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ABSTRACT

Public schools across the country are increasingly dealing with children who enter schools speaking a language other than English and Arizona is not the exception. As a result, schools across the country have to adequately ensure this populations’ academic achievement, which is directly impacted by English proficiency and ELLs (English Language Learners) program placement. However, restrictive language policies such as Proposition 203, the four-hour English Language Development (ELD) block, and the exclusion of ELLs from Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in Arizona are not effectively preparing linguistic minority and ethnic student populations for academic achievement and competitiveness in a global economy.

For the first part of the analysis, the author examined bilingual education and DLPs policies, access, and practices impacting Latina/o communities by utilizing a case study methodology framework to present the phenomenon of DLPs in a state that by law only supports English only education. The author discussed the case study research design to answer the research questions: (1) Which public k-12 schools are implementing Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in the state of AZ? (2) What are the DLPs’ characteristics? (3) Where are the schools located? (4) What are the stakeholder participants’ perceptions of DLPs and the context in which these DLPs navigate? The author also describe the context of the study, the participants, data, and the data collection process, as well as the analytical techniques she used to make sense of the data and draw findings.

The findings suggest that bilingual education programs in the form of DLPs are being implemented in the state of Arizona despite the English only law of Proposition
203, English for the Children. The growing demand for DLPs is increasing the implementation of such programs, however, language minority students that are classified as ELL are excluded from being part of such programs. Moreover, the findings of the study suggest that although bilingual education is being implemented in Arizona through DLPs, language minority education policy is being negatively influenced by Interest Convergence tenets and Racist Nativist ideology in which the interest of the dominant culture are further advanced to the detriment of minority groups’ interest.
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Currently in the country, the availability of Dual Language Programs (DLPs) continues to significantly increase (Howard & Christian, 2002) as a way to prepare students to be competitive and thrive in a multicultural global economy. DLPs is the umbrella term for programs related to bilingual enrichment education (Thomas & Collier, 2012). Furthermore, public schools across the country are increasingly dealing with children who enter schools speaking a language other than English and Arizona is not the exception (Arizona Department of Education, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a; 2011b). As a result, schools across the country have to adequately ensure this populations’ academic achievement, which is directly impacted by English proficiency and English Language Learners (ELLs) program placement.

In this educational time of accountability through high stakes testing, teacher evaluation, and the pressure for schools to demonstrate their students’ academic success, schools need to pay attention to meeting the educational needs of linguistically and ethnically diverse student populations to make adequate progress toward national and state academic standards for academic achievement. For this reason, as schools seek for solutions to the issue of academic adequacy for academic achievement, the success of students in DLPs is increasingly becoming more appealing. However, restrictive language policies such as Proposition 203 and the four-hour English Language Development (ELD) block in Arizona are not effectively preparing linguistic and ethnic student populations for academic achievement and competitiveness in a global economy (Jiménez-Silva, Gomez, & Cisneros, 2014). The ineffectiveness in academic preparation...
occurs because language minority students are submerged in English-only settings and segregated for up to 80 percent of the school day (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2010).

After the founding of the U.S., bilingual education was utilized for immigrant communities to establish themselves into American culture while also establishing and maintaining their cultural and linguistic heritage without being forced into assimilation (Ovando, 2003). However, throughout the years the support for bilingual education has changed and fluctuated depending on the levels of immigration and the governmental relationships with countries from which immigrants originated (Gándara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). Depending on the political climate, the views of bilingual education have shifted from support of literacy and heritage languages to antibilingualism through education policy.

The Problem and Purpose

The current issue with access to DLPs in Arizona and their benefits is the lack of accessibility for individuals based on English proficiency, which is highly interrelated with social economic status and race (Kitch, 2009; Yancy, 2012). As a result of Proposition 203, ELLs cannot participate in such programs until they are deemed English proficient by the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA). This gatekeeping process becomes an issue since Spanish language minority students who are considered ELL and their interests as well as benefits are not being systematically supported. Furthermore, this gatekeeping process affects working class Latino language minority students who can be systematically tracked as ELL because they represent a significant number of K-12 students in the state of Arizona. The progress and
implementation of DLPs can be a benefit for students from all backgrounds to achieve literacy and academic readiness regardless of English proficiency. The gatekeeping process takes place by denying language minority Latinos of their bilingualism development and therefore denying them of the development of their heritage language, which is directly intertwined with culture. The exclusion is executed through segregation employed by Proposition 203, the 4-hour block model, and the exclusion of ELL students from DLPs by employing English proficiency as a requirement for access to such programs. Programs that focus on bilingualism and bi-literacy support literacy with high cognitive learning, high academic achievement, and as a result, the opportunity to be competitive in a global economy. For this reason, it is imperative that the opportunity to be part of such programs is an option for students from all backgrounds in order to achieve education equity for all students regardless of English proficiency.

The purpose of this research is to gather information on existing DLPs in the state of Arizona in order to identify the characteristics and implementation of such programs in order to create networking resources for those existing programs as well as for future ones. Furthermore, the purpose of this research is to highlight language education policy in Arizona that systematically excludes language minority students, specifically Latino language minority students. Moreover, this research examines the context in which DLPs exist in order to explore the perceptions of stakeholders in regards to language policy in which their programs operate.

**Research Questions**
To accomplish this purpose, the following questions were crafted and maintained at the core of the study in order to investigate the social complexities that drive and maintain language education policy in the state of Arizona.

1) Which public k-12 schools are implementing Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in the state of AZ?

2) What are these DLPs’ characteristics?

3) Where are these schools with DLPs located?

4) What are the stakeholder participants’ perceptions of DLPs and the context in which they navigate?

Overview of Dissertation

In Chapter 2, I present the transformations and continuities in U.S. bilingual education in a review of the literature to demonstrate the fluctuation and shifts of bilingual education influenced by political, economic, and social trends. I begin with political trends starting in 1848 with the appropriation of Mexican territory by the U.S. in order to present the creation of a sub citizenship for Mexican origin people and their marginalization that translated through laws and policies to this day. I then follow with the economic trends, including the Flores v. Arizona case which has for more than 20 years fought for the financial support that ELLs receive by the state to acquire the services and support required for education equity. Lastly, I present the social trends impacting DLPs and language policy such as anti-immigrant sentiments, which lead to xenophobic views through racist nativist ideology in society, and are then translated into laws and policy (Perez Huber, Lopez, Malagon, Velez, & Solórzano, 2008; Perez Huber, 2011).
In chapter 3, I provide the theory and methodological frameworks that I utilized in order to develop and conduct this study. Also in this section, I explain why my study can be viewed through an Interest Convergence Theoretical lens (Bell, 1980, 2009; Delgado, 2006; Delgado, & Stefancic, 1994; Hill Collins, 2009) utilizing Racist Nativist tenets (Perez Huber, Lopez, Malagon, Velez, & Solórzano, 2008). Using these theoretical lenses, I explore how, despite academic research supporting the benefits of bilingualism and multiculturalism, the U.S has intentionally and persistently maintained the English language as the primal and only language in education and public settings (Gándara et al., 2010) and specifically, in Arizona, by excluding ELLs from Dual Language Programs. In chapter 3, I also provide the case study methodology framework (Green, Camilli, & Elmore, 2006) that I utilized to present the DLP phenomenon in a state that by law supports English only education.

In chapter 4, I present the results of the findings in two sections in order to answer my research questions. In the first section I report the results using the research tool. In the second section, I report the results as per the one-on-one phone interviews and in person audio recorded interviews through straight description of the findings, which include the schools that are implementing DLPs, their characteristics, and their locations. Furthermore, I synthesize the results of the one-on-one interviews by demonstrating how many of the participants fall under various coding categories. For example, I document how many participants are aware of research supporting DLPs and its benefits; how many of them employ a globalism, an employable skill, and/or an economic argument when talking about DLPs and its implementation; and how many of the participants recognize the importance of language and culture (see Table One for the coding categories).
Moreover, in this section I provide the results from an analytical perspective utilizing the context in the state of Arizona where DLPs are identified and analyzed. Furthermore, I disseminate the importance of the location of the programs, the perceptions of the stakeholder’s as per their interviews, as well as the programs characteristic for policy implications regarding education equity.

In chapter 5, I present the discussion and conclusion of my study which highlight the context of DLPs’ implementation in an English only state, their characteristics, and the perceptions of DLP implementation in order to demonstrate Arizona’s support and passing of questionable language/literacy policies that significantly impact educational equity for already marginalized groups, Latinos in general and language minority students in particular (Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2010; Martínez-Wenzl, Perez, & Gándara, 2010; Rios-Aguilar, Gonzalez Canche, & Moll, 2012). I demonstrate how these policies are driven by nativist sentiments (Perez Huber, 2010, 2011), which influence the political, social, and, therefore, educational climate against language minorities and Latinos throughout the state via an interest convergence argument of Proposition 203 and the education policies that came after. The policy makers and politicians who push for these exclusionary educational policies must be held responsible for inequitably preparing students as future working citizens of Arizona.
CHAPTER 2

Transformations and Continuities in U.S. Bilingual Education-A Review of the Literature

To demonstrate the fluctuation and shifts of bilingual education influenced by political, economic, and social trends, I utilize Ovando’s (2003) timeline on bilingual education, Gándara et al.’s (2010) illustration of law and policy for educating ELLs in the U.S. as well as Mora’s (2014) Mora Modules: Legal History of Bilingual Education to indicate the changes and the importance of bilingual education variations starting in 1848 with the expansion of U.S. territory. These fluctuations and shifts are also present in the increase of Dual Language Programs, the harmful effects of ELD, and by discussing the benefits of DLPs.

Political Trends: 1848-1864

Bilingual Education for Spanish-speaking students has a historical beginning in the southwest due to the appropriation of Mexican territory by the U.S. through the Mexican-American War (Acuña, 2000). In 1848, after the Mexican American War (1846-1848), Mexico and the U.S. signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Acuña, 2000), which gave Mexicans the right to speak Spanish in the U.S. As a result of the treaty, public schools taught non-native English students in monolingual or bilingual settings depending on the school. However, Mexican students were mainly in segregated schools with fewer resources than Anglo Americans (Gándara & Orfield, 2010).

The access and acceptance of bilingual education in the past has fluctuated depending on the political, economic, and social trends of the moment. During the 1700s and most of the 1800s, society in the U.S. was open to accepting many languages as
immigrants from all over the world arrived to the country (Thomas & Collier, 2012) as a result of the economic boom in the U.S. Consequently, bilingual education programs flourished across the country in regions with high numbers of non-English speakers (Kloss, 1998; Thomas & Collier, 2012). However, not all groups were accepted equally, and restrictive policies against “immigrant languages” soon spread across the country. For example, in contrast to Mexican-Americans who decided to stay in the new U.S. territory and who were protected to utilize Spanish in the classroom by the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty, Native Americans were prohibited from being taught in their own native language in public spaces, especially in classrooms. In 1864, Congress prohibited the use of Native American Languages in educational settings (Maffay, 1998; Harvey, 2015), and it set the precedence that the approach of teaching language minority students is that of “Americanization” in which language minority students are assimilated by immersion into mainstream society (Ovando, 2003). As the country grew in territory and population, so did the nativist sentiments from those who were considered “real Americans” and, therefore, utilized their status as “Americans” to exclude and marginalize recent immigrants. The recent immigrants were considered the “other” and, therefore, ostracized from full participation in U.S. society by the implementation of policies and laws to minimize, if not completely eliminate, their legal status as well as limit their political and social participation (Galindo & Vigil, 2006; Johnson, 1997; Perea, 1997; Perez Huber, 2010; Sanchez, 1997).

This exclusion and marginalization strengthened the idea of defending national identity from “foreign threats” (Higham, 1955) and has historically targeted different and specific groups according to societal perceptions of who fits into the American national identity.
identity. In 1864, Native Americans were the threat. On the other hand, in 1906, due to an immigration wave of Italians, Slavs, and Jews, the attention shifted to these new immigrants and potential foreign threats. As a result, Congress passed the first Federal Language Law that required individuals to know English in order to receive naturalization (Gándara et al., 2010; Ovando, 2003).

**Political Trends: 1917-1974**

In 1917 the U.S. entered WWI, and as a result of foreign threat, the Federal Government increased federal aid for the teaching of English only, which restricted schools from implementing bilingual programs (Higham, 1992). Anti-German sentiment rapidly turned into hostility towards all minority languages, and by the mid 1920s, bilingual education was dismantled across the country (Gándara et al., 2010). By 1923, 34 states mandated English-only instruction in all schools (Ovando, 2003) placing a roadblock for bilingualism and bi-literacy (Kloss, 1998). Significant research patterns and outcomes suggested that children who were bilingual were disadvantaged because they demonstrated low language development, low educational achievement and intellectual progress as well as high risk for a lack of emotional stability Arsenian, 1937; Barke & Perry-Williams, 1938; Carrow, 1957; Darcy, 1953; Dolson 1985; Grabo, 1931; Harris, 1948; Saer, 1923, 1931).

However in 1958, promoted by the National Defense Act in response to the competition with Russia’s Sputnik, the study of foreign language was advocated for English only monolinguals. On the other hand, existing bilingual and bi-literacy resources of multiple language speakers were misspent by pushing the implementation of English only instruction in the classroom (Ovando, 2003).
It was not until 1961 that Dade County, Florida implemented full bilingual biliterate education programs for Cubans as a result of a Cuban immigration wave to Miami (Garcia & Otheguy, 1989). This particular immigration wave was propelled by the Cuban revolution of 1959 (Zuazo, 2004). By 1964, as a result of the support for civil rights, the Civil Rights Act established itself as a true entity by establishing the Office of Civil Rights in 1965 and, soon after its establishment, the Naturalization Act of 1906 was revoked by the Immigration Act (Gándara et al., 2010). With the establishment of the Civil Rights Movement, marginalized communities received support through the law to move forward their interests, and this included language minority individuals who wanted support for culture and heritage revitalization through language restoration within bilingual education.

As the fight for inclusion grew around the country, Florida implemented full bilingual programs, and Congress approved the Bilingual Act of 1968, which allocated school funding for the implementation of bilingual programs for the integration of native-language instruction (Ovando, 2003). Research began to positively turn in favor of bilingualism when several early studies argued that bilingual education yielded positive results (Dolson, 1985). Once certain variables were controlled for, factors believed to influence outcomes such as SES, bilingualism proficiency, and gender, bilingual student’s performance demonstrated higher rates than their monolingual counterparts (Coronado, 1979; Cummins & Gulatsan, 1974; Peal & Lambert, 1962). As positive outcomes of bilingualism increased, so did research and studies supporting bilingualism and bilingual education. Such studies supported the argument that bilingual individuals had higher cognitive abilities, mental elasticity and metalinguistic awareness (greater

In addition, bilingual education was seen by Latino communities as a means for maintaining Spanish, but also as a way to conserve their culture and heritage. For this reason, as part of the Chicana/o movement in 1974 Latino students in Texas demanded to speak Spanish, study Chicano history, and be taught by Chicano teachers (Acuña, 2010). These Latino students and their supporters made it their social responsibility to defend and demand their right for equitable education through bilingualism. The growing demand from students, parents, and community opened way for Lau v. Nichols in which the Supreme Court ruled that schools without special provisions to educate language minority students were not providing equal education and violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As a result of the Lau v. Nichols ruling, the Federal government, driven by the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, allocated 64 million dollars for bilingual education. Lau v. Nichols also provided guidelines, known as the Lau Remedies, for schools to identify and determine the English proficiency of language minority students to regulate the qualifications for educators who would work with language minority students. Furthermore, Lau v. Nichols also required district accountability by reporting effective educational outcomes for language minority students, which of course included literacy (Gándara et al., 2010; Ovando 2003).

In hand with the Civil Rights movement that was bringing attention to social change, the federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was a historical landmark that led to the passage of educational policy for minority students (Crawford, 2002; Leibowitz,
1980). The three main purposes of the Bilingual Education Act were to “increase
English-Language skills, maintain and increase mother-tongue skills through bi-literacy,
and support the cultural heritage of the student” (Leibowitz, 1980, p.24; see also Thomas & Collier, 2012). By 1971, a total of 30 states were requiring implementation of
transitional bilingual education for students with limited English proficiency (Ovando, 2003; Ovando, Combs & Collier, 2006).

**Political Trends: 1975-2000**

With the increased support of bilingual education, by 1975 the National Association for Bilingual Education was founded. However, regardless of the growing demand for federal and state support for bilingual education, cultural awareness programs, high academic student achievement, and support for language minority students, Dade County, Florida, whose residents previously supported and implemented a full bilingual education program for Cubans, passed the anti-bilingual ordinance (Ovando, 2003).

Between 1980 and 2000 the growth of bilingual education programs did not diminish the disapproval of such programs with the masked argument that schools were not meeting the needs of minority language students, and therefore needed to be removed. Anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments increased, as did the population of foreign-born residents by 40 percent in the 1980s. By 1994, California had passed Proposition 187, making it illegal for children of undocumented immigrants to attend public schools (Cal. Educ. Code, 1996; Gándara et al., 2010). The Federal Court ruled Proposition 187 unconstitutional, but in 1998 California’s voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition 227, eliminating bilingual education programs and requiring all instruction to be in English only. Following California, in 2000 Arizona passed its version of English only
laws, Proposition 203. Massachusetts soon followed in 2002 with its own English-only measure which, regardless of the research evidence, maintained that literacy in students’ native languages increased achievement in the second language (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Cummins, 1979; Dresseler & Kamil, 2006; Genessee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Thomas & Collier, 2002, 2012).

Bilingual education was coined as schooling for ELLs, which resulted in an increase of negative connotations against bilingual education in the 1990s and peaked at the beginning of the 21st century. Negative connotations towards bilingual education programs gave rise to the growing popularity of Dual Language Programs also known as Two-Way Immersion Programs (TWIP) in order to avoid negative attention and to receive support (Thomas & Collier, 2012; Wilson, 2011). As attacks on bilingual education increased, bilingual educators and school administrators began to disassociate themselves from bilingual education because they realized that it had become a negative term. The term dual language substituted bilingual education and soon became the umbrella term utilized to identify bilingual immersion, heritage language maintenance, one-way, two-way, 90:10 and 50:50 instruction, enrichment, and developmental language programs (Soltero, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

**Political Trends: 2000-2015**

**Arizona Proposition 203.** The Anti-bilingualism campaigns propelled by anti-immigrant, and anti-“otherness” sentiments peaked with the passing of Proposition 203 known as *English for the Children* in November of 2000. The new policy implemented the mandated rule that ELLs needed to be taught English by being taught in English (Arizona Revised Statutes, 2000; Wright & Pu, 2005). However, Proposition 203 ignored
the damage this policy would have on ELLs’ literacy and consequently, student achievement. The mandate stated that students labeled as ELLs were to receive education separately in English language classrooms utilizing Structured English Immersion (SEI) for one year. Unfortunately, this educational solution is not based on informed research and literature in the field. Once again, political and social nativist sentiments (Perez Huber, 2010, 2011) clouded the social responsibility that people in power have towards young students in providing them with equitable education opportunities.

