

University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

ScholarWorks @ UTRGV

Theses and Dissertations

8-2020

A Comparative Study of Principals' Perceptions of Bilingual Education in School Districts in South Texas

Enrique H. De la Cruz

The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

De la Cruz, Enrique H., "A Comparative Study of Principals' Perceptions of Bilingual Education in School Districts in South Texas" (2020). *Theses and Dissertations*. 650.

<https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/etd/650>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. For more information, please contact justin.white@utrgv.edu, william.flores01@utrgv.edu.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF BILINGUAL
EDUCATION IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN SOUTH TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

ENRIQUE H. DE LA CRUZ

Submitted to the Graduate College of
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

August 2020

Major Subject: Educational Leadership

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF BILINGUAL
EDUCATION IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN SOUTH TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

ENRIQUE H. DE LA CRUZ

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Velma Menchaca
Chair of Committee

Dr. Marie Simonsson
Committee Member

Dr. Roberto Zamora
Committee Member

Dr. Federico Guerra
Committee Member

Dr. Francisco Guajardo
Committee Member

August 2020

Copyright 2020 Enrique H. De La Cruz

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

De La Cruz, Enrique H., A Comparative Study of Principals' Perceptions of Bilingual Education in School Districts in South Texas. Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), August, 2020, 156 pp., 8 tables, references, 261 titles.

At a time when school leaders are held accountable for academic achievement and student growth, this study served to inform school leaders, who implement bilingual education programs, on the influence their perceptions have in their students' academic success. This study examined and described elementary principals' perceptions about bilingual education in a district implementing an early-exit bilingual program and in a district implementing a dual language bilingual program and its effectiveness to help ELLs achieve academic success. The study focused in determining if elementary principals' perceptions were a function of their bilingual proficiency or language discourse, level of academic knowledge of bilingual education, and years of experience in bilingual education.

An explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) was selected for the study. The quantitative and qualitative data collected during the study provided insight into factors that influence elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs, specifically early-exit and dual language. The data provided a look at the similarities and differences that exist amongst elementary principals about their perceptions of bilingual education in an area where stakeholders are predominantly English and Spanish speakers.

Through survey instrumentation and focus interviews, the researcher developed a picture of principals' experiences with two different models of bilingual education. This study found that there is a statistically significant association in the perception held by elementary principals regarding bilingual education as it relates to academic knowledge, years of experience, and their language discourse, i.e. bilingual proficiency, [$R=.43$, $R^2=.19$, $p<.05$]. The study also found that there was a statistically significant difference in elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education based on the two bilingual programs, early-exit and dual language, [$t=3.79$, $p<.05$].

DEDICATION

The completion of my doctoral program would not have been possible without the love and support of my family. I want to thank my children, Enrique III, Victoria, Valerie, and Viviana for their love and understanding throughout this journey. Thank you kids for those nights when you had to do homework in the hallway and wait until my class was over. I want to thank my wife, Belinda, who along with my stepdaughters, Karina, Katrina, and Kaylei, understood how important this undertaking was for me. I also want to thank my brothers and sisters for their continued support but especially Juan and Jesus who encouraged and challenged me to take on this endeavor.

I want to dedicate this doctoral degree to my parents, Enrique and Maria Elena De La Cruz, who instilled in me a passion for learning and an understanding of perseverance. *Gracias Mamá y Papá por su amor, apoyo, y bendiciones.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Velma Menchaca, chair of my dissertation committee, for her support, guidance, and encouragement in helping me to bring this dissertation to fruition. My most sincere thanks go to my dissertation committee members: Dr. Marie Simonsson, Dr. Roberto Zamora, Dr. Federico Guerra, and Dr. Francisco Guajardo. Your advice, input, and comments on my dissertation helped to ensure that I understood the importance of this experience. Thank you for being a great inspiration for students. Thank you Dr. Simonsson for helping me make sense of my data.

I would also like to thank the office staff of the Organization and School Leadership department for being readily available to assist me with any pressing situation. Also, I would like to thank and acknowledge the principals who participated in this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Theoretical Framework.....	8
Methodology.....	11
Definition of Terms.....	12
Significance of the Study	14
Research Hypotheses	15

Limitations of the Study.....	15
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	17
Historical Context	18
Bilingual Education 1960-1990	24
Bilingual Education 1991-2017	30
Bilingual Education in Texas.....	34
Bilingual Education/Bilingualism in South Texas.....	39
Bilingual Education Programs	42
Benefits of Dual Language Programs	47
Language Discourse.....	50
Principals' Perceptions.....	53
Leadership Roles.....	55
Experience in Bilingual Education Programs	60
Knowledge of Bilingual Education.....	62
Future of Bilingual Education.....	64
Summary	68
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	69

Research Design.....	70
Sample.....	74
Instrumentation	75
Data Collection Procedures.....	76
Data Analysis Procedures	78
Summary	79
CHAPTER IV. QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS.....	80
Language Discourse.....	81
Academic Knowledge.....	82
Years of Experience in Bilingual Education.....	83
Language Discourse, Academic Knowledge and Years of Experience.....	84
Bilingual Programs	86
Summary.....	86
CHAPTER V. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS	88
Principal's Expectations.....	89
Bilingual Proficiency	91
Bilingual Programs	93

Summary	94
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION.....	96
Summary of Findings.....	96
Discussion of Findings.....	100
Recommendations	103
REFERENCES	105
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A. BILINGUAL SURVEY	141
APPENDIX B. FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS	147
APPENDIX C. TABLES	149
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	156

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha for Language Discourse Subscale	150
Table 2: Bivariate Pearson Correlation for Language Discourse Subscale	150
Table 3: Bivariate Pearson Correlation for Academic Knowledge	151
Table 4: Bivariate Pearson Correlation for Years in Bilingual Education.....	151
Table 5: Multiple Linear Regression Stepwise Method	152
Table 6: Multiple Linear Regression Enter Method	153
Table 7: Three-Way ANOVA-Main and Combined Effects	153
Table 8: Independent Samples t-Test.....	155

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The population of English Language Learners (ELLs) in the United States has continuously been on the rise (Khong & Saito, 2014). Of the 74 million children in the United States today, 17.5 million are Hispanic and the largest and fastest growing racial/ethnic minority group (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017; Murphey, Guzman, & Torres, 2014). Hispanic children make up 80 percent of the U.S. English language learner population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017; Garcia, 2007; Capps, Fix, Murray, Ost, Passel, & Herwantoro, 2005). The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2017) reports that in the 2014-2015 school year, there were close to five million ELLs in the United States. The majority of ELLs are from families that migrated from Mexico and other Latin America countries (Zong & Batalova, 2016). In 2013, Mexican-born immigrants accounted for 28 percent of the 41.3 million foreign born in the United States, making them by far the largest immigrant group in the country (Zong & Batalova, 2015). The children of these immigrant families are registered in schools where they are expected to receive an adequate education.

Young Hispanics often come from two-parent families, have a strong work ethic, value education, and are bilingual (Garcia, 2007). However, Hispanic students continue to face challenges in school, and for some, graduation is not a reality. ELLs are among the lowest performing group of students in the nation's schools in terms of graduation rates and high-stakes testing performance (Zacarian, 2012). Over the last three decades, the dropout rate of Hispanic

students remains at a staggering rate of approximately 30% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). The status dropout rate has improved from 27.8% to 9.2% in the period between 2000 and 2015 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). The status dropout rate consists of the number of youth between the ages of 16 to 24 who are no longer enrolled in school and have not earned a high school diploma or a General Education Development certificate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017).

Even though there have been favorable trends, Hispanics continue to lag behind their White and Asian American peers at all proficiency levels of reading and mathematics throughout all levels of schooling (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016; Braswell, Daane, & Grigg, 2003; National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). One possible reason for this achievement gap is that most bilingual programs are transitional, with the goal to transition from the students' native language to English as quickly as possible (Babino & Gonzalez-Carriedo, 2015).

Transitional bilingual education programs, also known as early-exit bilingual education, use both languages for instruction, but the ratio of English to Spanish increases over time. The primary purpose of a transitional bilingual program is to facilitate the ELLs transition to an all English instructional program (U.S. Department of Education, 2018). Baker and Kanter (1981) define transitional bilingual education as a program in which subject matter is taught in the children's home language until their English is strong enough to participate in an all-English classroom. The use of the students' native language is gradually phased out, and the use of English phased in (Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005). Academic achievement results have shown that students who receive transitional bilingual classes achieve higher achievement levels

than students who receive English-only instruction (Whitacre, 2015). Most transitional bilingual education programs are subtractive and remedial; the goal of these programs is monolingualism in English with little or no second language support (Collier & Thomas, 2009).

A proposed solution to improving the achievement gap requires rich language environments early in children's education, starting in pre-kindergarten with dual-language programs and high quality, bilingual teachers (Garcia, 2007). Research shows that ELLs in dual language programs not only close the achievement gap concerning standardized test scores, but also surpass native English speakers in academic achievement (Estrada, Gomez, & Ruiz-Escalante, 2009; Gomez, 2006; Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005). Many educators and policymakers see dual language as a promising way to close achievement gaps and foster academic success for ELLs and other disadvantaged students (Li, Steele, Slater, Bacon, & Miller, 2016).

Dual language programs are growing at record rates in the United States. Dual language programs, such as two-way immersion, combine students from two language groups for instruction in both of their languages (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2016). According to the Center for Applied Linguistics (2014), 441 schools are implementing two-way bilingual immersion programs, serving students in grades Pre-K through 12. The increasing popularity of these innovative programs is because they are considered the most reliable form of bilingual education (Babino & Gonzalez-Carriedo, 2015).

Research has shown that bilingual education is consistently superior to all-English approaches, and that developmental bilingual education programs are superior to transitional bilingual education programs (Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005). It is important to remember

that being bilingual can benefit young children's development and learning, particularly in terms of their inhibitory control and cognitive flexibility (Barac, Bialystok, Castro, & Sanchez, 2014; Carlson & Meltzoff, 2008; Martin-Rhee & Bialystok, 2008; Morales, Calvo, & Bialystok, 2013; Poarch & van Hell, 2012; Poulin-Dubois, Blaye, Coutya, & Bialystok, 2011). The U.S. Department of Education (2015) through Title III proposes three basic models of bilingual education: Transitional, Developmental, and Two-way bilingual educational programs (Weimer, Kuri, Esquiedo, Guajardo, & Correa, 2015).

In Texas, the number of students participating in bilingual or English as a second language program increased by 47.9% in the last ten years (*Secondary School Completion*, 2017). These ELLs can be taught using any one of the following four different programs to develop English proficiency: English as a second language, English Immersion, transitional bilingual education, and two-way/dual language bilingual education (Texas Education Code § 29.053, 2019). Texas school districts have to report to the State their choice of bilingual program to be implemented. For example, a school district must decide on implementing an early-exit or late exit transitional bilingual program, or implementing a dual language program (Whitacre, 2015).

The state of Texas is experiencing rapid growths in the number of immigrant families migrating from Mexico and other Latin America countries. The Texas Education Agency reports that Hispanic students account for the most significant percentage of total enrollment (52.4%), followed by White (28.1%), African American (12.6%), and Asian students (4.2%) (*Secondary School Completion*, 2017). In the 2016-2017 school year, Texas had 888,307 students enrolled in bilingual education (*Secondary School Completion*, 2017). According to the 19 Texas Administrative Code § 89.1201, the goal of bilingual education programs shall be

to enable ELLs to become competent in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English through the development of literacy and academic skills in the primary language and English (19 Texas Administrative Code § 89.1201, 2019).

Over the last five years, the dropout rate in Texas for ELLs remains 29% (2014 Comprehensive Biennial Report, 2015). The dropout rate for the 2015-2016 school year alone was at 17.1% (*Secondary School Completion*, 2017). These changes have prompted an urgency for public school administrators to be more innovative and progressive in creating learning opportunities for ELLs and enrichment opportunities for all other students. Administrators need to ensure that the programs offered in their schools are beyond adequate to provide students with an education that will prepare them for a diverse and global society. Administrators and parents are aware that bilingualism is a valuable skill in today's globalized communities, economies, and world markets (Murphy, 2016). District and school personnel should make it a goal to have as many students as possible educated in multiple languages (Murphy, 2016).

In response to these needs, schools and parents have sought alternative methods for meeting the academic needs of children (Adelman & Vallone, 2007; Crawford, 2007; Thomas & Collier, 2003b). Dual language bilingual programs offer such an alternative. This model provides an opportunity for students to develop skills in two languages. This model also improves their overall academic achievement by working with native-English speaking students and using both languages to learn academic content (Gomez & Gomez, 2017; Murphy, 2016; Estrada et al., 2009). This method calls for providing high-quality instruction in two languages for all bilingual students (Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005; Ovando, 2003). The ability to communicate in two languages and interact with a diverse group of people is an asset for these students as they enter an increasingly globalized world (Marian, Shook, & Schroeder, 2013).

This study analyzed and compared the perceptions that principals hold about bilingual education programs. The study is not meant to determine whether bilingual education programs are successful but rather to investigate whether principals' perceptions of these programs are a function of their language discourse, academic knowledge of bilingual education, and professional years of experience in bilingual education. In addition, a comparison was made between the principals' perceptions of a dual language bilingual program in one district with those of principals' perceptions of an early-exit transitional bilingual program in the other.

Statement of the Problem

Bilingual education programs, such as Early-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education, continues as a reality for over 93% of school districts in south Texas (Weimer et al., 2015). Since under this current bilingual program the achievement gap between ELLs and native-English speakers is not closing, there is a need to analyze the perceptions of principals regarding their district's bilingual program's effectiveness (strengths) or inadequacy (weaknesses). The study analyzed principals' perceptions of two different bilingual programs to help determine if there exists a desire for the implementation of more effective bilingual programs (Weimer et al., 2015).

The majority of bilingual education programs implemented in Texas help students reach English proficiency, not increase their proficiency in their native language, in most cases Spanish (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Principals perform the role of gatekeepers to new programs (Fullan, 2007). If principals fail to view bilingual education programs as essential, they will not develop a full understanding of the program which could lead to incorrect

implementation and an ultimate loss of effectiveness. Without strong leadership, fad cycle tendencies will dominate, including a flawed understanding of the program and failed shifts in paradigm, which chip away at programs' successes (Cuban, 1988). Without strong leadership, the sustainability of any bilingual program is questionable. Therefore, a crucial component in the implementation and sustainability of a bilingual education program is an active and committed principal who plans with staff to oversee and evaluate the program (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

Principals are vital instructional leaders who have formed their perceptions based on individual classroom experiences (Collier & Thomas, 2004). In the shaping of the school's culture, these personal perceptions are essential factors worth further exploration (Baker, 2005). The study examined perceptions and knowledge of principals concerning bilingual education and its effectiveness to help ELLs achieve academic success. A need exists to study the school leader's perceptions and attitudes about bilingual education and its impact on student achievement of ELLs (Gentilucci & Mutto, 2007). Research must continue to help educators understand the benefits of these programs because of the misconceptions that surround it. The study investigated principals' perceptions of the dual language and the early-exit transitional bilingual programs based on the independent and combined influence of the language discourse of principals, the level of academic knowledge of bilingual education, and years of professional experience in bilingual education.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the study:

1. What is the expectation of the principals' school district concerning bilingual education and to what extent does this expectation influence his or her perceptions?
2. How does a principal's language discourse (bilingual proficiency) influence his or her perception of bilingual education programs?
3. How does a principal's perception of bilingual education programs relate to the level of academic knowledge of bilingual education, years of experience in a bilingual education, and language discourse?
4. How does the principal's perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is guided by two theories, perception theory and Jim Cummins' theory of second language acquisition. Together they provide a theoretical basis for the study. Most people who plan instructional systems or prepare instructional materials have not considered looking to perception theory and research as a practical resource. This may be partly due to the lack of apparent connections between perception theories and association models of the learning process (Norberg, 1978). John W. Gyr (1972) and R. L. Gregory (1970) proposed that perception involves an interpretation of the outside world, not just a receiving or beholding of it, and that acting on the experience and providing feedback is required, along with optical stimulation (Norberg, 1978). Instead of learning by association, one might say the learner comes to know the association by directly perceiving it.

If perception is regarded as a constructive process, in some degree an interpretation of the "outside" world, and not just a direct apprehension of some presumed pre-existent reality, it then becomes reasonable to inquire into the means by which perceptual judgments are formed (Norberg, 1978). Many factors that influence how we perceive the external world are tied to social norms and what we feel should happen based on what we know about previous similar experiences, also called conceptual knowledge (Collins, 2014). Perceptions may be created or initiated by external events that the experiencer perceives as positive, negative, neutral, critical, or unimportant (Baker, 2010). Constructivist perception theory is compatible with the notion that perceptual experience in education can be usefully conceived as a means of serving the operational and developmental needs of the learner in properly phased coordination with other modes of behavior and representation (Norberg, 1978). Some philosophers are convinced that the world is a sum of information surrounding a subject and what we perceive are only perceptions and there is nothing else accessible to us except perceptions (Demuth, 2013).

Plato believed that education was seeing things differently; therefore, as our conception of truth changes, so will our education (Lodhi, 2017). Perception is the end product of the interaction between stimulus and internal hypotheses, expectations, and knowledge of the observer, while motivation and emotions play an essential role in this process (Demuth, 2013). Perceptions can be considered to be an individual's frame of reference. Principals' perceptions of a bilingual program are based on what they believe and have experienced (Smith, 2001). For example, information on bilingual education is gained through experiences and continued professional development in the area of bilingual education which is then processed through the school administrators' frame of reference. It is this frame of reference or perception that guides

the implementation and support of bilingual education in most cases. Furthermore, an administrator's perception has important implications for whether bilingual education will be valued and implemented with fidelity. Individual differences in our way of thinking, our personal history and uniqueness of our current disposition open up questions of subjectivity or objectivity of perception and the problem of individual dissimilarities (Demuth, 2013). Looking to the future, the place of perception theory in education will be determined by experimental testing of psychological hypotheses and philosophic assumptions (Norberg, 1978).

Jim Cummins' second language acquisition theory provides information on how to educate linguistically and culturally diverse students with varying levels of English language proficiency (Collier, 1995). Cummins believed that if a learner has already learned a language, namely their native tongue, then they are readily equipped to learn a second. This previous knowledge serves to support their understanding of basic skills and concepts related to language and, thus, a second language should theoretically come more natural to them, as would a third or even fourth come even easier as they progress (The Latino Family Project, 2018).

The second language acquisition theory supports dual language as a form of additive bilingualism in which the students' native language continues to be developed while acquiring the second language (Shoebottom, 2011). In comparison to early transition programs where ELL students are believed to have achieved English proficiency and acquired academic language cognition, dual language programs could continue offering high-quality language arts instruction in both languages for a more extended period (Thomas & Collier, 2003). In addition, second language acquisition research shows that the most effective bilingual programs require five to

seven years for ELLs to be at the same level as native English speakers regarding academic language (Shoebottom, 2011).

Jim Cummins (1998) hypothesized that children's achievement in the second language depends on the level of the mastery of their native language and that the most-positive cognitive effects occur when both languages are highly developed. Furthermore, Cummins states that development of both languages is a result of instruction provided to students in their native tongue in all subjects in a self-contained classroom with other students who speak the same language while being taught English by the bilingual teacher (Rossell, 2009).

Methodology

A mixed method design consisted of a survey and a focus group. A mixed method design provides the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell, 2009). In a mixed method design, the researcher collects and analyzes data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007). The collection and analysis of the quantitative and qualitative designs allow the researcher to examine in more detail the survey instrument (Munoz, 2006).

A quantitative research design using multiple linear regression determined whether specific variables are related and to what degree will be used (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2008). The researcher sought to answer if the dependent variable, principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs, is a function of academic knowledge of bilingual education, years of experience, and language discourse.

Focus groups are a form of qualitative research that consists of interviews in which a group of participants are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes toward a concept or idea (Nagle & Williams, 2017). A focus group is a strong research option as it allows for participants with similar skills and understandings to share their experiences. Focus groups also provide insights into how participants think and provide a deeper understanding of the phenomena being studied. Focus group interviews provide the researcher with the ability to capture more in-depth information than individual interviews (Nagle & Williams, 2017). The principals were grouped to form focus groups in their respective districts. Open-ended questions were asked regarding their perceptions about their districts bilingual education program. The questions were drawn from the *Survey on Bilingual Education* that was previously used in White's (2008) study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and their definitions are essential in establishing the context for this study.

Bilingual Education: Involves teaching academic content in two languages with varying amounts of time spent in both the native language and second language depending on the specific program (Parmon, 2010).

English Language Learner (ELL): A student who is unable to communicate fluently or efficiently learn in English, who often comes from a non-English-speaking home and background, and who requires specialized or modified instruction in both the English language and in academic courses (Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez, 2011).

English as a second language (ESL): An instructional program designed to teach English language learners to become proficient in English through the integrated use of second language methods in order to enable equitable participation in school (19 Texas Administrative Code § 89.1201, 2019).

Dual language program: A program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages and that promotes bilingualism and bi-literacy, grade level academic achievement, and multicultural competence for all students (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007).

Two-Way Dual Language program: This program is also referred to as two-way immersion (TWI), two-way bilingual education, enriched education, dual immersion (DI), and Dual Language Education (DLE). Two-way programs differ from one-way programs by the population they serve. The program serves both language learners and native English speakers in an enrichment setting with a focus on a rigorous curriculum and development of academic vocabulary and proficiency in two languages (Hill, Gomez, & Gomez, 2008).

One-Way Dual Language program: This program provides instruction in two languages for one language group (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005; Hill, Gomez, & Gomez, 2008).

First language: This term refers to a person's native language.

Second language: This term refers to the language of the majority people group. In Texas, the majority language is English.

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE): A program in which both the home language and English are used as instructional languages on a temporary basis. The program aims at

diminishing classroom use of the home language and establishing an English-only environment as quickly as possible (Murphy, 2014).

Hispanic: A Spanish-speaking person living in the US, one of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American descent (Austin & Johnson, 2012).

