingual programs such as the one analyzed here are few and far between (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015).

One of the benefits of utilizing a dual language bilingual education program is that it could help narrow the achievement gap (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Petitto, 2009; Lindholm-Leary & Hernández, 2011). There is an education achievement gap that exists globally, and Cornelius (2011) believes that the lack of adequate education policies is to blame, due to the universally applicable model of education. Cornelius (2011) goes on to state, "the problem stems from the fact that institutions mistakenly interpret rigor as adding more difficult coursework rather than demanding mastery..." (p. 51). This would be considered a Level 1 achievement as the concern

here is academic progress and student performance. Cornelius (2011) also mentions that millions of high paying jobs go unclaimed around the world each year because there are no qualified candidates to fill them. To fix this, the focus has shifted to Science and Math curriculum and to getting students proficient in the global language of English (World Bank, 1997; Crystal, 2004; Cornelius, 2011). However, focusing solely on English proficiency will not dismantle the achievement gap that exist between ELL's, monolingual, and bilingual students in the U.S. (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Petitto, 2009; Leary & Hernández, 2011).

In response to the achievement gap and educational inequality the U.S. enacted policies such as NCLB which aimed to get low income, disenfranchised, and LEP students an equal high quality education (Wright, 2010). The rationale was that if these students are achieving at a higher rate, than everyone (U.S. students) will be achieving at a higher rate, and the achievement gap both in the United States and globally would lessen. The first two goals of NCLB for LEP students are listed as follows;

- (1) to help ensure that children who are limited English proficient, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet;
- (2) to assist all limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, to achieve at high levels in the core academic subjects so that those children can meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet... (U.S. Department of Education, 2010)

This policy had adverse effects for bilingual students (Wright, 2010). The focus was taken from bilingual education and bilingual students and instead became about LEP students. Consequently, the goal became English proficiency, and assessing students primarily in English (Lyons, 1995; Wright, 2010). Each state is able to decide which policies it will support, and instruction in student's native language is optional. This has left dual language bilingual

education up for interpretation with no foundation to firmly build upon (Frenner & Segota, 2012).

The current U.S. education policy Common Core operates similarly with the focus being on English proficiency and no guidance offered for bilingual education (Frenner & Segota, 2012; TESOL, 2013). TESOL (2013) comprised an overview of the Common Core standards as they relate to ELLs and in it they state;

When the Common Core State Standards were published in 2010, the developers acknowledged in a brief addendum that the needs of ELLs should be taken into account in the CCSS implementation. However, beyond providing some general information and suggestions for ELLS, the developers initially left the question of how to implement the standards for this student population up to the states. (TESOL, 2013, p. 4)

ELL student learning is again not made a priority in academic legislation. Furthermore, bilingual education is not mentioned nor are any guidelines or resources presented. In response to the lack of bilingual education support as well as inequality in education President Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and ultimately the country's dedication to equal opportunity in education (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This gave us the unique opportunity to again redefine bilingualism for students, and include the bilingual learner among LEP and ELL students in legislation (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). State legislators and policy makers should take this opportunity to acknowledge dual language education research and the potential benefits for ELL and bilingual students if the goals of equity, inclusion, empowerment, and ultimately a level 2 achievement (high level of achievement including mastery) are going to be attainable for these students.

The policy within which the dual language bilingual school in Chicago operates within is minimal and largely comprised of state legislation passed by the State of Illinois School Board of

Education. When speaking with both the Principal and Vice Principal about the specific policy their school uses in regards to dual language bilingual education, they each directed me towards Chicago legislation which hasn't changed much since 1976 despite the many changes in the ELL population in Chicago (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). For example, TBE programs are still utilized most often with LEP students, and the dual language bilingual school that participated in this study is one of very few of its kind in Chicago. Though the school relies heavily on these policies for direction, much in the way of dual language bilingual education is not specified and thus left to the schools who employ dual language bilingual education curriculum to decide for themselves. Without any clear sense of direction, understanding what a dual language program can truly accomplish for students in regards to achievement becomes very difficult.

Title 23 Education and Cultural Resources Part 228 list the rules currently in effect for bilingual education. (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). The rules state that each school district must administer a home language survey for any student in preschool through the 12th grade who is entering the district for the first time (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). Once the survey is given the district goes on to screen the English proficiency level of the student using the English Language Proficiency Assessment prescribed by the State Superintendent of Education (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015, p. 10-11). The superintendent then determines the score at which a student is considered English proficient. Students who score as proficient will exit the bilingual program and will no longer be considered an English learner. However, students who are not yet English proficient (as determined by the scores decided by the superintendent) are required to take the assessment every year until they reach English proficiency (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015, p. 11). The two programs

mentioned throughout legislation for dual language students are the TBE and the TPI. The requirements for a TBE program are listed as the following:

- A) Instruction in subjects which are either required by law (see 23 III. Adm. Code 1) or by the student's school district, to be given in the student's home language and in English; core subjects such as math, science and social studies must be offered in the student's home language, except as otherwise *provided in subsection (c)(3);
- B) Instruction in the language arts in the student's home language;
- C) Instruction in English as a second language, which must align the applicable English language development standards set forth in Section 288.10; and
- D) Instruction in the history and culture of the country, territory, or geographic area which is the native land of the students or of their parents and in the history and culture of the United States. (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015, p. 15)