There has been significant research regarding the effectiveness of bi-literacy through bilingual education, DLPs, TWIP, and other bilingual education models. Two prominent studies conducted by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) (Genessee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006) and the National Literacy Panel (NLP) (August & Shanahan, 2006) confirmed that reading instruction in an individual’s first language (L1) increases the levels of reading achievement in English (L2). Furthermore, being able to spell and write in one’s first language connects in important ways to literacy development in English. Additionally, utilizing these skills can place ELLs at an advantage in comparison to their peers in English-only settings over time (Thomas & Collier, 2002). However, this information was ignored, and Arizonans supported Proposition 203. Warnings against Proposition 203 came before and after the passing of the policy stating that the negative effects of SEI were likely to emerge in later years as a result of students being completely immersed in a language they do not understand. According to the warnings, the cumulative effects of ELLs not understanding the curriculum would take a significant toll (Mahoney et al., 2005).
The consequences of having limited programs available to teachers delivering instruction to ELLs as a result of Proposition 203 are now evident in Arizona. Prior to Proposition 203, Arizona school districts were able to select from a variety of program models, including various forms of bilingual education, to develop English proficiency and support academic attainment for their ELLs. However, this flexibility regarding the choice of program models for ELLs ended in school districts with Proposition 203 (Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, & Garcia, 2010). Proposition 203 might not have completely removed bilingual education programs from public schools; however, it did force English immersion programs as the default choice for families (Wright & Choi, 2006), further dismantling bilingual programs. This continuous eradication led way to DLPs, TWIP and other labels for what is essentially bilingual education with different names that would not attract unwanted attention or lack of funding support.

With the implementation of Proposition 203, the vast majority of bilingual programs in K-12 schools have been eliminated, or have been transformed into more marketable, supported, and implemented programs such as DLPs (Thomas & Collier, 2012). California and Massachusetts also supported and passed policies similar to Arizona Proposition 203; however, in Arizona, there has been a purposeful effort to greatly restrict the number of bilingual programs approved under waivers (Jiménez-Silva & Grijalva, 2012).

Also, a decrease in the number of teachers who have an English as a Second Language (ESL) or Bilingual Education (BLE) endorsement has been taking place. Since 2006, the number of teachers with BLE endorsements has decreased by 16 percent, and teachers with ESL endorsements have decreased by 7 percent (Arias & Harris-Murri,
2009). As a result, teachers who are knowledgeable in effectively working with ELL populations will continue to decrease as the SEI endorsements continue to be implemented and fewer ESL/BLE endorsements are granted (Arias & Harris-Murri, 2009).

**Four-Hour ELD Block Model.** Further negatively affecting the education of ELLs, their literacy, and academic achievement is the implementation of the four-hour English Language Development block model. In order to provide a prescribed instructional program, the Arizona English Language Learners Task Force was established in 2006. The Task Force created what is now called the four-hour ELD block model (Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2010, 2013). The four-hour block model requires ELLs to receive ELD services in an English immersion setting for at least four hours of the school day during the first year of being classified as an ELL student. The four-hour block model supports the idea that ELLs can achieve proficiency in English at a faster pace and with a deeper understanding in an English-only instructional environment (Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, & Garcia, 2010).

However, the four-hour block model enacts extensive and continued daily segregation as well as the grouping of students by language proficiency. This grouping and segregation of students does not align with research in the field of second language acquisition, nor does it align with cognitive infrastructure theories connected with the development of second language learners (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Martinez-Wenzl, Perez, & Gándara, 2010). The segregation of ELLs in the four-hour block model is not based on any type of research that supports the isolation of these students for a majority of the day because it does not exist (August et al., 2010; Krashen,
Rolstad, & MacSwan, 2007; Rios-Aguilar, Gonzalez Canche, & Moll, 2012). According to Lillie et al. (2010), in order to be an effective educator, teachers should focus on both grade-level content and active communication skills when educating language minority students in order to achieve the same academic levels as their native English-speaking peers. Furthermore, Garcia et al. (2010) state that in order to advance in language learning, language minority students need abundant opportunities to interact and network with those students who have a higher English proficiency than their own so that they are able to hear and participate in language and cognitive activities in which academic language is utilized for learning academic content. Moreover, Johnson’s (2012) research, based in Arizona, has highlighted the value of bilingual peers assisting ELLs in content area instruction in what the author calls “peerlingual” education. However, when students are segregated, peerlingual education is not possible.

In regards to the segregation component of the four-hour block model, Gándara and Orfield (2010) concluded that in Arizona’s schools, the excessive segregation is most harmful to language minority students’ achievement and literacy, while also negatively impacting their social and emotional development. This segregation within the instructional model which mandates the separation of ELLs from mainstream students for at least four hours of the school day, silences and marginalizes language minority students (Curran, 2003; Garcia et al., 2010; Bernhard et al., 2006; Morrison, Cosden, O’Farrell, & Campos, 2003; Osterman, 2000, Rios-Aguilar & Gándara, 2012). Students also report feeling isolated (Lillie, 2011), both physically and socially (Lillie et al, 2010). More concretely, school principals report having a strenuous time complying with the mandate of segregating students by language proficiency with just utilizing their own
personal understanding of what establishes effective instruction for ELLs (Jiménez-Silva & Grijalva, 2012). Consequently, the four-hour block model is problematic for many reasons.

One reason is that ELLs are being excluded from the core academic areas of math, science, and social studies because they have to be placed in the four-hour block for 60 percent of their school day (Lillie et al., 2010). This lack of access to core academic areas ultimately denies ELLs access to core academic content and deprives them from receiving core content to develop their literacy as their English-proficient counterparts (Garcia et al., 2010).

Since Dual Language Programs are programs for English proficient students, they can avoid the political “red tape” and the segregation enacted through the English Only mandates of Proposition 203. The implementation of the programs can then be less restrictive and financially supported through federal education policies that reinforce and promote high levels of student achievement in all U.S. schools. The issue becomes that ELL students are being purposefully excluded from DLPs. This exclusion is a violation to their civil rights because it denies the access to equitable education (Gándara & Orfield, 2010). ELLs should be protected under education policies that protect their civil rights to an equitable education, but on the contrary, through policies and educational initiatives, their rights to an equitable education are being violated and, therefore, this becomes a social justice issue. It is our social responsibility to provide equitable education for all students regardless of English proficiency, race, and social economic status.

**No Child Left Behind.** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was passed in 2001 by congress as part of the Elementary and Second Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which
ensured funding for low-income children set forth by President Lyndon Johnson’s administration’s “War on Poverty” (Menken, 2009). At the core of NCLB is accountability. It is the way the Federal Government assures that their investment in public education yields positive and measurable results in its citizens’ academic achievement. To measure results, high stakes testing was implemented to see the results/success/improvements of every public school, district, and state related to student performance.

Because of the political and social negative connotations associated with bilingual education, NCLB eliminated Title VII of the ESEA, the Bilingual Education Act, completely eradicating the word “bilingual” from the legislation, and as a result, funding for bilingual programs was negatively affected (Gándara & Baca, 2008; Johnson, 2007; Wiley & Wright, 2004; Menken, 2009; Menken, 2008a). Federal funding for ELLs was still offered under NCLB, but under different and new ways. First of all, the Bilingual Education Act was replaced with Title III of NCLB: The English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Olneck, 2005). This change placed languages, other than English, as problems and not as resources for the acquisition of English or for academic achievement (Ruiz, 1984). Furthermore, Title III did not allow funding for transitional bilingual education programs (Wiley & Wright, 2004).

The focus of these changes was for English Language Learners (ELLs) to learn English rapidly. As a result, schools with high percentages of ELLs were closely observed and judged, and this close observance discouraged the use of native language instruction (Crawford, 2002). The elimination of the word “bilingual education” from legislation, and certainly from NCLB, also eliminated the work that the Bilingual
Education Act (Crawford, 2002; Leibowitz, 1980) had established in solidifying the importance of L1 and L2 in providing the means for students to successfully access curriculum that directly affects their achievement (Menken, 2009). NCLB negatively impacted ELLs’ access to DLPs because it demanded for immediate results (due to high stakes testing). DLPs are more of a slow process in L2 development, even though this model has the highest positive results in acquiring L2 proficiency (Menken, 2009).

Race to the Top. In 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) went into law. This new law was designed and implemented as legislation to stimulate the economy, support job creation, and most importantly for the purpose of this paper, to invest in critical sectors such as education. The ARRA supports education reform that invests in innovative strategies that have a high potential to lead towards improved results for students by establishing long-term gains in school and school system capacity, as well as increased productivity and effectiveness (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provides $4.35 billion for the Race to the Top Fund, a competitive grant program designed to encourage and reward States that are creating the conditions for education innovation and reform; achieving significant improvement in student outcomes, including making substantial gains in student achievement, closing achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, and ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers; and implementing ambitious plans in four core education reform areas; Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction; Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and Turning around our lowest-achieving schools. (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, p. 2).

Race To The Top (RTTT) came into place after NCLB as a way to evade and eradicate the failings of NCLB (McGuinn, 2012) in achieving school progress and student achievement, and closing the achievement gap as it was hoped to accomplish (Mintrop & Sunderman, 2009). Furthermore, when it came to language policy and ELL education, RTTT was supposed to incentivize and not sanction schools and districts like NCLB did (McGuinn, 2012); however, it further excluded language policy, including bilingual education, from the legislative language.

In order for states to be eligible for the RTTT grants, the applications were rated on a 500-point scale according to the rigor in which the implementation of the reforms proposed by the four administration priorities listed above would be applied (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). On the 500-point scale, there were 30 points allocated for states to demonstrate they had narrowed the achievement gap for subgroups, which could include ELLs (Zehr, 2010). Such a low allocation of points in which ELLs could be categorized placed little to almost no weight on the ELL criteria, which ignored the need and the importance of supporting ELLs in closing the achievement gap (Zehr 2010).

As a result of little support for minority language students, DLPs managed to avoid being stigmatized as minority language Bilingual Education Programs and promoted as programs for English language students who wanted to learn a second language. This
detachment allowed DLPs to gain political support. In the next section, I will cover the
history of Bilingual Education funding that pertains to the development of Dual
Language funding.

**SB1242 Critical Languages; Economic Development; Pilot.** Arizona recently
passed SB1242 Critical Languages; Economic Development; Pilot to support the
implementation of DLPs for the economic development of students to compete in a
global economy (Arizona State Legislature, 2014). However, ELLs are excluded from
participating in this pilot, which serves as a gate keeping process that does not allow
ELLs to take part in this economic development process which could benefit them
academically as well as economically. This exclusion is a civil rights violation issue
because ELLs are being intentionally excluded from DLPs, which supports students’
opportunities of preparation for a global economy and to achieve higher academic
achievement. The support granted through DLPs should be granted to all students
regardless of national origin, English proficiency, culture, or class.

**Economic Trends: Flores v. Arizona**

Policy decisions regarding the education of ELLs directly or indirectly impact
DLPs because of the similarities in goals and outcomes, which are helping students
acquire language fluency while obtaining academic grade level achievement. For this
reason, funding for DLPs can be implemented and finalized by the inclusion of ELL
students, or DLPs can become competition for ELL resources, such as allocated school
funding. As a result, it is important to understand the funding concerns and issues for
ELLs in order to understand the probable funding issues for DLPs. The issue with
funding for ELLs in Arizona was brought forth by the prominent court case, *Flores v.*
Arizona, which stated that the state was inadequately funding instructional programs. Concretely, the U.S. District Court ruled that the $150 allocated per ELL student was not based on any data and hence was "arbitrary and capricious." As a result, the ELL programs' cost was inaccurate and based on random inaccurate information (Flores v. Arizona, 160 F. Supp. 2d 1043-Dist. Court, D. Arizona 2000). In 2001, House Bill 2010 was enacted making it the first bill to be approved by the Arizona legislature that attempted to address the funding needs of ELLs. HB 2010 allocated nearly $144 million over a four-year period for the funding needs of ELLs (Jiménez-Silva, Gómez, & Cisneros, 2014).

HB 2010 doubled the ELL per-pupil funding allocation to $320 and provided an increase in funding for ELL instructional materials, teacher training, compensatory instruction, a literacy pilot program, and teacher bonuses (Division of School Audits, 2007). However, despite the increase in funding, the plaintiffs continued to challenge the State’s per-pupil funding in April 2002, arguing that the funding allocated for ELL instruction remained inaccurate because it continued to be based on random, inaccurate information. As a result, the National State Legislative Conference, in support of the plaintiffs, conducted a cost study to address the insufficient funding for ELLs. In 2004 the National State Legislative Conference cost study suggested that Arizona's ELL students needed a significant increase in funding of up to $2,495 per pupil in elementary school and up to $1,662 per pupil in high school in order to be able to keep up with their academic peers. However, as a result of a flawed methodology, the cost study was dismissed and a new cost study was never conducted (Jiménez-Castellanos & Topper, 2012).
In May of 2005 HB 2718 was passed, providing an increase for ELL funding resulting in an increase of $420 per-pupil, which was to be implemented in the 2006 fiscal year. However, the democratic governor at the time vetoed the bill, stating that the increase remained inadequate in meeting the State’s ELLs’ needs. As a result of this veto, the Legislature passed SB 1198 in 2006, but again, the governor vetoed this bill due to the nature of the tax credits and called the legislature into special session (Arizona Senate Research Staff, 2008). A few months later, the Legislature passed HB 2064, which increased the ELL per-pupil funding to $420 as well as provided $10 million for ELL instruction (Division of School Audits, 2007). The same governor at the time allowed this bill to go into law without her signature, anticipating that the U.S District Court would find it inadequate. The U.S. District Court ruled that the Legislature had not provided adequate funding for ELL students through HB 2064. In April 2008, the Legislature passed SB 1096 that allocated $40.7 million to fund SEI programs. The Governor again predicted that this would not be adequate and allowed SB 1096 to go into law without her signature. In May 2008, the plaintiffs continued to challenge the Legislature arguing that the funding levels in SB 1096 failed to comply with the District Court’s order (Arizona Senate Research Staff, 2008).

The *Flores v. Arizona* case finally made its way to the U.S. Supreme Court in 2009 and transformed into *Horne v. Flores* (2009). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in a 5-4 vote that the State of Arizona remained in violation of the Equal Education Opportunity Act (EEAO), but at the same time, they reaffirmed that education and the funding of education is a state issue and should be resolved at the state level. For this reason, the case was returned to the district court (Education Justice, 2011). This time around, there
was a stronger emphasis placed on the instructional components of ELL education. The debate over what consists as adequate funding for ELLs in Arizona continues, regardless of the March 2013 ruling in which the district court denied plaintiffs’ motion to further increase the funding for ELLs (Flores v. Arizona, 2013).

The fight to acquire adequate education for ELLs in Arizona through equitable funding has been a battle that has taken 20 years to reach its current status. This battle complicates the possible funding for Dual Language Programs because all the caveats attached to ELL funding from the federal government might not be worth it or sufficient for programs to take on such a task. Also, the structure of DLPs is that all students, regardless of English proficiency, race, class, and gender benefit from Dual Language. For this reason, Two Way Immersion Programs are not classified as remedial education needed by students with special or extra needs, but as mainstream education (Thomas & Collier, 2012) and they, therefore, do not classify for extra funding. For this reason, a school might decide to have a Dual Language Program, but have ELLs in a different program to receive extra funding per ELL student.

Social Trends Impacting Dual Language Policies

In the U.S., there are roughly 40 million Latina/o foreign-born immigrants living in the country (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011b). Furthermore, roughly 22 percent of all 5-18 public school-aged students speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a). In Arizona, this converts to roughly 150,000 ELLs, which is 13 percent of all K-12 public school enrollments, of which the majority speak Spanish (Arizona Department of Education, 2010). The significant presence of immigrant Latinas/os, as well as Spanish speaking citizens whose home language is Spanish in Arizona and across
the U.S., has the potential of negatively or positively influencing and shaping policy depending on the social attitudes of the dominant culture in regards to their presence. In Arizona, individuals with xenophobic, anti-immigrant, racist nativist views and sentiments support the approval of policy that can target and marginalize the Latina/o population, such as the Tucson ban on ethnic studies, H.B. 2281, and S.B. 1070. Xenophobic, anti-immigrant, racist nativist sentiments and views that propel laws and policies are important to discuss when it comes to education language policy specifically because anti-immigrant sentiments and context can negatively affect the support for bilingual education, the education of immigrant populations, minority language students, and in particular, the education of Latinos. Latino education has become a social justice issue since education policies and laws enacted in states such as Arizona further marginalizes language minority and Latino students. For this reason, our social responsibility to provide equitable education for all students regardless of English proficiency, race, ethnicity, culture and social economic status should be implemented through education policies that can support all of our students and reject those policies and laws that further marginalize those who are already living in the margins.

Negative connotations and negative propaganda toward bilingual education increased in the 1990s and peaked at the beginning of the 21st century with the passing of English only education in Arizona. Prior to the establishment of the “English for the Children” policies in California, Massachusetts, and Arizona, several studies that attempted to delineate and evaluate the differences between English only and bilingual programs came to light with conflicting conclusions (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010). Baker and Kanter (1981) utilized 300 previous program evaluations geared
towards the education for ELLs. Of those 300, the authors only included 28 programs that utilized random but equal selection of ELLs students into a treatment group and control group. Baker and Kanter (1981) reviewed and scored the programs with a yes or no. A “yes” signified that the program supported bilingual education and a “no” signified that they did not. Researchers concluded that the effectiveness of transitional bilingual programs were so weak that they should not be exclusively utilized to educate ELLs (p. 10); however, they did not show any numbers/percentages representing the degree of programs’ success or failure. As a result, the authors did not specify why they were successful or not, just that they were.

Utilizing Baker and de Kanter’s (1981) review, Rossell and Baker (1996) ran their own analysis utilizing the same 300 program evaluations; however, they selected 72 programs, which they considered acceptable based on methodology. The methodology included groups in which students were randomly selected into treatment or control group, but also, studies that statistically controlled the differences between groups. Their analysis also included student achievement in standardized test scores in the English only programs as well as in the bilingual programs. The authors concluded that bilingual programs were not superior or that they did not yield higher results than English only programs in educating ELLs. Although, Baker and de Kanter’s (1981) study as well as Rossell and Baker’s (1996) found no significant differences between bilingual and English only programs, these two studies were utilized to support the argument that English only programs for ELLs were better than bilingual education.

On the other hand, several studies (Francis, Lesaux, & August 2006; Greene, 1997; Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005; Willig, 1985) utilized a meta-analysis
methodology in which the authors combined data from many studies. This combination and the statistical technique applied allowed them to calculate the average effect of an outcome by measuring the instructional procedure (in this case bilingual approaches compared to English only) accounting for the magnitude of the effect. Researchers of the studies who measured the effectiveness of bilingual education concluded positive effects in bilingual education programs which teach ELLs to read in their native language, or in their primary and secondary language simultaneously (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010).

For example, Greene’s (1997) study included a meta-analysis of the same data utilized by Rossell and Baker (1996), however, Green utilized studies which quantified the effect of bilingual programs after one academic year which limited his study to eleven studies. He also only included the studies that controlled for individual factors such as family income and parental education if the students were not randomly selected into control and treatment groups. Greene (1997) concluded that there is evidence to demonstrate that there is a positive and significant outcome favoring programs that use the student’s native language for instruction.

Willig (1985) also utilized previous data, however, her data set was from Baker and de Kanter (1981). The author decreased the study sample because she eliminated studies that did not fit her criteria, such as studies that were conducted outside of the U.S. or for studies in which the differences were not controlled for in the previous analysis. Although Willig’s (1985) research question was different than that of Baker and de Kanter (1981), she was able to demonstrate positive and higher effects for bilingual programs “for all major academic areas” (p. 297) for ELL students, therefore, stating that
bilingual education yielded better results than English only programs in the study. Similarly, Rolstad, Mahoney, and Glass, (2005) also compared English learners in bilingual programs and English only programs and concluded that there is a positive effect for bilingual education programs educating ELLs with an effect size of 0.23. Finally, Francis, Lesaux, and August (2006), with a sample of 15 studies, followed the authors’ methodological criteria (students in both elementary and secondary education and Spanish speakers receiving special education services) and also yielded positive effects for bilingual instruction.