Language Discourse: The use of written or spoken language in a social context. While discourse can refer to the smallest act of communication, the analysis can be quite complex. Several scholars in many different disciplines have theorized about the different types and functions of discourse (Literary Devices, 2019).

Significance of the Study

In addressing perceptions of a particular segment of the school population, this study has the potential of awakening an awareness of the need for instructional leaders to self-assess their perceptions of other specialized groups within their school environments and their program needs. The dual language program is on the heels of bilingual education as the new response to the diversity of languages spoken in today's 21st century American classrooms (Gomez, 2006). Principals are key instructional leaders who have arguably formed their perspectives based on individual classroom experiences. These perspectives are important factors in creating a school's academic culture and as such are worth exploring further (Baker, 2005).

The study provided information about principals' perceptions of bilingual education that can assist school districts with their hiring process and professional development of school principals. Principals' perceptions need to be considered as they are the decision makers that affect student achievement. The study noted that participants believed that their bilingual program encouraged both bilingualism and the academic success of students. Furthermore,

principals believed that their bilingual program addressed the needs of the students and community they served. Language discourse and academic knowledge of bilingual education were significant factors that influenced these principals' perceptions. The better versed the principals were about bilingual education and the benefits it provides, the more impact they had on students' academic achievement.

Research Hypotheses

Research question 3 and 4 were developed into hypothetical constructs, research hypotheses that were used in the study. The following research hypotheses were used in this study.

H¹ There is a statistically significant relationship in public elementary school principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs and language discourse, academic background knowledge and professional years of experience.

H² There is a statistically significant difference in elementary school principals' perceptions based on the bilingual program implemented.

Limitations of the Study

The population defined for this research study was from school districts in South Texas implementing two different bilingual education programs; therefore, the findings may not be generalizable to other school districts. In addition, the response rates of the participants were low. There were 79 elementary school principals surveyed but only 47 responded of which 38 of them completed the survey in its entirety. Twenty were selected and invited to participate in focus groups and nine ended up participating.

The Bilingual Survey used in the study was checked for validity and reliability. A review of the 31 items measuring perceptions produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.68 which fell under the minimum level of acceptable reliability of 0.70. After conducting factor analysis to determine the validity and reliability of the survey questions, only 15 items indicated internal consistency and reliability (IDRE, 2016). These 15 items, which produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83, were used in data analysis.

When answering questions 7 and 8, data from the survey indicated that all the participants were bilingual and not one was monolingual resulting in a very small variance of language discourse. The two-way and three-way ANOVA was not used as a statistical analysis because a common mean between variables of different groups, bilingual and monolingual, could not be analyzed. Instead, a linear regression, which is mainly used to make estimates or predictions for the dependent variable with the help of single or multiple independent variables, was used for the data analysis of the principals' perceptions as they relate to academic knowledge, years of experience in bilingual education, and the language discourse subscale in the survey.

Additionally, variations of implementation of both the early-exit and the dual language bilingual programs have to be taken into account. Principals do not necessarily implement the bilingual program in their districts the same way due to the pressure of meeting district goals, or student needs.

A review of the literature follows in the next chapter to provide a firm foundation for the advancement of knowledge by facilitating theory development, identifying areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovering areas where research is needed (Levy & Ellis, 2006).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Education is seen as being critical to economic success and economic growth. O'Shea (1999) stated that economic and social status is increasingly conferred on the basis of access to, and performance in the education system (Belanger, 2001). As the racial and ethnic diversity in the United States population increases, so do social issues including those in education and most notably those concerning the Hispanic population (Oropesa & Landale, 2004). The United States is experiencing rapid growths in the number of immigrant families coming from Mexico and other Latin America countries. The children of these immigrant families are enrolled in schools where they are expected to receive an adequate education. Most of these children are enrolled in bilingual programs and aspire to become proficient in the English language. Nevertheless, there exist many inconsistencies in implementing and differing views as to which bilingual program is best suited to meet the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). These inconsistencies have brought about debates as to whether or not bilingual education is effective. To understand some of the current issues related to bilingual education, it is essential to understand the events that led to the development of this program.

Historical Context

English was not always the language of instruction in American schools. During the eighteenth century, classes were conducted in German, Dutch, French, and Swedish in some schools in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia (Porter, 1998). In the 19th century, bilingualism and bilingual education were quite common in the United States. Immigrants who wanted to educate their children in their native language and culture formed schools to maintain the traditions of their homeland (Weimer, Kuri, Esquierdo, Guajardo, & Correa, 2015). The history of immigration to the United States is a continuing story of peoples from all over the world looking for better social and economic opportunities. Immigrant families learned that social and economic advancement could be attained through education.

The Common School was built on the premise of utilizing education as a means of equalizing academic opportunities across all social classes. Horace Mann was a great champion of education for all and felt that education was to be used as the chief instrument for assimilating the foreign-born into the mainstream of American life and culture (Pulliam & Van Patten, 2007). Approximately 35 million immigrants came to America in the nineteenth century, and they were Americanized mainly by public schools (Pulliam & Van Patten, 2007).

Germans valued education and their influence was evident in establishing state laws that allowed for bilingual instruction (Ramsey, 2009). The importance placed by the German community on knowing two languages was due to the concern of losing their rich culture in literature and the financial benefits it provided (Ramsey, 2009). In 1839, Ohio became the first state to adopt a bilingual education law that would allow teachers to instruct in both English and German (Rodriguez et al., 2014). Louisiana followed with a provision for French-English

instruction in 1847 and then New Mexico in 1850 for Spanish-English instruction (Rodriguez, Carrasquillo, & Soon-Lee, 2014). In Texas in 1832, Anglo Texans such as Stephen F. Austin desired bilingual education to help assimilate Anglos into Mexican life (Blanton, 2004). The German-English School of San Antonio, in 1858, non-German, English speaking students were mixed in with German speakers where both languages were taught (Blanton, 2004). The dual language program flourished during the 1870s and 1880s, and it became a very lucrative program because it gave Anglo-American students an opportunity to also learn two languages (Ramsey, 2009). The reasons found for implementing bilingual education in the 1800s were to Americanize foreign-language immigrants and to appease the large population of recent immigrants (Ramsey, 2009). Bilingual education helped in assimilating people into the diverse cultures that existed at that time.

The United States was involved in World War I from 1914 to 1918. By 1917, Americans demanded that German-English instruction be eradicated (Cerde & Hernandez, 2006). Controversial issues that arose concerning bilingual education involved racial prejudice and language restrictions that created a hostile environment toward immigrants as English was viewed as the dominant language. The prevalence of a war against the United States was the cause of a counterattack against language minorities. Nieto (2009) writes the following:

In 1917, President Theodore Roosevelt stated his support for English being the language of the American people by saying, “We have room for but one language in this country and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house” (p. 62).

The story of Mexican immigrants is similar to the many ethnic groups that migrated to the United States in search of opportunities. However, Mexico's proximity to the United States makes it a compelling case as to how these opportunities came about. In 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, concluding the Mexican War, extended U.S. citizenship to approximately 60,000 Mexican residents of the New Mexico Territory and 10,000 living in California. In 1850, New Mexico adopted its first bilingual education law for instruction in English and Spanish. In 1871, the first Texas superintendent of public instruction, Jacob C. De Gress, administered the state's brief sanctioning of bilingual education by providing German and Spanish instruction for no more than two hours a day to ensure a bilingual climate essential for the growth and support of public schools (Blanton, 2004)

The Mexican Revolution of 1910 also sends thousands of Mexicans over the border in search of refuge that end up settling in the United States. In addition to the vast number of immigrants coming into the United States, industrialization and urbanization also helped to create a period of rapid social change (Ramsey, 2009). This change was evident in the southern part of the United States where a significant number of Mexicans from the interior of Mexico were finding their way to the border towns in search of better wages. An estimated 300,000 native-born *Tejanos* and Mexican immigrants increased the population in Texas (Blanton, 2004). Mexico's migration was initially encouraged by the United States with the construction of the railroad system across borders and with the *Bracero* Accords in which Mexican workers were recruited to help ease labor force shortages in their economy that resulted due to many factors (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002). In 1904 the completion of the St. Louis-Brownsville-Mexican Railroad marked the beginning of the new economic transformation in South Texas (San Miguel, 1987).

The United States, as well as Mexico, encouraged Mexicans from the interior of Mexico to move to border areas with the promise of work on the railroad. U.S. railroad companies were happy with the migration flow. This was the first immigrant contract labor program for Mexicans (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002).

The first *bracero* program was initiated during WWI. The war would bring about fears and uneasiness to the country in regards to non-English speakers and German Americans in particular. There was a sense of distrust in the American people towards all immigrants. Consequently, bilingual education was also affected. Mexican immigration had a particularly strong impact on educational institutions (San Miguel, 1987). The Progressive Education philosophy advanced the notion of Americanization and English-only curriculum (Blanton, 2004). English-only instruction laws were enacted to Americanize non-English speakers with expediency (San Miguel, 1987). By 1918 English-only was to be fully enforced in Texas as a mandate with specific criminal punishments (Blanton, 2004; San Miguel, 1987). In the 1920s Americanization was more focused on Mexican Americans with disastrous educational results and adding to the racist school segregation of Mexican Americans (Blanton, 2004). By the mid-1920s bilingual education was dismantled (Parmon, 2010).

Despite the social and educational changes taking place Mexicans continued to search for opportunities in the United States. Mexicans easily found employment as a result of the Immigration Act of 1917 which restricted the entry of Asians to the country (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002). The Act would have also restricted illiterate Mexicans from entering the country had it not been for the shortage of labor during the period between 1917 and 1921 in the U.S. (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002).

The period of industrialization growth in the U.S. during the 1930s eventually led to the official *Bracero* Program of 1942 (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002). Due to the flight of American workers to the areas of the country where industrialization growth was occurring, a shortage of farm workers resulted. In 1941 U.S. farmers had no choice but to ask the U.S.D.A. to allow workers from Mexico to be brought in. The U.S. created the MFLA or *Bracero* Program of 1942 only as a temporary program in which the U.S. contracted Mexican workers for short-term farm labor (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002). According to Rodriguez-Scott (2002), the negotiations over the guest worker program occurred between U.S. President Roosevelt and Mexican President Avila Camacho.

Those that signed on to the *Bracero* Program were given temporary working visas to enter and work in the U.S. Once their contracts expired, they were to return their visas and return to Mexico. Unfortunately, from the beginning, Mexican braceros were at a disadvantage when they were required to sign English only contracts in order to work (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002). Because of their lack of knowledge of the English language and inability to understand their contracts, Mexican immigrants stayed in the United States looking for more opportunities once their contracted work had been completed.

Mexican migration to the United States has been a significant area of contention for U.S.-Mexico bilateral relations since the 1920s. Despite restrictive U.S. immigration law, Mexico continues to be the leading country of origin for legal and illegal immigrants (Rodriguez-Scott, 2002). The language used to instruct them was not very clear, so English-only classrooms were the norm in the country through the 1940s and 1950s. English-only pedagogy served as a convenient tool for maintaining segregated schools in Texas, where it was legally protected, as

the language was racialized by the *Salvatierra* decision (Blanton, 2004). In the court case of Independent School District v. Salvatierra, the court declared that school officials were not enforcing unlawful segregation because the school district's method of classifying Mexican students as non-English speakers for placement purposes was not arbitrary or unconstitutional (San Miguel, 1987). The *Salvatierra* decision allowed segregation of Mexican students based on educational grounds (San Miguel, 1987).

Educating the children of immigrant families is the responsibility of the United States as protected by the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution (Soltero, 2000). Curtis (1986) stated that the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution of 1868 protects citizens' privileges and provides equal protection under the law (Martinez, 2016). The Fourteenth Amendment does not explicitly address education, but it serves as a provision for school decisions and court cases.

The 1946 Supreme Court case of *Mendez v. Westminster* was the first to successfully challenge segregation in U.S. schools for Mexican-American students (Blanco, 2010). The plaintiffs asserted that their children, along with about 5,000 other children of Mexican origin, were discriminated against and forced to attend schools assigned to Mexican children (Wallace, 2013; San Miguel, 1987). This was the first time Mexican Americans were concluded to be "racially" segregated in public schools (Blanton, 2004; San Miguel, 1987). Even though it did not gain much popularity, it would set the stage for the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* case which made the first reference to education as a "right which must be made available to all on equal terms," when the separate but equal doctrine was established (IDRA, 2012). Mexican-Americans shared in the struggles of African-Americans as they opposed regional, national, and

international politics to find commonalities that would suppress discrimination and school segregation (Foley, 2010).

Bilingual Education 1960-1990

In the mid-1960s when the civil-rights movement for African-Americans was at its height, Latino activists began to protest the damaging circumstances that led to unacceptably high proportions of school dropouts among Spanish-speaking children (Porter, 1998). Mexican Americans were speaking out for their rights to a better education challenging the conventional wisdom that they were passive victims of their educational fates (Donato, 1997). Organizations such as the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and the Mexican American Generation dealt significantly with the language issue in a legal challenge to racial segregation in Texas public schools (Blanton, 2004).

In the 1960s, Florida and Texas offered a bilingual program that taught students in their native language and still offered English as a way to allow students to become fully bilingual (Anderson & Boyer, 1978). The first modern two-way bilingual education program was developed in 1963 for Spanish-speaking Cubans and Anglos at Coral Way Elementary School in Dade County, Miami, Florida. This was a response by federal authorities and the education community to accommodate a large number of refugees arriving regularly from Castro's Cuba; and, demonstrate to the world the creativity and flexibility of American schools (Blanton, 2004). The goal was to fuse children from both Cuban and English-speaking homes into one homogenous academic environment, thereby developing their bilingual fluency (White, 2008).

Texas followed Florida's lead closely, when in 1964, the United Independent School District in Laredo, Texas, implemented what was considered the second official bilingual education in the U.S. (Anderson & Boyer, 1978).

Education became instrumental in the war on poverty of the 1960s (San Miguel, 2004). The emerging Chicano and Chicana movement opposed to assimilation, cultural repression, and Anglo hegemony became a vital ingredient in the rationale for bilingual education (San Miguel, 2004). The Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO) led walkouts at the public schools in Edcouch-Elsa in 1968 and in Kingsville and Crystal City in 1969 demanded the immediate institution of bilingual-bicultural education (Blanton, 2004). One hundred sixty-two students walked out in Edcouch Elsa demonstrating their frustration against a racist educational environment (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004). In the fall of 1968, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) successfully filed suit against Edcouch-Elsa school district officials for expelling sixty-two students involved in the walkout (San Miguel, 1987). The students were reinstated in December 1968. Gladwell (2000) stated that the Edcouch-Elsa High School Walkout of 1968 became the tipping point in a shift of power from White to Brown in south Texas (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004).

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which guaranteed freedom against discrimination, granted the U.S. Office of Education the right to provide financial assistance where it was needed for education. The need for bilingual education was publicized in a report by the National Education Association in 1966 stating the negative impact of the schools on Mexican-American cultural identity and their school performance (San Miguel, 2004). The federal government responded to the needs of all Spanish-speakers by passing the 1965 *Elementary and Secondary*

Education Act (ESEA) which was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson. Ralph Yarborough, U.S. Senator from Texas, introduced the first bilingual education act in the U.S. on January 1967 (San Miguel, 2004). Bilingual education came to be federally recognized as a legitimate program to aid in the teaching of language minorities (Blanton, 2004).

In 1968, Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law *The Bilingual Education Act Title VII* (Crawford, 1999) as an amendment to the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1965 intended to help poor Mexican-American children learn English (Porter, 1998; San Miguel, 2004). The *Bilingual Education Acts* of 1968 and 1974, also known as Title VII, provided supplemental funding for school districts that were interested in establishing programs to meet the special education needs of large numbers of children of limited English speaking ability (White, 2008). Title VII funded 76 bilingual programs and assisted students who spoke 14 different languages (Blanco, 1978). The 1974 reauthorized *Bilingual Education Act* grew in scope to include allocated funds for professional and teacher-training development, curriculum development, research and data collection, and federal administration of bilingual education (San Miguel, 2004).

By the 1970s, classrooms began to transform as bilingual education was supported. In the case of *United States v. State of Texas et al.*, of 1971, Chief Justice William Wayne specified that the Mexican-American students in the Del Rio, Texas, school districts of San Felipe and Del Rio were subjected to segregation and subservient to unequal educational freedom (Martinez, 2016; Blanton, 2004). The court ordered that school districts provide the necessary curriculum that was designed to meet the needs of all students (Kemerer, 2010).

However, inadequate teaching practices continued to limit the educational opportunities of minority students. The Supreme Court case *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) gave momentum to the movement for equal educational opportunity which led to the passing of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act in August 1974 (Mares, 2014). The plaintiffs claimed that the San Francisco Board of Education failed to provide programs designed to meet the linguistic needs of non-English speaking students (Gollnick & Chinn, 2002, p. 265). In *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) the Supreme Court asserted that there is no equality of treatment by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum, for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education (JUSTIA 2018; White, 2008; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990). The Supreme Court's decision provided Chinese-American students with equal access to bilingual education by facilitating students' rights to an equal education that offered them the opportunity to succeed in schools (Crawford, 1998). The Lau Remedies specified students not proficient in English needed assistance and English as a Second Language (ESL), English tutoring, and/or bilingual education could serve as educational support (Wright, 2011).

Serna v. Portales, 1974, was another court case that addressed the equal access to bilingual education for students in New Mexico. A Spanish-surnamed American, Romana Serna, was seeking to demonstrate that the Portales municipal school district violated her daughter's constitutional right to equal protection of the laws as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and of their statutory rights under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (JUSTIA 2018). The court ordered the Portales municipal schools to

accommodate English Language Learners with a bilingual and bicultural curriculum to ensure student success (Cardenas, 1995).

In 1978, in the case of *Rios v. Reed*, the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of New York Judge William Wayne found that Patchogue-Medford school district's transitional bilingual program was being inadequately implemented. The reasons stated were the lack of training for school professionals in bilingual education, the absence of a clearly defined curriculum, clear entrance and exit criteria, and firm guidelines about how much instruction should be in the native language of the students (Wright, 2010). Students at Patchogue-Medford school district were deprived of an adequate education because they did not receive instruction in Spanish. Even though the court issued no specific remedies, the case is significant because it made a strong case for offering bilingual education and for doing it right (Wright, 2010).

The right to bilingual education was again contested in 1981 in the case of *Castaneda v. Pickard*. The plaintiffs argued that the Raymondville Independent School District engaged in deliberately implementing policies and practices that were racially discriminatory against Mexican-American students (Martinez, 2016). The Raymondville Independent School District was failing to address the needs of English language learners as mandated by the Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA) of 1974 (Wright, 2010). The court found that Raymondville ISD fell short of meeting the requirements of the EEOA leading to the creation of a three-pronged test to determine whether schools are taking action to address the needs of English language learners as required by the EEOA (Wright, 2010). The three prongs of the *Casteñeda vs. Pickard* test for language programs are: (1) that the program is based on research, (2) that the program is implemented with fidelity, and (3) that the program achieves the intended

results for students' language proficiency and content achievement (Grayson, 2016). The Castaneda test has essentially become the law of the land in determining the adequacy of programs for English language learners (Wright, 2010).

Six years after *Castaneda v. Pichard*, 1981, *Gomez v. Illinois State Board of Education*, 1987, Senior Circuit Judge Eschbach declared that school districts had the responsibility to provide English language learners an education suitable to their linguistic abilities in order to comprehend the instruction being provided (Martinez, 2016). The class action suit was brought on by the named plaintiffs on behalf of Spanish-speaking children of limited English proficiency who claimed that their school districts had not tested them for English language proficiency nor had they received bilingual instruction or compensatory instruction (JUSTIA, 2018). Plaintiffs argued that their rights had been violated under the *Equal Educational Opportunities Act* of 1974 (EEOA), Title VI of the *Civil Rights Act* of 1964, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution (JUSTIA, 2018). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit relied heavily on *Castaneda* in its decision and gave state boards of education the power to enforce compliance with the EEOA (Wright, 2010).

Even though bilingual education was gaining favor in the courts, the politics of language education during the Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations began to suppress its momentum (Ovando, 2010). President Reagan acknowledged that there was a need to educate students who spoke a foreign language through bilingual education, but not to the extent of preserving their native language (Lyons, 1990). According to Reagan, preserving a student's native language meant a lesser opportunity to acquire English adequately and therefore reducing their opportunity to participate in the job market (Crawford, 1999, p.53; Lyons, 1990; Ovando,

2010). In limiting the role of the federal government, Reagan put a halt to the growth of bilingual education by decreasing funding from 158 million to 133 million (San Miguel, 2004).

Bilingual Education 1991-2017

The Department of Education released in February 1991 the Ramirez Report, which was a comprehensive study, comparing the three most common methods of teaching English language learners: late-exit bilingual education, early-exit bilingual education, and English immersion (San Miguel, 2004). The final results of the study concluded that all three methods worked and that administrators could choose the method that best suited their students (San Miguel, 2004). The Department of Education's bilingual education director, Rita Esquivel, hoped that the study would lay to rest the political storm over the use of native language instruction versus immersion programs in which only English was used (San Miguel, 2004).

The *Improving America's Schools Act* of 1994 (IASA) was the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* and President Bill Clinton's effort to reform education (Riddle, 1995). Clinton proposed that the IASA reclassify the program's functionality rather than pedagogical doctrines and be inclined toward programs that developed native-language skills and at the same time fomented second language acquisition and academic attainment (Crawford, 2002). This policy change encouraged late-exit, bilingual developmental programs that featured a more gradual transition to English (Crawford, 2002).

Clinton sought ways to promote diversity in the country by opposing the English-only legislation. He supported bilingual education by allocating resources to assist researchers and

educational stakeholders with programs that would increase high school graduation rates and produce a more competitive workforce (Martinez, 2016). Clinton was committed to ensuring that students with limited English skills get the extra help they need in order to learn English and meet the same high standards expected of all students (Martinez, 2016).