The requirements are clearly stated and outlined, and the legislation goes on to explain part time bilingual education, and education for students whose home language cannot be written and thus instructional materials cannot be created, there is no mention of dual language education and the requirements for those programs (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015, p. 18). In the same way the Illinois State Board of Education list the requirements for the TPI program as the following:

- 2) Program Components—A transitional program of instruction must include instruction or native language support in the student's home language to the extent necessary, as determined by the district on the basis of the prescribed screening instrument or procedures, as applicable... A transitional program of instruction shall include instruction in ESL, which must align to the applicable English language development standards set forth in Section 288.10. A transitional program of instruction also may include, but is not limited to:
 - A) language arts in the students' home language; and
 - B) instruction in the history and culture of the country, territory, or geographic area that is the native land of the students or of their parents and in the history and culture of the United States. (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015, p. 19)

Similarly, to the background section on bilingual education in Chicago, Illinois mentioned above, TBE and TPI are the main programs mentioned in current legislation. CPS has only created significant support for these two programs (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015).

Two-way dual language programs such as the one used at the bilingual school in this study are not supported by state legislation. The global concerns of equity and inclusion that are addressed through the empowerment of being taught continuously in one's home language are not accounted for in these legislative policies. The global perspective, research, and recommendations on bilingual education are not fully considered, and ELL and/or dual language students who participate in public education are not able to partake in a truly equitable, inclusive, and empowering education system that fosters high achievement at a level 2.

When viewing information on the school's website one is presented with their mission of striving to promote academic excellence through bilingual and multicultural education, thus including and empowering students in public education. Their goal is to promote social and cognitive development in which families are active partners in student's schooling (school website). This mission is aligned with Title 23 Education and Cultural Resources Part 228 which states, "In accordance with Section 1703(f) of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA), a school district must provide services that will enable English learners to "overcome barriers that impede equal participation by these students in the district's instructional programs " (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015 p. 12). Together the goals of promoting cognitive development and overcoming barriers in CPS for LEP students demonstrate the desire for positive outcomes and speak to the goals of equity, inclusion, and empowering students to achieve. However, there are still no specific dual language policies which can serve as a reliable foundation for the school to build upon outside of the general consensus of wanting LEP, ELL, and bilingual students to do well in CPS. CPS adequately sees ELL's through to becoming proficient in English, however, there is no inclusion of dual language teaching past reaching English proficiency in local legislation.

Regarding specific policy decisions within the school, there is a Dual Language Committee who makes these decisions based on research and their expertise on the subject. Their process involves the following; an action plan, implementation, ongoing monitoring, conducting updates, and strategic direction where they analyze and recommend (School Strategic Plan, 2015). Recently they have decided to implement an 80/20 dual language model throughout the school, with 80 percent of instruction in Spanish and 20 percent in English. They are also accessing the new 80/20 program via the University of Chicano STEP assessment for pre-k through 8th grade (School Strategic Plan, 2015). The Strategic Plan also mentions some of the challenges the school has, such as much of their curriculum not being measured by the School Quality Rating Policy (SQRP) (the District's policy used to measure annual school performance), funding being connected to enrollment, and getting materials in Spanish. Most if not all of which could be resolved with the appropriate resources and policies in place (School Strategic Plan, 2015).

These policies enacted by the state of Illinois were put in place to fulfill the goal of educating these students and providing them with the resources necessary to be successful in education. They were also designed to fill a gap in education, and the gap in ELL/bilingual student achievement when compared to their peers (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015; greatschools.org, 2016). Part of the Chicago Public School mission for language and culture education is;

Language education is critical to learning and success in college, career, and life in the 21st century. Language education includes developing the native-language and English-language proficiency of English learners, strengthening the English skills among native-English speakers, and providing all students with the opportunity to learn a world language. (Chicago Public Schools, 2015)

Though the stated goal may be centered on equitable inclusive and empowering education, the policies and decisions made do not produce those outcomes for bilingual students. It appears as though the ELL and dual language education policies in Chicago are examples of unsuccessful attempts at promoting an equitable, inclusive, and empowering education system for language minority students.

Language minority students comprise most of this Chicago dual language school's enrollment. Demographically the school is 0.8 percent Asian, 2.0 percent Black, 81.4 percent Hispanic, 10.6 percent White, and 5.1 percent other. Within that school population 50.7 percent are low income and 31.5 percent are LEP (CPS, 2015-2016). All students are taught in the dual language Spanish to English model. The model supported high achieving students for some time, however in the last four years' scores have started to decline. In the next part of this discussion we examine student performance on the Illinois Standard Achievement Test (ISAT) (Figure 2) (greatschools.org, 2016). Test scores are an important part of measuring how this school facilitates achievement for these students.

Figure 2. ISAT Proficiency Scores

Grade Level	Subject	2011	2012	2013	2014
3 rd	Math	90%	87%	40%	38%
	Reading	68%	71%	56%	44%
4 th	Math	86%	89%	54%	73%
	Reading	66%	68%	57%	58%
	Science	71%	83%	84%	77%
5 th	Math	86%	83%	59%	68%
	Reading	61%	78%	47%	60%

6 th	Math	88%	80%	52%	71%
	Reading	97%	74%	61%	66%
7 th	Math	85%	99%	64%	65%
	Reading	85%	91%	59%	73%
	Science	88%	89%		98%
8 th	Math	98%	93%	83%	76%
	Reading	95%	94%	81%	52%

According to the results listed in Figure 2., the school has progressively scored lower in the past few years, with some exceptions. These scores demonstrate that students are not reaching mastery goals (a tenant of a level 2 achievement) and as such may not be at a level 2 achievement. No one cause can be undoubtedly linked to this decline, as there are many factors that arguably could have contributed, such as; frequent shift in school leadership, misuse of district funds, curriculum changes, etc. (Dabrowski and Klinger, 2014). The decline in performance is crucial to understanding the level of achievement this bilingual school successfully facilitates for its' students and if the motivations of equity, inclusion, and empowerment are present.