Nonetheless, despite research that yielded positive effects of bilingualism and refuted the early negative findings against bilingual programs, “English for the Children” was passed in Arizona which led to the elimination of most bilingual programs in the state. The elimination of bilingual programs in the state gave rise to the growing popularity of Dual Language Programs (Wilson, 2011), also known Two Way Immersion Programs. As a result of the anti-immigrant sentiment in Arizona and the social trends associated with negative sentiments against bilingual programs, and with the lack of support in Federal Legislative educational policies, administrators of DLPs are persuaded to disassociate their programs from being classified as bilingual education, which has incorrectly become synonymous for programs serving only ELL populations. For this reason, due to anti-immigrant sentiments and policies that affect the Latino student population in and outside of the classroom, programs are being promoted as preparing English language students for a highly competitive global economy (see Darling-Hammond, 2010) and disassociating their services with ELLs. This disassociation alludes to the tension regarding the education of the high number of Latinos in the state and the
priority given to their academic achievement. This tension is visible in other education policies pertaining to the education of minority students in general, and Latinos specifically, as exemplified by the ban on ethnic studies (H.B. 2281) in the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD).

**Ban on ethnic studies (H.B. 2281).** H.B. 2281 was signed on May 11, 2010 prohibiting Arizona school districts and charter schools from offering classes that, according to the Arizona Revised Statues 15-112 and those who support it, (1) promote the overthrow of the U.S. Government, (2) promote resentment toward a race or class of people, (3) offer classes that are designed for students of a specific ethnic group, or (4) that advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of students as individuals. This policy directly affected Tucson Unified School District’s Mexican American Studies (MAS) Program (Feldman 2012).

Despite the fact that the goal of the MAS program was to increase student achievement among Latino students by providing them with curriculum rooted in Latino history and culture (Gómez & Benton, 1998), and the research supporting that they were attaining this goal (Cabrera, Casteel, Gilzean, & Faulkner, 2011; Milem & Marx, 2012), in January 2012 MAS was considered in violation of HB 2281. As a result, MAS was required to be eliminated, and if the TUSD did not comply with the new law, it faced losing ten percent of state funding (Horne 2010). This anti-Latino, anti-immigrant, xenophobic, racist nativist sentiment resulted in over 100 books being banned from classrooms, and also in the disintegration of MAS, and with it, its improvements in Latino student academic achievement.
Regardless that culturally relevant pedagogy can make learning meaningful to students who have been historically marginalized by the educational curriculum and increase their academic achievement, ethnic studies was banned affirming the argument that racist and nativist societal sentiments drive racist and nativist policy implementation like HB 2281. Such education policies intentionally and purposefully exclude a large percentage of Latinos from achieving educational excellence and their preparation for a global economy, instilling continuous and deep rooted, second-class status for working class Latinos living in the U.S. Like ethnic studies programs, bilingual education programs can increase academic achievement, however, the access to bilingual education programs for language minority and Latino students was severely limited in Arizona through Proposition 203 (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Cummins, 1979; Dressler & Kamil, 2006; Genessee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Thomas & Collier, 2002, 2012). On the other hand, the elimination of bilingual education through Proposition 203 pushed for the increasing support for DLPs, however, access to DLPs for language minority and Latino students continue to be a problem because Proposition 203 is still being implemented.

**Dual Language Programs Increase**

Several factors propelled the increase of Dual Language Programs in the state of Arizona, including the elimination of bilingual education through Proposition 203, English only education, and through policies and practices that support DLPs for academic success as well as preparing students to become part of a global economy through bilingualism. DLPs can be seen as the umbrella term for program names related
to bilingual enrichment programs (Thomas & Collier, 2012). DLPs evolved from bilingual education and if implemented correctly, can be considered bilingual education.

DLPs include two-way, one-way, and one-way heritage language as well as Language Restoration Programs (Thomas & Collier, 2012). An effective DLP according to Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) consists of 50 percent majority language speakers and 50 percent minority language speakers being submerged in a 50/50 time span between both languages in a two-way format. On the other hand, Thomas and Collier (2012) argue that one-way models are equally as important and effective as two-way models. A program is considered a one-way DLP when, for example, Native English speakers acquire the curriculum being taught by the teacher through English and another language as a foreign language through an immersion program (Tedick, Christian, Fortune, & Ebrary, 2011). Another example of one-way DLPs is when students of one heritage language background, for example, Spanish or Mandarin, attend DLPs where the curriculum is taught through the students’ heritage language as well as English (Thomas & Collier, 2012; Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2011). Two-way DLPs on the other hand, are when two different language groups are taught through their two languages. For example, native/heritage Spanish speakers attend DLP classes with native English speakers (Thomas & Collier, 2012; August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010).

The structure of DLPs can vary from a 90/10 model to a 50/50 model (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Morales & Aldana, 2010; Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2011; Soltero, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2001, 2003, 2012). The 90/10 model can be explained as a pyramid demonstrating how students at the beginning stage of their language immersion process are taught 90 percent of the time in the minority language or also known as the
partner language and 10 percent in English. However, this model changes as students advance to the point that the percentage the teacher spends teaching in the students’ second language decreases while the percentage the teacher spends teaching in the student’s native language increases. Through this process, the goal is for students to eventually be taught 50 percent of the time in their native language and 50 percent of the time in the second language to be learned (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; Thomas & Collier; Christian, Howard, & Loeb, 2000). On the contrary, in a 50/50 Dual Language program, students start with being taught 50 percent of the time in one language and 50 percent of the time in another language (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008).

Although both structural models, when implemented properly, can have positive effects on academic achievement and language acquisition, evaluations of the two models, 9:10 and 50:50 in one-way programs, demonstrate that the 9:10 has a higher success rate for students’ acquiring higher academic proficiency in the second language to be acquired (Collier, 1992; Genesee, 1987; Thomas, Collier, & Abbot, 1993; see also Thomas & Collier, 2012). On the contrary, restrictive language policies such as Proposition 203 and the 4-hour ELD block are not effectively preparing linguistic and ethnic student populations for academic achievement because language minority students are submerged in English-only settings and segregated for up to 80 percent of the school day (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2010).

**Harmful Effects of English Language Development (ELD)**

The 4-hour ELD block model is based on the assumption that ELLs can achieve proficiency in English much faster and better in an English-only instructional
environment (Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, & Garcia, 2010). Research, on the other hand, demonstrates that “English learners who initially learn to read in their native language, or learn to read in their native language and a second language simultaneously, demonstrate somewhat higher levels of reading achievement in English than students who do not have the opportunity to learn to read in their native language” (Martinez-Wenzl, Perez, & Gándara, 2010, p. 12). This is due to additive bilingualism, which “refers to the form of bilingualism that results when students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language” (Cummins, 2000, p. 37). On the contrary, the 4-hour ELD block model, featuring prolonged daily segregation and the grouping of students by language proficiency, does not align with research in the field of second language acquisition or cognitive infrastructure theories associated with the development of second language learners (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010). As a matter of fact, there is currently no body of scientifically based research that recommends the isolation of ELLs for four hours a day into English language classes, where they are segregated and kept from participating in and benefiting from core content and cognitively rich instruction (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Krashen, Rolstad, & MacSwan, 2007). Lillie et al. (2010) state that,

Any professionally responsible educator would expect that the model take advantage of the best practices that are available, not only for the development of English skills, but also for effective communication and English literacy in academic contexts that enable grade-level academic parity and success with their native English-speaking peers. (p. 33).
Garcia et al. (2010) add that, “in order to progress in language learning, ELLs need ample opportunities to interact with those beyond their own level of proficiency, and to hear and participate in language and cognitive activities that involve academic content” (p. 3). An instructional model that mandates the isolation of ELLs from mainstream students and classrooms for at least 80 percent of the school day negatively impacts the social and cultural well-being of these students by silencing and marginalizing them within the greater school context; thus, diminishing their sense of belonging to the educational environment, and further limiting their chances of academic success (Bernhard et al., 2006; Curran, 2003; Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2010; Morrison, Cosden, O’Farrell, & Campos, 2003; Osterman, 2000). The socialization of ELL students via language and instructional policy marginalizes students and alienates them by perpetuating systems of oppression facilitated through SEI in which students labeled as ELLs are to be educated separately in English language classrooms for a period not to exceed one year. The rhetoric around the issue is that speaking a language other than English is a deficiency in the U.S. educational system. As a result, the message is not to merge a student’s native language with the learning of a new one, as in bilingual education, but rather to abandon the native language and adopt English only. On the contrary, research demonstrates how such programs are beneficial for both, language majority and minority student achievement (Thomas & Collier, 2003; Cobb, Vega, & Kronauge, 2006; Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010), cognitive development (Bialystock, 2001, 2015; Nagy, Berninger, & Abbot, 2006), and student social interaction (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Whitmore & Crowell, 2006).

**Benefits of Dual Language Programs**
Dual Language Programs can serve both as an alternate to transitional models to educate ELLs and for English proficient students to reach proficiency in a second language. The benefits of utilizing DLPs instead of transitional programs are to maintain the primary language of the student as well as acquire English proficiency instead of transition the student into English proficiency only which is the main goal of most transitional programs currently utilized (Morales & Aldana, 2010). The positive outcomes in student achievement and student’s cognitive abilities for both ELLs and English proficient students are incentives for the insertion and increase of DLPs nationwide. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics (2012), there were 250 schools implementing DLPs in 2003, and this number increased to 448 schools in 37 states in 2011. These 37 states teach all or part of their curriculum through a second language in what they call Foreign Language Immersion Programs. By 2012\(^1\) from the 448 schools, 248 in 23 states identified their programs as TWIP.

**Student Academic Achievement.** Research data demonstrated that there are much better ways of teaching English to language minority students, including DLPs. Data has demonstrated that DLPs have benefited both ELL and native English speaking students in obtaining higher levels of academic achievement than their counterparts in mainstream classrooms. Thomas and Collier (2003) demonstrated that ELL students in DLPs scored in the 51\(^{st}\) percentile when taking the national Stanford 9 standardized test in the English language section; on the other hand, their peers in mainstream classrooms scored in the 34\(^{th}\) percentile. Furthermore, native English speaker students also achieved

---

\(^1\) DLP numbers reflects only the programs that self-report to CAL, for this reason, the number can be significantly larger and this variance is difficult to track (See Eaton, 2012).
higher scores than their mainstream classroom counterparts in the same test scoring in the 63rd and 70th percentile in reading as opposed to the 50th percentile for their counterparts (Thomas & Collier, 2003).

A study done by Cobb, Vega, and Kronauge (2006) analyzed the effects of a two-way model DLP in student’s last year of elementary school and first year of middle school academic achievement. The authors utilized longitudinal large scale, standardized achievement test data in writing, reading, and mathematics from native Spanish-speakers and native English-speaker students from the Two-Way immersion program. The population represented in this study was selected from a Northern Colorado school district of which 2 groups, the experimental group (n=83), and the control (n=83), were matched. Findings support the benefits of the Two-Way immersion programs by demonstrating that the students in the experimental group outperformed the control group in all three academic achievement areas.

Alanís and Rodríguez’s (2008) findings also supported the fact that students in general are doing well in Dual Language Programs. The authors demonstrated that 5th grade native English language students who are in these programs, in the particular district studied, demonstrated high test scores in the 80th and 100th percentile range on the English reading standardize test section. Furthermore, ELLs also performed better on the same section in comparison to the state average with 90 percent of the students receiving passing scores (Alanís & Rodriguez, 2008, p.311). Social Economic Status (SES) is also important to recognize in the academic achievement of students that are in DLPs, since it is an important factor that can highly influence the outcome.
In a study completed by Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010), they focused on identifying primary schools that have significant numbers of Spanish-speaking ELLs from low SES background. Furthermore, they identified English Proficient students from low SESs in DLPs with a focus on 4th and 5th graders. The results demonstrated that both groups of students in comparison to their peers in mainstream classrooms performed at higher levels on the state assessment. English proficient 4th grade students in DLPs reached 38 percent proficiency while 5th graders reached 50 percent proficiency in the English language arts section. On the other hand, their mainstream counterparts reached only 27 to 42 percent proficiency in the first study and 35 to 19 percent in the second study (p. 51). Similarly, ELLs in DLPs reached higher proficiency percentages with 33 percent for 4th graders and 21 percent for 5th graders. On the other hand, ELL 4th graders in mainstream classroom reached 24 percent proficiency and 20 percent of 5th graders reached proficiency. The Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010) study highlighted the success of DL programs for all students regardless of English proficiency, SES, or student race.

Previous to the study presented above, Lindholm-Leary (2001) conducted a longitudinal study over a period of 4-8 years that examined the academic achievement of 4,900 students in 20 U.S. schools with DLPs. The author analyzed data gathered from students’ academic achievement in several content areas from standardized testing as well as student’s language proficiency through language proficiency tests. Lindholm-Leary demonstrated that DLP students, regardless of model implementation (whether a 50:50, or 90:10 model) developed high levels of second language proficiency. More congruently, Lindholm-Leary (2001) demonstrated that English- and Spanish-speaking
students significantly improved in reading and academic achievement in both their native and second language across all grade levels examined.

de Jong (2002), correspondingly, demonstrated how bilingualism is effective for language minority students’ academic achievement as well as language majority students. She looked at a Massachusetts two-way bilingual education program that provides first language literacy development for all of its students during the first years K-12 education and teachers the curriculum half of the time in the student’s primary language and the other half in student’s secondary language by third grade. de Jong (2002) highlights the fact that by 5th grade both groups, native and non-native English speakers, meet the linguistic and academic achievement goals (p. 76). The Massachusetts program, highlighted in de Jong’s study (2002) is based on the theories of bilingualism for minority students, which seems to be supported by research. The research indicates that strong native language literacy skills are a strong predictor for the learning of a second language and high levels of proficiency in the primary language as well as the second language through what is known as additive bilingualism (Cummins, 1981; de Jong, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Similarly, in a national study conducted by Thomas and Collier (2001), the authors highlighted characteristics of successful programs for language minority students including DLPs (See also August & Hakuta, 1998, 1997; Cloud, Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003; Escamilla, 2000; Genesee & Hamayan, 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Senesac, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997). School districts that participated followed every language minority students for a year by identifying the program attended, student background such as SES status, the student’s primary and second language proficiency
when entering the program, prior schooling, student achievement, and standardized test scores. The authors also conducted qualitative analyses using data derived via school visits, interviews, source documents, surveys, as well as data on the sociolinguistic and social context of school programs. The result of Thomas and Collier’s (2001) research highlighted, amongst other benefits, that 90-10 and 50-50 one-way and two-way developmental bilingual education programs in DLPs were the only programs that were found to assist students to fully reach the 50th percentile in the student’s primary and secondary language in all subjects. Researchers also highlighted that the DLPs helped students to maintain high levels of achievement, and in some cases, even reach higher levels. Furthermore, the authors demonstrated how these programs had the fewest dropout rates.

**Cognitive Development.** The success of DLPs with students from different backgrounds can be explained by the benefits of bilingual education for children’s cognitive process. Bilingual education can influence much of their intellectual life and their ability to focus on utilizing language in a productive way (Bialystock, 2001, 2015; Nagy, Berninger, & Abbot, 2006). Bialystok’s (2010) research examined “how bilingualism influences the linguistic and cognitive development of children” (p. 6). The author examines the developmental abilities such as language acquisition, metalinguistic ability, literacy, and problem solving of bilingual children in comparison to monolingual children. Bialystok’s (2010) results conducted with children of different backgrounds, such as SES, demonstrate that being bilingual has a substantial impact on children’s ability to pick and choose relevant information. For this reason, according to the author,
development of two languages during the early stages of life turns out to have a profound significance that ripples throughout the life of individuals.

**Student Social Interaction.** Programs that give equal importance to the primary language as well as to second language are highly important for the development of student interactions, which are central to the sociocultural learning process of students (Wong Filmore, 1991). For this reason, both group of students’ standardized testing (Stanford, state test MCAS, and Aprenda Spanish Achievement Test) and academic achievement patterns demonstrated that the program design is positively effective since both groups scored at or above grade level as well as outperformed their grade-level peers from the mainstream classrooms. Lastly, de Jong’s (2002) study in as example of how second language acquisition and bilingualism can translate into actual effective practices (p. 80).

Furthermore, the interrelationships amongst different students promoted by DLPs’ exposure to bilingualism, bi-literacy, and multiculturalism can reduce prejudice and stereotypes that can promote societal cohesion for economic and societal improvement (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Whitmore & Crowell, 2006). In an ethnographic research study conducted by Whitmore and Crowell (2006) in a third grade bilingual magnet in a Tucson classroom, the authors concluded that the “diverse classroom environment offered cross-cultural learning (such as girls’ sleepovers) that widen their views of the world and offered real contexts for hearing and using each other’s home language” (p. 279). Concurrently, Dual Language Education allows children to develop a strong and positive self-identity in terms of ethnicity, race, and as students (Hawkins, 2005; Linton & Franklin, 2010; Reyes & Vallone, 2007).
As I have demonstrated in chapter two, the benefits of properly implemented and utilized bilingual education programs through DLPs are a benefit for both ELLs and English proficient students. There is an extant body of studies with research that demonstrates the efficiency of teaching students in one language (L1) will be easier for them to learn it in a second language (L2) (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Cummins, 1979). This holds true across all types of different students, whether it be students with different levels of English proficiency, different ages, or various reading levels (Dressler & Kamil, 2006). For example, the awareness and ability to identify letters with their sound, word reading, as well as spelling in one language, can efficiently be transferred into a second language (Abu-Rabia, 1997; Chitiri & Willows, 1997; Durgunoglu, Nagy, & Hancin-Bhatt, 1993; Edelsky, 1982; Fashola, Drum, Mayer, & Kang, 1996; Gholamain & Geva, 1999; Nathenson-Mejia, 1984; Zutell & Allen, 1998). The knowledge transferred across languages is also evident when it comes to vocabulary in English-Spanish bilinguals (Garcia, 1998; Jiménez, Garcia, & Pearson, 1996) as well as reading comprehension skills (Nagy, McClure, & Mir, 1997; Reese, Garnier, Gallimore, & Goldenberg, 2000). This transferable knowledge is positive not only for full bilingualism but also for academic achievement.

In addition to the benefits of bilingual education listed above, and if both groups of students in DLPs reach dual language proficiency, these outcomes are more increasingly valued in today’s global economy (Morales & Aldana, 2010). Students that are placed in DLPs have increased levels of proficiency in both languages because DLPs have the autonomy to implement language acquisition models that are efficient, but also because both groups of students in 50/50 models are valued equally in their educational
environment (Morales & Aldana, 2010). However, as I have demonstrated in the literature review with the political, economic, and social trends of bilingual education, the support for bilingual programs, regardless of what administrators chose to identify such programs as, fluctuate. This fluctuation is attached to how we, as a society, as voters, and as policymakers, internalize the externalities of our world that might negatively affect the way we see entire groups of people and anything associated with their cultures including language.

Despite academic research supporting the benefits of bilingualism and multiculturalism, the U.S has intentionally and persistently pursued the maintenance of the English language as the primal and only language in education and public settings (Gándara et al., 2010). With laws and education policies such as Proposition 203 “English for the Children” in Arizona and Proposition 227 in California, Spanish-speaking children might be transitioning out of the ELL label at a faster rate compared to previous generations, but they are also rapidly losing the ability to Speak Spanish than previous generations (Tienda & Mitchell, 2006). For this reason, the U.S. has been described as “a graveyard for languages” (Rumbaut, Massey, & Bean, 2006, p. 448). U.S language policy is driven by an irrational idea in which English has the possibility of losing its domination in the culture regardless of its world hegemony (Gándara et al., 2010). Schmidt (2000) argues that, “the dispute over language policies is essentially a disagreement over the meaning and uses of group identity in the public life of the nation-state, and not language policy as such” (p.47).