Clinton's views on education were challenged by political activists groups across the nation that opposed bilingual education (Ovando, 2010). House Majority Whip, Tom DeLay, introduced a bill to eliminate federal bilingual education policy in 1998 arguing the program's ineffectiveness of making learning English easier for children (San Miguel, 2004). A hundred and fifty parents with children in Brooklyn public schools filed a lawsuit in September of 1995, charging that because their children routinely remained segregated these children were not receiving adequate instruction in English which is the language, according to the State Education Law, that leads to opportunities in schooling, jobs, and public life in the United States (Porter, 1998). Similarly, in Los Angeles, California, Hispanic parents protested against their children's school because school leaders insisted that these U.S. born children not be taught English until they had learned to read and write in Spanish (Porter, 1998). Hispanic opposition to native-language teaching programs was publicly apparent.

Even though most parents say they want special help for their children in learning English and other subjects, they differed on whether their children should be taught in their native languages. A vast majority of parents felt that it is the family's duty, not the school's, to teach children about the history and traditions of their ancestors. When Mexican parents were asked if they wanted the school to teach reading and writing in Spanish and English, 70 percent

answered yes, but when they were asked if they wanted Spanish taught in school if it meant less time for teaching English, only 12 percent were in favor (Porter, 1998).

The accumulated research of the past thirty years reveals almost no justification for teaching children in their native languages to help them learn either English or other subjects (Porter, 1998). In 1997, voters in Arizona, California, and Massachusetts enacted the country's most restrictive language policies, severely limiting the use of the home language in the education of language minority students (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015). English-only advocates argued that bilingual-bicultural programs segregated non-English speaking students, hindered assimilation, and delayed the student's acquisition of English-language skills (Valent & Chavez, 2011). Educators and political figures, such as Jaime Escalante and Ron Unz, argued that ELLs need to be immersed in English as soon as possible. Ron Unz, a Silicon Valley entrepreneur and millionaire, had long been concerned about the California education system's failure in educating limited-English students. Unz proposed initiative in 1998, Proposition 227 also known as English for the Children, gives preference to English-language programs for immigrant children, reduces the length of time children may remain in special programs, and make the state spend \$50million a year to teach English to adults (Garcia, 2009; Porter, 1998). This movement would place all English language learners in English classrooms while prohibiting the use of their native language for instruction (Garcia, 2009). Many Latino leaders in California supported Unz's initiative, and other states like Arizona and Massachusetts followed suit. However, after Proposition 227 was approved, English language learners were underachieving in reading and math when compared to fluent English speakers (Bali, 2001).

On March 2014, California Senator Ricardo Lara proposed Senate Bill 1174 to overturn Proposition 227 (Mongeau, 2016). The *California Non-English Languages Allowed in Public Education Act* (Senate Bill 1174) was unanimously passed with a 73% vote (Mongeau, 2016). Senate Bill 1174 repealed the English-only immersion requirements of Proposition 227 (Mongeau, 2016). It allowed schools to utilize multiple programs, including bilingual education (Mongeau, 2016).

The 2001 reauthorization of ESEA under the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), bilingual education was left far behind, no longer part of the federal framework for the education of English language learners as it had been since 1968 (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015). President George W. Bush signed it into law in January 2002 while also reauthorizing the *Bilingual Education Act* of 1994, formerly known as Title VII under ESEA, to be now known as Title III under NCLB (San Miguel, 2004). Title III stresses academic achievement and the learning of English only while holding states accountable for annual increases in English proficiency; therefore, discouraging the use of native-language instruction (San Miguel, 2004). NCLB changed the goal of English language learners' instruction from English language acquisition to the goal of reaching academic proficiency while developing language proficiency (Valent & Chavez, 2011).

The *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) replaced the NCLB in 2015. ESSA identified issues of English learners in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language as being denied a) the ability to meet the challenging State academic standards; b) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or c) the opportunity to participate fully in society (Barrow & Markman-Pithers, 2016). ESSA requires

only that programs for developing English proficiency be evidence-based, not that the program be designed to make students fluent only in English or bilingual in English and their native language (Barrow & Markman-Pithers, 2016).

Bilingual Education in Texas

From 1918 until the late 1960s, bilingual education in Texas was illegal (Blanton, 2004). The only exception was the public free schools in counties in the border between Mexico and the United States which was made possible by an amendment sponsored by three legislators from El Paso in West Texas and one each from Harlingen and Edinburg in South Texas (San Miguel, 1987). The effect of court decisions that found that school districts did not have adequate bilingual programs designed to address the needs of language minority students nor did they have teachers adequately trained to teach those students prompted the State of Texas to re-evaluate policies and practices that characterized the principle of language development (Martinez, 2016). The State of Texas stipulates its policies under 19 Texas Administrative Code § 89.1201, stating that every student whose home language is other than English and is identified as an English language learner will be provided with an equal educational opportunity (19 Texas Administrative Code § 89.1201, 2019). The goals of the bilingual education programs in Texas are to enable English language learners to become competent in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in the English language through the development of literacy and academic skills in the primary language and English (*Secondary School Completion*, 2017). Even though teaching Spanish was still prohibited by law, statewide policymakers granted a special dispensation to the Corpus Christi School District to pioneer an elementary Spanish program which was successful

enough to prompt the Texas Legislature to pass a bill in March 1941, that allowed other elementary schools the right to adopt this program (Blanton, 2004),

In May of 1969, the Texas legislature passed the state's first bilingual education bill, House Bill 103, which was authored by Senator Carlos Truan who acknowledged English as the primary language of instruction in school, but emphasized that learning would be more natural if the language the child understood was used for instruction (Legislative Reference Library of Texas, n.d.). Lawmakers repealed the "English Only" statute of 1918 which made it a misdemeanor for any teacher or administrator to use a language other than English in school. On June 3, 1973, the enactment of the *Bilingual Education and Training Act* (SB 121) mandated that all Texas public elementary schools that were enrolling 20 or more children of limited English ability, in a given grade level, provide bilingual instruction (Rossell, 2009). The mandate did not indicate which bilingual model or program would be implemented, leaving it wide open for school districts in Texas to decide which one was the most appropriate for their bilingual students (Rossell, 2009).

The Texas Education Agency published a manual that describes the importance of incorporating the students' native language and asserted that bilingual education is not merely using the first language of a child as a bridge to English and then eliminating the first language as proficiency in English is attained. It is the total development of the child bilingually so that he can function within his capabilities in two languages (Ackerman & Tazi, 2015).

As part of the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001, K-12 public schools are required to identify English language learners and subsequently demonstrate via assessments scores that

these students are attaining levels of academic achievement that are consistent with state learning standards and improving in their English proficiency (Abedi, 2007). However, it is up to the states to determine which students should be classified as English language learners, which type of language assistance is to be provided in their K-12 classrooms, and which assessments will be used to demonstrate students' subsequent English proficiency (Brassard & Boehm, 2007, Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005). In Texas, ELLs can acquire English through four different programs at the elementary level as per the Texas Education Code § 29.053: English as a second language (ESL), English immersion, transitional bilingual education, and two-way/dual language bilingual education (Alecio-Lara, Galloway, Irby, Gomez & Rodriguez, 2005; Texas Education Code § 29.053, 2019).

In 1994, with the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), dual language programs received federal support. The federal government promoted dual language programs, where students who speak only English and the minority student population speaking a language other than English, could both become biliterate. According to Capps et al. (2005), Hispanic children make up approximately 80 percent of the U.S. English Language learner population (Garcia & Jensen, 2007). The National Center for Education Statistics (2003) showed that Hispanics lag behind their White and Asian American peers in all proficiency levels of reading and mathematics throughout their K-12 schooling (Garcia & Jensen, 2007). Reardon (2003) noted that these achievement differences were attributable to factors both in and out of school (Garcia & Jensen, 2007).

Academic achievement gaps for Hispanics, especially recent immigrants, exist at the beginning of kindergarten, solidify in grade 3-8, and result in significantly lower rates of high

school completion and college attendance (Garcia & Jensen, 2007). August et al. (2006) state that research shows that when teachers use Spanish in the classroom, it heightens the transfer of academic skills between languages and increases early achievement outcomes for young bilingual and emergent bilingual students (Garcia & Jensen, 2007).

There are many social and economic implications in not educating the growing number of Hispanic students in Texas and other states experiencing similar growth (Samson & Collins, 2012). Therefore, it is imperative that educators come up, through a collective effort, with a definition of what bilingual education should be in order to prepare teachers to meet the needs of ELLs in the state of Texas and across the country (Samson & Collins, 2012). Jim Cummins developed one of the more popular hypotheses on bilingual education. Jim Cummins (1998) hypothesized that children's achievement in the second language depends on the level of the mastery of their native language and that the most-positive cognitive effects occur when both languages are highly developed. Furthermore, Cummins states that it is instruction provided to students in their native tongue in all subjects in a self-contained classroom with other students who speak the same language while being taught English by the bilingual teacher (Rossell, 2009). Cummins's hypotheses were interpreted to mean that a solid foundation in native-language literacy and subject-matter learning would best prepare students for learning in English (Porter, 1998). The key to academic success for all students in the United States is meaningful, taught at grade-level education which includes accelerated instruction in two languages (Thomas & Collier, 2003). Jim Cummins theories on second language acquisition support dual language as a form of additive bilingualism where the student's native language continues to be developed while acquiring the second language (Shoebottom, 2011).

In comparison to early transition programs where ELLs are believed to have achieved English proficiency and acquired academic language cognition, dual language programs could continue offering high-quality language arts instruction in both languages for a longer period (Thomas & Collier, 2003). In addition, second language acquisition research shows that the most effective bilingual programs require five to seven years for ELLs to be at the same level as native English speakers regarding academic language (Shoebottom, 2011).

If the sole purpose of educators was to ensure that all students acquire knowledge and receive an education that will make them productive members of society, but most importantly life-long learners, then a dual language education would be most appropriate (Howard et al., 2007). In some school districts in Texas with dual language programs, students have made it all the way through K-12 dual language classes (Gomez, 2006). These dual language students excel academically, have a high graduation rate, and are admitted to four-year universities with scholarship assistance (Thomas & Collier, 2011).

In the state of Texas, bilingual education is stressed primarily at the elementary level, and its implementation and effectiveness remain questionable. Moreover, at the middle school and high school level, administrators have the flexibility of providing only English as a Second Language instruction to those students who otherwise would benefit from a bilingual program (Rossell, 2009). Educational leaders in Texas, like in other states, may want to explore other options for educating ELLs.

Bilingual Education/Bilingualism in South Texas

More than 430,000 children live in the Rio Grande Valley (RGV), which is made up of four counties: Cameron, Hidalgo, Starr, and Willacy (Tingle, Haynes, & Li, 2017). Hispanic children represent the future workforce and leaders of the Rio Grande Valley and Texas. The RGV is one of the most bilingual regions in the U.S. with Mexican-origin residents making up 90% or more of the population (Murillo, 2012). Despite the impressive levels of community bilingualism, Spanish is sometimes unwelcomed in local schools (Murillo, 2012; Diaz, 2011). On many indicators of children's health, education and financial security, the Valley is not doing as well as Texas overall, revealing a pattern of disinvestment in children's futures (Tingle et al., 2017).

The region is a product of a political economy predicated on cheap land, cheap labor, and good weather (Brannstrom & Neuman, 2009). Rio Grande Valley schools are home to 282,600 students in bilingual or ESL programs (Tingle et al., 2017). The determination and persistence of the Mexican American communities in south Texas have forced changes in the ethnic makeup of its school leaders to be more representative of the learning community (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004). However, these changes have been slow in manifesting themselves (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004). The culture of education continues to be an oppressive force that squashes creativity in schools and communities created by State policies (Guajardo, Guajardo, Oliver, & Keawe, 2012).

Mexican Americans in the Rio Grande Valley have been denied equal access to opportunities for several generations through discrimination and segregation in schools, places of employment, and courts (Tingle et al., 2017). Today our education system often struggles to

provide equitable opportunities for all children, threatening their futures and our collective economic security (Tingle et al., 2017). After the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, which made the practice of segregation illegal, the implementation of policies and most importantly change in South Texas came at a very slow pace. Guajardo & Guajardo (2004) stated that the “Edcouch-Elsa High School walk out of 1968 was a manifestation of what *Brown* was intended to accomplish legally but could not achieve politically or socially” (p. 515). Kemerer (1991) wrote that Texas failed to implement any policy until November 1970, after Federal Judge William Wayne Justice announced school integration in all Texas public schools (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004). Gladwell (2000) stated that the Edcouch-Elsa High School Walkout of 1968 became the tipping point in a shift of power from White to Brown in south Texas (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004).

The shift in power presented a new dynamic in social structures for Mexican Americans including their views on education. Scholars argue that, from a neo-Vygotskian perspective, intellectual development is socially and culturally based, and that what happens in the home, school, and local community (which most likely mirrors the characteristics of the larger society) is crucial to understanding the learning processes and academic achievement of all children, including minority children (Trueba, 1988). Henry Trueba, 2002, asserts that academic failure or success can be understood solely within a socio-cultural and anthropological lens and that, “resistance to learning should be viewed as students’ rejection of cultural values and academic demands placed on them by school personnel” (Swenson, 2010, Trueba, 2002, p. 153).

Anthropologist John Ogbu’s cultural-ecological theory of minority schools performance states that community forces establish structural barriers, such as vilification of language and culture, created by White institutions that result in low school performance by minority students

(Swenson, 2010). Minority students encounter an educational system in which hegemonic ideologies discriminate and marginalize students of color (Swenson, 2010). This is of significance because as a society of educators in the state of Texas, it is a moral obligation to ensure that we offer a quality education to all students, so that they will have an opportunity to compete and succeed in national and global markets. There should be a sense of urgency for all stakeholders in education to come to a consensus on how to best educate ELLs.

Many current decision-makers about bilingual education in South Texas' Rio Grande Valley have deeply held beliefs (Weimer et al., 2014). Only three of twenty-nine school districts in the Rio Grande Valley implement an additive, dual language program at the elementary level (Weimer et al., 2014). In school districts in Texas where students have made it all the way through K-12 dual language classes, the dual language students excel academically, and they have a strong graduation rate and are admitted to four-year universities with scholarship assistance (Thomas & Collier, 2011). The other twenty-six school districts use an early-exit transitional bilingual program (Weimer et al., 2014)

New initiatives in education have added to a positive future outlook for students in South Texas. Rio Grande Valley leaders celebrated what they say is a “generational shift” in educational attainment in the region where area students now match or outperform their Texas peers in eight out of 11 key indicators – from high school graduation rate, to FAFSA financial aid and AP/dual credit completion (Jara & Taylor, 2017). Efforts continue by innovative school districts in South Texas in emphasizing the importance and value of bilingual education. The Pharr-San Juan-Alamo school district in Hidalgo County outperforms state averages on high school graduation rates (Tingle et al., 2017). The Seal of Biliteracy Program at Valley View ISD is a perfect example of initiatives that stress the importance of bilingualism (Seal of

Biliteracy, 2018). The program expands the existing minor in Medical Spanish Minor that helps prepare minority students for postsecondary education and the workforce (Seal of Biliteracy, 2018). Students develop advanced language skills, critical cultural knowledge, and verbal and written communication skills in Spanish (Seal of Biliteracy, 2018). Research has shown that college graduates who speak a second language earn higher wages than those who only speak English (Tingle et al., 2017).

Researchers caution that despite the economic growth of the Rio Grande Valley over the past two decades, many residents are undocumented, unemployed or underpaid, and suffer limited access to health and educational services (Murillo, 2012). Government officials, school administrators, educators, and the entire learning community need to continue to advocate for all students regardless of immigration or social status (Alvarez Gutierrez, 2013). Making sure that Hispanics are being educated as well as their peers should be a priority for all educators because the Hispanic population is growing in record numbers (Garcia & Jensen, 2007). Immigration reform will not prevent the continued influx of Latin Americans from settling in the state of Texas and adding to the Hispanic population in our classrooms as history has shown (Diaz, 2011).

Bilingual Education Programs

Considering the continued lack of achievement of ELLs, it is important to examine the types of second language programs that are available in the U.S. to assist ELLs. It is essential to make a distinction between the different bilingual programs. Bilingual education programs can be considered either additive or subtractive in terms of their linguistic goals (Zelasko, 2018). Additive programs promote bilingualism and biliteracy for students and support native language

instruction as students learn the second language (Howard et al., 2007). Subtractive programs use the student's native language to learn and transition to the second language and then drop the native language altogether for instruction (Howard et al., 2007).

An early-exit transitional bilingual program fosters subtractive bilingualism. This type of program is considered to be of a subtractive bilingual nature because of the focus on teaching English while minimizing the development of the native language (Bilingual Education Committee, 2019). These programs are intended to help minority language students move quickly from the minority language to English (Baker, 2011; Ovando & Combs, 2012). Transitional bilingual early-exit program is a bilingual program that serves students identified as students of limited English proficiency in both English and Spanish and transfers a student to English-only instruction not earlier than two or later than five years after the student enrolls in school (Secondary School Completion, 2017).

Transitional bilingual late-exit program is a bilingual program that serves students identified as students of limited English proficiency in both English and Spanish and transfers students to English-only instruction not earlier than six or later than seven years after the students enroll in school (Secondary School Completion, 2017). Late-exit bilingual programs are considered as maintenance or developmental bilingual education because it focuses on developing both languages (Bilingual Education Committee, 2019). Unlike the early-exit program, this kind of program is considered to be of an additive bilingual nature because both languages are developed simultaneously (Bilingual Education Committee, 2019).

English as a Second Language (ESL) Program uses only English for instruction. Generally, students are pulled out of the general classroom setting to receive direct instruction on English vocabulary, grammar, and communication skills (Baker, 2011; Crawford, 1999; Cummins & Corson, 1997). The goal of ESL programs is to enable ELLs to become competent in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and composition of the English language through the integrated use of second language methods (Secondary School Completion, 2017). The ESL program emphasizes the mastery of English language skills, as well as mathematics, science and social studies, as integral parts of the academic goals for all students to enable English language learners to participate equitably in school (Secondary School Completion, 2017).

Maintenance and additive programs strive to maintain the students' native language or add to the language skills that the students bring with them. In these programs, the native language is considered an asset and therefore used as a learning tool for acquiring the majority language and to learn content (Baker, 2011; Ovando & Combs, 2012). Dual language programs are an example of a maintenance and additive bilingual program.

Dual language programs cannot be viewed as merely a shift in the schedule of a transitional bilingual education program (Gomez, 2006). Dual language programs provide an outstanding opportunity for some or all students to develop skills authentically in two languages and to improve their overall academic achievement by working cooperatively with others and by using both languages to learn academic content (Murphy, 2016). Dual language programs are referred to as an additive bilingual education model in that the second language does not replace the first language, but is developed alongside it. Dual language refers to any program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages, and that promotes

bilingualism and bi-literacy, grade-level academic achievement, and multicultural competence for all students (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007).

The initial step in planning and providing professional development for the implementation of a dual language program is to recognize it as a successful bilingual program. States, districts, and schools that want dual language programs but do not want to disturb the classroom roles or school structure will fail in implementation (Cuban, 1988; Marzano et al., 2005). Dual language deals with the issue of bilingualism; it empowers minority groups by granting them full access to education through closing the academic achievement gap, as well as granting students in the program a pathway to biliteracy (Gomez, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Hargett, 2007). Dual language programs are not substitutes for other bilingual programs. Dual language is a program with a unique vision, unique goals, and a different system of operation (Collier & Thomas, 2009).

Dual language program models are labeled either 90/10 or 50/50. In the 90/10 model, 90% of instruction is in the minority language, whereas 10% of instruction is in English during the first year of schooling (CAL 2016). Each year the percentages increase in English until about fourth grade when the instruction balances out to be 50% in the minority language and 50% in English (CAL 2016). The 50/50 model includes a balance of instruction of 50% in the minority language and 50% in English every year (CAL 2016). Districts and schools select these program types based on the varying preference of school administration.

The Gomez and Gomez Model of Dual Language Enrichment requires that all learners at the elementary level, regardless of language background, learn certain subjects only in English

and other subjects only in the minority language (Gomez, 2000). The Gomez and Gomez model was first implemented in 1996 in the Pharr-San Juan-Alamo Independent School District in South Texas (Gomez & Gomez, 2017). Students begin in prekindergarten continuing into first grade with learners receiving language arts in their native language. Beginning in second grade, students are heterogeneously mixed receiving language arts instruction in both their native and their second languages (Gomez, Freeman & Freeman, 2005). Characteristically, these programs begin in kindergarten and extend through fifth grade while in elementary. Lindholm-Leary (2005) showed that students who participated in dual language instruction beginning in kindergarten or first grade became proficient in both languages by the time they reached fifth or sixth grade. Students who continue to participate in dual language programs beyond their elementary years are more likely to continue developing higher levels of communication in the second language, and are more likely to retain the second language beyond their K-12 educational experience (Murphy, 2010). In addition, these students have a more significant potential of becoming balanced bilinguals or individuals who can use both languages equally well (Murphy, 2010).

Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan (2000) identify nine critical features of effective enriched education programs: “1. parent involvement is integral to program success; 2. effective programs have high standards; 3. strong leadership is critical for effective programs; 4. effective enriched education programs are developmental; 5. effective instruction is student-centered; 6. language instruction is integrated with challenging academic instruction; 7. teachers in effective enriched education programs are reflective; 8. effective enriched education programs are integrated with other school programs and schools; and 9. effective

enriched education programs aim for additive bilingualism” (p. 90). Dual language programs fall under the title of enriched education programs because they share these nine features. The ultimate goal of dual language programs is full bilingual proficiency (Lindholm-Leary & Hargett, 2007).

Even though research has shown that transitional bilingual education programs can ensure academic growth, most researchers believe that when compared to dual language education programs, transitional bilingual education programs are not deemed as successful (Lopez, 2016; Baker, 2006; Hofstetter, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Benefits of Dual Language Programs

Dual language programs make it possible for native English speakers and speakers of other languages to develop bilingual literacy, learn from each other, and learn academic content in a cooperative, academically rigorous setting (Murphy, 2016). According to Mora, Wink, and Wink (2001), the goal of such programs is not to seek out the shortest route to proficiency in the second language, but to create a learning environment that promotes bilingual and bi-literate development that fosters positive attitudes to both languages and their associated cultures (Murphy, 2016).