In summary, the document analysis uncovers the motivations behind bilingual (dual language) education as equity, inclusion, and empowerment that leads to high achievement. Achievement itself however, was never fully defined in the global, national, and local contexts. Though these documents do provide a layer of understanding in relation to the rationale for bilingual education and what it should achieve for students, a definition of achievement is not provided. If this is the evidence that teachers and administrators use to develop their own definitions of achievement, one might expect those definitions to be vague and contrasting.

Nevertheless, I have uncovered the motivations for bilingual student achievement which is useful in building context around the decisions, views, and rationale of teachers and administrators. I continue this discussion in the interview findings where I examine interviews with teachers and administrators and explore their views on equity, inclusion, empowerment, and the overall achievement of their students.

Interviews

The interviews were designed to answer both research questions; “What are the ways in which bilingual educators and school administrators define achievement for students” and “What type of evidence do educators/schools use to measure achievement”? Interviews were conducted during the spring of 2015. The interviews with the principal and vice principal were conducted in person and teacher interviews were conducted via telephone. Upon reading and re-reading the text themes emerged in reference to achievement, and only those that were present in every conversation were considered legitimate. After looking through transcripts and coding information as it related to achievement there were three main themes that emerged from the interviews and that were present in every conversation. Having themes that were present in every conversation simplifies the process of comparing within the local context, and adds layers to the experiences being shared. The themes are as follows: first is that achievement is not clearly defined in the school, secondly, that administrators and teachers view achievement differently, lastly, that there is a lack of inclusion on behalf of the dual language bilingual, making equity, inclusion, and empowerment in CPS more difficult for these students. Together these form the main findings from the interview portion of the analysis and give insight into the level of achievement at the two-way dual language bilingual school

The first theme of achievement not being clearly defined arose in many conversations. The principal had been employed at the school for a year and two months when the interview took place. When asked about how he defines achievement he said, "...to be able to learn language through content and content through language, that is called achievement for us" (Principal 1, personal communication, May, 2015). However, it was never made clear what that means, and the statement itself appears vague. When asking the vice principal, the same question she posed a question herself saying,

Are we achieving the goal of bicultural bi-literate and what exactly does that mean, and what [does] that look like? I think it's a bit vague...and there is no real way for us to measure it, there is no assessment for us to monitor it... (Vice Principal 1, personal communication, May, 2015)

She had only been employed at the school for 3 months when the interview took place, and did not yet have a grasp on what achievement meant for the school. In the interviews with administrators it became clear that their definition of achievement is vague, and thus understanding the type of achievement this school works to foster in students is unclear. It was not possible to confirm a level of achievement based on the information provided here by the principal and vice principal. Their definitions were too vague and their conception of achievement was not made clear.

Teachers on the other hand defined achievement based on the individual progress of a student Teacher 3 mentioned;

I define achievement by each student's ability to make adequate progress or growth from his/her initial level toward a realistic goal. I can create formative assessments that monitor progress along the way and modify my instructional practices as a response to students' needs. Then there's also the data gathered by state mandated assessments that can provide information on how students are performing compared to students beyond our school setting. (Teacher 3, personal communication, May 2015)

Teacher 2 echoed Teacher 3's sentiment when she stated;

I define achievement as whether they are making progress within a subject, I am able to see whether they do achieve a particular goal, and I take into consideration reading assessments (teacher made formative assessments), and I am able to see what they struggle in... (Teacher 2, personal communication, May, 2015)

Teachers seem to define achievement based on one's individual trajectory, focusing more on student's growing at their own pace, and often creating their own assessments to gauge progress. This way they can tailor their lessons to what students need. As demonstrated in state legislation, most assessments currently available for teachers are given in English with little to no translation options in Spanish and other languages (Frenner & Segota, 2012; Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). Therefore, teachers are required to categorize their bilingual students' achievement levels based on that students' individual progress with little to no insight from state academic policy about what bilingual student achievement should look like. Teachers are then left to create the equity, inclusion, and empowerment opportunities for their students where legislation and policy do not.

Achievement is not clearly defined for administrators and teachers causing individual interpretations of achievement to be somewhat vague. They do not align on the ways in which they view achievement, leading us to the second theme that arose from interviews, that administrators and teachers view achievement differently. When asked how achievement is measured, the principal said, "Data is important, achievement is defined by assessments...". When asking Teacher 1 how she defines achievement, she had a very different view of assessments saying,

Everything is measured in standardized tests, everything is taught in a dual language... the 6th grade gets a lot of criticism if the growth is not what is expected. I don't agree with standardized tests in measuring achievement, [it] doesn't measure what the students know, and they are totally biased. (Teacher 1, personal communication, May, 2015)

I then asked Teacher 1 what her expectations are regarding achievement and she said, “Achievement is to see them mature academically, not only academically, see them confident, making the connections between both languages” (Teacher 1, personal communication, May, 2015). She is focused on empowering her students, and seeing them confident and maturing academically in both languages. She recognizes that standardized tests are a part of the learning process, but does not base her students’ progress solely on standardized tests.