Minority languages are always culturally subordinate to the majority or “official” language and, thus, so are their speakers. As a result, such cultural subordination always
carries potential negative economic consequences (ELL exclusion from Dual Language Programs). These negative economic consequences can be the result from the exclusionary education policy that affords some students with higher levels of preparation than others for higher levels of economic stability. Moreover, “the stakes are very high for language policies, as they shape the core identity of groups of people, and determine their social, educational, and economic opportunities” (Gándara et al. 2010, p. 22).
Chapter 3

Conceptual Framework and Methods

In this section, I explain why my study can be viewed through an Interest Convergence Theoretical lens utilizing Racist Nativist tenets. In order to provide clarity on Interest Convergence and a Racist Nativist lens, I synthesize Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Critical Latina/o Theory (LatCrit), which is from where the two theoretical lenses I utilized in this study stem. In this section, I also provide the case study methodology framework (Green, Camilli, & Elmore, 2006) that I utilized to present the findings of the phenomenon of DLPs in a state that by law only supports English only education. Furthermore, I utilize Interest Convergence with tenants of Racist Nativist Theory to examine bilingual education and Dual Language Programs’ policies, access, and practices impacting Latina/o communities. Since Interest Convergence stems from Critical Race Theory (CRT) as well as Critical Latina/o Theory (LatCrit) which is utilized in Racist Nativist, the tenets of all four theories are explained below in order to understand Interest Convergence and Racist Nativist

Critical Race Theory (CRT)

CRT grew out of a black-white dual understanding of race that failed to capture some important issues and distinctions applicable to the experiences of racialized groups. CRT allows researchers to examine the multiple forms of oppression that systematically affect people of color (Ladson-Billings 2009; Pérez Huber, 2010), and it is a framework that seeks to identify, analyze, and transform those structural and cultural aspects of society that maintain the marginal position and subordination of people of color
CRT starts with the premise that race and racism are common and permanent constructs. The position is taken that racism occurs in various dimensions: (a) in micro and macro components; (b) institutional and individual forms; (c) conscious and unconscious elements; (d) and on individuals and groups (Davis 1989; Lawrence, 1987; Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998). Although race and racism are at the center of a critical race lens, they are also viewed at their intersection with other forms of subordination including gender and class discrimination (Crenshaw 1993). Thus, CRT has a social and racial justice research agenda that works to empower people of color, giving a focus to the significance of the first-hand knowledge of individuals (Bell 1987; Delgado 1989, 1995a). It also draws from an interdisciplinary perspective to challenge dominant ideologies, including meritocracy, colorblindness, race neutrality, and equal opportunity that camouflage the self-interest, power, and privilege of the dominant group (Bell, 2009; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Delgado and Stefancic, 1994; Hill Collins, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).

**Critical Latina/o Theory (LatCrit)**

Building on CRT, LatCrit seeks to expand the exploration of civil rights analysis beyond race (Aoki & Johnson, 2008). For this reason, I have applied the concept of LatCrit in the current sociopolitical Arizona context affecting language policy, which highly affects low-income Latina/o communities. The Arizona context marked by anti-immigrant sentiment affecting DLPs access for Latinas/os can be explained through the
LatCrit lens to challenge the dominant discourse that fails to acknowledge the Latina/o lived experiences (Bernal 2002; Pérez Huber 2010; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

Conceived as an anti-subordination and anti-essentialist theory, LatCrit is concerned with a progressive sense of a coalitional Latina/o pan-ethnicity (Valdes, 1996), and seeks to better articulate the experiences of the Latina/o community through a more focused examination of their unique forms of oppression (Pérez Huber, 2010; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). LatCrit is used to reveal the ways Latinas/os experience race, class, gender, and sexuality, while also acknowledging issues of nationality, language, immigration status, ethnicity and culture (Bernal, 2002; Pérez Huber, 2010; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

More specifically, LatCrit challenges the dominant paradigms of immigration discourse that have distorted and/or erased the experiences of undocumented Latinas/os. For this reason, LatCrit is a more political than a racial movement (Iglesias & Valdez 1998), and attempts to link theory with practice, scholarship with teaching, and the academy with the community (LatCrit Primer, 1999). Furthermore, LatCrit takes into consideration other tenets that highly influence the Latino experience such as nationality, language, and immigration status, which CRT does not. The issue with utilizing LatCrit is that it has the potential of generalizing the Latino experience in the U.S. that might not be applicable to all Latinos as a result of extreme variance between Latina/o groups.

**Interest Convergence**

Emerging from CRT, Interest Convergence also contains a social and racial justice research agenda that works to empower people of color (Bell 1987; Delgado 1989, 1995a). It draws from an interdisciplinary perspective to challenge dominant ideologies,
including colorblindness, race neutrality, and equal opportunity in the eyes of the law that camouflage the self-interest and power of the dominant group (Bell, 1980, 2009; Hill Collins 2009; Delgado, 2006; Delgado & Stefancic, 1994). It is specifically used to analyze the interaction of race with the law and how the interests of black Americans and those of white elites coincide, even if for a short period of time, allowing minority progress such as via *Brown v. Board of Education* (Bell, 1980).

In fact, Derrick Bell (1980) coined the term Interest Convergence theory after utilizing it to explain the court decision to desegregate schools in the Brown decision of 1954. He argued that Brown was approved at that time not because the Supreme Court saw this decision as fair, just, or moral, but because approving desegregation was necessary to support the U.S. Cold War objectives. These objectives, according to Bell (1980), included sending a clear message to the world that the U.S. was committed in supporting and advancing blacks’ interests and conditions in the U.S. to gain support from countries around the world against communism. Interest convergence is the idea that racial equality for African Americans and other people of color, including the Latino students in this study, will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites (Bell, 1980).

The influence and use of Interest Convergence to examine marginalized groups through race relations, power, and the law have moved beyond black and white binary relations and has since been utilized by academics in a wide array of principal areas (Driver, 2011). In the same sense, English only education was promoted and passed in Arizona through Proposition 203 because the interests of Latinos and the dominant culture intersected. The mutual interest was advertised as providing specialized education
and support for ELLs in the learning of English. The goal was to incorporate ELLs to
general education as soon as possible and this interest was promoted through English
only education (Proposition 203). In this manner, ELLs would receive specialized
education only for a year and after that year the students would become English
proficient and therefore assimilated into American culture. On the other hand, the
dominant culture would feel altruistic in knowing they helped in the assimilation of
“others” into American culture and resourceful in being able to efficiently utilize tax
money by reducing the resources for specialized education of ELLs for only a year.

The incorporation of ELLs into mainstream education as fast as possible through
English only education would allow ELLs to fully participate in the mainstream
classroom in order to achieve academic success in schools. The shift in language policy
through Proposition 203 momentarily included the advancement of minority language
interests, however, in the long run, it further pushed for the advancement of the dominant
culture and ideology. The interests of the dominant group were presented as the same
interests as the minority population for the advancement of ELLs and Latinos’ interests
through more efficient language policy and programs; however, utilizing interest
convergence theory, the interest of the dominant culture was to maintain power by

I used Interest Convergence to serve as an analytical lens in order to argue that the
growth of DLPs and the exclusion of ELLs from accessing these programs forward the
interest of the dominant culture. This interest is propelling the bilingualism of white
middle and upper class children affording them further academic, social, and economic
progress while doing the opposite for language minority students. As a result, the Interest
Convergence of language minority and dominant culture through language policy is camouflaging the self-interest and power of the dominant group. For example, DLPs are giving way for bilingual education to return which can be interpreted as an interest convergence opportunity for language minority students; however, its restricted access benefits the dominant group while further marginalizing language minority students. This access restriction takes place through the English only education policy which is masked as being beneficial for ELL students in particular and language minority Latinos in general, while actually being beneficial for the dominant culture by requiring English proficiency as a qualification to enroll in DLPs. The misconceived benefits for ELLs promoted through policies such as Proposition 203 and the 4-hour ELD block model, then, propel erroneous beliefs of minority progress to camouflage the self-interest and power of the dominant group by supporting the interest of middle and upper class white Americans of becoming bilingual for economic gains, while diminishing the self-interest and power of language minority groups by denying them the right to be part of DLPs based on English proficiency.

**Racist Nativism**

Following tenets of CRT and LatCrit, Racist Nativism places racism at the core of its conceptualization. A Racist Nativism conceptual framework helps researchers understand how the historical racialization of immigrants of color has shaped the contemporary experiences of Latinas/os and immigrants (Perez Huber, Lopez, Malagon, Velez, & Solórzano, 2008). Notions of white supremacy and privilege are used to support racial hierarchies, which operate on the basis of a system of racial domination and exploitation, whereby power and resources are unequally distributed (Bonilla-Silva 2001;
Dubois 1999; Roediger 1999) such as access to DLPs. English hegemony, similarly, is utilized to maintain social domination over linguistic minority (non-white) groups by reinforcing the ideological superiority of the English language (Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari 2003; Perez Huber 2011). These notions of superiority not only position whites as the entitled beneficiaries of unearned societal privilege and status, but also normalize white values, beliefs, and experiences as legitimate (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Sue, 2003).

Nativism is utilized as a function to exclude immigrants from full participation in U.S. society by limiting their political, social, and legal status (Galindo & Vigil, 2006; Johnson, 1997; Perea, 1997; Perez Huber, 2010; Sanchez, 1997). It illuminates the process of defending national identity from foreign threats (Higham, 1955; Kitch, 2009) and has historically targeted specific groups according to racialized perceptions of who fits into the “American” national identity. Drawing from a similar logic in defining racism, nativism is a perceived superiority of the “native,” which justifies perceived native dominance to opportunities and access, such as DLPs, over those accessible to “non-natives.”

The values, beliefs, and perceptions associated with whiteness are closely allied with a dominant national identity that maintains and supports not only a racial hierarchy, but also a normalized belief that whites are inherently native (Perez Huber et al., 2008). Thus, Perez Huber et al. (2008) merge the notion of racism with that of nativism and define racist nativism as

the assigning of values to real or imagined differences, in order to justify the superiority of the native, who is to be perceived white, over that of the non-native,
who is perceived to be people and immigrants of color, and thereby defend the right of whites, or the natives, to dominance. (p.43)

I utilize this definition as a potential analytical lens for my study to highlight the effects of the state’s education and language policies based on racist nativist ideology that affect the access DLPs which ultimately shape the Latina/o educational experience as well as affect the core identity of groups of people, and determine their social, educational, and economic opportunities.

The Interest Convergence theory combined with Racist Nativist components informs the case study research method that I use by providing the most appropriate platform to understand DLPs as the “case” or unit of analysis (Green, Camilli, & Elmore, 2006). Moreover, the educational policy contradictions in the state of Arizona that support bilingual education programs but also as per English only educational practices, is the “real life” context in which it occurs (Green, Camilli, & Elmore, 2006).

Furthermore, the exclusion of language minority students from participating in DLPs is supported by interest convergence components. For example, the entire purpose of the passing of Proposition 203 was promoted and supported as the most beneficial way to yield positive academic student achievement for ELLs; however, the contrary is being done with the exclusion of language minority students from participating in DLPs, which yield positive academic student achievement. As a result, I will explore what exactly are DLPs in the state of Arizona? How are they being implemented and supported in a state that strongly reinforces English only education? And what is occurring with access to DLPs in a context of xenophobic laws and policies?

In this section, I also discuss the case study research design that I utilized to
answer my research questions: (1) Which public k-12 schools are implementing Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in the state of AZ? (2) What are the DLPs’ characteristics? (3) Where are the schools located? (4) What are the stakeholder participants’ perceptions of DLPs and the context in which these DLPs navigate? I also describe the context of the study, the participants, data, and the data collection process, as well as the analytical techniques I used to make sense of the data and draw findings.

**Case Study Method**

A case study method allows for the examination of data at a micro level within a very specific context, geographical area, and or subjects of study (Yin, 1984). According to Yin (1984) the case study research method is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (p. 24). The case study method is particularly appropriate to utilize when there is a need for an in depth exploration and investigation of complex issues in order to provide a holistic view for understanding of a phenomenon occurring within a particular area and/or a small particular subject of study (Crowe, Cresswell, Robertson, Huby, Avery & Sheikh, 2011; Robson, 2002; Sufimi So, 2011; Yin, 2009; 1984).

In order to report on the current program accessibility to DLPs in the state of Arizona, I utilize a case study research design to examine in depth the case of DLPs in the Arizona state context. According to Yin (2009; 2006; 1984), a case study design can be utilized to examine important topics considered “cases” within their real life contexts. Furthermore, the case study method is appropriate to use when the research is geared to answers a descriptive questions in nature such as my research in regards to describing
what is happening in Arizona with DLPs as well as to answer exploratory questions of
how and why it is happening (Shavelson & Towne, 2002). I utilize the case research
design to explore the phenomenon of the fast growing DLPs in the state of Arizona
within a context of an “English only” law in education. This exploration allows me to use
the research questions that guide the case study research project (Green et al., 2006;
Kennedy, 2005) to get an in depth and a close understanding of DLPs in order to
highlight student access to Arizona’s programs. According to Bromley (1986), the case
study method helps to illuminate a particular situation by taking a close look to get an in
depth and first hand understanding of the case. Furthermore, the case study method
allows me to gather original data in a natural setting and to make direct observations as
opposed as to just using unoriginal data derived from other sources solely such as test
results, or only school statistics, or government information maintained by government
agencies (Bromley, 1986).

DLP access across the state has not previously been identified since there is no
existing public data providing the characteristics, locations, or identifying the DLPs
offered throughout the state. For this reason, data on the topic of DLPs in Arizona is
scarce and therefore original, but challenging to collect. Since the implementation and
growth of DLPs are new in the state of Arizona, it allowed me to make direct
observations regarding the questions of what, how, and why of the growth and
implementation of DLPs instead of relying on derived data as discussed by Blomley
(1986). As a result, the research questions as well as the topic of access to DLPs are
exploratory in nature (Shavelson & Towne, 2002). The exploratory nature of the topic
gives me the flexibility to address the questions of what, how, and why? In this case
study the case being observed in its real life context are the DLPs in Arizona (Green et al., 2006; Kennedy, 2005). DLPs in Arizona have not previously been identified or defined (Monroe College, 2011); hence, the purpose of this research is to obtain new insight and familiarity with DLPs within the context of Arizona in order to address questions of program accessibility in an “English only” state.

**Interview Method With a Case Study Approach.** The qualitative research interview method seeks to describe the central themes behind a participants experience in order to understand the meaning behind their words (Kvale, 1996). Moreover, interviews of participants are particularly pertinent in retrieving in-depth information regarding the experience of the participant within the specific topic of investigation (Sandelowski, 2000). As a result, I use phone and in person one-on-one interviews with key DLPs’ stakeholders as a means to provide a more focused in depth view of the investigation and exploration of DLPs in Arizona. More specifically, I conduct one-on-one in person interviews using semi-structured and open-ended questions in order to guide the interview, but not restrict it only to my questions and experiences with the topics of DLPs (Brenner, 2006; Kvale, 1996; Spradley, 1979).

According to Brenner (2006), the purpose of open-ended interviews is to understand the participants on their own terms since they will unveil how they make meaning of the knowledge within the topic of investigation influenced by their experiences, world views, and cognitive process. My job as the researcher is to develop open-ended questions that are semi-structured to encourage the participants to extensively talk about the topics (Brenner, 2006). To develop an open-ended interview, I started with big topic questions and funneled down to the details as suggested by Spradley (1979) in
order to expand on the participants’ responses. The expansion of the participant’s response will allow me to gather a broader perspective of the participants’ knowledge when it comes to DLPs and the context of DLPs in Arizona. Furthermore, since the case study method helps to illuminate a particular situation by taking a close look to get an in depth and first hand understanding of the case, interviews with DLPs’ stakeholders will allow me to get an in depth first hand understanding of DLPs in the Arizona context.

**Triangulation of Sources Within a Case Study Approach.** One of the benefits of case study research is that it is not limited to a single source of data allowing for multiple sources of data that allowed me to make my findings as complete as possible to provide in-depth information on the topic of DLPs (Yin, 2006). According to Denzin and Patton (1978), there are four types of identified triangulation processes which are (1) methods triangulation; (2) triangulation of sources; (3) Analyst triangulation and; (4), theory triangulation. Method triangulation is when a study has qualitative and quantitative methodology to provide a more complete view of the same unit of analysis through different perspectives of study. Triangulation of sources is examining the stability of different data sources within the same method in order to provide different angles of information for a broader examination of what is being studied. Analyst triangulation is utilizing different observers and/or analyst to analyze the same results in order to avoid blind spots when analyzing the information or to provide an examination of the different ways of viewing the same data. Theory triangulation is when the researcher looks at the data through different theory perspectives in order to interpret the data (See also Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2008). For the purposes of the case study of DLPs in Arizona, I utilized a triangulation of sources to illuminate DLPs in the
Arizona context in order to explore student access to such programs and to provide different angles of information for a broader examination of the case. The triangulation process included government and school reports and information as well as the phone and the in person one-on-one interviews. The triangulation of the sources allowed me to provide different angles of information for a broader examination of DLPs in order to highlight their context within Arizona.

**Participant Sample**

Given my goal to explore the characteristics and locations of the Dual Language Programs to determine student access, it was important that I directly contact school-level administrators who might hold the answers to my questions regarding their DLPs. District superintendents, superintendents’ secretaries, school and district office personnel served as key mediators in helping me identify relevant participants. I called the mediators to collect the contact information of the most applicable personnel who might be knowledgeable about the implementation and characteristics of DLPs at their respective schools and/or districts.

In order to identify the public schools in Arizona that are implementing DLPs, I started by identifying all of the 427 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in the state by using the information on the latest 2012-2013 school year report on districts, also identified under LEAs, and schools posted in the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) official website (http://www.azed.gov). I downloaded the 2012-2013 school year list that listed the 427 LEAs and was organized by county and LEA name. I then double checked the LEA list by downloading the 2012-2013 A-F letter grades which also listed all of the 427 LEA entities in the state as well as the 1,733 school names, the county, and
school letter grades. The 2012-2013 A-F letter grades list also identified whether the LEAs and schools were part of the charter schools system. For the purpose of this research, I did not include charter, private, or post-secondary schools because this research only focuses on K-12 public schools. Thus, I narrowed down the list of the 427 school districts/LEA to the 230 K-12 public school districts as per the ADE website.

I then attained the phone numbers for these 230 districts through the ADE website and through the Google search engine. Most of the phone numbers were obtained through the ADE website by typing the district name in the search box with the exception of 12 districts from Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, Pinal, Yavapai, and Yuma counties, whose phone numbers or any type of contact information were not listed in the ADE website, or the phone numbers were no longer in service. For these 12 districts, I conducted a Google search by district name to obtain contact information. After I identified the contact information for all 230 districts, I began making phone calls asking for the ELL district coordinator’s contact information. All of the pertinent information gathered from the 230 districts were recorded in an excel database (See data collection section below for details).

To identify the sample for this research study, which specifically include the public schools in Arizona that are/were implementing DLPs, I then contacted each of the 230 school district’s ELL coordinators as the first contact to establish if the district had any schools with DLPs. Since the person in the ELL district coordinator position was working with language learners, he/she would know what schools had DLPs and who needed to be contacted for the phone interview if they were not able to answer the questions regarding DLPs. After I obtained the ELL district coordinator’s contact information, and I reached the correct individual, I conducted the phone interviews.
I established a Phone Call Protocol in order to reach the indicated individuals in the district who would be able to answer whether the district had any DLPs, to answer the questions regarding the characteristics of the DLPs, or to provide follow up contact information of the individual who could provide such information (see Figure 1 for the Phone Call Protocol followed).