A sign of the popularity and growth of this program can be seen in Texas. During the 2016-2017 school year, over 570 campuses were implementing the Gomez and Gomez Dual Language Enrichment Model (Gomez & Gomez, 2017). In the past five years, over 100 campuses in some of the largest school districts in Texas, including the Dallas, Houston, and San

Antonio Independent School Districts, have implemented dual language programs. The rapid increase in program implementation is a measure taken by districts to support the shift in the language diversity of the Texas population. It is important to recognize that dual language enrichment programs close the achievement gap between ELLs and native English speakers (Collier & Thomas, 2004). A study conducted by Sugarman (2012) concluded that dual language programs created an environment of equitable instruction for all students. Most ESL programs and bilingual education programs are subtractive and remedial; the goal of these programs is monolingualism in English with little to no second language support (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Dual language education has a plethora of benefits for all students.

Christian et al. (2000) found that dual language programs promoted positive relationships across cultures and that students who participated in these programs exhibited positive attitudes about the second language. Many countries around the world other than the United States have children learning more than one language. Multi-language learning is beneficial for youth in the United States because it sets a precedent of cultural awareness and acceptance that is so desperately needed (Wallstrum, 2009). Having the ability to communicate and relate to other cultures around the world is invaluable.

According to Ramos (2007), parents chose dual language instruction for their children because it gave them a chance to build a stronger bilingual and bicultural foundation. Dual language programs have been found to provide the highest academic gains for language minority students when compared to the academic achievement of language minority students attending other types of bilingual or ESL programs (Shannon & Milian, 2002). Students who had become fluent English speakers while participating in a dual language program attained higher levels of

academic achievement than other students also identified as English language learners in a general education program (Lindholm-Leary & Hernandez, 2011).

The research found that ELLs participating in dual language instruction outperformed ELLs who participated in developmental bilingual programs and transitional bilingual programs in reading (Collier & Thomas, 2009). In addition, research also demonstrated that parents were pleased with their children's participation in dual language programs. Black (2006) found that validation and development of language and culture were vital to benefit from a dual language program, and were crucial for parents choosing such programs for their children.

These programs that promote high levels of bilingualism create an additive environment in which a new language is added without taking away from the students' existing language (Thomas & Collier, 1998). Researchers Collier and Thomas have found that the academic success students experience is not short-lived, but continued long after their participation in a dual language program. Unfortunately, many public schools in the United States do not understand the value of dual language education; therefore, do not offer these programs (Wallstrum, 2009).

Dual language programs are being compromised in exchange for easier bilingual or ESL programming that offers quicker, yet inferior, results (Collier & Thomas, 2009). School leaders are opting for the instant success of programs that are cheaper and offer easier implementation at the elementary grades but have short-term gains (Collier & Thomas, 2002). Dual language program implementation is a long-term commitment that requires strong leadership to sustain the program (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008).

Language Discourse

Language discourse is the ability to speak and write in a social context in one or various languages (Nordquist, 2020). Renkema & Schubert (2018) went further to suggest that “discourse is more than a message between sender and receiver. The joint activity is undertaken to accumulate the common ground of the participants. With common ground is meant the sum of the joint and mutual knowledge, beliefs and suppositions of the participants” (p. 48).

Explaining why and how minority students continue to fail remains entrenched in a deficit discourse – a discourse that is actualized in the everyday experiences of students formed by the practices of teachers and the policies of schools (Swenson 2010). Some educators consider bilingualism and biculturalism as deficits instead of assets (Brown & Souto-Manning, 2008).

Culturally competent leaders need to recognize their cultural history and current status, as well as that of their students and their communities (Mares, 2014). For school leaders, it is essential to have the ability to communicate with parents and community members from diverse backgrounds in their home language about the education of their children (Medina, 2008).

Leaders should attempt to learn a new language, such as Spanish, Arabic, or Mandarin, and become bilingual in order to deliver instruction that will make communicating with students easier (Ovando & Combs, 2012). Bilingual students would be validated and willing to participate in learning by knowing that an individual delivering instruction understands their needs (Zacarian, 2012). Arguelles (2007) posits that students’ ability to understand often exceeds their ability to produce; a student may know an answer in his native language, but not be able to articulate it in English (White, 2008). According to White (2008), elementary school

principals whose language discourse is bilingual has a more positive perception of bilingual education and a better understanding of students and their academic needs. Monolingual administrators face more significant challenges as their campuses rapidly fill up with students of different nationalities and linguistic traditions (Merchant, 1999).

Even though Hispanic administrators may possess the language of the student population, their perceptions of that language can be impacted by prejudices they experienced during their elementary school years (Peterson & Heywood, 2007). Some of these administrators are second generation Mexican American students, whose parents faced academic barriers and were punished for speaking Spanish in the midst of the 1960s, and now have grown up with a language and culture deficit (San Miguel, 1987). The parents of these children emphasized the English language which to them ensures the path to academic success (San Miguel, 1987). Their parents sheltered these children from discriminatory experiences that most Mexican American students encounter in schools (San Miguel, 1987). The lack of an authentic cultural upbringing perpetuates subtractive thinking toward bilingual education and the use of the Spanish language (Peterson & Heywood, 2007). Ideally, bilingual learners can be supported from birth to adulthood, but this will require much more communication among educators than is happening now (Weimer et al., 2014). It is clear that we have progressed since those times, but the memories still sting in the hearts and minds of grandparents and parents who face the challenge of embracing a new way of educating that includes celebrating heritage language and traditions (Weimer et al., 2014). Some cannot accept this new approach and therefore resist practices of teaching content in both languages, despite mounting evidence of its effectiveness

(Weimer et al., 2014). It is time to value Spanish, as much as English, as they both define the bilingual, bicultural, and binational realities of this part of the world (Weimer et al., 2014).

Principals and superintendents receive very little professional development in working with diverse student populations (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). The preparation programs for administrators offer insufficient information on effective instructional leadership in diverse settings (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). Administrators' lack of preparation in these areas is reflected in their inability to provide guidance and support to teachers whose students come from differing racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds (Medina, 2008). Bilingual teachers sometimes feel ill prepared because they were not allowed to fully develop their grasp of academic Spanish (Guerrero et al., 2001; Waldschmidt, 2002; Midobuche, 1998; Flores-Mulero, 2003; Hernandez, 2005). Teachers feel inadequate delivering academic content when their language discourse is minimal or deficient (Guerrero, 2003).

Effective bilingual education classrooms are made up of teachers who are certified in the languages of instruction (White, 2008). Educators who come from the same culture as bilingual students bring both the language and cultural sensitivity to the classroom interactions (White, 2008). These educators prefer administrators who can offer instructional leadership in these areas (White, 2008). Administrators who possessed a dual language orientation played an essential role in the status message of that language (Baker, 2006). The increasing numbers of English language learners merit school principals who have knowledge, competencies, and experiences to meet the challenges and needs of this student population (Medina, 2008). Equally important to note is that the national anti-Latino immigration discourse has politicized

and jeopardized the enhancement of the profession of education as seen with educational reforms that discriminate against Latino students and their families (Alvarez Gutierrez, 2013).

Principals' Perceptions

Studies of effective schools consistently and conclusively demonstrate that high-quality programs exist when schools have a cohesive, school-wide shared vision; goals that define their expectations for achievement; and an instructional focus and commitment to achievement and high expectations that are shared by students, parents, teachers and administrators (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary & Rogers, 2007). Principals' views and understanding of multiculturalism, second language acquisition process, and the values they attribute to specific languages form their dual language education frames of reference. Principals of dual language programs are responsible for not only modifying their paradigm but also leading the reform on their campus (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008).

The need to incorporate new strategies to the new and emerging need of accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, and excellence in our schools has led higher education institutions to rethink their school administration and leadership programs (Green, 2005). The growing number of low performing students, the rapid growth of a diverse student population, and the dropout rate of minority students are all excellent reasons why institutions of higher learning need to revamp their preparation programs for school principals. Principals, as the campus leaders, have a tremendous responsibility not only to shape their own paradigms in relation to the change, but to lead the schools' belief and support of the change (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008;

Rodriguez, 2009). Baker (2005) stated that principals made decisions based not only on knowledge but also on an individual system of beliefs. Their perceptions impact administrators' support of school support services and curricular programs. These points of view can affect how administrators oversee the staff (Baker, 2005). An administrator's perception has important implications for whether bilingual education will be effective.

In their *School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals*, Stephen Davis, Linda Darling-Hammond, Michelle LaPointe, and Debra Meyerson (2005) noted that programs used for the preparation and development of principals should have certain features that are important in developing effective school leaders (Medina, 2008). These features include that programs be research-based, have curricular coherence, provide experience in authentic contexts, use cohort groupings and mentors, and be structured to enable collaborative activity between the program and area schools (Medina, 2008). In addition, high-quality leadership preparation programs should have most or all of the following features: “(a) rigorous selection that addresses prior leadership experience and initial leadership aspirations; (b) underserved groups, particularly racial/ethnic minorities are given priority; (c) have clear focus and clarified values about leadership and learning around which the program is coherently organized; (d) promote standards-based content and internship experiences; (e) provide supportive organizational structures to facilitate retention and engagement; (f) focus on coherent, challenging, and reflective content and experiences; and (g) boast appropriately qualified faculty” (Medina, 2008, p. 36).

Leadership Roles

Current research on leadership has contributed a thorough understanding of individual behaviors of effective leaders and their role in making organizations successful (SEDL, 2011). If the leader fails to give credibility and respect to the many diversified individuals in any organization, he limits the productivity of that organization (Northouse, 2010). The administrator is the key to success or failure of any program at the school. Leaders who inspire confidence in their teachers enable teachers to inspire their students (Jackson & McDermott, 2009). If a school is a vibrant, innovative child-centered place, has a reputation for excellence in teaching, and students are performing to the best of their ability, one can always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success (Marzano & Waters & McNulty, 2005). Principals develop learning communities, build the professional capacity of teachers, and take advice from parents. Principals engage in collaborative and consultative decision making, resolve conflicts, and engage in effective instructional leadership. These school leaders attend respectfully, immediately, and appropriately to the needs and requests of families with diverse cultural, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds (Shields, 2004).

High stakes accountability systems have placed school principals in an interesting predicament. Principals are required to plan accordingly year after year to ensure that all students achieve proficiency in reading, mathematics, and science. School principals are expected to improve teaching and learning while serving the diverse needs and interests of all their stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, district office officials, unions, state and federal agencies (Grosso de Leon, 2006).

In 2001, the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) supported the passing of the *No Child Left Behind Act* in anticipation that the enforceable requirements would lead to more attention placed on the academic progress of ELLs (Crawford, 2004). Legislators and community leaders agree that holding school districts accountable for results, the achievement gap that exists between minority and White students and between poor and wealthy students will lessen (Crawford, 2004). Under the law, schools must show that all students, including ELLs, meet the academic standards in reading and math (Van Roekel, 2008). In addition, ELLs are expected to master content in English before they have reached a certain level of English proficiency (Van Roekel, 2008).

As part of an internal accountability system, leaders need to take it upon themselves to self-analyze and hold themselves personally accountable for the successes or failures of the students they impact (Richardson, 2015). Principals are not directly compensated for performance through accountability policies; nevertheless, they act as agents for students in danger of dropping out (Billger, 2007). These educational leaders make sure that schools are complying with mandates and that systems and processes are in place that will meet the requirements imposed on them by the state or federal government (Southern Regional Education Board, 2010). School principals as described by Cooley and Shen (2003) are the key to accountability (Billger, 2007).

Advocates for primary language instruction argue that ELLs learn English better and faster when they are taught content area material in their native language (Krashen, 2010). Hispanic administrators appear to have a sincere interest in implementing bilingual programs to meet the needs of Hispanic bilingual students (Pena Cruz, 1995). Principals of dual language

schools genuinely love what they do. They stay in their positions for many years; it is hard to persuade a dual language principal to retire. The commitment to the community and the joy of creating a bicultural gathering place or environment is a stimulus for saying principals see magic happening in their schools (Collier & Thomas, 2004). The principal is a critical player in making the model happen as planned. A crucial component of the program is an active and committed principal who hires qualified teachers and plans collaboratively with staff, providing for ongoing staff development and planning time. The principal also helps to create community partnerships and oversees program implementation and the ongoing evaluation of the program, including student performance on tests (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

Knowledgeable and skillful school leaders lead successful organizations. These leaders establish a culture in which key personnel are motivated to work collaboratively towards a common goal (Jackson & McDermott, 2009). When school and community leaders integrate their positive attitudes toward bilingualism, this enables them to progress together; and language-minority students will look upon their native language as a benefit or resource to nurture, and not a deterrent to surmount (MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000).

The school leader must be prepared and ready to handle the transition of a bilingual program to a dual language program (Rodriguez, 2009). This can be a challenge because previous bilingual education programs have similar elements of dual language programs; however, they have very different program goals, different populations served, and different best practices (Rodriguez, 2009). Without strong leadership, the dual language programs will fail (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008). The principal must be the leader of the program, the most influential voice leading the dual language program (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008).

According to Sergiovanni (2001), principals share seven common functions: instructional leadership, cultural leadership, managerial leadership, human resources leadership, strategic leadership, external development leadership, and micro-political leadership (Portin, 2004). These functions are essential to the development and sustainability of strong organizations. Through instructional leadership, they ensure the quality of instruction, modeling teaching practices, supervising curriculum, and ensuring the quality of teaching resources (Portin, 2004).

Principals tend to the symbolic resources of the school such as its traditions, climate, and history. When school leaders have reflected and felt they understand a school's culture, they can evaluate the need to shape or reinforce it (Deal & Peterson, 1999). It is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for teaching and learning, the level of professionalism, and ultimately the success or failure of students. Leaders who inspire confidence in their teachers enable teachers to inspire their students (Jackson & McDermott, 2009). If a school is a vibrant, innovative child-centered place, has a reputation for excellence in teaching, and students are performing to the best of their ability, one can always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Principals develop plans to include the community as partners of their schools. The principals' function of external development leadership entails representing the school in the community, developing capital, tending to public relations, recruiting students, buffering and mediating external interests, and advocating for the schools' interests (Portin, 2004). Principals are the main link between communities and schools; therefore, how they perform the duties of their schools determine the attitudes of parents and students about their schools (Gentilucci &

Muto, 2007). As leaders in the community, principals must be able to communicate effectively with all stakeholders (Graczewski, Knudson, & Holtzman, 2009). Principals should involve parents and community members in the development of the school's vision, its goals, and programs (Graczewski et al., 2009).

Principals inspire a shared vision. They see pictures in their mind's eye of what the results will look like even before they have started their project, much as an architect draws a blueprint (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Strategic leaders direct and guide their staff through developing and communicating a future strategy (Quong & Walker, 2010). These principals have a vision of the desired future of the campus and are able to share that vision with the staff which will serve to empower them to act on that vision (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1993). A clear focus, expressly written within school mission and vision statements, helps direct the activities of the school (Leone, Warnimont, & Zimmerman, 2009). Therefore, another function for principals is to set the vision for schools and make sure that all embrace that vision and work to make it a reality. Leadership for cultural diversity in schools is connected with schools' mission, vision, curriculum and instruction, resource allocation, professional development for teachers and decision-making (Dimmock et al., 2005).

In a culturally proficient society, school leaders must be responsible for closing the achievement gaps in our schools, especially for English language learners (Franco, Ott, & Robles, 2011). Moreover, schools need principals and administrators who are visionaries and are aware of the disparities associated with diversity and equity which are essential goals of social justice (Franco, Ott, & Robles, 2011).

Experience in Bilingual Education Programs

Principals in schools with a high population of English language learners are more likely to be Hispanic and hold a doctoral degree as opposed to their counterparts (Consentino de Cohen, Deterding, & Clewell, 2005). Administrators need to have a general understanding of the students' and families' social, economic, and cultural issues as they relate to their native country (Stuft & Brogadir, 2011). Principals who received their certification many years ago did not have any attention to issues of diversity, social justice, or multicultural education (Gardiner & Enomoto, 2006). Principals had minimal knowledge about how the second language programs operated in their schools.

Principals attribute the success of bilingual programs to the teachers in the program (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Principals with knowledge of second language programs can provide support to teachers, as well as determine the type of training that their teachers may need to effectively assist second language students (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Experienced principals noted that teachers are the greatest strength in the bilingual programs (Padron & Waxman, 2016). In order for supervisors to offer meaningful and constructive feedback to teachers of ELLs, they must possess some basic familiarity with language development methodologies and be able to support and identify various content sheltering and differentiation techniques to promote their implementation (Baecher, Knoll, & Patti, 2013).

Principals also indicate that the challenges of implementing second language programs stem from the lack of professional development for their second language teachers (Padron &

Waxman, 2016). Principals have voiced that hiring truly bilingual teachers is hard to do (Padron & Waxman, 2016). They attribute the success of bilingual programs to the support of parents in their children's education. Principals are expected to take critical and often difficult steps to build more socially just schools while reflecting on their world and privileges and to assess what they know and what they do with their knowledge (Marshall & Theoharis, 2007). It is important that school principals ensure that all members of a school community share common values, visions, and goals regarding ELLs. Challenges in bilingual education that principals face include staffing teachers who are fluent in the target language (Schwabsky, 2013). Principals' authority is challenged when they lack fluency in the target language or experience communication constraints (Schwabsky, 2013).

Administrators of schools with effective bilingual programs provide the staff with sound educational and staff development programs as well as opportunities that address the issues surrounding the cultural, political, and ethnic backgrounds of English language learners (Kurtz-Costes & Pungello, 2000). Staff development programs must be held for all faculty that focus on effective instruction for ELL students (Araujo, 2009; Hansen-Thomas, 2008; Lucas et al., 1990; Tikunoff et al., 1991). Principals who provide professional development opportunities to all school personnel have been successful in facilitating ELL programs in their schools (Garrett & Morgan, 2002; Goodwin, 2002; Kurtz-Costes & Pungello, 2000; Rong & Brown, 2002).

Principals who implement different approaches for developing strong relationships among the school and immigrant families and communities are most effective in promoting ELL in their schools (Garrett & Morgan, 2002; Peterson & Heywood, 2007). Principals solicit the

experience and cultural knowledge of students, staff, parents, and their own educational experiences when making decisions for schools improvement (Wiemelt & Welton, 2015).

School leaders in bilingual settings must use research literature to craft effective and integrated service delivery for students by promoting high-quality curriculum, cultivating bilingualism and biliteracy, and fostering positive sociocultural development (Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). Principals who demonstrate culturally responsive leadership can embrace a position as learners who challenge stereotypes and conventional wisdom (Gardiner & Enomoto, 2006). Principals must challenge the subtractive system in which they work and transform the learning opportunities for students by leading school communities forward with the goals of long-term bilingual programs such as dual language immersion (Wiemelt & Welton, 2015).

Knowledge of Bilingual Education

Principals must be aware of the cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity in their schools (Garrett & Morgan, 2002). Principals must have the knowledge needed to support teachers in working with ELLs (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Graczewski et al., 2009). School leaders must be responsible for closing achievement gaps in our schools, especially with students who are English language learners (Franco, Ott, & Robles, 2011). Schools need principals and administrators who are visionaries and are aware of the disparities associated with diversity and equity which are essential goals of social justice (Franco, Ott, & Robles, 2011).

Principals may not have the basic knowledge of second language programs to be effective instructional leaders for second language teachers (Brown, 2004; Torres, 2006). The

lack of training for teachers necessitates that principals have the appropriate knowledge about second language programs so that they can support teachers in working with ELLs (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Principals' knowledge and perceptions of how programs should be implemented are also important when implementing programs for ELLs because negative attitudes, prejudices, and misinformation about bilingual education/second language programs may lead to inappropriate practices (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Rodriguez, 2009).

Research has found that principals do not receive formal learning experiences related to bilingual education in their academic preparation (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Principals in dual language schools have a better understanding of second language learning focusing more on content learning than learning English (Hickman & Garcia, 2014). Principals have various levels of knowledge of second language acquisition depending on their professional preparation and experiences related to second language programs (Padron & Waxman, 2016). In order for second language programs to be effective and for ELLs to experience academic success, principals must be knowledgeable and supportive of the goals and design of these programs (Padron & Waxman, 2016).

Research suggests that principals need to become knowledgeable and supportive of their teachers so that the needs of a growing ELL population are met, and the achievement gap between native English speakers and ELLs closes (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Principals who lack the knowledge and understanding of culturally responsive leadership may be at a disadvantage and see not only themselves as weak or even at risk, but consequently, their leadership as challenged (Schwabsky, 2013).

Material resources, as well as teachers, aides, and administrators trained to work with language minority students, are critical components of an ELL program (Stuftt & Brogadir, 2011). Effective schools with bilingual programs have high expectations for all students with expert instructional leaders and teachers who understand ELL students and have a passion for them to succeed (Lucas et al., 1990; Pease-Alvarez et al., 1991; Tikunoff et al., 1991). In addition, effective ELL programs have active parental involvement in formal support activities for both parents of the language minority and language majority students (Araujo, 2009; Garcia, 1991).

Future of Bilingual Education

Bilingual education in the United States has primarily been a program whose goal is to teach English rather than to develop bilingualism or biliteracy (Gandara & Escamilla, 2017). Future principals in the United States and Texas are entering school environments that are increasingly bilingual (*2009–10 Academic Excellence Indicator System*, 2010). Dual language programs are rising in popularity, and so are the responsibilities of principals to be able to lead these programs. Principals' views and understanding of multiculturalism, second language acquisition processes, and the values they attribute to specific languages form their dual language education paradigm. Principals of dual language programs are responsible for not only modifying their paradigm, but also leading the reform on their campus (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008).

Dual language program implementation requires not only a paradigm shift but also a change in the entire school culture (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary & Rogers, 2007). Principals, as the campus leaders, have a tremendous responsibility not only to shape their own paradigm in relation to the change, but to lead the schools' belief and support of the change (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Rodriguez, 2009).