It appears that teachers are defining achievement as ‘Academic Progress’ which is part of the first level of achievement, while the principals’ definition is aligned with ‘Mastery Goals’ based on mandated standards in the 2nd level of achievement. Teachers distrust standardized tests and make their own assessments to measure achievement in their classrooms based on students’ individual progress. Though standardized tests must be administered they are often not sufficient in assessing language minority and bilingual dual language students, therefore teacher made assessments are what instruction and progress are based on in the classroom. Teacher 3 reiterates this point saying,

There’s all this research about language acquisition and best practices for teaching and assessing English language learners, not to mention specific data about the average number of years it takes an ELL to gain English proficiency, and yet very little of that seems to trickle down into instructional practice and assessment. Why don’t state mandated assessments take into account the developmental nature of language acquisition and expect bilingual students (particularly those in grades 1 through 3) to perform as well as monolingual students? (Teacher 3, personal communication, May, 2015)

Teacher 1 states a similar point of view by saying.

As of now, the biggest concern is the testing because it is bias against bilingual students because of the content and the complexity of the tests, the way that they play with idioms and language in the questions they have to read. [There are] 2 or 3 kinds of discourse. (Teacher 1, personal communication, May, 2015)

Teacher 2 also shared her frustration saying, “It’s frustrating that tests are administered this way and kids are not being viewed as a whole student” (Teacher 2, personal communication, May, 2015). All three teachers share the belief that student achievement is progressive and individual, and believe that the assessments they are given do not adequately represent their students’ abilities. Teacher 2 went on to say, “I don’t give as much weight to the standardized tests as I do to the classroom [formative] assessments” she values and trust teacher assessments more than she does the standardized tests that they are given for dual language students. The lack of appropriate testing materials for dual language education is a direct representation of what national and local policies are missing. Not supporting the unique way these students learn by testing them accordingly means that we are in some ways excluding them from an equitable education experience in CPS. This in turn has influenced how teachers and administrators define achievement differently and is surely not helping dual language students reach either level of achievement.

In addition to standardized tests not being sufficient for bilingual students, teachers also note that there is a lack of overall inclusion for dual language learners in education, which is the third and final theme that emerged from interviews. When asked what efforts bilingual education reform should focus on Teacher 1 said,

Include more literature not only from Spanish speaking culture but other cultures that are more reflective of what our society is. Being more aware of literature or news from other countries, and geography they can make the vocabulary more accessible for the kids... (Teacher 1, personal communication, May, 2015)

Providing these students with a broader sense of the world through testing and curriculum will help shape their world view and will also bring language and culture they are familiar with into their education experience (Hollins, 1996; Espinosa, 2005). This in turn would make that

experience more equitable and empowering for them as they would have the opportunity to learn using information and materials that they are familiar with. In the current model teachers must collaborate with one another to redesign curriculum to fit the needs of their students. Teacher 3 states,

Because of the nature of the Dual-Language model in my school, I have to collaborate with my colleagues to design curriculum and implement instruction that meets the learning targets set forth by the Common Core Standards and that aligns with what is being taught in the other grade levels. (Teacher 3, personal communication, May, 2015)

Not having the appropriate curriculum and materials to teach students automatically places them at a disadvantage in their education. They are not able to fully take part in the thoroughly researched and standardized education that their peers experience, though they are tested in the same way. Teacher 2 discusses these challenges saying,

We put so much effort in our Spanish curriculum and then they are tested in English and this is kind of saying that Spanish is not important because we are not being tested in it... we are trying to have them understand that Spanish is as valuable to them as English because it's going to open doors for them as well. (Teacher 2, personal communication, May, 2015)

This exclusion is not helpful in producing high achieving students. Legislatively the goal is to produce an equitable education system for bilingual students, however in practice teachers are continuously left to figure things out for themselves (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). Teachers are frustrated with a system that offers little support and guidance, and want better for their students and themselves. They want their students to be included and empowered in the education system while achieving at their own pace. Teacher 2 mentioned that she uses a mixture of Common Core and teacher created standards for students, and when asked which aspect of bilingual education needs reform she stated the following;

...policy makers should understand that students develop as English Language Learners, students progress at different levels and that those levels should be taken into account.

And that students are not going to learn another language in 3 years, they should be given the time to progress overtime and given the tools and the resources for that... (Teacher 2, personal communication, May, 2015)

Again, this comment on the lack of resources for dual language students learning English and Spanish is made. Legislation does provide some guidance for ELLs in the beginning of their education, however, dual language programs are not included throughout education policy. As student's progress overtime in both languages the education system at the national, state, and local level is responsible for accurately measuring their growth. Helping teachers decipher student academic achievement levels and providing them with resources that support their students' dual language development can ultimately help those students achieve at a higher level (Espinosa, 2005).