Figure 1

Phone Call Protocol

Following the Phone Call Protocol illustrated in Figure 1, from the first step to the last, I contacted approximately 460 people. Of those 460, 230 (50 percent) were
school district representatives and at least another 230 (50 percent) people were either ELL district coordinators, curriculum and instruction coordinators, school office staff or school personnel, superintendent office, world language coordinators and language acquisition directors who helped me identify the 35 public schools implementing DLPs in the state and also the 24 participants who were directly working with the 35 DLPs. After I identified the 35 schools implementing DLPs, I then contacted the 24 participants who were directly working with the 35 DLPs and therefore were knowledgeable in all the characteristics of their School’s DLPs.

The 24 key participants included district ELL coordinators, district coordinators, world language coordinators, language acquisition directors, and school principals, yielding 24 key participants representing 19 (eight percent) school districts and their respective 35 schools implementing DLPs. The number of key participants exceeds the number of districts because in a few instances, there were multiple schools implementing DLPs within the same district. As a result, there was more than one key participant interviewed per district. On the other hand, the number of key participants is lower than the 35 schools implementing DLPs because there were multiple DLPs within the same district who were supervised by the same individual such as the language acquisition director, yielding a smaller number than 35. The 24 key participants for the phone interviews were identified by superintendents, superintendents’ secretaries, and school and district office personnel who served as mediators in helping me identify relevant participants who would be able to answer my questions regarding the DLPs. Within the same 24 key participants, nine of them participated in a more in depth one-on-one in person interview after the phone interview.
Data Collection

I employed three stages of data collection. The first stage included the information and reports collected through the Phone Call Protocol illustrated in Figure 1, the ADE, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2013), and the DLPs’ school websites. The second stage included the information collected through the phone interviews with the 24 participants from the 35 identified schools implementing DLPs. The third stage included the information collected through the one-on-one in person audio recorded interviews with the nine participants. During the first stage, I collected all of the information described in the participant sample section above and illustrated in the Phone Call Protocol and all the relevant information to the identification of DLPs generated from all the initial phone calls (Column A-K in the research tool). The information was recorded in an excel database that served me as a DLPs directory and to what I will hereafter refer to as the research tool. The initial information that I recorded in the research tool from the collected information included the district name, the phone number, the district’s ELL coordinator, contact information, and the district’s county (see Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected).

I began the calling process in April 2014 and ended at the end of September 2014. Because of the contradictory policies in which DLPs navigate through an English only state, some contacts were comfortable with identifying the schools that offered DLPs while others were very hesitant and had questions about where the information gathered would be posted. After I Identified the 35 schools implementing DLPs and the 24 respective key participants, I gathered DLPs and school information through the NCES (2013) website, the ADE (2014) website, and the schools’ websites.
More specifically, I utilized the NCES database 2012-13 school year information to retrieve school statistics for the 35 identified DLPs such as school socio economic status (SES) through the free and reduced lunch percentages as well as the student race/ethnicity (Column V and W) report. I also utilized the ADE website to gather the school grade letter report for the 2012-13 school year (Column Z) as well as school the schools’ websites to gather the objectives/mission statement of the DLPs (Column R). In summary, the information that I gathered through the first stage of the data collection process for each of the 35 schools included:

1. School name
2. Name of program
3. School website
4. County
5. District name
6. School population demographics (race, ethnicity, SES)
7. District phone number
8. District ELL Coordinator
9. ELL contact information
10. DLPs contact if different than ELL Coordinator
11. DLPs contact information
12. School letter grade (See Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected)
I gathered and recorded the information through the schools’ websites, the NCES and the ADE before the phone interviews with the 24 key participants to ensure that the interview time did not exceed 15 minutes by asking the participants questions that could be found online. Stage two included the information gathered from the phone interviews which comprised questions that were not easily accessible online or not included at all such as the model implemented in the DLPs, and the number of students enrolled in the DLPs, as well as the partner language (see Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected).

**Research Tool.** To establish accurate descriptions in regards to the characteristics of the 35 identified DLPs, I created an excel database as a research tool in which I collected all of the information needed to identify the DLPs in the state and their characteristics. The research tool includes 33 different columns in which each column represents a different sections of information such as the district name, their phone number, the district’s ELL coordinator, their contact information, and the county as described above (see Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected). In the 33 columns within the research tool, I recorded the information gathered in stage one and stage two of the data collection which include column A through column AG. For example, column A through K has the information that lead to the identification of the 35 DLPs through the Phone Call Protocol illustrated in figure 1. Column A has the name of the schools implementing DLPs. Column B contains the name of the program, column C has the name of the program, D is the county, E is the district name, F is the district phone number, G is the districts’ ELL coordinator, H is the ELL contact phone number, I is the status/existence of DLPs (Yes
or No), J is the DLPs’ contact if different than ELL coordinator, and K is the phone number of the DLPs’ contact (See Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected. For stage two, the information gathered through the phone interviews with the 24 participants are also recorded in the research tool. The questions that I asked the 24 key participants through the phone interviews include the model implemented, and the number of students enrolled in the DLPs (See Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected).

**Phone Interviews.** The phone interviews with the 24 key participants were also audio recorded in the research tool and are part of stage two of the data collection process. I developed and utilized a brief and succinct calling script to explain the project and my collaboration in it as well as to explain the reason for calling and collecting the information (See Appendix B). The calling times, messages left, shifting of persons contacted for each district, and school that provided DLPs was significantly different and it ranged from one message to five or more in the time range in which I collected the information. The people that I contacted for the phone interviews were also concerned with how the information collected was going to be utilized and for what purpose. To ease and assure the participants of the security of their participation, I utilized a disclaimer statement (See Appendix D) which stated that the information and quotes retrieved from our conversation would ONLY be utilized in research presentations and/or publications, if they would give me permission to do so, again, without identifying them or their school. If they did not feel comfortable in saying yes, they had the option of saying no, and I respected their wishes of not utilizing their quotes in any public format.
I spoke with the 24 participants who were knowledgeable about the implementation and characteristics of the school DLPs approximately between 10-15 minutes to gather the information regarding the DLPs using the structured research tool. The questions used for the phone interviews with the participants included 15 questions including what is the DLP Language? What is the mission/objective of the DLPs, and how is academic proficiency measured? (see Appendix C for the phone interview questions).

I piloted the phone interview questions through a previous research project in which I was involved with Mesa Community College for a program that provides services for pre-service teacher and current teachers working with language learners. The project was geared towards identifying the public schools in Maricopa County that were implementing DLPs. Using the same idea, I expanded this project to the entire state of Arizona by adding sections, questions, and components to the research tool. More specifically, I added questions/sections that I thought were missing in the piloted research tool in order to investigate my research questions. The added questions that helped me with three research areas:

1. Address my research questions
2. Gather enough information on the implementation of the DLPs to be able to distribute the appropriate information to parties that are interested in building networks of teachers, students, parents, and community seeking DLPs.
3. Gather DLPs school and student demographics to determine if the DLPs services are equally distributed across the state to adhere to education equity.

For this reason, I added four major sections to the piloted research tool listed below:
1. Strengths, challenges, and naming issues, if any
2. Recruitment and retention
3. Interest convergence
4. Opinion based questions on program support and growth

By asking the participants for program strengths and challenges, I wanted to know what they identified as the strengths of their DLPs as well as the challenges in implementing their programs in the context of Arizona. I also wanted to know any naming issues they might have encountered when naming their DLPs because of the political context in Arizona regarding bilingual education.

One-on-one Interviews.

The third stage of the data collection process involved one-on-one in person audio recorded interviews with nine participants of the original 24 participants who agreed to do an in person one-on-one interview. I implemented the one-on-one audio recorded interviews to investigate the context of these specific DLPs and how the schools navigated through issues of accessibility, finance, implementation, and policy that directly affected the setting, context, and environment of their programs as well as student access. Additionally, I implemented the interviews to further explore the DLPs in order to investigate how programs are implemented in an English only state, which directly affects student access to such programs.

As part of stage three of the data collection, I conducted the interviews using semi-structured and open-ended questions (Brenner, 2006; Kvale, 1996; Spradley, 1979) with nine present and past principals, world language coordinators, and language acquisition directors from different districts implementing DLPs in Arizona. I utilized
open ended questions to give the participant the space to guide the interview in order to express their knowledge on the structure of DLPs. Furthermore, I also wanted them to express their awareness and knowledge in the context in which their DLPs navigate as well as their own experiences in it using their own words (Kvale, 1996; Brenner, 2006). I employ this interview method in order to describe the central themes behind the participants experience in order to understand the meaning behind their words as explained by Kvale (1996). Moreover, interviews of the nine participants are particularly pertinent in retrieving in depth information regarding their experience within implementing DLPs in an English only state (Sandelowski, 2000).

I selected the nine participants through a self-selected process from the original 24 participants from the 35 schools implementing DLPs. The self-selected process involved me contacting the 24 participants from the phone interviews to invite them to participate in a one-on-one face-to-face audio-recorded interview. I contacted the 24 participants by sending an email reminding them of who I was, how they had participated previously in the phone interviews, and asking for their participation in the one-on-one in person interview (see email invitation Appendix E) in their location of convenience (all of the participants requested to meet in their offices). The 24 people who participated in the phone interviews received email invitations (see email invitation Appendix E) to participate in the one-on-one interview with a consent form attached to the email (see consent form Appendix F) explaining the study in details, the process of their participation, as well as the potential benefits of their participation.

The one-on-one interviews were guided by, but not limited to 15 questions since as the conversations progressed through out the nine interviews, different questions and
conversations emerged depending on the participants’ experience and knowledge. As the interviews and the project progressed and evolved, so did the interviews (Howe & Dougherty, 1993). The 15 questions were informed by the results of the first coding cycle with the information from the research tool (see One-on-one Interview Questions Appendix J). Moreover, I developed the 15 questions following a semi-structured open-ended strategy in order to encourage the participants to extensively talk about the topics (Brenner, 2006). Furthermore, I started with big topic questions that the participant would feel comfortable and confident in answering, such as the following: what is/was your involvement in the creation/implementation of dual language education? (For example, teacher, principal, ELL coordinator etc.); what are/were your responsibilities within DLPs? I would then funnel down to the details and more specific questions as suggested by Spradley (1979) in order to expand on the participants’ responses to the context of DLPs within their schools and the state. Additionally, I crafted the 15 questions in order to provide a deeper understanding of the context in which DLPs are implemented in an English only state and how it affects student access to such programs (see one-on-one interview questions Appendix J). I recorded the interviews with the permission of the participants as long as their identities would remain anonymous. After I completed the nine in person interviews, I used a dictation program to transcribe 262 audio recorded minutes and 62 total pages of interviews.

Data Analysis

In the data analysis process, I analyzed the data in three stages. In the first stage, I analyzed the information from the Phone Call Protocol illustrated in figure 1, the ADE, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2013), and the DLPs’ school
websites. In the second stage, I analyzed the phone interviews with the 24 key participants. The information analyzed in stage one and two was all the information organized and placed in the research tool. During the third stage, I analyzed the one-on-one interviews with the 9 participants.

First Stage. The information gathered through the Phone Call Protocol were placed in the research tool columns A-K (see Appendix A). Column A through K contain information pertaining to the 35 DLPs’ school information as well as the contact information for all the people I contacted from the 230 school districts which helped me identify the 24 key participants. For this reason, I came to the conclusion that there is nothing to analyze within these columns as they were only used to identify the 35 DLPs. For continuity purposes, I want to make the reader aware of their existence as I am describing the research tool in the data analysis section. Column R, on the other hand, contains information I gathered through the DLPs school websites about the mission statement/objective of the DLPs in order to see what kind of vocabulary was present in the objectives of the programs that are growing in an English only state. I wanted to see what the mission statement/objectives would tell me about the programs, the characteristics, and implementation of DLPs in the Arizona context.

Column V and W of the research tool contain the student SES and the race/ethnicity reports of the 35 schools implementing DLPs collected through the NCES allowed me to gather more information pertaining to the characteristics of the program in order to determine the major race/ethnicity category of the community in which the DLPs are being implemented as well as their SES. The SES percentages of the students attending the schools of where DLPs are being implemented, as well as their
race/ethnicity percentages, can ultimately give me more information on the DLPs characteristics that can help me identify a clearer picture regarding the implementation and the growth of DLPs in an English only state. The six categories for race/ethnicity included American Indian/Alaskan, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, White, Other. Lastly, I gathered the schools’ letter grade that it received for the 2012-13 school year in column Z to possibly identify the level of student achievement in the school and the implementation of DLPs, which would also give me information regarding the DLPs characteristics. For stage two and three, I utilized descriptive coding as well as color-coding (Saldaña, 2013; Lewins & Silver, 2007) in order to make sense of the data collected through the phone interviews as well as the one-on-one interviews.

**Second Stage.** I employed a descriptive method when analyzing the information gathered through the phone interviews with the 24 key participants. A descriptive method is “the method of choice when straight descriptions of phenomena are desired” (Sandelowski, 2000, p. 334). A qualitative descriptive research method involves a description and interpretation of the phenomenon, which in this case are the perceptions of the participants regarding their DLPs in their schools/districts in the state of Arizona (Saldaña, 2013; Sandelowski, 2000). The descriptive method categorizes data for the researcher to grasp and analyze the content of the study (Miles, Huberman, & Sandaña, 2014). In other words, following the descriptive format I formulated a categorized inventory of the phone interview data and the one-on-one-interviews (Wolcott, 1994) through descriptive coding (Miles, Huberman, & Sandaña, 2014).

In the first coding cycle I used initial coding in order to analyze the data using an open-ended approach to begin examining the information gathered in the research tool to
find patterns within the different codes and formulate categories of data. (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña; 2014; Saldaña, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). According to Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, (2014):

 codes are labels that assign symbolic meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study. Codes are usually attached to data “chunks” of varying size and can take the form of a straight forward, descriptive label. (p. 73).

Furthermore, “codes can come from data consisting of interview transcripts, participant observation field notes, journals, documents, drawings, artifacts, photographs, video, internet sites, e-mail correspondence, literature and so on” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 3). For the purpose of my research, I created codes from the data gathered through the reports of the NCES, ADA, and school websites, as well as the phone interviews with the 24 key participants. I also wanted to keep an open mind about applying all possible theoretical directions depending on the data gathered. According to Charmaz, (2006) the data will indicate the theoretical direction of the study. Moreover, the breaking down of the data through codes allowed me to examine the different components of my data in order to identify the categories within the data, the “chunks”. Grbich (2013) defines the process of arranging the codes in a systematic order or classification, as categorizing or codifying the data. Furthermore, Bernard (2011) states that the analysis of codes is the search for patterns in the data that will help the researcher explain the patterns.

After I had gathered all the information from stage one and two of the data collection process, I created codes to make sense of the information gathered and recorded through the Research tool. My initial codes included 33 codes within the 33
columns in the research tool. As I went through the different columns I attached a descriptive word to the columns to identify the content within each column. At the end of this process, I ended with (1) 11 columns (A-K) with the word “information” in each; (2) six columns (M-Q) with the word “characteristics”; (3) one column I with the word “objectives”; (4) another three columns (S-U) with the word “characteristics”; (5) two columns (V and W) with the words “theory?”; (6) two columns (X and Y) with the word “testing”; (7) one column (Z) with the word “grade”; (8) two columns (AA and AB) with the word “eligibility”; (9) one column (AC) with the words “support”; (10) one column (AD) with the word “support”; (11) and three columns (AE, AF, AG) with the words “strengths, naming issues, and challenges.

I then collapsed the 33 codes within the 33 columns in to nine categories by placing the columns that had the same code into one category. Column Z and Column R maintained their own code and category because they had only one code each. The nine categories categorized the information within the research tool in nine different chunks (Saldaña, 2013). The nine categories include (1) General information; (2) Program characteristics; (3) Program goals/objectives (4) Theory (5) Measures of success; (6) School grade; (7) Recruitment/retention; (8) Support and growth; And (9) Strengths/challenges (See figure 2 Research Tool Categories and Columns).

Category one of the general information refers to the information pertaining to the 35 DLPs’ school information as well as the contact information for all the people I contacted from the 230 school districts, which led to the 24 key participants (Column A-K) (See Appendix A to see a full list of the Research Tool: Questions and Information Collected). The second category, program characteristics, refers to what the 24
participants answered in the questions pertaining to their DLPs characteristics such as DLP partner language, DLPs model, and number of students enrolled in the DLPs (Column L-Q and S-U). The third category, program goals/objectives, refers to the goals of the DLPs or the identified objectives for the students within the DLPs (Column R). The fourth category, theory, refers to the information that can help me make assertions about my theory. It can answer questions of the context of DLPs within Arizona, which will inform the theory in which I will be analyzing the results (Columns V, W, and AA). For example if Arizona is an English only state, what is the admission eligibility to be part of the DLPs? What is the populations race/ethnicity of the schools where DLPs are being implemented? And what is their SES? This category can give me information regarding the student access to such programs. The fifth category, measures of success, refers to the evaluation system in place to measure DLPs students’ language and academic achievement (Columns X and Y). The student evaluation systems used within the DLPs is important to identify because it can link the goals and objectives of the program with the support it has from their district and their communities for the implementation of DLPs. The sixth category, school grade, refers to the letter grade (A, B, C, D, or F) the school received from the district for the 2012-13 school year (Column Z). It is important to know the school grade because this can give me a deeper understanding of what type of schools are able to implement DLPs and if there is any relation between the school grade and the support for the implementation of DLPs as well as a relation to school grade and school SES and race/ethnicity. Category seven, recruitment/retention, refers to the DLPs admission eligibility as well as the grades in which DLPs are implemented (Columns AA and AB). The admission eligibility is
important to understand because it can directly provide a link between the context in which DLPs are implemented, English only state, and student accessibility, which is important for student recruitment. The grades in which DLPs are implemented are also within this category because early implementation of DLPs have higher results in student bilingualism achievement which can directly affect retention of students linked to district and community support. Category eight, support and growth, refers to the community support from parents, teacher, school administrators, and the district when it comes to DLPs implementation as well as the growth of DLPs within their district according to the participants perceptions (Columns AC and AD). This particular category can help me determine the support and growth of DLPs that can be linked to future growth and popularity of DLPs despite the English only law within the state of Arizona. Category nine, strengths/challenges, pertain to the strengths of the DLPs identified by the participants as well as any naming challenges or overall challenges they might have had with the implementation of DLPs (Column AE, AF, and AG). This category is important because it can highlight the participants’ perceptions of DLPs and the context in which they navigate. Arizona being an English only state can create hostility around the perception of DLPs that can directly affect support and retention of such programs, which can make it challenging to implement bilingual programs. On the other hand, DLPs do exist in Arizona so there must be some kind of strengths within the programs that allow DLPs to flourish in an English only state and I want to find out what are those strengths.
After I placed the different codes into “chunks”, or into the nine categories, I then color-coded the nine categories to further help me categorize the codes visually making the categories easily identifiable within the research tool. For example, all the columns within the research tool that fall under the general information category are highlighted white, the program characteristics category are highlighted yellow, the program goals/objectives is highlighted green, the theory is red, the measure of success is purple,
the school grade is light orange, the recruitment and retention is blue, support and growth is orange, and strengths and challenges is pink. Color-coding is a simple, but effective way to identify the data categories or as Salndaña (2013) would say “chunks” of data. In this case, the chunks or categories are attached to a color forming a color “coding scheme” (Lewins & Silver, 2007).