An innovative change in language acquisition is the use of technology. Technology commands an ever-larger presence in American life and has transformed the way English language learners learn in the 21st century. New means of communication have modernized society and offer the opportunity to reach a broader spectrum of second-language learners through multifaceted strategies. Hughes (2005) supports this technological juncture and finds there is educational promise in the resources that are made available to teachers and students to develop innovative technology that supports instruction and learning experiences. Research indicates that teachers perceive that appropriate technology gives bilingual students greater access to academic language (Daniel & Cowen, 2012). According to Erben, Ban, Jin, & Summers (2007), technology facilitates second language acquisition because it can be used to enhance intercultural communication (Daniel & Cowen, 2012).

Multi-modal instruction can be a medium to offer content-rich contexts that both address and add to English language learners' funds of knowledge, while focusing on listening, speaking, reading, writing, and discussion (Cummins, Brown, & Sayers, 2007). Allowing English language learners to read, listen, and watch vocabulary all in one story is only possible when using technology (Cutter, 2015). Technology programs such as the Substitution Augmentation Modification and Redefinition (SAMR) model are utilized by teachers across the nation to allow

students opportunities to enhance and transform their learning experience and impact their achievement (Puentedura, n.d.). This strategy of infusing technology in the class will motivate English language learners to continue pursuing their language and academic goals. Soon these students will be required to take assessments on computers as a result of the Common Core State Standards, which makes the learning and ease of navigating and reading on a computer even more important (Martinez-Alba, Cruzado-Guerrero, & Pitcher, 2014).

Even though change is welcomed to enhance learning, some initiatives can be considered counterproductive. The United States instituted two additional national policy initiatives in 2009 that do not support the creation of new bilingual program models (Gandara & Escamilla, 2017). The two initiatives are the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and the accompanying assessment known as Partnership for Assessment Consortium (SBAC) (Gandara & Escamilla, 2017). The Common Core State Standards do not include standards about bilingualism, biliteracy, nor cross-cultural competence. These standards limit teachers' control over the curriculum they teach and the time they allocate for instruction, making the implementation of transitional bilingual and dual language programs more challenging (Berliner & Glass, 2014). Nevertheless, some of the most respected scholars of bilingual education have endorsed the Common Core and are working hard to make it relevant for English language learners (Bale, 2015). The National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) issued a position statement in January 2013 stating that they were working collaboratively with policymakers to ensure that implementing the Common Core did not negatively impact English learners (Bale, 2015).

Despite the challenges faced by English language learners in the United States, the 21st century continues to see the growth and need for bilingual education to open unlimited learning possibilities for these students (Gonzalez, 2016). If resources are available, ELLs will capitalize on the chance to become not only bilingual but possibly multilingual. These students will be academically and cognitively prepared to succeed in any global economy where knowledge of more than one language is required. Research finds that bilingual education and dual language programs, in particular, will continue to evolve and will become the preferred form of education for U.S. students since democracy and our economy depend on a world where communicating in multiple languages is essential (Gonzalez, 2016). The desired approach for advocating for bilingual education is to seek beyond English-only policies and encourage and promote bilingualism and multilingualism (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011).

We aspire to a day when every child has the opportunity to be bilingual or multilingual. If federal and state education policies supported bilingualism as an essential goal for all U.S. students, and incentives were created to recruit and train bilingual teachers, this country could rapidly join other nations that have long supported multilingualism and nurtured it in their students (Gandara & Escamilla, 2017). Experience and research in the United States and other countries around the world have demonstrated that children can learn their own and a second or even third language and turn out academically and linguistically competent in both, all three, or more (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015).

Summary

In the field of bilingual education, there exists a significant body of work that explores its history, defines the program models, posits leadership theories, and presents evidence of its effectiveness. Scholars persist in exploring bilingual education and dual language instruction, continually adding to the body of work. Much of what has been written speaks favorably about bilingual and dual language instruction. There has been considerable research demonstrating that dual language education is beneficial for both language majority and language minority children. The literature identified the critical role that principals undertake to ensure academic success for bilingual students. Understanding that there is a need to address the educational gap that exists between Hispanic students in bilingual programs and that of their White peers is a good way for principals to develop intercultural competence. Taking into consideration accountability structures found in education and the diversity of cultures in our schools, principal preparation programs can be better suited to address these issues and provide the tools necessary for principals to sustain a diverse school culture that emphasizes the academic success of bilingual students through a dual language program.

This chapter explored the work of researchers who are the leading experts in bilingual and dual language education. The next chapter addresses the research design and methodology used in conducting the study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter included information about the research design and methodology used to provide research-based information about the perceptions of principals about bilingual education programs. The methodology selected by the researcher to collect and analyze data is dependent on the orientation of the researcher and the nature of the problem under study (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). An explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) which is comprised of a survey for the quantitative section and a focused group for the qualitative section was applied. A mixed method is the most appropriate research design because the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research can yield a better understanding (Creswell, 2009). A mixed method is defined as research in which the investigator collects and analyzes data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007).

The collection and analysis of the quantitative and qualitative sections allow the researcher to examine in more detail the survey instrument (Munoz, 2006). The study examined the relationship between principals' perceptions about bilingual education programs as they relate to academic knowledge, years of experience in bilingual education, and language discourse (bilingual proficiency). These constructs were the variables operationally defined to be measurable (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006) using a 31-item *Bilingual Education Survey* modified by White (2008) from Shin and Krashen's (1996) survey on *Attitudes Toward Bilingual*

Education. Included in this chapter are the following sections: research design, a sample of study participants, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and summary.

Research Design

The study analyzed the quantitative data using multiple linear regression to test if survey results are significant. Survey research involves collecting data to test hypotheses or to answer questions about people's opinions on some topic or issue (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). Survey research can be used to gather information about a group's beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and demographic composition (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). Survey research requires the collection of standardized, quantifiable information from all members of a population or large random sample.

A multiple linear regression test can include three independent variables and one dependent variable that can be tested at the same time. A multiple linear regression analysis gave the researcher the opportunity to examine interactions to ascertain whether the perceptions of principals concerning bilingual education programs relate to the principals' language discourse (bilingual proficiency), the academic knowledge base of bilingual education, or years of experience in bilingual education. A linear regression design is one in which variables are manipulated simultaneously to study the independent effect of each variable on the dependent variable, as well as the effect of interaction among the variables (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988). Using the multiple linear regression model for this study, to address the third research question, produced the most practical and efficient means for studying the independent and

combined effects of the variables language discourse (bilingual proficiency), level of academic knowledge of bilingual education and years of experience in bilingual education on principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs.

The independent variables are language discourse (bilingual proficiency), years of experience in bilingual education, and level of academic knowledge of bilingual education. Language discourse as a variable depends on whether the principal speaks English only or Spanish only or both languages. In addition, language discourse, as defined previously, is an integral part of developing bilingual proficiency as it is considered as an expression of an individual's thought process (Literary Devices, 2019). Level of academic knowledge in bilingual education is based on how well versed principals are in policies and procedures associated with bilingual education. Years of experience in bilingual education are described as zero to ten years, eleven to twenty years, or twenty-one years or more.

The independent variables are constructs identified in perception theory and second language acquisition theory. Perception theory states that perception is the end product of the relationship that exists between stimulus and internal hypotheses, expectations, knowledge, motivation, and emotions of the observer (Demuth, 2013). Principals' perceptions of a bilingual program are based on what they believe and have experienced (Smith, 2001). In reference to second language acquisition theory, principals have various levels of knowledge of second language acquisition depending on their professional preparation and experiences related to second language programs (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Principals' views and understanding of multiculturalism, second language acquisition process, and the values they attribute to specific languages form their dual language education frames of reference (Medina, 2008).

The dependent variable is the principals' perceptions of bilingual education. This variable guides the study to determine if there is a relationship with the independent variables. This construct connects to perception theory which posits the notion that principals' experience in education is useful in serving the developmental needs of students (Demuth, 2013). In doing so, principals' perceptions is an important variable in understanding the role of principals in helping ELLs develop the second language and achieve academic success (Medina, 2008).

Additionally, an independent samples case t-test was used to make comparisons between early-exit and dual language bilingual programs with regard to the principals' perceptions of bilingual education. This analysis helped address the fourth research question: How does the principals' perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district? The independent samples t-test compares the means of two independent groups to determine whether there is statistical evidence that the associated program means are significantly different (Kent State University Libraries, 2017). The independent variables being compared are defined by the number of principals in the early-exit bilingual program and the number of principals in the dual language bilingual program. Thus, the null hypotheses tested were:

First Null Hypotheses, which corresponds to Research Question 3, H^{01} : There is not a statistically significant relationship in public elementary school principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs and language discourse, academic background knowledge, and professional years of experience in bilingual education.

Second Null Hypotheses, which corresponds to Research Question 4, H⁰²: There is not a statistically difference in public elementary school principals' perceptions based on the bilingual program implemented.

The research design for the qualitative part of the study consisted of focus groups, which are a form of qualitative research that consists of interviews in which a group of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes toward a concept or idea (Nagle & Williams, 2017). A focus group was a strong research preference as it allows for people with similar skills and understandings to share their experiences. Focus groups give insights into how people think and bring a deeper understanding of the phenomena being studied. Focus groups are group interviews that give the researcher the ability to capture more in-depth information better than individual interviews (Nagle & Williams, 2017). The principals were grouped to form focus groups in their respective districts. Open-ended questions were asked concerning their perceptions about bilingual education in their respective school districts. The questions were drawn from the Survey on Bilingual Education that was once used in White's (2008) study. This qualitative design provided results that supported the quantitative results by addressing the following research questions:

1. What is the expectation of the principals' school district concerning bilingual education and to what extent does this expectation influence his or her perceptions?
2. How does a principal's bilingual proficiency influence his or her perception of bilingual education programs?

4. How does the principal's perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district?

Sample

The population of this study included elementary school principals from different school districts in south Texas that implement either an early-exit bilingual program or a dual language bilingual program. These school districts were chosen because of their high concentration of ELLs and the continued growth they are experiencing. Principals identified for participation in the study were contacted initially through email. The consent letter and the link to take the survey were included in the email. In some cases, the principal was contacted in person or by phone to obtain the approval to participate before being sent the survey. A total of 30 principals implement an early-exit program, and 49 principals implement a dual language program. All 79 elementary school principals were surveyed but only 47 responded of which 38 of them completed the survey in its entirety. Out of the principals who responded, twenty were selected and invited to participate in focus groups and nine ended up participating. There were five participants in the group of principals who implement an early-exit bilingual program and four participants in the group of principals who implement a dual language bilingual program.

The focus group participants for the early-exit bilingual program consisted of three male and two female principals. The range of experience as educators in bilingual education was from 12 to 41 years. The combined years of experience as public elementary school principals was 52 years. The focus group participants for the dual language bilingual program consisted of two male and two female principals. Their range of experience as educators in bilingual

education was from 19 to 30 years. Their combined years of experience as public elementary school principals was 21 years.

Instrumentation

Data was gathered and examined using the *Bilingual Education Survey* created by Shin and Krashen (1996) and used in White's (2008) study which measures elementary school principals' perceptions of bilingual education, years of experience in bilingual education, bilingual proficiency or language discourse, and the components that influence knowledge of bilingual education (Shin & Krashen, 1996; White, 2008). The first part of the survey consists of 11 questions which addressed demographics, years of experience in bilingual education, and type of bilingual program implemented in the participants' school. Perceptions of bilingual education were measured using Likert type questions in the second part of the survey. For each of these 31 questions, participants chose from five alternatives: strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree. The 31 questions were also categorized into the following subgroups: proficiency, funding, discourse, and knowledge. The third part of the survey consists of 10 questions that help identify the principals' academic knowledge of bilingual education.

The *Bilingual Education Survey* as adapted by White (2008) was found to be valid and reliable. White (2008, p. 54) wrote the following about the validity and reliability of the survey:

The survey instrument was piloted with a small group of K-5 public school principals and revised for clarity before the actual administration. In addition, the survey was reviewed

for content/face validity by six assistant professors in the field of education. For expert validity, it was reviewed by five authors in bilingual education and consultants in the field of education. The Split-Half Procedure was computed to assess reliability for the *Bilingual Education Survey*. This type of reliability correlates the even-numbered items with the odd-numbered items. Split-Half reliability of .72 was computed for the instrument. To assess the reliability of the survey, the Spearman-Brown formula was applied to the Split-Half coefficient. A reliability coefficient of .78 was computed for the test. Graveter (2000) stated that when the reliability coefficient was .70 and above, the instrument was considered reliable. Thus, the instrument was found to be reliable for this study.

In the current study, a review of the 31 items measuring perceptions was done through factor analysis to determine the validity and reliability of the survey questions. A principal component method of extraction was used to find a linear combination of variables that accounts for as much variation in the original variables as possible (SPSS, 2020). The analysis revealed that 15 items out of the 31 measuring perceptions produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83 indicating internal consistency and reliability (IDRE, 2016). It was these 15 items that were used in the analysis of the data.

Data Collection Procedures

Approval was sought from the Institutional Review Board at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley to conduct the study. The superintendents from the participating school districts

were asked for permission to conduct the study in their respective districts. The email address of principals were requested from the applicable district personnel with the permission of the corresponding superintendent. An email was sent to each participating campus principal explaining their role in the study and invitation to participate. An Informed Consent/Thank you Letter for participating in the study was also included. The *Bilingual Education Survey* was sent using Qualtrics software (2019) with an electronic link with instructions to complete. Follow-up emails were sent out in an attempt to maximize participation. The participants were assured that their participation and responses were strictly confidential.

As part of the study, focus groups comprising of principals from participating districts were convened to learn more from their experiences and perceptions concerning their respective bilingual programs. A focus group is a strong research preference as it allows for individuals with similar skills and backgrounds to collaborate and share their experiences (Creswell, 2007). Participants completed the Informed Consent forms. A list of questions on bilingual education were presented to the groups. Upon the completion of the focus group interviews, the information obtained was reviewed and analyzed. The participants of the focus groups were assured confidentiality.

Elementary principals in a school district implementing an early-exit bilingual program and elementary principals in a school district implementing a dual language bilingual program were selected using convenience sampling. In convenience sampling, the sample for the focus group includes participants with characteristics of the overall population who can contribute to helping the researcher gain a greater understanding of the topic (Nagle & Williams, 2017). The focus groups were conducted between December 2018 and February 2019. Each group was comprised of 4-5 participants with discussions lasting approximately one hour. Research shows

that a sample size of two to three focus groups will likely capture about 80% of themes on a topic in a study with a relatively homogeneous population (Guest, Namey, & McKenna, 2017). The names of the participants or schools were not included in the study's results. Instead, codes were assigned to the participants so that strict confidentiality could be kept.

In order to begin the analysis of qualitative data, the researcher analyzed transcripts from each of focus groups to develop an initial code list. The researcher conducted readings of the transcripts to search for words or phrases that could be associated with priori codes. Establishing priori codes in this way allowed the researcher to establish a link between the qualitative and quantitative parts of the study.

Coding the focus group transcripts enabled logical organization of the interview data into categories that the researcher can more easily interpret (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2012). The researcher used NVivo to organize the focus group interviews and arrange coding groups according to categories derived from the interview protocols and the list of priori codes. Organizing in this way allowed the researcher to visualize the data and examine the themes that described principals' perceptions towards their bilingual programs. The three major themes, consistent with the quantitative data and the analysis of the transcripts were the following: diversity in principals' expectations; influence of bilingual proficiency; and dichotomies in principals' perceptions of bilingual programs.

Data Analysis Procedures

Two tests of significance were conducted to address research questions 3 and 4. First, a multiple linear regression analysis was used to evaluate the amount of the total variance in principals' bilingual education perceptions as it relates to language discourse, years of

experience in bilingual education, and bilingual education knowledge. Second, an independent samples case t-test was used to evaluate possible differences in bilingual education perceptions of principals who had implemented early-exit versus dual language bilingual education programs on their campuses. The alpha level used was .05.

Summary

Chapter three provided information on the research design and methodology that was applicable to this study. The research design and methodology was identified along with the sample population, instrumentation, and data collection procedures. A survey distributed to the participating principals and a questionnaire for the focus groups were the instruments used to obtain data. The mixed method design was the most appropriate research design because the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research can yield a better understanding of the study (Creswell, 2009). The quantitative data analysis will be addressed in chapter four and the qualitative analysis in chapter five.

CHAPTER IV

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to examine principals' perceptions about bilingual education programs in their school districts. The study determined if the principals' years of experience in bilingual education, knowledge of bilingual education, and bilingual proficiency or language discourse were factors which influenced their perceptions of bilingual education programs. Data was collected and statistical analysis were performed to answer the following research questions:

3. How does principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs relate to level of academic knowledge of bilingual education, years of experience in bilingual education, and language discourse?

4. How does the principal's perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district?

Principals from school district that implemented either an early-exit bilingual program or a dual language program were invited to complete the *Bilingual Education Survey*. The survey was administered through Qualtrics software (2019) and sent out through email to 30 principals implementing an early-exit bilingual program and 49 principals implementing a dual language bilingual program. The participants from early-exit programs reported having between 2-36 years of experience as an elementary school principal and 10-36 years of experience in bilingual

education. Ninety seven percent held Bilingual or ESL certifications. They served approximately 100-400 English Learners on their campus.

The participants from districts with dual language bilingual programs reported having between 1-16 years of experience as an elementary school principal and 6-40 years of experience in bilingual education. Ninety percent held Bilingual or ESL certifications. They also served approximately 100-400 English Learners.

During the data collection, 23 elementary principals from the early-exit campuses responded but only 19 completed the survey. There were 24 elementary principals that responded from the dual language campuses but only 19 completed the entire survey. The total number of respondents was 38, N=38.

While this did not provide data for a robust statistical analysis, descriptive statistics and results from linear regression analysis determined the contribution of the predictor variables language discourse (bilingual proficiency), academic knowledge, and years of experience in bilingual education on the dependent variable, perceptions. Initially, an exploratory analysis, bivariate Pearson Correlation, was conducted to examine the individual effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable to provide additional data that would support the interpretation of the linear regression outcome.

Language Discourse

The variable language discourse or bilingual proficiency was examined to answer the research question 3. The data from the survey indicated that all the participants were bilingual English and Spanish speakers resulting in a very small variance of language discourse. A statistical analysis would not provide any relevant information that would determine the variable

language discourse or bilingual proficiency as a factor influencing the principals' perception of their bilingual education programs, $p > .05$. However, an exploratory analysis was conducted using the language discourse subscale in the survey as the language discourse variable as it returned a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.84, indicating a level of internal consistency. Table 1 in Appendix C displays the reliability statistics in using the language discourse subscale.

A correlation analysis was conducted to test if there was a statistically significant relationship between the principals' perceptions of bilingual education and the predictor variable, language discourse. Table 2 in Appendix C displays the results of the correlation analysis. Descriptive statistics showed that the sample of elementary school principals exhibited a mean of 17.00 with a standard deviation of 2.09 for language discourse. A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between language discourse and the principals' perceptions of bilingual education: Pearson $r = .43$, $N = 38$, $p < .05$. Principals' perceptions of bilingual education has a moderate correlation to their language discourse.

Academic Knowledge

The independent variable of academic knowledge of bilingual education was also examined to answer the research question 3. Academic knowledge of bilingual education was measured using the 10-items in the third part of the Bilingual Survey. Descriptive statistics showed that the sample of elementary school principals exhibited a mean of 6.58 with a standard deviation of 1.24 in academic knowledge. A correlation analysis was done to determine if there was a relationship between principals' perceptions of bilingual education and their academic knowledge of bilingual education. The analysis results, displayed in Table 3 in Appendix C, present the relationship that academic knowledge of bilingual education has on principals'

perceptions of bilingual education. The correlation was not statistically significant: Pearson $r=.30$, $N=38$, $p>.05$. The results indicate a weak relationship between the two variables.

Years of Experience in Bilingual Education

The independent variable, years of experience in bilingual education, was determined by the responses obtained from the survey question which stated: How many years have you been involved with bilingual education? The participants years of experience with bilingual education ranged from 2 to 41 years (range=39). The variable years of experience in bilingual education was also included in examining research question 3. This independent variable like the previous two was examined separately to determine if the principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs relate to years of experience in bilingual education.

Descriptive statistics showed that the sample of elementary school principals exhibited a mean of 21.95 with a standard deviation of 8.37 in the years involved with bilingual education. A correlation analysis was done to determine if there was a relationship between principals' perceptions of bilingual education and their years of experience with bilingual education. The correlation analysis indicated on Table 4 in Appendix C measured the elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education by the years of experience in bilingual education. A statistically significant difference was not found in the relationship between the principals' perceptions and the years of experience in bilingual education: Pearson $r=-.06$, $N=38$, $p>.05$. The negative and low coefficient indicates an inverse and very weak relationship between the principals' perceptions of bilingual education and the years of experience in bilingual education.

Language Discourse, Academic Knowledge and Years of Experience

A multiple linear regression analysis was computed to examine the combined effects of language discourse (bilingual proficiency), level of academic knowledge, and years of experience in bilingual education on the perceptions of elementary principals to answer research question 3. As shown previously, each independent variable was first examined separately using a bivariate Pearson Correlation analysis to determine any statistical significance in relation to the principals' perceptions of bilingual education. The combined variables were then analyzed using the multiple linear regression analysis stepwise and enter methods. Summary from the multiple linear regression analysis stepwise method is displayed in Table 5 in Appendix C. A statistically significant difference was found in elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education as it relates to academic knowledge, years of experience, and language discourse: $F(1,36)=8.05, p<.05$. The multiple linear regression outcome using the stepwise method indicated that language discourse was the only variable that was statistically significant, $p<.05$. Furthermore, the language discourse variable explains 18.7% of the total variance of principals' perceptions of bilingual education.

Summary from the multiple linear regression analysis enter method is displayed in Table 6 in Appendix C. A statistically significance was also found when examining the combined effects of academic knowledge, years of experience, and language discourse on the elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education: $F(3,36)=3.96, p<.05$. Using the enter method, 26.5% of the total variance of principal perceptions towards bilingual education was explained. The difference in outcomes of the stepwise and enter method is the result of the stepwise method considering only variables that are statistically significant as a predictor variable in determining

total variance as opposed to the enter method that takes all entered variables in calculating the total variance (Hinkle et al., 1998).