Achievement

When discussing achievement as it relates to the information presented here; much will be gleaned from the mention of achievement (albeit minimal) in legislation and policy, as well as the descriptions provided by teachers and administrators. A concerted effort is made using the definitions of achievement at a Level 1 and Level 2 to form a clear definition of the type of achievement that this dual language bilingual school fosters in students. Globally, nationally, and locally the concept of achievement is discussed as an effort in equity, inclusion, and empowerment for language minority students (Lyons, 1995; UNESCO, 2003; Sakash, 2005; Wright, 2010; Frenner & Segota, 2012; Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). No specific level of achievement was gleaned from this information; however, these things are crucial components of achievement for students. The documents analyzed here speak to the concepts of equity, inclusion, and empowerment in a number ways. There is mention of Common Core standards, Early and Late exit bilingual programs, TBE And TPI programs, and how these things

work to support social and cognitive development for students. With little to no mention of two-way dual language programs there appears to be no expectation regarding what these dual language students should achieve outside of becoming English proficient (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015). Furthermore, examining the progressively low test scores at this two-way dual language bilingual school, some guidance on achievement levels could prove beneficial in providing a firm foundation of expectations for teachers and students.

Coupled with the education goals of equity, inclusion, and empowerment the interviews provide further insight into the achievement level at the school within the three themes that emerged. Administrators and teachers do not clearly define achievement making it difficult to identify the level of achievement at this school. The principal and the teachers also define achievement differently. The principal focusing more on how students achieve in relation to mandated standards (Level 2 Achievement), and the teachers focusing more on students' individual progress (Level 1 Achievement). Interviews also revealed an overall lack of inclusion regarding assessments and resources for bilingual students. As I move through the themes that arose from the interviews, a specific level of achievement is discovered. The key to understanding the level of achievement that the school exhibits starts here.

Teachers' desires align with the first type of achievement 'Academic Progress', as they are concerned with how students are progressing individually in their classes. While administrators are most concerned with student performance on standardized assessments or 'Mastery Goals'. Teacher's also want bilingual students to be included as a priority in education policy, legislation, and assessment making so these students can fully access an equitable, inclusive, and empowering education where their outcomes reflect that of 'Achievement of Higher Order Skills and Knowledge'. When examining students test scores throughout the past

few years combined with the information presented here it is evident that the current structure is not facilitating that outcome of achievement for student. With the type of achievement being ‘Academic Progress’, the goal of achievement a ‘Mastery Goal’, and the outcome of achievement not that of ‘Achievement of Higher Order Skills and Knowledge’ this evidence suggest that this bilingual dual language school is producing a Level 1 achievement.

Discussion

The use of a vertical case study allows us to look deeper into the level of achievement produced by this elementary school by situating their dual language bilingual model within the local, national, and global context of achievement. Therefore understanding the level of achievement a two – way dual language bilingual program fosters in students is thoughtfully uncovered. Similarly to Petrzela (2010) findings here illustrate the prevalence of speaking legislatively on the need to create an equitable, inclusive, and empowering education system, however, in practice the support structures needed to achieve this for students are not there.

The evidence from the document analysis suggests that the global motivations of equity, inclusion, and empowerment have influenced the incorporation of bilingual education in national and local policies. Federal policies and local legislation discuss the tenants of equity, inclusion, and in some ways empowerment as the basis for the current system of bilingual education (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). However, those guidelines mention little to no specifics regarding achievement for dual language bilingual programs apart from reaching English proficiency. The United States has had a history of using bilingual education as a tool for students to become English proficient without maintenance of their first language (U.S. Department of Education, 2010; TESOL, 2013). This may seem like a minor detail given that the United States is an English-speaking country. However, with the

amount of Spanish speaking students in this country and given what we know about bilingual education it is surprising that there are not more specifications, resources, and guidelines in legislation and policy that adequately support two-way dual language programs. When bilingual education is mentioned in state legislation or reporting it is positioned as a way to support ELL or immigrant students not to educate them long term. This is evident in the following state legislation which states;

Districts that receive State bilingual funds are also eligible to receive federal funds to supplement expenditures in educating EL students. Of the 307 educational entities that received State bilingual funds, 205 received funds from Title III, a federal program to provide instructional support for limited English proficient and immigrant students. (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015)

Until two-way dual language programs are included in legislation as a form of continued education, providing an equitable, inclusive, and empowering education for bilingual students will prove difficult. It has proven difficult for this institution as they struggle to define achievement for their students. In practice administrators and teachers craft their own definitions of achievement for bilingual students and hope for the best. There is no explanation of what achievement is or looks like for these students (in policy or legislation) creating an uncertain foundation upon which both administrators and teachers seek out definitions in a space where one is not clearly defined.

One of three main findings in the interview analysis is that achievement is not clearly defined in the school. Administrators define achievement vaguely while teachers are focused on progress. Each person is making that very significant decision based on a set of personal beliefs and systems. This can create a culture of confusion explaining why a clear definition of achievement at this school does not appear to exist.

This explains the second interview finding that administrators and teachers define achievement differently. Teachers are more concerned with how students are progressing day to day on material and assess their students accordingly. They create their own formative assessments as there are none mandated that adequately assess bilingual dual language students' abilities. Administrators on the other hand trust mandated assessments to accurately demonstrate student abilities. Given that most high stakes assessment results carry with them decisions on school funding, school ranking, and overall reputation one can understand why school administrators may value them so highly (Nicholas, Berliner, & Noddings, 2007; Au, 2009). With teachers being responsible for what directly happens in the classroom and administrators being responsible for the school performance overall, one can understand why they would define achievement differently.