In the second coding cycle, I used the nine categories to create major themes from the data (See figure 3 Themes). These themes are: DLPs implementation, Student access to DLPs, and the Arizona language policy context of DLPs. Each of the nine categories (1) General information; (2) Program characteristics; (3) Program goals/objectives (4) Theory (5) Measures of success; (6) School grade; (7) Recruitment/retention; (8) Support and growth; and (9) Strengths/challenges, fall in one or in multiple themes illustrated in Figure 2 below.
I then broke down the data within the nine categories by tallying the data in each column of the research tool and I provided the percentages and results for each of the nine categories. These results include the percentages of the tallying, the mean, standard deviation, the range the medium and the mode to have the results inform at least one of the three themes. For example, in column L which has the partner language implemented in the different 35 DLPs and which falls under, Category (2), program characteristics, I went through the entire column for the 35 DLPs and wrote down the three partner languages provided by the 24 participants, which were Spanish, Mandarin, and Navajo. I then tallied the number of partner languages that are Spanish, Mandarin, or Navajo. After I tallied each of the 35 DLPs, I then provided a result in percentages of the amount of DLPs that fall under each partner language (I have provided the results in the result section below).

The same tally method was used in column M to find out how many of the DLPs were applying one-way or two-way program models. For column N, I also used the tally method to find out what DLPs are using the 50/50 model or any other percentage model.
For column O, I also tallied the results in order to find out how much of the DLPs time was spend in the partner language as well as column Q, to tally how many of the DLPs were connected to other schools’ DLPs. For column R, I was looking for the mission statements of the programs, goals, or objectives in order to see if there was any indication of the reasons why DLPs were being implemented and if bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism were any part of the mission statement. For this reason, I tallied the 35 DLPs and divided them into four categories depending on the language present in their mission statements. The first category had academic achievement, bilingualism, biliteracy, and/or biculturalism. The second category had the term globalism in their mission statement. The third category had language in the mission statement that was more general to the implementation of any program and not specific to DLPs. The fourth category are mission statements that were none existent because it was not available, the participant did not know it nor was it in their program website, or they were in progress of developing one.

For column S, I wanted to find out if there was a low student to teacher ratio I wanted to find out if the teacher to student ratio was connected to the school’s SES, which could potentially have negatively impact in the implementation of DLPs if the school did not have enough resources to lower the student to teacher ratio. For this reason, I compared the schools with high and low SES and looked for connections between high SES and low student to teacher ration and low SES with high student to teacher ratio. For column T, I calculated the mean, the standard deviation, the minimum, the maximum, and the range in order to see what was the average number of students enrolled in the DLPs, what was the smallest and largest number of students enrolled in
the DLPs. This information will give me more detailed information of the implementation of DLPs and the amount of students it serves approximately. Furthermore, for column U, I calculated the range, the minimum and maximum, as well as the median and the mode of the years in which the particular DLPs began being implemented. The information in U should allow me to see the oldest DLPs, the newest and everything in between which will tell me more information about when did DLPs began to be implemented and if there is a year in which DLPs begun to increase. In column V, I calculated the mean, median, mode, range, min, max of the race/ethnicity percentages of the students in the 35 DLPs to get more detailed information in regards the race/ethnicity than just the percentage itself. In the same manner, I wanted to know the range, median, mode, maximum, and minimum for column W in order to see as a group, what was the SES percentage that was re occurring or the maximum and the minimum SES percentage which will provide more details regarding the SES status of the school population in which the DLPs are implemented.

Since evaluation systems are important for program development, for column X and Y, I tallied the information to find out what form of academic achievement measure as well as language achievement measure was being utilized by the DLPs. In column Z, I also tallied the schools that received the letter grade A through F to see if there is a relationship between the school letter grade and the implementation of DLPs. I wanted to see if there is a high percentage of As in the DLPs population, which will have direct implications in student academic achievement, which could also have a connection to program implementation. For this reason, I tallied the number of As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs and created percentages for the percentage of As received, Bs received and so on. In
column AA, I wanted to see the admission eligibility to be part of the DLPs, specifically, I wanted to know how ELLs where being included or excluded from accessing the 35 DLPs, for this reason, I tallied the ways in which DLPs select their students and how ELLs are affected by the admission process. For column AB, I tallied the DLPs that are implemented from kinder garden to 5\textsuperscript{th} grade, pre kinder garden to 6th grade, kinder garden to 12\textsuperscript{th}, Pre kinder garden to 8\textsuperscript{th}, and the programs that are only implemented for a couple of years like kinder garden and 1st grade or 3rd grade and 4\textsuperscript{th} grade in order to see the highest percentage of the school grades in which DLPs are implemented. For column AC, I tallied the responses of the participants to see how many of the 24 participants felt community support in the implementation of their DLPs. For this reason, I tallied those that said yes or no or those that identified issues with the support. For column AD, I wanted to know the perception of the participants in the growth of DLPs in their districts, as a result, I asked them to answer with numbers zero for no growth, one for maintaining, two for minimal growth, and three for significant growth. For this reason, I tallied how many participants answer 0, 1, 2, or 3 in order to provide a percentage attached to the growth of DLPs. For column AE, I tallied the DLPs strengths identified by the participants whether it was the teachers who where identified as the strengths of the DPLPs, community support and collaborations, or a particular part of the DLPs implementation process that was providing positive results. For column AF, I tallied the yes or no for the naming challenges answers and for AG I identified the most common answer for the overall challenges facing the implementation of DLPs.
**Third Stage.** For the first coding cycle within the third stage of the data analysis, I transcribed the nine one-on-one in person interviews that were recorded using the 15 open-ended interview questions using the Dragon transcribing program, which is a speech to text software. I also utilized descriptive coding (Miles, Huberman, & Sandaña, 2014; Sandelowski, 2000) in order to analyze and interpret the data that I gathered in the one-on-one interviews. For this section I also utilized Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, (2014) descriptive method approach to qualitative data in which I assign symbolic meaning to the information that I gathered from the one-on-one interviews with the nine participants. I created codes for the interview data by reading the transcribed information for the first participant and attaching codes to the information. Codes as explained by Miles, Huberman, & Sandaña, (2014), are labels that assign symbolic meaning to the data, which is what I used in order to assign coded to the one-on-one interviews. Furthermore, descriptive coding refers to the summary of a topic in a passage in qualitative data through a word or short passage (Saldaña, 2013). These words or short passages are codes identifying the topic of a passage, which can be a sentence or a paragraph within the data (Tesch, 1990).

Using the method of codes, I read the transcripts for the first participant and every time the participants answered a question, I would create codes for their answer. In this manner, every time the participants talked about, for example, the research supporting the implementation of DLPs, I would attach a code to this section called “aware of research”. Furthermore, every time the participant talked about the benefits of implementing DLPs, I would attach a code called “aware of benefits” or when they talked about globalism as a reason for implementing DLPs, I would attach a code called “globalism” to the section
and so on and so forth until I finished the transcript and created codes for all the information. I then utilized the codes created in the transcript of the first participant as a sample to look for the same codes in all the rest of the nine interviews. When there was a new code created, I would then go back to all of the previous three transcripts and look for the existence of the newly created code and attach it to the information, if it was present. After processing the interviews in this manner, I had compiled 207 reoccurring codes within the transcripts of the nine participants’ interviews. I then grouped the 207 reoccurring codes into 23 categories by grouping all the reoccurring codes into one category creating 23 “chunks” of data. For example, I grouped all of the “aware of research” codes within all the nine interviews into one category with the same name “aware of research”. The 23 categories are demonstrated in Table 1 below.
Table 1

One-on-One Interview Coding Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coding Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>aware of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>aware of benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>globalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>employable skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>economic reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>enrichment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>skeptic ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>racial tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>teacher tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>203 affecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>203 not affecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>participant ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>access problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>access not a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DLPs beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>include ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>perceptions of BE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the second coding cycle within the third stage of the data analysis, I collapsed the 23 coding categories in Table 1 into 17 categories listed in Table 2 as well as color-coded in order to see the similarities and differences between the participants’ responses (see Appendix I for Color-Coded Categories). For example, category three, four, and five in table one are globalism, employable skills, and economic reasons, which can be collapsed into one category because they are similar. For this reason, I collapsed the three different categories into only one and I labeled it “employ globalism argument, employable skills,
and for economic reasons” and attached it to the maroon color (see Appendix I for Color-Coded Categories).

These three categories emerged in the data when the participants spoke of DLPs as beneficial for students based on giving them employable skills that would give them the opportunity for higher economic gains because students would be prepared to work in a global economy by speaking more than one language. These three categories all referred to the same argument, which surrounded the preparation of students to work in a global economy. For this reason, I highlighted this argument within the transcripts in maroon and I labeled it employ globalism argument, employable skills, and for economic reasons” collapsing the three categories into one category. As a result, every time the participants employed a globalism argument, employable skills, and for economic reasons as the main purpose for the implementation of DLPs, the text was highlighted in a maroon color (see Appendix I for Color-Coded Categories). The color-coding categorization process (Margolis & Pauwels, 2011; Saldaña, 2013) also allowed me to organize and select the topics that emerged from the one-on-one interviews.
Table 2

One-on-one Interview Collapsed Coding Categories

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participants are aware of research supporting DLPs and its benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employ globalism argument, employable skills, and for economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recognize DLPs as an enrichment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recognize the importance of language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>They feel skeptics should educate themselves on what are DLPs because the pushback against DLPs is due to ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>They believe the push back against DLPs has to do with racial tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is important to select a DLP model that is good for your community as well as having the choice to implement DLPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Support from their district, teachers, colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teacher tension etc…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Proposition 203 is affecting the implementation of their program and they would like to see language policy reform to be able to include a broader spectrum of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prop 203 is not affecting the implementation of their program and they do not care to see language policy reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Uncertainty of the implementation and reform of prop 203 or/and bilingual ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Access to DLPs is a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Access to DLPs is not a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Awareness that the participation to DLPs is beneficial for all students including ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Association of bilingual ed. With DLPs (perceptions of bilingual education )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 demonstrates Table One and Table Two side by side to illustrate what categories from the second coding cycle (Table 1) were collapsed into the 17 categories in the third coding cycle (Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Participants are aware of research supporting DLPs and its benefits</td>
<td>1 aware of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 aware of benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Employ globalism argument, employable skills, and for economic</td>
<td>3 globalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 employable skills,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 economic reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Recognize DLPs as an enrichment program</td>
<td>6 enrichment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Recognize the importance of language and culture</td>
<td>7 language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Challenges</td>
<td>8 challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 They feel skeptics should educate themselves on what are DLPs because</td>
<td>9 skeptic ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the pushback against DLPs is due to ignorance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 They believe the push back against DLPs has to do with racial tension</td>
<td>10 racial tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 It is important to select a DLP model that is good for your community</td>
<td>11 choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as well as having the choice to implement DLPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Support from their district, teachers, colleagues etc.</td>
<td>12 support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Teacher tension etc…</td>
<td>13 tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Proposition 203 is affecting the implementation of their program</td>
<td>14 203 affecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and they would like to see language policy reform to be able to</td>
<td>15 change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include a broader spectrum of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Prop 203 is not affecting the implementation of their program and</td>
<td>16 203 not affecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they do not care to see language policy reform</td>
<td>17 no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Uncertainty of the implementation and reform of prop 203 or/and</td>
<td>18 participant ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Access to DLPs is a problem</td>
<td>19 access problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Access to DLPs is not a problem</td>
<td>20 access not a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Awareness that the participation to DLPs is beneficial for all</td>
<td>21 DLPs beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students including ELLs</td>
<td>22 include ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Association of bilingual ed. With DLPs (perceptions of bilingual</td>
<td>23 perceptions of BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researcher’s Role, Responsibilities, and Validity

According to Peter Coffey (1917) consciousness is when we are directly and indirectly aware of something. As the researcher of this project, I am aware that it is my responsibility to present the information in a transparent manner in order to identify my epistemological assumption that drove my analysis and led me to my conclusion. This transparency will allow the readers to place themselves within my epistemological assumptions and infer their own conclusions (Ruby, 1980; Guba, 1981; see also Holloway-Libell, 2014). In research, the assumption might be that the researcher is presenting the information and taking the readers through the analytic process through an objective lens that allows the researcher to eliminate any bias driven by subjectivity in order to present “the truth.” However, objectivity and truth are by definition subjective.

This subjectivity comes from personal, educational, and professional experiences that have shaped the way I define and experience the world. As a Mexican immigrant, a woman, a Mexican-American, and an academic my world construct is created by my different identities. As a result, I prefer to use the term trustworthiness since validity, in the traditional sense, refers to the researchers objectivity; however, objectivity cannot be reached when everything we do as researchers is influenced by our experiences, values, and construction of our realities. On the other hand, trustworthiness can be reached by how transparent my analytic roadmap is presented and in doing so, I cannot claim that my research project is objective, but I can claim that it is trustworthy. I do this by being transparent in my research process, analysis, and claims and in doing so assuring the readers that my knowledge is true because I recognize that my truth is compiled of my own epistemologies which in turn are subjective to my world’s environment, context, my
education, my experiences, etc. For this reason, in order to address the validity of my study, I present the information through my subjectivity, which in turn explains my analytical process and perspective.

My analytical process and perspective surrounding DLPs in the state of Arizona began as a research assistantship through Mesa Community College where part of my job was to take part in research projects for a program called Teachers of Language Learners Learning Community (TL3C). TL3C is a program committed to increase the pool of highly qualified teachers of language learners as well as provide support for teachers of language learners in a variety of programs in local schools around the valley. Through my research involvement with TL3C, I began to ask questions about language learner programs such as Dual Language Programs and quickly realized that there was no consensus regarding the type of programs that were available and their location. The professionals working within DLPs had an idea of other local programs that were similar to their own, but there was no central database or document through the Arizona Department of Education or otherwise that could inform them of all the DLPs in the state for networking and implementation advice purposes. Attached to this realization were questions of DLPs accessibility attached to the political climate in Arizona in regards to immigration, language, culture, and race. Not only did I want to gather the information about DLPs in Arizona for networking and a tallied consensus of their existence, but also, I wanted to find out if the political climate in the state was impacting issues of accessibility for certain students.

Furthermore, as a Latina English language learner in Southern California in the early 90s, I feel language rights and culture were significant components of my
educational formation and not having alternative programs available for learning English without eliminating my native language, would have been harmful and counterproductive to my learning in content as well as English learning. For this reason, I feel passionate about advocating for educational policy and programs that afford all students the opportunity for an adequate education regardless of race, English proficiency, and social economic status.

**Limitations of the Study**

All studies have perimeters and therefore, limitations. The focus of this study was to identify the public schools in the state of Arizona that are implementing DLPs and for this reason, private and charter schools were left out of the sample. There were three charter schools incorporated into the public school sample, however, as explained in the methodology section, I did not include charter schools in the focus of the study. As a result, the sample of DLPs only applies to public schools, which does not identify all programs in the state.

Also, a macro view of DLPs was utilized when identifying the characteristics and implementation of DLPs and only DLP administrators were interviewed. Consequently, this study does not give a view of the characteristics and implementation of DLPs at a micro level in the classrooms from, for example, teachers’ or students’ perspectives. An ethnographic study would give a view into the “black box” that this study does not. A micro level analysis would highlight what is really happening with the implementation of DLPs in the classroom, which this study also does not. Moreover, since the 35 DLPs data was collected 18 months ago, and DLPs are growing in the state of Arizona, it is easy to assume the number of DLPs have increased since then.
Challenges Faced and Lessons Learned

The political climate in AZ made people hesitant to participate at times, especially during the phone interviews. Also, I realized that the Arizona Department of Education staff could improve their ability to provide district and school public information records. In its most recent report year, which I used to identify the district list, the Arizona Department of Education had districts that where no longer in existence. One of those districts had not been in existence for ten years, however, it was still listed on the Arizona Department of Education’s district list. I came to this realization because after searching the district’s website and not finding the contact information for it. I then took my search to Google and social media. After exhausting all possibilities, I asked another district administrator in that same county about this particular district and he said that the name had been theirs years ago, but they were no longer operating under that name and had not done so in a decade. I learned a significant number of people believed that DLPs were “illegal” in the state because we were an English only state although they reiterated that they were not engaging in illegal activities in their schools. Others lumped DLPs with ELLs and thought that since DLPs was bilingual education, they must be for ELLs only.

Additionally through this research project I realized that there is no singular definition for the implementation of Dual Language Programs in the state, how the research defines dual language, and that the way they are typically implemented in schools might not align. The various DLPs models vary considerably. As a result, there is no congruity, which is further extended by the lack of cohesive data when it comes to the amount of DLPs/TWI programs, bilingual programs, or whatever term schools are utilizing for bilingual education programs in the state or the country. This lack of
reporting on DLPs is the result of the absence of national data instruments with the ability to track the various types of DLPs around the country (there is conflicting data on the existing number of these programs). Furthermore, currently there is no analysis exploring the racial, nativist, and linguistic power of the majority culture in education policy in general and DLPs’ support and implementation in particular. As a consequence, the discourse of the linguistic power of the majority culture over minority language policy in the growth of DLPs in an English only state is missing from the discourse of DLP access for minority language students. For this reason, my study will be contributing to the discourse since it is important to understand the support or lack thereof for language minority low-income students’ academic success and social economic mobility.
CHAPTER 4

Results/Findings

In this chapter, I will present the results of my findings in two sections in order to answer my research questions:

1. Which public k-12 schools are implementing Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in the state of AZ?
2. What are these DLPs characteristics?
3. Where are these schools located?
4. And what are the stakeholder participants’ perceptions of DLPs and the context in which they navigate?

In the first section I report the results from the research tool, which include the schools that are implementing DLPs, their characteristics, and their locations. Furthermore, the include the phone interviews with the 24 participants from the 35 DLPs. Moreover, these results will address research questions one through four. In the second section I report the results from the interviews with the nine participants from the original 24 key participants sample. Furthermore, I synthesize the results of the interviews by demonstrating how many of the participants are aware of research supporting DLPs and its benefits, how many of them employ a globalism, an employable skills, and/or an economic argument when talking about DLPs and its implementation, and how many of the participants recognize the importance of language and culture etc. (see Appendix I for Color-Coded Categories). The results from the interviews will provide a more in depth answer to research question number four.
In this section, I impart the results from an analytical perspective utilizing the context of the state of Arizona. I disseminate the importance of the location of the programs, the perceptions of the stakeholder’s interviews, as well as the programs characteristic for policy implications regarding education equity. For the first part of the analysis, I link DLPs to education equity and access for language minority and Latino/a students by using the identification of the 35 DLPs sample, the characteristics of the programs and the location using the research tool. In part two I also attempt to link DLPs to education equity and access for Latina/o students and language minority, but this time, I use the interviews to demonstrate the stakeholder participants’ perceptions of DLPs and the context in which they navigate.

**Research Tool Results**

Out of the 230 school districts in the state of Arizona, I was able to identify 35 schools that are implementing DLPs. Out of those 35, three are charter schools (Italicized in Table 4) and 32 are regular public schools which means 91 percent of the DLPs are in public schools and 8 percent are charter schools. Because of the calling process to districts in order to identify the schools implementing DLPs, some of the districts identified charter schools in their districts that are implementing DLPs. For this reason, I kept in the 35 DLPs sample the three charter schools identified through the process although this research focused on regular public schools. Most schools that were identified by their districts’ office were willing to talk to me about their programs, however, out of the 35 DLPs identified, I was not able to get a hold of two of them after multiple calls, messages, and emails, but I was able to gather some information on the schools and DLPs through public outlets. Unfortunately, not all pertinent information,
such as opinion base questions on program growth, for the study was gathered on these two schools. Table 4 identifies the schools by name and school grade range. The schools that identified their DLPs grade range as K-4\textsuperscript{th} or K-2\textsuperscript{nd} are programs that are growing with their first DLPs cohort as they move through elementary school and are in their second or fourth year of implementation. Furthermore, Table 4 represents columns A (name of the school) and AB (grade in which DLPs are being implemented) from the research tool.