Additionally, an exploratory analysis using a three-way ANOVA was computed to examine the main and combined effects of language discourse, academic knowledge, and years of experience in bilingual education on the perceptions of elementary principals of bilingual education. The three-way ANOVA is used to determine if there is an interaction effect between three independent variables on a continuous dependent variable (Gahlaut, 2017). The outcome of the analysis indicated no significant interactions by the combined effects of the three independent variables. Table 7 in Appendix C summarizes the analysis of the main and combined effects. In examining the main effects, only language discourse was statistically significant when measured as an effect on principals' perceptions.

The three-way ANOVA results did not produce any statistically significant interactions or effects on the principals' perceptions of bilingual education. However, the multilinear regression analysis using both the stepwise and enter methods did produce a statistically significant difference in elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education as it relates to academic knowledge, years of experience, and language discourse. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The null hypothesis states the following: H^0 There is not a statistically significant relationship in public elementary school principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs and language discourse, academic background knowledge, and professional years of experience in bilingual education.

Bilingual Programs

An Independent Samples Test analysis was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in elementary principals' perceptions in an early-exit bilingual program with those in a dual language bilingual program. The following research question was examined: 4. How does the principal's perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district?

The early-exit bilingual program group exhibited a mean of 36.44 and the dual language bilingual program a mean of 42.26. There was a significant difference in means of principals' perceptions between early-exit and dual language bilingual programs ($t=3.79$, $df=35$, $p<.05$). Table 8 in Appendix C depicts the group statistics and the summary of the analysis. The null hypothesis states the following: H^0 There is not a statistically significant difference in elementary school principals' perceptions based on the bilingual program implemented. The null hypothesis was rejected indicating a difference in principals' perceptions of bilingual education based on the two bilingual programs examined.

Summary

In addressing research question 3, bivariate Pearson correlation analyses were done to examine individual relationships between the dependent and independent variables. The outcome showed that the variable language discourse had a statistically significant correlation with principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs. The other two independent variables, academic knowledge and years of experience with bilingual education, did not show a correlation with the dependent variable, principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs.

However, there are cases where variables might not show a strong bivariate correlation but may show a strong association in regression (Politzer-Ahles, 2019). Therefore, a multiple linear regression analysis using the stepwise and enter methods was performed to assess the association of principals' perceptions of bilingual education as it relates to academic knowledge, years of experience in bilingual education, and language discourse. The outcome using both methods showed that there was a statistically significant association of the dependent variable with the three independent variables. The first null hypothesis was rejected.

A three-way ANOVA was computed to examine the main and combined effects of language discourse (bilingual proficiency), level of academic knowledge, and years of experience in bilingual education on the perceptions of elementary principals. The outcome of the analysis did not show statistically significant difference in principals' perceptions as influenced by the combined effects of the independent variables.

In addressing the fourth research question, an Independent Samples Case t-Test was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in elementary principals' perceptions in an early-exit bilingual program with those in a dual language bilingual program. A difference in principals' perceptions of bilingual education based on the two bilingual programs was observed.

CHAPTER V

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

A qualitative approach was chosen for this study as it allowed principals to share their stories which contributed to a more in-depth understanding of principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs (Creswell, 2013). Focus groups were conducted at two different school districts to examine factors that influence principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs. The results followed from the analysis of the focus group interviews of elementary principals representing schools whose bilingual program is either an early-exit or dual language. The responses of the participants were grouped under three themes: principal's expectations, bilingual proficiency, and bilingual programs. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the expectation of the principals' school district concerning bilingual education and to what extent does this expectation influence his or her perceptions?
2. How does a principal's bilingual proficiency influence his or her perception of bilingual education programs?
4. How does the principal's perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district?

Principal's Expectations

The first research question in the study focused on the expectations that the school district have on principals concerning the district's bilingual program and the influence on their perceptions. Principals stated that the most important expectation of a school leader is letting staff know what is important: professionalism, teamwork, and focusing on kids. It was stated that the responsibility of the principal is to make the school represent his or her philosophy, their beliefs, and what they value. Principals believe that their duty is to help their staff help students believe they can be successful. Principal D1 from a dual language campus shared that, "Failure is not an option, students have to be motivated. Students are not lazy, just unmotivated, and they have to be motivated in order to have success." Bilingual students would be validated and willing to participate in learning if teachers and administrators understood their needs (Zacarian, 2012).

Participants who implement an early-exit bilingual program shared their expectations as having the need to create a bridge to connect with students in order to relate to them. Three of the principals discussed that their expectation was to help bilingual students achieve academic goals. Principal E4 stated, "Knowing the population you serve academically, socially, and emotionally while utilizing all resources to provide a well-rounded education is always the goal." The expectation that Principal E2 shared is, "to make sure students are successful in English and provide as much native language support in order to reach that goal." Principal E5 mentioned, "It is important to monitor and ensure that teachers are meeting the needs of bilingual learners because these students need to learn the skills in their native language." It was important for these principals to ensure that students are instructed with a bilingual certified teacher, a bilingual curriculum is available, and that implementation of the curriculum is in their assigned

language. Research shows that effective schools with bilingual programs have high expectations for all students with expert instructional leaders and teachers who understand ELL students and have a passion for them to succeed (Lucas et al., 1990; Pease-Alvarez et al., 1991; Tikunoff et al., 1991).

Participants who implement a dual language program shared that their expectation was to create a student who is bi-literate, not just bilingual; a student who can read and write correctly at the same level in both languages. It is the district's mission to educate students in becoming bi-literate, and it is in their credo. Three principals commented on the importance of students becoming bi-literate. Principal D1 said, "I believe that if you do get students inclined or succeeding in both languages at equal levels not one better than the other, you have a well-rounded student for society." Principal D2 said, "Here it is dual language, basically you want to do 50/50; so, you want the kids to get out of here knowing both languages and knowing how to speak and write the correct way and not the Tex-Mex way we grew up." Principal D4 agreed, "Here you want students to be bi-literate because they are taking core classes in Spanish at the high school.

Principals from dual language campuses shared that in their district dual language is very important and the responsibility of the leader is to ensure that students are prepared at the elementary level so that they can have success in middle school and high school. The expectations of the teachers that served bilingual students are high. Principal D1 summed it up as,

We have professionals who struggle because they cannot speak Spanish that well and struggle with parents that 'vienen con puro español'. Teaching isn't just a job, it is a life

experience, a passion, if I don't see that in a teacher, they don't belong here, they are not moving in the same boat as I am.

Bilingual Proficiency

The second research question was discussed by the focus groups under the theme of bilingual proficiency. The topics described by the principals related to advantages and experiences of being bilingual. Perception is often influenced by our expectations, experiences, moods, and sometimes cultural norms (Essay, 2018).

Principals from the early-exit bilingual program believed that bilingual proficiency or language discourse does influence their perception of the bilingual program. Principal E1 noted, "I see it as valuable in the capacity of education and as a school leader because students relate to him and parents are in tune with him." Principal E5 stated, "Bilingual proficiency does influence my perception of the program because we who have knowledge of the program can influence teachers in using the program effectively." Principal E3 commented, "We live in a society, in an area, where you have to be bilingual and if you do not believe in the program, you will not implement it to its fullest." Principal E5 further added, "We who are bilingual can visibly see the advantages that bilingual students have in the workforce."

In reference to being a bilingual student, educator, and school leader, experience plays a major role in developing bilingual proficiency. "The experience we hold and what we learn during those years in bilingual education does shape how effective you are as a leader," shared Principal E4. Principal E2 interjected, "I believe that my bilingual proficiency and experience does influence my perceptions about the bilingual program, but I still follow the district's bilingual program." He added, "Sometimes we want to do more or less than what the district's

bilingual program requires.” Principal E1 put into perspective when he said, “The older you get and the more experience you gain does impact the way you perceive bilingual education.”

Experiences also helped develop the bilingual proficiency of principals from dual language campuses which in turn influenced their perceptions of the bilingual program. Principal D3 stated, “The positive experience with a teacher, who understood my academic struggles as a bilingual student and built a relationship with me, helped me in pursuing high academic goals. She further stated, “because of her experience as a bilingual student, the perception she has about the bilingual program is positive and her expectations of teachers is that they make connections with students early enough so that they want to come to school and be the best versions of themselves.” Principal D2’s experience was a little different:

I was not a proponent of bilingual education so my perceptions of bilingual education were validated by the type of bilingual program implemented in the district. I came from an early-exit district, the sooner I transitioned the students the earlier their success.

Principal D1 shared some experiences that influenced his perception of the bilingual program:

My parents were very humble and supportive about education. They reminded my brothers and me that education was the way to get further to get a better job than what they did. It did help that I was working next to them in the fields. Those life lessons, you can’t just gift to someone; you have to experience it. I personally have gained from the benefits of being bilingual as a student, teacher, and school leader.

Bilingual Programs

Perceptions vary depending on the bilingual program implemented. In answering the question of which bilingual program do principals perceive is implemented by the district and which one are they actually implementing, a rigid dichotomy exists between what the district mandates and what the principal feels the campus needs. In keeping with the literature, the principal needs to set the tone and the directions to have everyone moving towards the same goal (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Principals changed their interpretation of their bilingual program to fit the needs of their campus. Some schools use our bilingual program as a dual language or even at times not providing any bilingual education. The practice in the district is to move to English instruction by the time students reach 4th grade at the expense of those who do not have success with the language. Principal E1 shared how he views the program:

In theory, we want students to participate in all English instruction by the time they reach 4th grade. We implement a transitional bilingual program in theory, but at our campus we consider the level of students' language skills to ensure that they are being instructed the way they learn.

Principals believed that there is no consistency in dual language campuses nor in early-exit campuses and in their effectiveness of program implementation. Principal E2 stated, "I think a lot has to do with the implementation experience with the bilingual program; I currently accept our bilingual program because the implementation is feasible and practical." Principal E5 agreed, "Students who were educated in the sixties and seventies, for example, experienced the sink or swim model which was not respectful of the needs of diverse learners; it goes to show that perceptions can vary based on what is believed to be needed at the time by school leaders."

Principal D2 from a dual language campus shared, “Given the population of students, the bilingual program begins with a 90/10 split in which 90% of the students in lower grades are doing Spanish.” The program is consistent with the Gomez and Gomez Dual Language Enrichment Model (Gomez & Gomez, 2017). Principal D2 continued, “By the time they are in 4th and 5th grade, the split changes to where 90% of the students are receiving English instruction.” The principal’s experience as a classroom teacher, and earlier on as a young administrator with bilingual education, influenced his perception of the dual language program that he is supposed to be implementing.

The school district dictates which programs are going to be implemented such that the dual language bilingual program at the district is a non-negotiable. However, Principal D4 shared, “There are only a few campuses in the district that can say they are truly dual language.” Principal D1 stated, “I can say what program I prefer but I know what is needed in this community; we need a dual language program because we are so close to the border, and that is our commerce, our community. The proximity to the Mexico border dictates what needs have to be met and what program benefits their community. Principal D3 agreed, “What we need here is a dual language program that is true which strengthens the person to be qualified in both languages and be bi-literate.” The principals of the dual language campuses agreed that the bilingual program is not perfect, but it meets the needs of the students and the community.

Summary

The focus group interviews addressed themes that described their perceptions and their beliefs about bilingual education in their specific district programs. The data showed that the perceptions of elementary school principals vary and can be influenced by their expectations,

bilingual proficiency and the bilingual programs implemented by their school district. The principals of dual language campuses expressed their dedication to preparing students to be bi-literate and in doing so, give them a better opportunity at success in a global economy. Principals from the early-exit campus also believed that providing a bilingual program would create global citizens by learning how to interact and bring down language barriers. All the principals found value in their bilingual programs.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe elementary principals' perceptions about bilingual education, in a district implementing an early-exit bilingual program and in a district implementing a dual language bilingual program, and its effectiveness to help ELLs achieve academic success. The study focused in determining if elementary principals' perceptions were a function of their language discourse (bilingual proficiency), level of academic knowledge of bilingual education, and years of professional experience. The following section reports the findings from this study. Throughout the summary of the findings, the quantitative and qualitative results will be discussed repetitiously and sequentially which is consistent with mixed methods data analysis.

Summary of Findings

The role the school leader plays in helping ELLs achieve academic success is explained and described through the integration of the inferences obtained from the qualitative and quantitative strands of a mixed methods study (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007). The quantitative and qualitative data collected during the study provided insight into factors that influence elementary principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs, specifically early-exit and dual language. The data provided a look at the similarities and differences that exist amongst elementary principals about their perceptions of bilingual education in an area where

stakeholders are predominantly English and Spanish speakers. Through survey instrumentation and focus group interviews, the researcher developed a picture of principals' experiences with two different models of bilingual education, early-exit and dual language. In this study, the participants' responses were insightful, conflicting, and surprising.

The first research question in the study sought to determine if the expectations of bilingual education programs held by the school district influenced principals' perceptions. The study focused on identifying expectations that could influence elementary principals' perception of bilingual education and the programs implemented in their respective school districts. Principals' knowledge and perceptions are important when implementing programs for ELLs because negative attitudes, prejudices, and misinformation about bilingual education programs may lead to inappropriate practices (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Rodriguez, 2009). The focus group interviews provided insight into how principals perceived the expectations of implementing their bilingual programs. These interpretations were based on policies set by the school district and the principals' held beliefs. Study participants believed that their campuses had implemented their bilingual programs to encourage bilingualism, and the future success of their students.

The second research question in the study sought to develop an understanding of how a principal's language discourse (bilingual proficiency) influence his or her perception of bilingual education programs. The focus group interviews confirmed this difference attributing it to the fact that the majority of the principals had positive experiences in developing their bilingual proficiency. In addition, principals believed that the bilingual program had value in addressing the needs of their communities. Principals and parents are aware that being bilingual is a

valuable skill in today's globalized communities, economies, and world markets (Murphy, 2016).

The third research question of the study examined principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs as they relate to level of academic knowledge of bilingual education, years of experience in bilingual education, and language discourse. These independent variables were tested separately using correlation analysis to determine relationship with the dependent variable. The outcome of correlation analysis of the independent variables, level of academic knowledge of bilingual education and years of experience in bilingual education, did not result in a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable, the principals' perceptions of bilingual education. However, the variable language discourse did show a statistically significant relationship with the principals' perceptions. These findings are consistent with the research that educators, who come from the same culture as bilingual students, bring both the language and cultural sensitivity to the classroom interactions (White, 2008). Principals may already have a predisposition to favoring bilingual education because of their personal experiences with family and education.

Further analysis was conducted to determine if the combined variables of principals' years of experience, knowledge of bilingual education, and bilingual proficiency were factors which influenced principals' perceptions of bilingual education programs. The researcher tested the first null hypothesis by conducting a multilinear regression analysis applying the stepwise and enter methods to determine if the combined independent variables had an effect in predicting the dependent variable, principals' perception of bilingual education. The results using both methods rejected the null hypothesis demonstrating, that even though two of the independent variables did not correlate with the dependent variable, the combined effects of the three

independent variables resulted in a statistically significant association with the dependent variable.

The focus group data supported this finding by confirming that life experiences and educational background, which are the basis for language discourse, contribute to principals' perception of bilingual education. It could be determined that academic knowledge and years of experience in bilingual education, which ranged from 4 to 40, are factors that can be associated with principals' perceptions. To further support this notion, principals must have the appropriate knowledge about second language programs so that they can support teachers in working with ELLs due to the lack of adequate training for teachers (Padron & Waxman, 2016). The data from the focus groups showed that principals can influence others if they are well versed about the program and the benefits they provide.

The fourth research question asked if there was a difference in principals' perceptions based on the bilingual program implemented by the school district. To answer the question, the second null hypothesis was tested using an Independent Samples case t-test to determine if there were any significant differences in elementary principals' perceptions in an early-exit bilingual program with those in a dual language bilingual program. It was found that there was a significant difference. The difference could be attributed to the varying views in the implementation of the dual language program. For example, the principals from the early-exit campuses have one ultimate goal in mind, which is for students to master the English language. These principals want students to transition to English instruction as soon as possible.

Principals' views and understanding of multiculturalism, second language acquisition process, and the values they attribute to specific languages form their dual language education frames of reference (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008). The dual language campus principals' goal is

for students to be bilingual and bi-literate ensuring that they can speak, read and write correctly at the same level in both languages. Cummin's theory of second language acquisition and other learning factors could be considered in the implementation of the dual language program. The second language acquisition theory supports dual language as a form of additive bilingualism (Shoebottom, 2011). Even though the level of rigor and complexity of acquiring bilingualism and bi-literacy is a daunting task at the elementary level, principals attempted to implement the dual language bilingual program with fidelity. However, all differences aside, principals from the dual language programs, just like the principals from the early-exit programs, believed that students could attain academic success which could then lead to economic prosperity.

Discussion of Findings

The evaluation of the variables that could influence principals' perceptions defines the larger academic environment in which beliefs or perceptions are nurtured. Principals in the study were bilingual and experienced bilingual education that formed their bilingual proficiency and discourse. These experiences prompted these school leaders to take an interest in understanding how to help students achieve academic goals and their schools to operate effectively. Furthermore, school leaders have a vested interest in understanding how to help bilingual students navigate through their education to reach their goals. The reviewed literature supports that school leaders are an essential factor of whether or not a school operates effectively and impacts students' chances of academic success (Marzano, 2003). Researchers agree that effective principals are responsible for establishing a schoolwide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students (Wallace Foundation, 2013). All of the participants discussed something about their responsibility for providing quality instruction. They all

seemed to share a common vision of bilingual education to provide students a quality education and improve their opportunities for success.

Principals expressed positive perceptions regarding their programs but understood the shortcomings as well. An interesting finding in the study was the significant influence bilingual proficiency plays on the principals' perceptions of bilingual education. A possible explanation for this finding might be that principals who developed bilingual proficiency understand that the success of bilingual education programs rest on the shoulders of educators who are bilingual. Pena Cruz (1995) stated that Hispanic principals have a sincere interest in implementing bilingual programs to meet the needs of bilingual students. Principals understand that bilingual educators have greater propensity of providing guidance and support for this special population of students.

Participants from both early-exit and dual language districts strongly supported the type of programs implemented in their school district. Principals from dual language campuses expressed confidence in the ability to provide a positive, enriching academic environment for their students and the potential to serve their community. Principals indicated that there was value and benefits to their programs in the areas of education, economics, and social interactions.

Principals from dual language campuses seemed to be more passionate about bilingual education because they have experienced the positive results of students who have been in the dual language bilingual program from elementary through high school. The literature reviewed on dual language programs indicates that the goal of such programs is not to seek out the shortest route to proficiency in the second language, but to create a learning environment that promotes bilingual and bi-literate development that fosters positive attitudes to both languages and their

associated cultures (Murphy, 2016). Principals from dual language campuses expressed the need to encourage bi-literacy not just bilingualism.

School leaders understand that there are flaws in the implementation of any educational program (Hall & Hord, 2014); bilingual programs are no exception. Even though principals reported finding their district's bilingual program meaningful, there was no consistency in the implementation of either of the bilingual programs. Some principals reported that they experienced challenges within their own campuses, noting that in some cases, the opportunities only happened for a few students. For example, the students who continue in a dual language throughout their school years were selected for the dual language program and were selected based on their proficiency in both languages. It was only these students that participate in a dual language through high school that reap the benefits of the program. These are some of the challenges that principals have to contend with that contribute to their perceptions of the bilingual programs they implement.

Principals from the early-exit bilingual program believed that districts with dual language programs do not effectively or efficiently implement them because students that come from their home district to theirs are limited in fluency in both languages. Every principal wants their students to succeed, but most importantly, they want their individual schools to be recognized. The lack of collaboration contributed to the differences in perceptions. Nevertheless, principals in these programs view the instruction the students receive as a gateway towards academic and economic success.

Recommendations

Several aspects of the South Texas culture including the attitudes of community members, students, and teachers towards bilingual education factor into the beliefs that principals develop in forming their perceptions. In this time when school leaders are held accountable for academic achievement and student growth, this study serves to inform school leaders on the role they play in their students' success. This study found that the perception that principals hold regarding bilingual education impact the future of students. Understanding the perceptions of principals can provide information of whether the programs are valued and to what extent they address the needs of a growing bilingual student population.

Despite limitations due to survey response rates, the results indicate that principals who address the needs of bilingual students have a higher degree of consideration for the community they serve. A future recommendation would be to include more districts that implement early-exit and dual language bilingual programs. With a larger dataset, a clearer understanding of the relationship amongst the variables could be made to examine the effects on principals' perceptions of bilingual programs.

Furthermore, understanding the impact principals' perceptions of academic programs have on teachers' beliefs and perspectives enables educational leaders to enhance the reflectiveness of their decision making and to consider the effects their decisions may have on students. It is important to gain insight on how best to encourage principals to maintain or improve their efforts for providing a meaningful bilingual education. The opportunity to self-reflect would allow principals to focus resources that would enhance the academic opportunities of bilingual students.