Though teachers and administrators define achievement differently one thing I believe they can agree on is that their bilingual students should have access to an equitable, inclusive, and empowering education system. Much of the schools' mission is centered on these tenants which leads us to the third and final interview theme, the lack of inclusion on behalf of dual language bilingual students. Teachers repeatedly mention their frustration with the lack of resources and assessments they have for students. They are required to use state mandated assessments and trust those results as a representation of their students' academic performance. Teachers express a significant distrust in these assessments as they do not account for the unique learning capabilities of these and other language minority students.

The final piece that anchors this information together is the level of achievement the school fosters in students. After examining the information presented above alongside the different parts of the levels of achievement, this study found this school produces a Level 1. All

parts of the Level 1 achievement are present. The first part of a Level 1 achievement being Academic Progress which teachers employ when monitoring individual student success based on their performance on teacher made formative assessments. And though administrators are concerned with student performance on standardized assessments meaning ‘Mastery Goals’ (part of a Level 2 achievement), student test scores do not currently align with this goal. We can also use those scores to infer that students are not performing Achievement of Higher Order Skills and Knowledge, the outcome of a Level 2 achievement. It then becomes evident that this school is producing a Level 1 achievement for students.

Test scores have declined, students are not progressing with the interventions from teachers, and the administrators are trying to keep performance high. The school is struggling and though not the focus of this study to figure out the exact cause; a more inclusive legislative backing and proper assessment tools for bilingual students accompanied with resources that support their learning, could potentially increase student outcomes. Improving student outcomes improves student achievement, making achieving the overarching goals of equity, inclusion, and empowerment that much more attainable for bilingual learners.

Conclusion

The main findings of this vertical case study suggest that this school is fostering a Level 1 Achievement for students; equity, inclusion, and empowerment are important on a global scale though not executed in practice at the local level, and dual language bilingual education is not well supported through legislation and policy, attributing to a major lack of resources. The guiding research questions; “What are the ways in which bilingual educators and school administrators define achievement for students?” and “What type of evidence do

educators/schools use to measure achievement?” are answered in the themes that emerged from the document and interview analysis.

Teachers and administrators define achievement differently. Teachers focusing on how students’ progress individually and administrators more focused on their performance on mandated assessments. Teachers unanimously feel that the best way to assess their students is not based on mandated standards, but on how each individual student progresses at their own pace. Assessments teachers are provided with do not support the bilingual brain and thus are not adequately assessing student achievement. This in turn means the goals of equity, inclusion, and empowerment are not supported in practice. This study provides evidence that equity, inclusion, and empowerment are important parts of achievement as they ensure students are provided with the tools they need to succeed in education. In a country where many students are a part of a language minority in public education, they become disenfranchised when an education system does not work to understand and included their learning and assessment needs.

Teachers repeatedly express their frustration and distrust in standardized assessments. They create their own formative assessments for students and rely on those to accurately portray student abilities and progress throughout the given curriculum. Fortunately, teachers have an environment where they can create helpful resources for their students. Nonetheless, helping students reach milestones and improve internally is not sufficient when the system within which they are evaluated does not support them in the same ways. No clear guidelines exist for teachers and administrators to follow. As bilingual education continues to grow domestically and abroad, it is important that the foundation upon which future policy stands is expanded to include adequate resources that will help students succeed and ultimately reach a Level 2 achievement. Equity, inclusion, and empowerment should be realized in practice, as students need be

supported to truly succeed. It is clear from the Literature Review that bilingual education can in fact bring about academic success for students (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Durán, Roseth, & Hoffman, 2010; Farver, Lonigan, & Eppe, 2009). However, having a clear definition and plan in regards to achievement is key. Administrators and teachers should work to be on the same page and testing materials should support ELL, LEP, and bilingual students by adequately reflecting their knowledge and achievement. Furthermore, state legislation should provide guidance and resources in line with Common Core for two-way dual language bilingual education. Bilingual schools within CPS should not be left to decipher achievement for themselves. Federal legislation has left it up to districts to decide how they define bilingual education for their students and districts have let administrators further decide how to implement it (Wright, 2010). Teachers are then left with the task of interpreting this for students, which has proven difficult given the lack of resources.

With the ESSA it is my hope that we can get bilingual education back on track by creating policies that are equitable, inclusive, and focus on mastery, a component of a Level 2 achievement. A Level 2 achievement is what bilingual educators and all educators should work to foster in their students, as that is what is necessary to compete in the global economy (Wright, 2010). English proficiency goals alone are no longer sufficient. Chicago, Illinois needs specific legislation that outlines goals for bilingual students.

It is hard for administrators to define achievement, teachers are focused on individual student progression, state legislation and policies do not offer guidance for a two-way dual language bilingual school, and test scores have continuously decreased over the past 4 years. The findings in this vertical case study demonstrate that some standard needs to be set signaling to teachers and administrators that bilingual education is still valued, and as such they will be

offered direction on how to facilitate achievement for their students. Bilingual students deserve more. They deserve education policies that adequately promote a Level 2 achievement so they can access equal opportunities across the world.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. How long have you been a teacher or administrator?
2. How long have you been a teacher or administrator at your current school?
3. What do you like about working at a bilingual school?
4. How do you define student achievement?
5. What are your expectations regarding achievement for your students?
6. How do you communicate those expectations to parents?
7. How would you compare student achievement here to student achievement in a monolingual school?
8. Are there any specific mandates regarding bilingual education that you are aware of, or are required to work within?
9. Is there a specific bilingual policy at this school?
 - a. If so, who writes it?
 - b. If not, who decides what policies the school will enforce?
10. Do you believe the policies put in place for bilingual education are yielding positive results in students?
 - a. If so, how?
 - b. If not, why?
11. Do you believe that bilingual education policies should be changed in any way?
 - a. If so, how?
 - b. If not, why?