Table 4

*Schools Implementing DLPs by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>DLPs Grade Level</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>DLPs Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>DLPs Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente de Hozho</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>Davis Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Desert Willow Elementary</em></td>
<td>Pk-6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Keller Elementary</td>
<td>K-6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Grijalva Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails Middle School</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{th} &amp; 8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Clarendon Elementary</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} &amp; 6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Hollinger Elementary</td>
<td>K-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Horse Shoe Trail Elem</em></td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Encanto Elementary</td>
<td>K-3\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
<td>Marry Belle McCorkle</td>
<td>K-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarwater Elem</td>
<td>K-6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Sandpiper Elementary</td>
<td>Pk-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Mission View Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilmore Prep Academy</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Santa Fe Elementary</td>
<td>K-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Roskrige Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>K-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Sage Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Herrera Elementary</td>
<td>K-6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Van Buskirk Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Peak</td>
<td>K-6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Valley View Elementary</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} &amp; 6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>White Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Pueblo Elementary</td>
<td>K-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Pistor Middle School</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} - 8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado Elem</td>
<td>(N.A) School is PK-8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Mohave Middle School</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} - 8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Pueblo Magnet High School</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} - 12\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Niños</td>
<td>K-4\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Ventana Vista Elementary</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td><em>Mesquite</em> Elementary</td>
<td>K &amp; 2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Lagos</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Sunrise Drive</td>
<td>K-5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The school names in Italics are charter schools identified through their school district.
Of the 35 identified schools implementing DLPs, 83 percent (29/35 DLPs) are being implemented as soon as pre-kindergarten or kindergarten. This result supports the argument made by research which states that in order for a child to effectively learn a second language, they need to be immerse in the L2 at a young age (Collier, 1992; Genesee, 1987; Thomas, Collier, & Abbot, 1993; Collier, 1992; See also Thomas & Collier, 2012). 11 percent of the DLPs (4/35 DLPs) are middle and high schools that are implementing a DLP continuum for bilingualism and bi-literacy. Five percent (2/35 DLPs) however, start their DLPs in 4th and 5th grade, which is not ideal for kids to start learning a second language by age 10, but these two schools might cater to a different community need. For example, Valley View Elementary has a high Latino population of 88 percent and Clarendon has a 68 percent of Latino enrollment. Although both programs are being implemented in later years (4th and 6th grades), which is not recommended by research for bilingualism and bi-literacy achievement, both schools are implementing a 50/50, two-way model, which explain their ability to institute the fidelity of the DLPs’ models since their students already have bilingual capabilities by 4th grade.

With Proposition 203 in place and the four-hour block, the late enrollment of students into their DLPs would avoid the exclusion of ELL students. By age 10, ELLs can participate in DLPs as long as the parents request a waiver for the student to be part of a DLP and as a result renounces ELL services for their children. ELL students cannot participate in DLPs until they are deemed English proficient by the AZELLA or if the parent requests a waiver, which is a gate keeping process. The three options given in the waivers provided by the Arizona Department of Education are as follows:

Waiver one (A.R.S. §15-753B.1): My child already knows English: the child already
possesses good English language skills, as measured by oral evaluation or
standardized tests of English vocabulary comprehension, reading, and writing, in
which the child scores approximately at or above the state average for his/her
grade level or at or above the 5th grade average, whichever is lower; or,

Waiver two (A.R.S. §15-753B.2): My child is 10 years or older: it is the informed belief
of the school principal and educational staff that an alternate course of educational
study would be better suited to the child’s overall educational progress and rapid
acquisition of basic English language skills as documented by the analysis of
individual student needs; or,

Waiver three (A.R.S. §15-753B.3): My child has special individual needs: the child
already has been placed for a period of not less than thirty calendar days during
this school year in an English language classroom and it is subsequently the
informed belief of the school principal and educational staff that the child has
such special and individual physical or psychological needs, above and beyond
the student’s lack of English proficiency, that an alternate course of educational
study would be better suited to the student’s overall educational development and
rapid acquisition of English. A written description of no less than 250 words
documenting these special individual needs for the specific child must be
provided and permanently added to the child’s official school records and the
waiver application must contain the original authorizing signatures of both the
school principal and the local superintendent of schools (Arizona Department of
Education, 2014).

For waiver one, the child can be part of a DLP if he/she passes the oral portion of
the AZELLA, however, it serves as a conditional acceptance since the students has to
eventually pass the reading and writing portion of the exam. For waiver two, at ten years
old, the student has already passed the recommended age to start exposure to a new
language, which should be at the youngest schooling age for full efficiency of acquiring
literacy in two languages (Thomas & Collier, 2012). For waiver three, parents can be
discouraged to pursue this option, not only because schools in the state and the Arizona
Department of Education do not promote it but because it involves multiple education
departments. Additionally, the parent has to give up the extra services provided for the
student for being designated as an English language learner and without that designation,
the school loses the funding for that students’ special need. Too often, people in those
different departments and parents can get lost in the “hoops they have to jump” in order
to attain waiver three.

The inclusion of language minority students into DLPs would allow the program
to truly follow a two way model which is the most effective way to follow a bilingual
education model. However, Proposition 203 and the four hour block model, are hindering
language minority students’ full potential of developing their heritage language on par
with their second language at an early age when it has the most cognitive benefits. From
the 35 DLPs, 80 percent (28/35 DLPs) provide Spanish as the partner language, 20
percent (7/35 DLPs) provide Mandarin/Chinese, and two percent (1/35 DLP) provides
Navajo or Spanish. Table five identifies the DLPs and the partner language. The partner
language is the language that students are learning and in Arizona, these partner
languages are Spanish, Mandarin, and Navajo. Table L represents Column L (Partner
Language being implemented) in the research tool)

Table 5

*Schools Implementing DLPs by Partner Language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Partner Language</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Partner Language</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Partner Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente de Hozho</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; Navajo</td>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Davis Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Willow Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Keller Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Grijalva Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails Middle School</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Clarendon Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Hollinger Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Shoe Trail Elem</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Encanto Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Marry Belle McCorkle</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarwater Elem</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Sandpiper Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mission View Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilmore Prep Academy</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Santa Fe Elementary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Roskruge Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DLPs, especially programs where Spanish is the partner language, are the most common in the state of Arizona as demonstrated in Table 5 with 80 percent (28/35 DLPs) of programs with Spanish as the partner language. However, publically, the endorsement and focus seems to be on the Mandarin/Chinese DLPs although these are far less common than Spanish DLPs. Arizona State ex-schools’ Superintendent John Huppenthal publically endorsed Deer Valley’s “A” rating district and their Mandarin/Chinese Project. According to the district, the project supports the importance of “all students” acquiring foreign language skills, however, the fact remains that it is not for all students to acquire “foreign” language skills because English proficiency is one of the requirements to be part of the program, so language minority students are excluded. Furthermore, Deer Valley School District caters to a very particular population and community with unstated affirmations. For example, the total population is 222,295, with 191,789 identified as White, 28, 842 are classified as Latinos, and only 1, 521 are Chinese students (Arizona School District Demographic Profiles, 2013). Moreover, About 70 percent of the household annual incomes are reported above $50,000 while 20 percent make more than $100,000 and the household average size is 2.88 (Arizona School District Demographic Profiles, 2013). It seems that the unstated affirmation is that as long as DLPs are in an
affluent community, where the students are learning a foreign language as opposed to a heritage language, they are doing something admirable that requires recognition.

As explained in chapter two, a program is considered a one-way DLP when for example Native English speakers acquire the curriculum being taught by the teacher through English and another language as a foreign language through an immersion program (Tedick, Christian, Fortune, & Ebrary, 2011). Another example of one-way DLPs is when students of one heritage language background, for example Spanish or Mandarin, attend DLPs where the curriculum is taught through the students’ heritage language as well as English (Thomas & Collier, 2012; Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2011). Two-way DLPs on the other hand, are when two different language groups are taught through their two languages. For example, native/heritage Spanish speakers attend DLPs classes with native English speakers (Thomas & Collier, 2012; August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010). Table 6 identifies the DLPs as one-way or two-way models. From the 35 DLPs, 48 percent (17/35 DLPs) are implementing one-way models, 45 percent (16/35 DLPs) are implementing two-way models and two percent (1/35 DLP) are implementing both, and for two percent (1/35 DLP), the information was not available. Moreover, Table 6 represents the results from column M (one-way/two way model) of the research tool.

Table 6

Schools Implementing DLPs by Two-way or One-way Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>One-way or Two-way</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>One-way or Two-way</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>One-way or Two-way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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It is also worthy to note that from the 45 percent of DLPs implementing two-way models, 37 percent (6/35) of them are in Maricopa County while 62 percent of them are in Pima County in the Tucson Unified School district which serves predominately a Latina/o student population.

In Table 7, I demonstrate that the most implemented model amongst the DLPs is the 50/50 model which means that for 50 percent of the their day, English is utilized to learn the curriculum and that in the other 50 percent, the partner language is used such as Spanish or Mandarin. Out of the 35 DLPs sample, 62 percent (22/35 DLPs) implement the 50/50 model, 22 percent (8/35 DLPs) implement 100 percent Spanish in pre-kinder garden, 90/10 (90 percent in Spanish, the partner language, and 10 percent in English) in
kindergarten. DLPs can also be implementing using an 80/20 model (80 percent in the partner language, 20 percent in English) in 1st grade, the 70/30 model (70 percent in the partner language and 30 percent in English) in 2nd grade, 60/40 in 3rd grade (60 percent in the partner language and 40 percent in English, and 50/50 by 4th grade. With this being said, within my 35 DLPs sample Five percent (2 DLPs) implement the 30/70 (30 percent in the partner language and 70 percent in English), two percent (one DLP) implements the 40/60 (40 percent in the partner language and 70 percent in English), two percent of DLPs did not have the model identified, but their students spent two periods out of seven using the partner language, and two percent of DLPs were not available due to unresponsiveness from the principal (The information from table 7 represents the result of column N). Because of Arizona’s high population of Spanish speaking students, the state could include them to easily implement two-way and 50/50 DLPs models in their truest and most beneficial form utilizing their Spanish speaking population as assets instead of as problems that need to be separated and marginalized through Prop 203 and the four-hour block model.
### Table 7

**Schools Implementing DLPs by Model (90/10-50/50)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>DLP Model</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>DLP Model</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>DLP Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente de Hozho</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Davis Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Willow Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Keller Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Grijalva Elementary</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails Middle School</td>
<td>33/67 This falls under the 30/70</td>
<td>Clarendon Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Hollinger Elementary</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Shoe Trail Elem</td>
<td>30/70</td>
<td>Encanto Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Marry Belle McCorkle</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarwater Elem</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>Sandpiper Elementary</td>
<td>Close to 50/50</td>
<td>Mission View Elementary</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilmore Prep Academy</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Santa Fe Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Roskruge Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Sage Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Herrera Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Van Buskirk Elementary</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Peak</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Valley View Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>White Elementary</td>
<td>Partner language decreases by grade 50/50 by 4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Pueblo Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Pistor Middle School</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado Elem</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Mohave Middle School</td>
<td>2 out of 7 periods=28/72</td>
<td>Pueblo Magnet High School</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Niños</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Ventana Vista Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Mesquite Elementary</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Lagos</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Sunrise Drive</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td></td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The implementation of the DLP model also varies by how much of the student’s school day is spent in the partner language since it can vary by grade level, by day, by week, by month, by class periods or subject. If the model is broken down by grade level, that means that the time percentage in the partner language decreases when the student moves from grade levels. For example in Table 7, Mission View Elementary students start in pre-kindergarten with 100 percent in the partner language (Mandarin or Spanish). By kindergarten it decreases to 90 percent in the partner language and 10 percent in English. This means that the percentage spent in the partner language decreases by grade until the student reaches a 50/50 model. If the model is broken by day, this means that 50 percent of the day is spent using the partner language and the other 50 percent is spent using English. The percentage by day can change depending on the DLPs. It can be a 50/50 model as explained above or it can be a 30/70 or 40/60 where the smallest percentage is the time spent using the partner language.

How much of the DLPs day is spent on the partner language (column O) and how the time is split between languages if by subject, what subject? (Column P) also varies (see Table 8 for *Schools Implementing DLPs by Time and Subject*). It is unusual for DLPs to break down the model by weeks or months, or by flip-flopping days, but there are a couple of programs that use these systems. In Gilbert Elementary and Clarendon, there is a day flip flop between languages for example, Mondays are in Spanish, Tuesdays are in English, Wednesdays are back to Spanish and so on. If it is broken up by weeks, one week the students use the partner language to learn the curriculum and the following week, the students switch to English. It can also be two consecutive weeks out of the
month using the same language. At Herrera Elementary, it is about 2 weeks in each language depending on the curriculum unit that the students are learning. Furthermore, all DLPs break down the time split between the two languages by time, subject, or both. When a DLP is identified as a two teacher model, it means that one cohort of students has two teachers who rotate through the day. For example, the teacher who instructs the students in the partner language is with the students in the morning, half of the school day, and then the teacher who instructs the students in English is with them in the later part of the school day, the second half of the day. When a DLP is identified as self-contained, it means that a bilingual teacher in English and the partner language is with the students all day and it is up to him/her to use both languages accordingly throughout the day. For example, the teacher might utilize Spanish in the first half of the school day and English for the second part of the school day. The teacher can also break it down by subjects, so for example, math and science in Spanish and social studies, and reading in English.

Table 8

*Schools Implementing DLPs by Time and Subject*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>How is the time Split Between the two Languages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente de Hozho</td>
<td>In the one-way immersion program, students who already speak English are “immersed” in Navajo for most of the day in kindergarten. Each year thereafter, the amount of English instruction is increased until there is a 50/50 balance between the two languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Willow</td>
<td>Time spent in each language is broken up by teacher/subject. Math and science are taught in Spanish for K-5th grade, then Science and social studies are taught in Spanish in 6th grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails Middle School</td>
<td>Social studies and honors high school level one or two Spanish language arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Shoe Trail</td>
<td>Math is taught in Chinese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Program Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarwater Elementary</td>
<td>Students spend their time working on basic oral, reading, and writing proficiency with an emphasis in learning the Chinese culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biltmore Prep Academy</td>
<td>Math, science, and the Spanish block in Spanish and language arts and social studies in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Sage Elementary</td>
<td>English side teachers are responsible for all ELA subjects and social studies. Mandarin teachers are responsible for math, science and Mandarin Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Peak School</td>
<td>English teachers are responsible for all ELA subjects and Social Studies. Mandarin teachers are responsible for Math, Science and Mandarin Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Elementary</td>
<td>Monday-Spanish, Tues-English, Wed.-Spanish and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Niños</td>
<td>Two teacher model with two classes and one classroom is self-contained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Lagos</td>
<td>Two teacher model with two classes as well as one teacher in self-contained classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>Reading math and writing in English, science, social studies and language arts in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Elementary</td>
<td>Each grade level teacher decides how to split the time, i.e. by morning/afternoon, day-by-day, or subject alternation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Elementary</td>
<td>All subjects are taught in both languages, using English one day and Spanish the next.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto Elementary</td>
<td>50/50 throughout the day. All subject areas in both languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandpiper Elementary</td>
<td>Science and math and a little social studies in Spanish depending on the activities of the day, the rest in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Elementary</td>
<td>Math and science in Spanish from k-6th, 7th and 8th social studies in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrera Elementary</td>
<td>Depending on the length of the unit, which is about every two weeks. It is self-contained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Elem.</td>
<td>Math is always in English and the rest can vary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Elementary</td>
<td>In K-4, Science and math in Spanish and social studies and language arts in English. In 5th grade, social science changes to Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave Middle School</td>
<td>Social science and Spanish Language are in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Vista</td>
<td>1st grade math and science are in Spanish, language arts and social science are in English, 2nd grade and above they learn language arts and math in English and science and social studies in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Drive</td>
<td>During the half-day kindergarten program, 100% of the core instruction (Language Arts/Chinese literacy skills, Math, Science, Social Studies) is taught in Chinese. All special area classes (Art, Music, PE) are taught in English. In first grade, Science, Math, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
literacy skills are taught in Chinese, while English Language Arts and Social Studies are taught in English. In second grade through fifth grade, Science, Social Studies, and literacy skills will be taught in Chinese, while English Language Arts and Math will be taught in English.

By time and subject (ELLs have 45 min in ELD) Self-contained from k-5 and team teaching can be incorporated in 6th-8th. Look at the TWDL handbook for exact time breakdown at http://www.tusd1.org/resources/twdl/twdlmodels.asp

Mesquite Elementary

In the morning: Mandarin, math, science and Chinese culture. On the second half of the day: Reading, social studies, and catch up on math in English just in case some of the students need clarification on the math that was taught in Mandarin.

Furthermore, a significant number of DLPs are connected to other schools outside of their school grade brackets. For example, 48 percent (17/35 DLPs) of the 35 schools are connected to other DLPs so that their students continue with DLPs through all of their k-12 education. This means that a student who is attending DLPs in an elementary school (K-5th grade), can than transfer into DLPs in his middle school years (6th-8th grade) and then to DLPs in high school. Another 23 percent (8/35 DLPs) are planning on growing their programs in the future as their first cohort in the DLPs advance through their k-12 education. Moreover, 20 percent (7/35 DLPs) responded with a definite “no” when asked if the DLPs were connected to other schools and one was not available.

Regardless of continuation of the programs from k-5 to middle school and then to high school, it is clear that the objective/mission of the DLPs’ schools is to give their students life-long skills that can potentially positively affect their personal as well as economic lives. These skills varied from high academic achievement, bilingualism, and/or bi-literacy and biculturalism. More specifically, 71 percent of DLPs employ the
words (25/35 DLPs) *Academic achievement, bilingualism, bi-literacy, and biculturalism* in their objective/mission statement, eleven percent (4/35) employ *globalism*, and for 17 percent (6/35) of DLPs, it was not available because the participant did not know it nor was it in their program website, or they were in progress of developing a mission statement.

Valley View Elementary is an example of a more general mission statement “In partnership with student, families, and the community, to provide a student-centered learning environment that cultivates character, fosters academic excellence and embraces diversity” while Davis Bilingual Magnet Elementary, which is one of the 10 schools in the Tucson Unified School District that are implementing DLPs and their mission statement is to is more specific to DLPs with “To provide instruction for cognitive and linguistic development in two languages for mainstream and ELL students with the educational goals of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and biculturalism.” Other schools’ mission statements were more centered on preparing students for a global economy by providing bilingualism for their students such as Gavilan Peak School which mission statement is “To create a world class, fully articulated Mandarin Chinese language curriculum from pre-kindergarten to the university which will enhance the future success of students in a global and technologically advanced society.”

The teacher to student (T/S ratio) is not correlated to Social Economic Status (SES) since in the schools with low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch have a high number of student to teacher ratio (See Table 9 for DLPs Teacher to Student Ratio and SES). For example, Sonoran Train Middle School has 13.34 percent of students on free/reduced lunch program, however, they have a one to 35 T/S ratio. On the other hand,
Keller Elementary School has a 75 percent of students on the free/reduced lunch program and on average a one to 25 T/S ratio. Furthermore, Biltmore Prep Academy has a 93 percent of students on the free/reduced lunch program and an average of one to 20 T/S ratio. Table 9 demonstrates the full list of DLPs and the school percentage of students on the free/reduced lunch program as well as the T/S ratios (Column S and W of the research tool). The T/S Ratio category means teacher to student ratio on average while the SES category is represented by the reported number of students in the free and reduced school lunch program. Furthermore, the SES range of the schools implementing DLPs are 92 percent, the minimum, is .68 percent, the median is 30 percent, and the mode is N.A. since there was not a reoccurring SES percentage. This result demonstrates that the range between the highest percent of students in the free reduce lunch program and the lowest is large with a 92 percent which indicates the inequality of SES between the schools implementing Dual Language Programs.