Taking into consideration, the formation of principals' perceptions of their bilingual programs are in part influenced by the district leadership. It is recommended that Bilingual Education departments assist in providing for principals a supportive and collaborative school culture by allocating training time, preparation time, and collaboration time. A more collaborative culture would provide a more systematic approach to the implementation of bilingual programs.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, J. (2007). English language proficiency assessment and accountability under NCLB Title III: An overview. In J. Abedi (Ed.), *English language proficiency assessment in the nation: Current status and future practice* (pp. 3-12). Davis, CA: University of California. Retrieved from http://cacompcenter.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/02/title_iii_elp
- Ackerman, D. J., & Tazi, Z. (2015). Enhancing young Hispanic dual language learners' achievement: Exploring strategies and addressing challenges. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ets2.12045>
- Alanis, I., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 7(4), 305-319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802143378>
- Alvarez Gutierrez, L. (2013). Costo alto de politica anti-imigrante sobre la familia y educacion: The adverse consequences of anti-Latino immigration laws. *Theory into practice*, 52(3), 169-179.
- Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. (1978). Bilingual schooling in the United States. Southwest Educational Development Lab. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED039527.pdf>

- Araujo, B. E. (2009). Best practices in working with linguistically diverse families. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 45*(2), 116-123.
- Arguelles, M. E. (2007). *Oral language development of English language learners*.
Presentation at the Advanced Coaching Institute II for Texas Reading First, Houston, TX.
- Arrieta, O. (1994). Language and culture among Hispanics in the United States. In Thomas Weaver (Vol. 4), *Handbook of Hispanic cultures in the United States: Anthropology* (pp. 168-187). Houston, TX: Arte Publico Press.
- Austin, G., & Johnson, D. (2012). Hispanic or Latino: Which is correct? *Profiles in diversity journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.diversityjournal.com/9724-hispanic-or-latino-which-is-correct/>
- Babino, A., & Gonzalez-Carriedo, R. (2015). Advocating for dual-language programs: Implementation of a public policymaking model. *Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction, 17*(1), 12-27.
- Baecher, L., Knoll, M., & Patti, J. (2013). Addressing English language learners in the school leadership curriculum: Mapping the terrain. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 8*(3), 280-303.
- Baker, B. (2005). Do principals with stronger academic backgrounds hire better teachers? Policy implications for improving high-poverty schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41*, 449-479.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, K. (2010). *Florida teacher perceptions concerning internet dangers for students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from STARS: Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019. (4309) <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4309>

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, K., & de Kanter, A. (1981). *Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of the literature*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education/Office of Technical and Analytic Systems.

Bale, J. (2015). English-only to the core: What the common core means for emergent bilingual youth. *Rethinking Schools*, 30(1). Retrieved from http://rethinkingschools.aidevt.com/archive/30_01/30-1_bale.shtml

Bali, V. (2001). Sink or swim: What happened to California's bilingual students after Proposition 227. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 1, 295-317.

Barac, R., Bialystok, E., Castro, D. C., & Sanchez, M. (2014). The cognitive development of young dual language learners: A critical review. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 29, 699-714.

Barrow, L., & Markman-Pithers, L. (2016). Supporting young English learners in the United States. *The Future of Children*, 26(2), 159-183.

- Belanger, K. (2001). Social justice in education for undocumented families. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 6(4), 61-73.
- Berliner, D., & Glass, G. (2014). 50 myths and lies that threaten America's public schools: The real crisis in education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bilingual Education Committee (2019). Bilingual education. Retrieved from <https://edfn313sacpbilingualeducation.weebly.com/bilingual-education-program-models.html>
- Billger, S. M. (2007). Principals as agents? Investigating accountability in the compensation and performance of school principals. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 61(1), 90-107.
- Black, D. (2006). "*We're becoming bilingual and biliterate!*": An ethnographic study on how a dual language program in Florida contributes to the literacy development of English language learners (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Central Florida, Orlando.
- Blanco, G. (1978). The implementation of bilingual/bicultural programs in the United States. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *Case studies in bilingual education* (pp. 457-468). Rowley, MA: Newbury House. NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.
- Blanco, M. (2010). Before Brown, there was Mendez: The lasting impact of Mendez v. Westminster in the struggle for desegregation. Retrieved from

https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/Mendez_v._Westminster_032410.pdf

Blanton, C. (2004). *The strange career of bilingual education in Texas: 1836-1981. 1.ed.* (Vol. 2). College Station: Texas A & M Univ. Press.

Brannstrom, C., & Neuman, M. (2009). Inventing the “Magic Valley” of South Texas, 1905-1941. *The Geographical Review*, 91(2), 123-145.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Implementation of shared governance for instructional improvement: Principals’ perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37, 476-500.

Brassard, M. R., & Boehm, A. E. (2007). *Preschool assessment: Principles and practices*. New York: Guilford Press.

Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(5), 700-745.
<https://doi.org/10.0077/0013161X06290650>

Brown, S., & Souto-Manning, M. (2008). Culture is the way they live here: Young Latinas and parents navigate linguistic and cultural borderlands in U.S. schools. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(1), 25-42.

Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *The Future of Children*, 21(1). 103-127.

Cardenas, J. A. (1995). *Multicultural education: A generation of advocacy*. San Antonio, TX: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

- Carlson, S. M., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2008). Bilingual experience and executive functioning in young children. *Developmental Science, 11*, 282-298.
- Castañeda v Pickard 648 F.2d 989 (1981).
- Center for Applied Linguistics (2012). Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the U.S. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (2014). Directory of two-way bilingual programs in the U.S. 1991-2004. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (2016). Planning and improving dual language programs with the guiding principles of dual language education. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org>
- Cerda, N., & Hernandez, M. C. (2006). Bilingual education. Retrieved from <http://www.freewebs.com/cerdahdz/>
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Collier, V. P. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. Directions in Language to Education. *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1*(9). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED394301.pdf>
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2002). Reforming education policies for English learners means better schools for all. *The State Education Standard, 3*(1), 30-36. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.thomasandcollier.com/professional-journal-articles.html>

- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-19. Retrieved from http://www.thomasandcollier.com/assets/2004-winter_njrp_astounding-effectiveness-of-dl.pdf
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Dual Language Education of New Mexico-Fuente Press.
- Collins, B. A. (2014). Dual language development of Latino children: Effect of instructional program type and the home and school language environment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 29, 389-397.
- Consentino de Cohen, C., Deterding, N., & Clewell, B. C. (2005). Who's left behind? Immigrant children in high and low LEP schools. *The Urban Institute*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED490928.pdf>
- Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (5th ed.). Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Company, Inc.
- Crawford, J. (1998). What now for bilingual education? *Rethinking Schools*, 13(2).
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education; History, politics, theory and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.
- Crawford, J. (2002). The Bilingual Education Act. Retrieved from <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/T7obit.htm>.

- Crawford, J. (2004). No child left behind: Misguided approach to school accountability for English Language Learners.
- Crawford, J. (2007). The decline of bilingual education: How to reverse a troubling trend? *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1(1), 33-37.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Cruz, C. (1996, March). *Implementation of Bilingual Education Programs in South Texas*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Orlando, FL.
- Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(5), 341-344.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Bilingual education in the United States: Power, pedagogy, and possibility. *The review of education, pedagogy, and cultural studies*, 20(3), 255-270.

- Cummins, J., Brown, K., & Sayers, D. (2007). *Literacy, technology, and diversity: teaching success in changing times*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Publishers.
- Cummins, J., & Corson, D. (Eds.). (1997). *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 5). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Cutter, M. (2015). *Using technology with English language learners in the classroom*. Retrieved from https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1314&context=education_ETD_masters
- Daniel, M. C., & Cowen, J. E. (2012). Exploring teachers' use of technology in classrooms of bilingual students. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 6, 97-110. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1062555.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2000). Shaping school culture. In The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership, *Eight roles of symbolic leaders* (pp. 197-209). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc
- Demuth, A. (2013). Perception theories. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/288341566/Demuth-Perception-Theories-1-1>
- Diaz, M. E. (2011). *A case study of Spanish language use in a Texas border colonia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas at Brownsville.

- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Donato, R. (1997). *The other struggle for equal schools: Mexican-Americans during the civil rights era*. Albany, NY: New York Press.
- Essay, UK. (2018). Theories of perception. Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/psychology/theories-perception-2618.php?vref=1>
- Estrada, V. L., Gomez, L., & Ruiz-Escalante, J. A. (2009). Let's make dual language the norm. *Educational Leadership*, 66(7), 54-58.
- Everett, D. (1984). The public school debate in New Mexico: 1850-1891. *Arizona and the West*, 26(2), 107-134.
- Flores-Mulero, H. (2003). *A comparison of the level of anxiety and the degree of acculturation among immigrant ESOL and mainstreamed-ESOL students in a public, rural high school in south Florida* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Lynn University, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Foley, N. (2010). *Quest for equality: The failed promise of black-brown solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Franco, C. S., Ott, M. G., & Robles, D. P. (2011). *A culturally proficient society begins in school: Leadership for equity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Gahlaut, V. (2017). Re: How would you do a 3 way ANOVA in SPSS with the factors being sex, drug exposure, and viral protein exposure. Is this even possible?. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_would_you_do_a_3_way_ANOVA_in_SPSS_with_the_factors_being_sex_drug_exposure_and_viral_protein_exposure_Is_this_even_possible/5993e52493553b052c00f302/citation/download.
- Gandara, P., & Escamilla, K. (2017). Bilingual education in the United States. In: García O., Lin A., May S. (eds) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312265592_Bilingual_Education_in_the_United_States
- Garcia, E. E. (1991). Effective instruction for language minority students: The teacher. *Journal of Education*, 173(2), 130-141.
- Garcia, E. E., & Jensen, B. (2007). Helping young Hispanic learners. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 34-39. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el200703_garcia.pdf
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gardiner, M. E., & Enomoto, E. K. (2006). Urban school principals and their role as multicultural leaders. *Urban Education*, 41(6), 560-581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085906294504>

- Garrett, J. E., & Morgan, D. E. (2002). Celebrating diversity by educating all students: Elementary teacher and principal collaboration. *Education, 123*, 268-275, 333.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2008). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. (9th ed). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). Survey research. In Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (Ed.), *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (pp. 183-201). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Gentilucci, J. L., & Muto, C. C. (2007). Principals' influence on academic achievement: The student perspective. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 91*(3), 219-236. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636507303738>
- Glover, V. (2007). The net fiscal effects of illegal and legal immigrants: Evidence from urban counties of Georgia. Master's thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA.
- Goldenberg, C., & Wagner, K. (2015). Bilingual education: Reviving and American tradition. *American Educator, 39*(3), 28-32. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1076564>
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2002). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (6th ed.). New York: Merrill.
- Gomez, L. (2000). Two-way bilingual education: Promoting educational and social change. *Journal of the Texas Association for Bilingual Education, 5*(1), 43-54.
- Gomez, R. (2006). Promising practices: Dual language enrichment for ELL students K-12. *Journal of the Texas Association for Bilingual Education, 9*(4), 46-65.

- Gomez, L., & Gomez, R. (2017). Dual language Training Institute. Retrieved from <http://dlti.us3.html>
- Gomez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50-50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1). Retrieved from https://www.dltigomez.com/uploads/1/1/8/2/118222138/promising_model_2005.pdf
- Gonzalez, L. M. G. (2016). *Dual language programs (DLPs): Questions of access to DLPs in the state of Arizona* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://repository.asu.edu/attachments/178534/content/GomezGonzalez_asu_0010E_16634.pdf
- Goodwin, A. L. (2002). Teacher preparation and the education of immigrant children. *Education and Urban Society*, 34, 156-172.
- Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., & Holtzman, D. J. (2009). Instructional leadership in practice: What does it look like, and what influence does it have? *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14(1), 72-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824660802715460>
- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2000). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Grayson, K. (2016). School leadership transforming schools with linguistically diverse student populations. IDRA Newsletter. Retrieved from <http://idra.staging.wpengine.com/resource-center/school-leadership-transforming-schools-linguistically-diverse-student-populations/>

- Grosso de Leon, A. (2006). The school leadership crisis: Have school principals been left behind? *The Carnegie Reporter*, 4(1).
- Guajardo, F., Guajardo, M., Oliver, J., & Keawe, L. O. M. A. (2012). Framework for a new political praxis: “Respeto, dignidad, y conocimiento.” *Journal of the Association of Mexican American Educators*, 6(1), 52-60.
- Guajardo, M., & Guajardo, F. (2004). The impact on Brown on the brown of South Texas: A micropolitical perspective on the education of Mexican Americans in a South Texas community. *American Education Research Journal*, 41(3), 501-526. Retrieved from https://www.utrgv.edu/b3-institute/_files/documents/impact%20on%20brown%20on%20the%20brown%20of%20south%20texas.pdf
- Guerrero, M. D. (2003). Acquiring and participating in the use of academic Spanish: Four novice Latina bilingual education teachers’ stories. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 2(3), 159-181.
- Guerrero, M., & Sloan, K. (2001). When exemplary gets blurry: A descriptive analysis of four exemplary K-3 Spanish reading programs in Texas. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 25, 173-201.
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2017). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes. *Field Methods*, 29(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X16639015>

- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2014). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Hansen-Thomas, H. (2008). Sheltered instruction: Best practices for ELLs in the mainstream. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 44. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238722025_Sheltered_Instruction_Best_Practices_for_ELLs_in_the_Mainstream
- Hernandez, F. (2005). *The racial identity development of selected Latino school principals and its relation to their leadership practice* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin.
- Hickman, P., & Garcia, S. (2014). Elementary principal leadership for equitable learning environments for diverse Latina/o students. *NYS TESOL Journal*, 1(2), 59-85.
- Hill, S., Gomez, R., & Gomez, L. (2008). What a difference a year makes: A large urban school district's transformation from remedial to enrichment dual language education. *The Journal of the Texas Association for Bilingual Education*, 10(1), 154-177.
- Hinkle, D., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1998). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hofstetter, C. (2004). Effects of transitional bilingual education program: Findings, issues and next steps. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(3), 355-377.

- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (2nd ed.). Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Hughes, J. (2005). The role of teacher knowledge and learning experiences in forming technology-integrated pedagogy. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(2), 277-302.
- Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) (2012). IDRA calls for greater federal role in education to increase excellence and equity. Retrieved from <https://www.idra.org/resource-center/idra-calls-for-greater-federal-role-in-education/>
- Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) (2017). Attrition and dropout rates in Texas. Texas Public School Attrition Study 2016-2017. Retrieved from https://www.idra.org/research_articles/attrition-dropout-rates-texas/
- Jackson, Y., & McDermott, V. (2009). Fearless leading. *Educational Leadership*, 67(2), 34-39
- Jara, S., & Taylor, S. (2017). Report: Generational shift in Valley's educational attainment. *Rio Grande Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://riograndeguardian.com/report-generational-shift-in-valleys-educational-attainment/>
- JUSTIA (2018). Gomez v. Ill. State Bd. Of Educ., 614 F. Supp. 342 (N.D. Ill. 1985). Retrieved from <https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/FSupp/614/342/2141399/>

- JUSTIA (2018). *Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools*, 351 F. Supp. 1279 (D.N.M. 1972).
Retrieved from <https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/FSupp/351/1279/2594883/>
- Kemerer, F. R. (2010). *United States v. Texas. Handbook of Texas Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/jru02>.
- Kent State University Libraries (2017). SPSS tutorials: Independent samples t test. Retrieved <https://libguides.library.kent.edu/SPSS/IndependentTTest>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). The leadership challenge. In The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership (2nd Ed.), *The five practices of exemplary leadership* (pp. 63-74). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Krashen, S. D. (2010). Second language acquisition: Theory, applications, and some conjectures. Retrieved from http://sdkrashen.com/content/articles/krashen_sla.pdf
- Kurtz-Costes, B., & Pungello, E.P. (2000). Acculturation and immigrant children: Implications for educators. *Social Education*, 64(2), 121-125. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234750348_Acculturation_and_Immigrant_Children_Implications_for_Educators
- Lara-Alecio, R., Galloway, M., Irby, B. J., Rodríguez, L., & Gómez, L. (2004). Two-way immersion bilingual programs in Texas. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), 35-54, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2004.10162611>
- Lau v. Nichols 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Legislative Reference Library of Texas (n.d.).

Leone, S., Warnimont, C., & Zimmerman, J. (2009). New roles for the principal of the future.

American Secondary Education, 37(2), 86-96.

Li, J. J., Steele, J. L., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Implementing two-way dual-language immersion programs: Classroom insights from an urban district. Research Brief. RB-9921. RAND Corporation. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED570931>

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). Dual language education. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005). Review of research and best practices on effective features of dual language education programs. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/240623592_Review_of_Research_and_Best_Practices_on_Effective_Features_of_Dual_Language_Education_Programs

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, 51(4), 256-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726053>

Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Hargett, G. (2007). *The evaluator's toolkit for dual language programs*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

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(6), 531-545. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ949445>

Literary Devices (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.literarydevices.com/>

- Lodhi, A. (2017, June 21). Education and Plato's allegory of the cave. *Thoughts and Ideas*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/indian-thoughts/education-and-platos-allegory-of-the-cave-bf7471260c50>
- Lopez, S. P. (2016). *A quantitative comparison of the reading achievement of English learners in dual language and transitional bilingual programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Commons at NLU (166). <http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/diss/166>
- Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 315-340.
- Lyons, J. (1990). The past and future directions of federal bilingual-education policy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508, 66-80. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1047619>
- MacGregor-Mendoza, P. (2000). Aqui no se habla espanol: Stories of linguistic repression in Southwest schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 333-345. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2000.10162772>
- Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of language minority education in the United States. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Advances in Language Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Mares, I. (2014). *School principals' perceptions of bilingual education and their relation to English language learners' 8th grade reading performance on STAAR* (Doctoral

- dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3626204).
- Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36(2), 167-186. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1024207>
- Marshall, J. M., & Theoharis, G. (2007). Moving beyond being nice: Teaching and learning about social justice in a predominantly white educational leadership program. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 2(2), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/194277510700200203>
- Martin-Rhee, M. M., & Bialystok, E. (2008). The development of two types of inhibitory control in monolingual and bilingual children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 11, 81-93.
- Martinez, R. M. (2014). *Differences in student achievement between early-exit and late-exit bilingual programs: A multiyear, statewide investigation* (Doctoral thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3580934)
- Martinez, G. Y. (2016). *A historical account of dual language programs in the state of Texas: 19th-21st Centuries* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ezhost.utrgv.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezhost.utrgv.edu/docview/1849463337?accountid=7119>
- Martinez-Alba, G., Cruzado-Guerrero, J. & Pitcher, S. (2014). Glogsters and Other Motivating Technology: A Multiple Case Study of English Learners. *Reading Matrix: An*

- International Online Journal*, 14(2), 253-262. Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/155035/>
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Medina, D. (2008). *School principals as leaders in a new role* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). (1416)
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2417&context=dissertations>
- Medina, M., & Escamilla, K. (1992). Evaluation of transitional and maintenance bilingual programs. *Urban Education*, 27(3), 263-290.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085992027003004>
- Merchant, B. (1999). Review of the book New concepts for new challenges: Professional development for teachers of immigrant youth. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23, 301-305.
- Midobuche, E. (1998). From LEP to academic: Reflections on my twenty years in Title VII. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 22, 49-63.
- Mongeau, L. (2016). California voters overturn English-only instruction law. The Hechinger Report. Retrieved from <http://hechingerreport.org/california-voters-poised-gut-english-instruction-law/>

- Montague, N. S. (2005). Essential beginnings for dual language programs. *The TABE journal*, 8(1), 18-25. Retrieved from http://www.thomasandcollier.com/assets/2005-spring_tabe-journal-v8_beauty-of-dl.pdf
- Morales, J., Calvo, A., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Working memory development in monolingual and bilingual children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 114, 187-202.
- Munoz, A. (2006). *Mentoring women central office administrators* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Texas Pan American, Edinburg, TX.
- Murillo, L. A. (2012). Learning from bilingual family literacies. *Language Arts*, 90(1), 18-29.
- Murphy, A. F. (2010). Bilingual and bicultural. *Principal*, 90(2), 40-47.
- Murphey, D., Guzman, L., & Torres, A. (2014). America's Hispanic children: Gaining ground, looking forward. *Child Trends*. <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/americas-hispanic-children-gaining-ground-looking-forward>
- Murphy, A. F. (2016). Implementing and maintaining a dual language program: The nuts and bolts of a pathway to academic excellence. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 82(4), 45-59.
- Nagle, B., & N. Williams (2017). Methodology brief: Introduction to focus groups. *Center for Assessment, Planning, and Accountability*. Retrieved from <http://www.uncfsp.org/projects/userfiles/File/FocusGroupBrief.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2003). *Computer and internet use by children and adolescents in 2001*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004014.pdf>.

National Center for Education Statistics (2016). English language learners in public schools. *The Condition of Education 2016*. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/pdf/Indicator_CGF/coe_cgf_2016_05.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics (2017). English language learners in public schools. *The Condition of Education 2017*. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/pdf/Indicator_CGF/coe_cgf_2017_05.pdf

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) (2017). Profiles of English learners. *Office of English Language Acquisition Fast Facts*. Retrieved from

https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/05-19-2017/ProfilesOfELs_FastFacts.pdf

Nieto, D. (2009). A brief history of bilingual education in the United States. *Urban Education Journal*, 6(1), 61-72. Retrieved from

http://www.academia.edu/2454406/A_Brief_History_of_Bilingual_Education_in_the_United_States

19 Texas Administrative Code § 89.1201 (2019).

Norberg, K. (1978). Perception theory: Does it make any difference? *Educational*

Communication and Technology, 26(1), 5-13. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30217955>

Nordquist, R. (2020). Definition and examples of discourse. Retrieved from

<https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-language-term-1690464>

Northouse, P. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Oropesa, R. S., & Landale, N. S. (2004). The future of marriage and Hispanics. *Journal of marriage and family*, 66(4), 901-920.
- Ortegon, R. R. (2014). *LULAC v. Richards: The class action lawsuit that prompted the south Texas border initiative and enhanced access to higher education for Mexican Americans living along the south Texas border* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1476380823)
<http://ezhost.utrgv.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezhost.utrgv.edu/docview/1476380823?accountid=7119>
- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-24,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589>
- Ovando, C. J., & Combs, M. C. (2012). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Padron, Y. N., & Waxman, H. C. (2016). Investigating principals' knowledge and perceptions of second language programs for English language learners. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 4(2), 127-146.
<https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2016.1706>
- Parmon, P. (2010). Educating immigrant children: Bilingualism in America's Schools. *Social Sciences Journal*, 10(1), 66-69.