Reference List

- Aguilar-Sánchez, J. (2005). English in Costa Rica. *World Englishes*, 24(2), 161-172.
- Au, W. (2009). Unequal by design: High-stakes testing and the standardization inequality. *Taylor & Francis*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Baker, C. & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon, UK; Philadelphia, PA; Ontario, Canada; NSW, Australia, Johannesburg, South Africa: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baker, K. & de Kanter, A. A. (1981). *Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of the literature*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Baker, K. & de Kanter, A. A. (1983a). An answer from research on bilingual education. *American Education*, 56, 157-169.
- Baker, K. & de Kanter A. A. (1983b). Federal policy and the effectiveness of bilingual education. In K. A. Baker & A. A. de Kanter (Eds.), *Bilingual Education* (pp. 33-85). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Banks, J. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129-139.
- Barnett, W. S., Yarosz, D. J., Thomas, J., Jung, K., Blanco, D. (2007). Two-way and monolingual English immersion in preschool education: An experimental comparison. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22(3), 277-293.
- Batt, L, Kim, J, & Sunderman, G. (2005). Limited English proficient students: Increased accountability under NCLB. The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. Retrieved from <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/nclb-title-i/limited-english-proficient-students-increased-accountability-under-nclb/batt-kim-sunderman-limited-english-proficient-2005.pdf>

- Biesanz, M. H., Biesanz, R., Biesanz, K. Z. (1999). *The Ticos: Culture and social change in Costa Rica*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Blanton, C. K. (2006). The rise of English-only pedagogy: Immigrant children, progressive education, and language policy in the United States, 1900-1930. In B. Beatty, E. D. Cahan, and J. Grant (Eds.), *When science encounters the child: Education, parenting, and child welfare in 20th century America* (pp. 56-76). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Brown, K. D., Goldstein, K. S. (2013). Preservice elementary school teachers' understanding of competing notions of achievement co-existing in post-NCLB public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 115, 1-37.
- Carter, T. P., & Chatfield, M. L. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. *American Journal of Education*, 95(1), 200-232.
- Cole, N. (1990). Conceptions of educational achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 19(3), 2-7.
- Collier, V. P. & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1).
- Cornelius, D. (2011). The education and skills gap: A global crisis. *Techniques*, 50-55. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ926104.pdf>
- Costa Rica Multilingüe. (2014). *Proyecto EILE*. Retrieved from http://www.crmultilingue.org/inicio/?page_id=33
- Crystal, D. (1999). English as she is spoke in the world: Why our tongue qualifies as the first ever global language. *Financial Times*, 4.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language. Second edition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Ontario, CA: California Association

for Bilingual Education.

Dabrowski T. & Klinger J. (2014). CPS pensions: From retirement security to political slush fund. Chicago, Illinois: Illinois Policy.

DePalma, R. (2010). *Language use in the two-way classroom: Lessons from a Spanish-English bilingual kindergarten*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Durán, L. K., Roseth, C. J., & Hoffman, P. (2010). An experimental study comparing English-only and transitional bilingual education of Spanish-speaking preschoolers' early literacy development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 25(2), 207-217.

Eccles, J. S. (1984a). Sex differences in achievement patterns. In T. Sonderegger (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, (Vol. 32). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Eccles, (Parsons), J. S. (1984b). Sex differences in mathematics participation. In M. Steinkamp and M. L. Machr (Eds.), *Advances in Motivation and Achievement* (Vol. 2). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Eccles, J., Alder, T. F., Futterman, R., Golf, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J., & Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spencer (Ed.), *Achievement and Achievement Motives*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman Publishers.

Eccles, J. S. & Wigfield, A. (1992). In the mind of the achiever: The structure of adolescents' academic achievement related beliefs and self-perceptions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 215-225.

Espinosa, L. M. (2005). Curriculum and assessment considerations for young children from culturally, linguistically, and economically diverse backgrounds. *Psychology in Schools*, 42(8), 837-853.

- Farver, J. M., Lonigan, C. J., Eppe, S. (2009). Effective early literacy skill development for young Spanish-speaking English language learners: An experimental study of two methods. *Child Development*, 80(3), 703-719.
- Frenner, D. S. & Segota, J. (2012). Standards that impact English language learners. Colorín Colorado. Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/standards-impact-english-language-learners>
- Fry, R. & Gonzales, F. (2008). A profile of Hispanic public school students: One in five and growing fast. PEW Research Center: Hispanic Trends, Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/08/26/one-in-five-and-growing-fast-a-profile-of-hispanic-public-school-students/>
- Garcia, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century a global perspective*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
- Garcia, O. & Otheguy, R. (1985). The masters of survival send their children to school: Bilingual education in the ethnic schools of Miami. *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe*, 12(1/2), 3-19. greatschools.org. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.greatschools.org/>
- Greene, J. (1997). A meta-analysis of the Rossell and Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(2), 103-122.
- Grimes, B. F. (1992). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Guadalupe, S. J. (2004). *Contested Policy*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Guadalupe, S. J., & Donato, R. (2010). Latino education in twentieth-century America: A brief history. In E. G. Murrillo Jr., S. A. Villenas, R. Trinidad Gálvan, J. Sanchez Muñoz, C. Martínez, & M. Machado-Casas (Eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and*

Education (pp. 27-62). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Guadalupe, S. J., & Valencia, R. R. (1998). From the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(3), 353-412.
- Hancock, D. R. & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hollins, E. R. (1996). *Transforming curriculum for a culturally diverse society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (1998). *Transitional Bilingual Education and Transitional Program of Instruction: Evaluation Report*. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.net/research/pdfs/ell_stu-prog_eval_rpt98.pdf
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2005). *Illinois Bilingual Education Programs:2004 Evaluation Report*. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/pdfs/ell_stu-prog_eval_rpt04.pdf
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2015). *Bilingual education programs and English learners in Illinois. SY 2013 (2012-2-13 School Year) Statistical Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/el-program-stat-rpt13.pdf>
- Kennedy, C. (2012). ESP projects, English as a global language, and the challenge of change. *Ibérica*, 24, 43-54.
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. & Hernandez, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(4), 531-545.

- Lehman, J. P. (1998). Mothers' roles a comparison between mothers of adolescents with severe disabilities and mothers of vocational students. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 21(2), 129-143.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(6), 531-545.
- Lyons, J. (1990). The past and future directions of federal bilingual education policy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508, 66-80
- McGroarty, M. (1992). The societal context of bilingual education. *Educational Researcher*, 21(2), 7-9+24.
- Méltiz, J. (2007). The impact of English dominance on literature and welfare. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, (64)2, 193-215.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- NABE (National Association for Bilingual Education). (2011). Perspectives: A publication of the National Association of Bilingual Education.
- Nicholas, S. L., Berliner, D. C., & Noddings, N. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613.
- Parker, S. W., Rubalcava, L. & Teruel, G. (2005). Schooling inequality and language barriers. *Economic Development & Cultural Change*, 54(1), 71-94.
- Petitto, L. (2009). New discoveries from the bilingual brain and mind across the life span:

Implications for education. *Mind, Brain, And Education*, 3(4), 185-197.

Petrzela, N. M. (2010). Before the federal bilingual education act: Legislation and lived experience in California. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 85(4), 406-424.

Rennie, J. (1993). ESL and bilingual program models. *Center for Applied Linguistics: Online resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/rennie01.html>

Roberts, C. A. (1995). Bilingual education program models: a framework for understanding. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(3-4), 369-378.

Rossell, C. H., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30(1), 7-74.

Royer, J. M., Carlo, M. S., Carlisle, J. F., & Furman, G. A. (1991). A new procedure for assessing progress in Transitional Bilingual Education programs. *Bilingual Press*, 16(1), 3-14.

Sakash, K. (2005). Bilingual Education. *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/137.html>

Sakash, K. & Chou, V. (2007). Increasing the Supply of Latino Bilingual Teachers for the Chicago Public Schools. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Fall 2007. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795186.pdf>

Schulzke, M. (2014). The prospects of global English as an inclusive language. *Globalizations*, 11(2), 225-238.

Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement goal theory at the crossroads: Old controversies, current challenges, and new directions. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(1), 26-47.

TESOL International Association. (2013). Advancing excellence in English language

teaching: Overview of the Common Core State Standards Initiatives for ELLs. *A TESOL Issue Brief*.

Tucker, G. R. (1998). *A global perspective on multilingualism and multilingual education*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

UNESCO. (2003). *Education in a multilingual world*. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Laws & guidance/elementary and secondary education*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>

Vavrus, F. & Bartlett, L. (2006). Comparatively Knowing: Making a Case for the Vertical Case Study. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 8(2), 95-103.

Vavrus, F. & Bartlett, L. (2009). *Critical Approaches to Comparative Education Vertical Case Studies from Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and the Americas*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vavrus, F. & Bartlett, L. (2014a). Transversing the vertical case study: A methodological approach to studies of educational policy as practice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 45(2), 131-147.

Vavrus, F. & Bartlett, L. (2014b). Vertical case studies and the challenge of culture, context and comparison. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 16(2), 30-33.

Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 6(1), 49-78.

Willig, A. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 269-316.

Wilson, D. M. (2011). Dual language programs on the rise. *Harvard Education Letter*, 27(2), 1-

2.

Wright, W. E. (2010). Language and Education Policy for ELLs. *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. (pp. 59-63). Toronto, CA: UTP Distribution.

Zappert, L. T. & Cruz, B. R. (1977). Bilingual education: An appraisal of empirical research *ERIC Institute of Education Sciences*, 1-106.

VITA

Erica Mallett is currently the Program Manager for KIPP Houston Public Schools. She has worked fervently in education research and policy for the past 3 years. She has published a book review in the NAFSA journal and has been selected to help lead focus group research at Loyola University Chicago. Her research interests include education development and policy as well as disenfranchised student success in primary and secondary education. Often a speaker, she has presented her research at several conferences including the Comparative and International Education Society's annual conference, the Community of Scholars Research Symposium at Loyola University Chicago, Chicagoland Partners for English Language Learners at Loyola University Chicago, and the McNair Scholars symposium and annual conference. It is her hope that her work will aid in creating a more equitable education system not only in the United States but around the world.