- Pease-Alvarez, L., Garcia, E. E., & Espinosa, P. (1991). Effective instruction for language-minority students: An early childhood case study. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6(3), 347-361. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006\(05\)80060-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(05)80060-2)
- Peterson, S., & Heywood, D. (2007). Contributions of families' linguistic, social, and cultural capital to minority-language children's literacy: Parents', teachers' and principals' perspectives. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 517-538.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.4.517>
- Poarch, G. J., & van Hell, J. G. (2012). Executive functions and inhibitory control in multilingual children: Evidence from second-language learners, bilinguals, and trilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 113, 535-551.
- Politzer-Ahles, S. (2019). Re: If there is no correlation, is there a need to run linear regression?. Retrieved from:
https://www.researchgate.net/post/if_there_is_no_correlation_is_there_a_need_to_run_linear_regression/5d4213c04f3a3e17ef148718/citation/download.
- Poulin-Dubois, D., Blaye, A., Coutya, J., & Bialystok, E. (2011). The effects of bilingualism on toddlers' executive functioning. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 108, 567-579.
- Porter, R. P. (1998). The case against bilingual education. *Atlantic Monthly*, 281(5), 28-39.
- Portin, B. (2004). The roles that principals play. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 14-18.

- PuenteDura, R. (n.d.). SAMR model. *Technology is Learning*. Retrieved from <https://sites.google.com/a/msad60.org/technology-is-learning/samr-model>
- Pulliam, J. D., & Van Patten, J. J. (2007). *History of education in America (9th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Qualtrics (2019). Provo, UT. <https://www.qualtrics.com>
- Quong, T., & Walker, A. (2010). Seven principles of strategic leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 38(1), 22-34.
- Ramos, F. (2007). What do parents think of two-way bilingual education? An analysis of responses. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(2), 139-150.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430701304807>
- Ramsey, P. F. (2009). In the region of Babel: Public bilingual schooling in the Midwest, 1840s-1880s. *History of Education Quarterly*, 49(3), 267-290.
- Renkema, J., & Schubert, C. (2018). *Introduction to discourse studies: New edition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Reyes, S. A., & Vallone, T. L. (2007). Toward an expanded understanding of two-way bilingual immersion education: Constructing identity through a critical, additive bilingual/bicultural pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 9(3), 3-11. Retrieved from http://www.languagepolicy.net/articles/Reyes_Vallone_Two-Way_Bilingual_Education.pdf

- Rhodes, R. L., Ochoa, S. H., & Ortiz, S. O. (2005). *Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students: A practical guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Richardson, L. M. (2015). Making learning foundational in developing school leaders. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 2069-2074.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.003>
- Riddle, W. (1995). Education for the disadvantaged: Analysis of the 1994 ESEA Title I allocations formula amendments. *Journal of Education Finance*, 21(2), 217-235.
- Rodriguez, A. P. (1999). Latino education, Latino movement. *Educational Theory*, 99(3), 381-400.
- Rodriguez, M. A. (2009). Instructional leadership that supports two-way immersion programs. *Soleado, Promising Practices from the Field*, 1, 8-9.
- Rodriguez-Scott, E. (2002). Patterns of Mexican migration from Mexico to the United States. Paper presented at the 82nd annual meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Rodriguez, D., Carrasquillo, A., & Soon-Lee, K. (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Promoting academic development, biliteracy, and native language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K., & Glass, G. V. (2005). The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English language learners. *Educational Policy*, 19(4), 572-594.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904805278067>

- Rong, X. L., & Brown, F. (2002). Immigration and urban education in the new millennium: The diversity and the challenges. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(2), 123-133.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124502034002001>
- Rosado, L. A. (2005). The state of Texas: Breaking new ground in dual language instruction. *The TABE journal*, 8(1), 7-17. Retrieved from http://www.thomasandcollier.com/assets/2005-spring_tabe-journal-v8_beauty-of-dl.pdf
- Rossell, C. (2009). Does bilingual education work? The case of Texas. *Texas Public Policy Foundation*, 1-24. Retrieved from <https://files.texaspolicy.com/uploads/2018/08/16093408/2009-09-RR01-bilingual-rossell.pdf>
- Samson, J., & Collins, B. (2012). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535608.pdf>
- San Miguel, G. (1987). *“Let all of them take heed”: Mexican Americans and the campaign for educational equality in Texas, 1910-1981* (1st ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- San Miguel, G. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education in the United States 1960-2001*. (Vol. 1, pp. 1-168). Denton, Tex.: Univ. of North Texas Press.
- Scanlan, M., & López, F. (2012). ¡Vamos! How School Leaders Promote Equity and Excellence for Bilingual Students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(4), 583–625. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436270>

Schwabsky, N. (2013). Exploring principals' nonroutine problems in bilingual immersion schools: Lessons learned for multicultural leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 23, 789-822.

Seal of Biliteracy (2018). *District Administration*, 54(7), 32. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezhost.utrgv.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=130593216&site=ehost-live>

Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public ... (2017). Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/dropcomp_2015-16.pdf

Shannon, S., & Milian, M. (2002). Parents choose dual language programs in Colorado: A survey. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 681-696.

Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 111-134; <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x03258963>

Shin, F., & Krashen, S. (1996). Teacher attitudes toward the principles of bilingual education and toward students' participation in bilingual programs: Same or different? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 20(1), 45-53.

Shoebottom, P. (2011). Second language acquisition-essential information. Retrieved from <http://esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/cummin.htm>.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N., & Calderon, M. (2011). Reading and language outcomes of a multilingual randomized evaluation of transitional bilingual education. *Educational*

Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33(1), 47-58.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373711398127>

Smith, A. D. (2001). Perception and belief. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 62(2), 283-309.

Soltero, C. R. (2000). Equality v. liberty v. pluralism: Latinos in American constitutional law. *Proceedings of the National Association of African American Studies & National Association of Hispanic and Latino Studies*, 125-154.

Southern Regional Education Board (2010). *The three essentials: Improving schools requires district vision, district and state support, and principal leadership*. Retrieved from <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Three-Essentials-to-Improving-Schools.pdf>

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (1993). *Vision, Leadership, and Change*. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues23.html>

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) (2011). *The principal's role in the instructional process: Implications for at-risk students*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues13.html>

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Stuft, D. L., & Brogadir, R. (2011). Urban principals' facilitation of English language learning in public schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 43(5), 560-575. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124510380720>
- Swenson, C. L. (2010). *The story of la raza studies: An historiography investigating deficit discourses, latino students and critical pedagogy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (763235849)
<http://ezhost.utrgv.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezhost.utrgv.edu/docview/763235849?accountid=7119>
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Editorial: The new era of mixed methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 3-7. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906293042>
- Tedick, D. J., Christian, D., & Fortune, T. W. (2011). The Future of Immersion Education: An Invitation to 'Dwell in Possibility': Practices, policies, possibilities. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 1-10). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Texas Education Code § 29.053 (2019).
- The Latino Family Project (2018). James Cummins' theory of second language acquisition. Retrieved from <https://www.latinoliteracy.com/james-cummins-theory-second-language-acquisition/>
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership*, 55(4), 23-27.

- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2011). Drs. Thomas and Collier share the educational implications of their research on dual language programs. *ESL Globe*, 8(1), 1-2. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational leadership*, 61(2), 61-64.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Retrieved from <http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/CMMR/CollierThomasExReport.pdf>
- Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., van Broekhuizen, L. D., Romero, M., Castaneda, L. V., Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1991). *Final report: A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs*. Los Alamitos, CA: The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Tingle, K., Haynes, M., & Li, D. (2017). State of Texas children 2017: Child well-being in the Rio Grande Valley. Center for Public Policy Priorities. Retrieved from <http://www.forabettertexas.org/kidscount.html>
- Torres, N. L. (2006). *Administrative support for English language learners: How the SIOP model empowers teachers, administrators, and English language learners* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://opencommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/AAI3231250>
- Trueba, H. T. (1988). Culturally based explanations of minority students' academic achievement. *Anthropology & education quarterly*, 19(3), 270-287.

- Tudico, C. (2010). *Before we were Chicanas/os: The Mexican American experience in California higher education, 1848-1945* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Penn Dissertations. (148). <http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/148>.
- 2014 Comprehensive Biennial Report on Texas Public Schools. (2015). Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/Comp_Annual_Biennial_2014.pdf
- 2009–10 Academic Excellence Indicator System. (2010). Retrieved from <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/aeis/2010/index.html>
- United States Census Bureau. (2013). Language use in the United States: 2011. Retrieved from <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2013/acs/acs-22/acs-22.pdf>
- United States Census Bureau (2017). Facts for features: Hispanic heritage month 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2017/hispanic-heritage.html>
- U.S. Department of Education (2015). Dear colleague letter. Office of Civil Rights. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-el-201501.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education (2018). Developing programs for English language learners: OCR memorandum. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/print/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/september27.html>
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (2008). Preparing to serve English Language Learner students. Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/appalachia/pdf/REL_2008049main.pdf

U.S. Department of Justice (n.d.). The Civil Right Division. Educational opportunities.

Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/edu/types.php>

Valent, A., & Chavez, I. (2011). Educating English language learners, is there a best practice?

LULAC Education News. Retrieved from

http://old2018.lulac.org/publications/LULAC_E_News_March_2011.pdf

Van Roekel, D. (2008). English language learners face unique challenges. *An NEA Policy Brief*.

National Education Association. Retrieved from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.190.2895&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Waldschmidt, E. D. (2002). Bilingual interns' barriers to becoming teachers: At what cost do we

diversify the teaching force? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 537-561.

Wallace Foundation (2013). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching*

and learning. The Wallace Foundation, New York, NY. Retrieved from

<https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning-2nd-Ed.pdf>

Wallstrum, K. (2009). *Benefits of dual language education*. Retrieved from

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED506123.pdf>

Weimer, A. A., Kuri, D., Esquierdo, J. J., Guajardo, F. J., & Correa, L. A. (2015). Desiring dual

language bilingual education: One community's perspectives on past and future

directions for bilingual learners. *Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction*,

17(1), 1-11. Retrieved from https://www.utrgv.edu/b3-institute/_files/documents/desiring%20dual%20language%20education.pdf

Wiemelt, J., & Welton, A. (2015). Challenging the dominant narrative: Critical bilingual leadership (liderazgo) for emergent bilingual Latina students. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(1), 82-101.

Whitacre, M. (2015). Attitudinal perspectives: A factor to implementation of a dual language program. *International Journal of Instruction*, 8(1), 35-46.

White, M. E. (2008). *Principal's perceptions of bilingual education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation database. (304417912)
<http://ezhost.utrgv.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.eu1.proxy.openathens.net/docview/304417912?accountid=7119>

Wright, W. (2011). Historical introduction to bilingual education: The United States. In C. Baker (Ed.), *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed., pp. 183-205). Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Wright, W. E. (2010). Language and education policy for ELLs. In Wayne E. Wright (Ed.), *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice* (pp. 70-76). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Zacarian, D. (2012). *Serving English learners: Laws, policies, and regulations*. Washington, DC: WETA.

- Zelasko, N. F. (2018). *Bilingual Education: Need for bilingual education, benefits of bilingualism and theoretical foundations of bilingual education*. Retrieved from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1788/Bilingual-Education.html>
- Zong, J., & Batalova, J. (2016). Mexican immigrants in the United States. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/mexican-immigrants-united-states-5>

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION SURVEY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your perceptions of Bilingual Education. The survey takes 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Thank you for your cooperation.

Part One

Please complete the following by selecting the best answer:

- (5) Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female
- (6) Age ☐ 20-29 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60 or over
- (7) Are you bilingual (Spanish/English)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (8) Are you monolingual (English)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (9) Are you the assigned principal at your campus? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (11) How many years have you been an educator? _____ year(s)
- (12) How many years have you been a principal? _____ year(s)
- (15) Are you Bilingual or ESL certified? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (16) How many years have you been involved with bilingual education? _____ year(s)
- (17) Bilingual grade levels on your campus (check all that apply)
☐ K ☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐ 6th
- (18) Approximate number of bilingual (Spanish/English) students in your school:
☐ 0-100 ☐ 101-200 ☐ 201-300 ☐ 301-400 ☐ 401-500 ☐ 501-600
☐ 601-700 ☐ 701-800 ☐ 801-900 ☐ 901-1000 ☐ 1001-1200

Part Two

Place a checkmark beside the response which most clearly represents the belief which you currently hold, not the belief you think you should hold.

Proficiency

- (1) I believe that if children are not proficient in English, they should be in a class which presents reading and language arts in both their native language and English.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (2) I believe that if children are not proficient in English, they should be in a class in which mathematics and science are taught in both their native language and English.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (3) I believe that learning subject matter in the first language helps second language students learn subject matter more readily when they progress to study in English only classes.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (4) I believe that students developing literacy in the first language will facilitate the development of reading and writing skills in English.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (5) I believe that if students are proficient in both English and Spanish, they should be enrolled in classrooms where their first language is part of the curriculum.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (6) I believe that if students are not proficient in English, they will do better in school if they learn to write in their first language.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (7) I believe that children who can read and write in their first language will be able to learn English faster and more easily than children who cannot read and write in their first language.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (8) I believe that if second language learners are in an English only class, they will acquire the English language at a quicker rate.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (9) I believe that a developmental bilingual program is the best way for Spanish-speaking students to learn English in the long term.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (10) I believe that a traditional bilingual program is the best way for Spanish-speaking students to learn English in the long term.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree

- (11) I believe that a two-way bilingual/immersion program is the best way for Spanish-speaking children to learn English in the long term.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (12) I believe that the emphasis should be on encouraging students to enter English-only classes as quickly as possible.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree

Funding

- (13) I believe that the funding for bilingual education classes should be increased.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (14) I believe that the funding for bilingual education classes should be decreased.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (15) I believe that the funding for bilingual education classes should be kept the same.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree

Discourse

- (16) I am confident in my understanding of the total bilingual education instructional program in my school.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (17) I am confident that I understand and can communicate to staff the complex instructional and motivational issues that are presented by a diverse student population.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (18) I have a clear sense of my own bilingual education professional development needs and the resources I can access to address those needs.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (19) I am confident in my ability to assess the bilingual education professional development needs of my school.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree
- (20) I believe that, as a whole, English language learners possess a distinct set of instructional needs.
[] Strongly Agree [] Agree [] Undecided [] Disagree [] Strongly Disagree

Knowledge

- (21) I believe the challenges that principals face in schools with bilingual education are student-based.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (22) I believe the challenges that principals face in schools with bilingual education are curriculum-based.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (23) I believe the challenges that principals face in schools with bilingual education are staff-based.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (24) I believe that having a knowledge base of the Spanish language impacts my effectiveness as a principal on this campus.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (25) I believe that, as a whole, parents of English language learners possess a distinct set of parental involvement needs.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (26) I can identify and describe the services of community agencies that provide services for the families of bilingual children in my school.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (27) I am confident in my ability to involve Hispanic families and community stakeholders in the decision-making process at our school.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (28) I am confident in my ability to resolve issues related to bilingual education.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (29) I am confident in my ability to interact positively with Hispanic families that make up my school community.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (30) I believe that students who attend bilingual education classes are able to transfer learned academic content into their second language at a faster rate than students who do not attend bilingual education classes.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
- (31) I believe that students who attend bilingual classes with certified teachers who are proficient in both English and Spanish are able to transfer learned academic content into their second language at a faster rate than students who do not.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Undecided ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Part Three

Please check True or False for each of the following questions:

- (1) The Texas Education Code (TEC) §89.052 defines a student of limited English proficiency (LEP) as one whose primary language is other than English and whose English language skills are such that the student has difficulty performing ordinary class work in English.
☐ True ☐ False
- (2) English language learners are identified by the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee.
☐ True ☐ False
- (3) Each school district which has an enrollment of 20 or more English language learners at the same grade level district wide shall offer a bilingual education program for English language learners in Pre-K to grade 5.
☐ True ☐ False
- (4) An English as a Second Language (ESL) program is required for all English language learners for whom a district is not required to offer a bilingual education program, regardless of the number of students, the students' grade level, and home language.
☐ True ☐ False
- (5) The Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) is responsible for identifying, processing, annually reviewing, exiting, and monitoring all English language learners on each campus.
☐ True ☐ False
- (6) The English as a Second Language (ESL) model focuses on second language acquisition through first language instructional support.
☐ True ☐ False
- (7) The English language learners' first language (Spanish) interferes with the second language acquisition.
☐ True ☐ False
- (8) Students in bilingual programs are grouped according to their native language and teachers must be proficient in the students' primary language.
☐ True ☐ False
- (9) The ESL students need to be taught basic skills before they can move on to more complex tasks.
☐ True ☐ False
- (10) The transitional bilingual education program is the most common form of bilingual education for English language learners in the United States.
☐ True ☐ False

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your educational background?
2. How many years have you been involved with bilingual education?
3. What is the expectation of the principals concerning bilingual education and to what extent does this expectation influence his or her perceptions?
4. Does a principal's bilingual proficiency or language discourse influence his or her perception of bilingual education programs?
5. Does a principal's level of academic knowledge of bilingual education influence his or her perceptions of bilingual education programs?
6. Do a principal's years of experience as a leader in a bilingual education program influence his or her perceptions of bilingual education programs?
7. What do you perceive to be the most important responsibility of a principal toward students in bilingual programs?
8. What bilingual program do principals perceive is implemented by the district?
Which one is actually implemented by the principal at his or her campus?
9. Do the principal's perceptions of bilingual education differ based on the type of bilingual education program implemented in his or her school district?
10. Is there anything else that you would like to add or share?

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

TABLES

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha for Language Discourse Subscale

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.837	4

Table 2: Bivariate Pearson Correlation for Language Discourse Subscale

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Percep2	39.4324	5.46474	37
Discourse4	17.0000	2.09246	38

Correlations			
		Percep2	Discourse4
Percep2	Pearson Correlation	1	.432**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.008
	N	37	37
Discourse4	Pearson Correlation	.432**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	
	N	37	38

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Bivariate Pearson Correlation for Academic Knowledge

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Academic Knowledge	6.5789	1.24405	38
Percep2	39.4324	5.46474	37

Correlations			
		Academic Knowledge	Percep2
Academic Knowledge	Pearson Correlation	1	.297
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.074
	N	38	37
Percep2	Pearson Correlation	.297	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.074	
	N	37	37

Table 4: Bivariate Pearson Correlation for Years in Bilingual Education

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Percep2	39.4324	5.46474	37
Years in bilingual education?	21.95	8.366	38

Correlations			
		Percep2	Years in bilingual education?
Percep2	Pearson Correlation	1	-.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.713
	N	37	37
Years in bilingual education?	Pearson Correlation	-.063	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.713	
	N	37	38

Table 5: Multiple Linear Regression Stepwise Method-Model Summary and Coefficients

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.432 ^a	.187	.164	4.99745

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discourse4

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	200.974	1	200.974	8.047	.008 ^b
	Residual	874.107	35	24.974		
	Total	1075.081	36			

a. Dependent Variable: Percep2

b. Predictors: (Constant), Discourse4

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	20.192	6.832		2.955	.006
	Discourse4	1.128	.398	.432	2.837	.008

a. Dependent Variable: Percep2

Excluded Variables ^a						
Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	Academic Knowledge	.254 ^b	1.701	.098	.280	.989
	Years in bilingual education?	-.145 ^b	-.936	.356	-.158	.967

a. Dependent Variable: Percep2

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Discourse4

Table 6: Multiple Linear Regression Enter Method-Model Summary and Coefficients

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.514 ^a	.265	.198	4.89452

a. Predictors: (Constant), Years in bilingual education?, Academic Knowledge, Discourse4

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	284.522	3	94.841	3.959	.016 ^b
	Residual	790.559	33	23.956		
	Total	1075.081	36			

a. Dependent Variable: Percep2

b. Predictors: (Constant), Years in bilingual education?, Academic Knowledge, Discourse4

Table 7: Three-Way ANOVA-Main and Combined Effects

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Percep2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
AcademicKnowledge	149.134	5	29.827	.999	.435
Error	925.947	31	29.869		
Total	1075.081	36			

a. R Squared = .139 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Percep2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discourse4	418.395	7	59.771	2.640	.031
Error	656.687	29	22.644		
Total	1075.081	36			

a. R Squared = .389 (Adjusted R Squared = .242)

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Percep2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
YrsInBIL	368.048	20	18.402	.416	.967
Error	707.033	16	44.190		
Total	1075.081	36			

a. R Squared = .342 (Adjusted R Squared = -.480)

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Percep2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q16YrsInBIL *	1042.581	34	30.664	1.887	.407
NoCorrectBILsurvey *					
Discourse4					
Error	32.500	2	16.250		
Total	1075.081	36			

a. R Squared = .970 (Adjusted R Squared = .456)

Table 8: Independent Samples t-Test

Group Statistics					
	Program	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Percep2	1.00	19	42.2632	4.05301	.92982
	2.00	18	36.4444	5.23812	1.23464

1=Dual Language

2=Early Exit

Independent Samples Test					
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Perceptions	Equal variances assumed	.170	.683	3.791	35
	Equal variances not assumed			3.765	32.024

Independent Samples Test				
		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Perceptions	Equal variances assumed	.001	5.819	1.535
	Equal variances not assumed	.001	5.819	1.546

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Enrique Humberto De La Cruz was born in Ciudad Valles, San Luis Potosi, Mexico to Enrique and Maria Elena De La Cruz in 1969. He graduated valedictorian from Edcouch-Elsa High School in 1987. He attended The University of Texas at Austin on a Presidential Scholars scholarship from 1987 to 1989. He graduated from Saint Edwards University in 1991 with a Bachelor of Business Administration. In 2003, he obtained the Bilingual Generalist-Spanish Texas teacher certification for grades pre-kindergarten through 4th. He received a Master of Education Degree in Educational Administration in 2007 from The University of Texas Pan American. In 2020, he received a Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership Degree from The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley.

He worked for IBM, BankOne, and Ford Motor Credit Company after graduating from Saint Edwards University. His teaching career began as a bilingual Kindergarten teacher at Widen Elementary in the Austin Independent School District in the 2002-2003 school year. For the past 15 years, he has worked for the Edinburg Consolidated Independent School District as a teacher, Curriculum Assistant, and Principal. Enrique lives in Edinburg, Texas and can be reached through email at ehdlc36@yahoo.com.