Table 9

_DLPs Teacher to Student Ratio and SES_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>T/S Ratio</th>
<th>SES %</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>T/S Ratio</th>
<th>SES %</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>T/S Ratio</th>
<th>SES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente de Hozho</td>
<td>1 to 24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>1 to 29</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Davis Bilingual</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Willow</td>
<td>1 to 28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Keller Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Grijalva Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails</td>
<td>1 to 34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Clarendon Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hollinger Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Shoe Trail</td>
<td>2 to 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Encanto Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marry Belle</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarwater Elem</td>
<td>1 to 25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sandpiper Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mission View</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilmore Prep</td>
<td>1 to 20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Santa Fe Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Roskruge Bilingual</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Sage</td>
<td>1 to 22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Herrera Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Van Buskirk</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Peak</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Valley View</td>
<td>1 to 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>White Elementary</td>
<td>1 to 27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of students enrolled in the DLPs varies from the highest number of 480 students to the minimum of 30 students (Column T of the research tool). The range for students enrolled in DLPs is 450 while the mean is 212. This means that although there is a wide range in difference between the number of students in DLPs, on average, most programs have about 212 students enrolled in their programs.

When implementing a programs, it is always necessary for economic and community support to be able to show the efficiency of the program. For this reason, most schools implementing DLPs have some type of language achievement measure to be able to evaluate the success of the program. DLPs can use the American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines for language achievement measures. The ACTFL Assessment of Performance towards Proficiency in Language (AAPPL) is one of the tests that uses the ACTFL guidelines to assess language proficiency. Within the 35 identified DLPs, 34 percent (12/35 DPLs) utilize ACTFL or AAPPL to measure the language proficiency of their students. Moreover, 28 percent (10/35 DLPs) utilize LAS Links, 14 percent (5/35 DLPs) identified the Arizona English Language Learners Assessment (AZELLA) as a form of language achievement measure for its students and the rest 23 percent (8/35 DLPs) either did not have a specific tool to identify the language achievement of their students, they have their own classroom assessment bench marks, or are shopping around to see what tool they could afford and implement (Column X in the research tool). One of the principals I spoke to said that they
are “working on it. At this point we are using informal things. We used AAPPL last year and that was great, but it is very expensive and we only got a grant for one year.” When it comes to academic achievement measures, all DLPs use state and district assessments like AIMS, NWEA assessment, and Galileo benchmarks for their students (Column Y of the research tool).

As for the school letter grade (Column Z in the research tool), 25 percent (9/35 DLPs) received As, 42 percent (15/35) received Bs, 17 percent (6/35) received Cs, 2 percent (1/35) received a D, none of the schools received an F, and for 11 percent (4/35) of the schools the letter grade received was not available. The fact that the schools implementing DLPs received the letter grade A through D indicates that there is no correlation between receiving a high letter grade and the implementation of DLPs.

The admission eligibility for students to be part of DLPs is something that I was interested in reporting because it directly affects student access. For this reason, I incorporated the question of eligibility in the phone interviews with the 24 key participants. With their answers, I was able to report the results for column AA within the research tool. The admission eligibility for all the DLPs fell under at least one of the four categories:

1. Students are part of a waiting list
2. Students are part of a lottery system
3. Students need to either start at the beginning of the program or if they join later, pass an admission test that indicates they are at the level needed to be part of the DLP they are joining.
4. ELL students must pass the AZELLA if they are 10 years old and below, which means English proficiency is part of admission eligibility.

Regardless of whether DLPs fall under any of the categories 1-3, by law all DLPs need to follow category number four in order for ELLs to be part of DLPs. All 24 participants informed me that if students are identified as ELL and want to be part of DLPs, the parents need to fill out a waiver to select the program for their children. If the ELL student is under 10, they have to be orally English proficient and if the student is over 10 then they can be part of the program. This is problematic because of cases where the student is not orally English proficient and they are under 10. This means that based on the eligibility category number four listed above, the student cannot participate in DLPs until they are orally English proficient or until they are 10 years old, whichever comes first. The restriction for ELL students’ accessing DLPs comes as a mandate of Proposition 203 “English for the Children” which makes Arizona an English only state.

From the DLPs that participated in answering the questions in the research tool database (24 key participants), all of them agreed that there is community support from parents, teachers, administrators, and community members to implement DLPs in their schools (Column AC in the research tool). One of the principals from the schools implementing DLPs stated, “yes, we have outstanding dedicated and loyal families. Many of our teachers have their own children attending our school.” Another principal stated, “of course, yes, the program would not be where it is without teacher and parent's support.” As indicated by all the participants from the phone interviews, there seems to be plenty of community support for schools implementing DLPs because there is a growing demand from parents which means that the schools are meeting a community
need by providing parents with the choice of enrolling their children in DLPs. Unfortunately, not all parents can have a choice of placing their children in bilingual programs (DLPs) due to English proficiency being the standard qualification to be part of DLPs.

The participants were also asked to report on a scale from zero-three (zero no growth, one maintaining, two minimal growth, three significant growth), whether their DLPs and increasing in your district or maintaining. Zero participants identified no growth, 48 percent (17/35 DLPs) of the DLPs answered that the programs in their districts were maintaining, 11 percent (4/35 DLPs) identified minimal growth, 37 percent (13/35 DLPs) identified significant growth, and one was not available. The results described above are from column AD from the research tool.

Moreover, the 24 key participants from the phone interviews reported the strengths of their programs and the overall challenges (Columns AE and AG). These strengths and challenges are documented in Table 10. Because the last few questions that I asked about the challenges and strengths of the DLPs can be considered opinion based, in order to protect the identity of my participants, the answers to these questions are not identified with the school names. The comments will be associated to a participant number that does not follow any particular order. Furthermore, the same comments apply to several of the school because they fall under the same district or only one administrator who is involved with several schools was reached for participation. For this reason, the number of comments will not reflect the total number 35 for the 35 DLPs identified, but 24 since two program representatives were not reached for interviews. Only two participants identified a program naming challenge (column AF of the research tool), the
rest stated that there was no challenge in naming the program or they were not present when the name for the DLP was chosen, so they are not aware of any naming issues. Naming challenges/issues refer to programs that possibly might have or had issues in selecting names that represented bilingual education in the title and as a result, ended having a push back from school or district administrators, or even parents and community members. From the participants that identified naming issues one of them stated “Yes, there were, there are always challenges, especially when a new program is starting, but now we have other challenges that are more center stage and that is the finance component. The other one said “there were issues because we were not sure we were a dual language program since there are many definitions of it. I did not think we should call ourselves dual language.”

Table 10

**Program Strengths and Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  We have been quite successful academically and otherwise. For instance, in the spring of 2003, 79 percent of our English language learners (ELLs) were reclassified as “fluent English proficient” after only one year</td>
<td>Finding qualified teachers for the various languages can be difficult. The lack of instructional materials in the partner languages and bussing students from all parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Students have been achieving the targets required for each grade level</td>
<td>Finding materials and resources/curriculum for the partner language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  The targets that have been set have been met by students</td>
<td>Finding instructional materials in the partner language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  The collaboration between our DLP teacher and our traditional English teacher</td>
<td>Finding instructional materials in the partner language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Highly qualified teachers, strong district and parental support, and the strong desire of students to learn the language</td>
<td>The real challenge is growing the program, what curriculum materials to use, and cultural differences between American teachers and the partner language teacher`s country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  The continuity of a DLP for our students</td>
<td>Making sure that we are keeping with the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Some of the wording has been changed to protect the identity of the participants, however, the overall meaning has not been changed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>fidelity of the model and the communication with our constituency and stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The data over the last 4 years shows that students in the program are testing at or above grade level</td>
<td>Teacher certification because teachers that are coming from other countries to teach the DLPs is not the same as in the U.S., so it is difficult working with the Arizona teacher certification process and getting over that hurdle, we would like to see more home grown teachers, but until then…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>our students in the program are testing at or above grade level, and also that the majority of our DLP teachers are from the country where our students are learning their L2.</td>
<td>Teacher certification for DLP teachers coming from other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teachers are the strength and heart of it. If they were not committed the program would flop.</td>
<td>Staffing, finding certified and highly qualified teacher, materials, teaching in combos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teachers make the program. Districts started supporting us more this year. The grants that we have received helped us tremendously with the science clubs and the PDs</td>
<td>Money, we do not have the resources needed. We need books in the partner language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The program is very new so I will skip that question</td>
<td>Finding highly qualified teachers. If we continue to grow, we will need a significant pool of applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teaching training our staff for continual growth and learning. We send teachers to ACTFL training and we tracking the proficiency of our students</td>
<td>The newness, finding qualified teachers who are pedagogically aware and know how to teach in another language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The teachers who are dedicated to the dual language development and the parents who are dedicated to having their students continue in the program</td>
<td>Finding time to truly maintain the DLP model and finding qualified teachers who are able and willing to teach in DLPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Parent support, administrative support at school and district level, curriculum, and continuity</td>
<td>Financial piece. Being able to finance the program is always a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Being a choice program and having parents support and having Spanish native speakers really makes our program great</td>
<td>The state setting restrictions on who can enter the program. The fact that non-English proficient students cannot enter the program is problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Amazing group of teachers that work together in defining the program to get better at it. They are committed at making it work</td>
<td>Finding qualified teachers that are bilingual. I am worried every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The teachers are exceptional</td>
<td>The growth. We cannot accommodate everybody because of limited space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dedication and the desire of the staff and the parents support because they really are committed to the program</td>
<td>Making sure we have materials that meet our program and what we are trying to meet at the proper levels for English and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cultural diversity, Dual language proficiency, multicultural diversity, developing higher self-esteem, family unity among peers with character building across</td>
<td>Keep students engaged with limited resources, district lack of support with funding, finding certified teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students are fantastic, they do very well in proficiency especially in reading. Finding dual language qualified teachers and advertising for budget purposes.

That kids are bilingual. Finding curriculum and materials in the partner language that are aligned to state standards.

The draw to the school because it is meeting a need. Students are performing better academically than peers who are not in the program. Keeping parents informed and confident that they have made the right decision in keeping their kids in our program.

N.A. N.A.

Being able to reach our goal of bilingualism and bi-literacy. We are now offering a seal of bi-literacy, well more of a certificate because legislature needs to be passed/approved for the seal and it has not been supported. Keep the fidelity of the 9/10, 50/50, 80/20 etc. from our teachers so we decided to do a breakdown of a schedule for utilizing both languages for all teachers to follow.

It is really new so it is hard to say at this moment. Finding the resources and being able to access the curriculum.

The strengths and challenges identified by the 24 key participants and demonstrated in Table 10 above vary, however, the predominant challenges were characterized by funding and finding the qualified personnel to teach in the DLPs. The characteristics of the identified DLPs vary according to the schools’ resources as well as the communities’ demands and their ability to meet the need. However, currently there is no funding for DLPs outside of the school’s regular budget. If a school wants to implement a DLP, there is no additional funding from the state, or the federal government for the implementation of such programs. That means that the schools need to allocate funding from their existing budgets for the resources they might need for the implementation of DLPs. For example, teachers with the qualifications to teach language learners, materials for students, teachers, and testing materials, as well as teacher professional development and any other resources for DLPs must be covered in the budget. In Arizona for example, SB 1242 Critical Languages; Economic Development; Pilot (U.S. Congress. Senate, 2014) was passed in 2014 to support the implementation of DLPs for the economic
development of students to compete in a global economy. Unfortunately, since funding is not attached to the Bill, that means schools need to figure out how to fund it.

In order to understand the relationship between race/ethnicity and access to DLPs, I collected the race/ethnicity demographic of the students in the 35 schools implementing DLPs and it is demonstrated individually in table 11 (Column V in the research tool).

Table 11

*Schools Implementing DLPs Student Race Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Student Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Student Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente de Hozho</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 28.38% Asian/Pacific Islander .80% Black .53%</td>
<td>Hispanic 41.38% White 83.99% Other 1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Willow</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 0 Asian/Pacific Islander 4.79% Black .96%</td>
<td>Hispanic 9.85% White 83.99% Other .41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails Middle School</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan .37% Asian/Pacific Islander 3.37% Black 1.12%</td>
<td>Hispanic 8.48% White 86.53 Other .12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Shoe Trail</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan .41% Asian/Pacific Islander 3.18% Black 1.52%</td>
<td>Hispanic 10.51% White 84.09% Other .28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarwater Elementary</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 1.12% Asian/Pacific Islander 9.96% Black 5.60%</td>
<td>Hispanic 15.57% White 66.25% Other 1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biltmore Prep Academy</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 4.93% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.11% Black 4.58%</td>
<td>Hispanic 45.42% White 42.25% Other .70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Sage Elementary</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 1.40% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.49% Black 2.49%</td>
<td>Hispanic 14.17% White 76.64% Other 2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Peak School</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan .48% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.14% Black 1.19%</td>
<td>Hispanic 9.14% White 84.09% Other 2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Elementary</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan .73% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.78% Black 4.25%</td>
<td>Hispanic 40.26% White 50.37% Other 1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 1.19% Asian/Pacific Islander 1.95% Black 3.58%</td>
<td>Hispanic 16.06% White 77.36% Other .87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los Niños</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 15.12% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.13% Black 16.47%</td>
<td>Hispanic 41.67% White 22.67% Other 1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene de los</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 4.70% Asian/Pacific Islander 5.64%</td>
<td>Hispanic 22.18% White 54.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Black %</td>
<td>Other %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 2.96%</td>
<td>Hispanic 38.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 3.42%</td>
<td>White 47.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 5.92%</td>
<td>Other 1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 2.40%</td>
<td>Hispanic 64.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 2.56%</td>
<td>White 25.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 4.97%</td>
<td>Other 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 7.40%</td>
<td>Hispanic 67.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .22%</td>
<td>White 14.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 8.30%</td>
<td>Other 1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 8.89%</td>
<td>Hispanic 68.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 1.96%</td>
<td>White 12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 7.38%</td>
<td>Other 1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandpiper Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 1.01%</td>
<td>Hispanic 14.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 5.29%</td>
<td>White 73.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 2.27%</td>
<td>Other 3.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 2.05%</td>
<td>Hispanic 58.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .73%</td>
<td>White 30.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 4.40%</td>
<td>Other 3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrera Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 1.59%</td>
<td>Hispanic 92.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .29%</td>
<td>White 1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 4.20%</td>
<td>Other 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 1.34%</td>
<td>Hispanic 88.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .45%</td>
<td>White 4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 5.54%</td>
<td>Other .15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 2.05%</td>
<td>Hispanic 15.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 4.58%</td>
<td>White 70.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 5.85%</td>
<td>Other .95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 3.81%</td>
<td>Hispanic 19.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 4.73%</td>
<td>White 68.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 2.74%</td>
<td>Other .76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 0</td>
<td>Hispanic 24.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 11.79%</td>
<td>White 58.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 2.84%</td>
<td>Other 2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan .78%</td>
<td>Hispanic 20.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 10.68%</td>
<td>White 63.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 1.94%</td>
<td>Other 2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 2.81%</td>
<td>Hispanic 84.06 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .31%</td>
<td>White 10.94 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 1.56%</td>
<td>Other .31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grijalva Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 3.72 %</td>
<td>Hispanic 90.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .28 %</td>
<td>White 2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 2.07 %</td>
<td>Other .55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollinger Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 2.71%</td>
<td>Hispanic 91.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .45%</td>
<td>White 4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 0</td>
<td>Other .45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Belle McCorkle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 3.11%</td>
<td>Hispanic 90.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander .60%</td>
<td>White 4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black .96%</td>
<td>Other .48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission View Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan 6.29%</td>
<td>Hispanic 87.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander 0</td>
<td>White 3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black 2.32%</td>
<td>Other 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roskruge Bilingual Magnet</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buskirk Elementary School</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Elementary</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistor Middle School</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Magnet High School</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite Elementary</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated in Table 11 and highlighted in Appendix G, most schools with more than 50 percent Latino enrollment have a high number of free and reduced lunch percentage which highlights the low SES of the families in those particular schools (See Appendix G for the Districts implementing DLPs where Latinas/os are more than half of the student Population). This means that there is an additional economic burden in the implementation of DLPs in low-income neighborhoods that are already struggling with financing the needs of their students to achieve education equity.

Additionally, Figure 4 shows the average of students’ race/ethnicity in the schools implementing DLPs for a clear visual of the student’s race demographics. Figure 4 shows that on average, there are more Latinos enrolled in DLPs than any other race or ethnicity. Furthermore, Figure 4 demonstrates a macro perspective of access to DLPs, however, there are two things that need to be discussed in order to highlight the possibility that if...
we look at the access to DLPs from a micro level, the numbers can show us something different. First, the students’ race and ethnic demographics that I utilized was extracted from the entire school population and not specifically to DLP enrollment. Since it is not a requirement for schools to provide DLPs students’ race and ethnic demographics for public access, this information is rarely available, and if it is, it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. This means that the demographics of the DLPs can be very different than the demographics of the overall schools, especially with Proposition 203 and the four-hour block in place which excludes ELLs from DLPs which means that they will be accounted for in the overall school demographics, but not necessarily in the DLPs. If the program is located in a school/community with high number of Latinos whose home language is Spanish, they will be scrutinized by the AZELLA and if given the ELL title, they will not be able to participate in DLPs. For this reason, schools offering DLPs might be forced to promote their DLPs for students outside of their communities to maintain the program while a high number of students already attending the school will not have access to DLPs do to the ELL classification.

Secondly, if the Tucson Unified School District is taken out of the DLPs enrollment, the Latino average percentage decreases from 51 percent to 34 percent and the white student enrollment increases from 38 percent to 53 percent (See Appendix H for Student’s Race/Ethnicity Average in Schools Implementing DLPs). This is important to note because through my interviews and in working with this topic and with the language learners community, I have learned that Tucson Unified has a long history with bilingual education and language heritage programs. When Proposition 203 was passed and their bilingual programs became under attack and under the microscope, Tucson
Unified was able to save its ideals towards bilingual education and they defended the right for students to learn in their heritage language, which resulted in saving a few programs. Now that DLPs and the support for bilingual education programs is increasing in the state again, Tucson Unified Districts’ DLPs is exponentially increasing as well. Tucson Unified as a district, has the most DLPs in the state and they are able to include ELLs in their programs for most of the day, but still adhering to Proposition 203 and the ELD block. On the other hand, the other 18 districts implementing DLPs, with the exclusion of Flagstaff, because they are also a heritage language DLP, are very new and their ideals towards bilingual education and its access is very different than those of Tucson.

Some DLPs are fighting to defend the right for students to maintain and learn their heritage language while some of them are focused on the globalization ideal of the commodification of language which is the exchange of intellectual competence, that can be directly exchangeable for material goods or money. This view of language commodification can be a detriment to DLPs’ access for ELLs because the argument behind the implementation of DLPs is not focused on language heritage rights, but in a neoliberal perspective in the globalization of education for language learners instead of language minority students. This globalization perspective detaches the issue of providing education equity for all students and instead focuses on providing a higher quality of education for those students that are already at an advantaged completely ignoring those that are not, such as language minority students.
One-on-one Interview Results

For the one-on-one interviews, the nine present and past principals, world language coordinators, and language acquisition directors from different districts implementing DLPs in Arizona were self-selected from the 35 DLPs contacted for the phone interviews. The nine participants accepted an email invitation to participate in the study, (See Appendix E). In order to protect the identity of my participants, instead of using names, I used numbers from one to nine to represent the nine participants who agreed to the one-on-one interview. In the following section I will describe and analyze the results of the one-on-one interviews by identified the number of participants that fall under the 17 categories from the color-coding process of the nine one-on-one interviews.
Additionally, I overlapped the 17 categories into two main themes, which are the participants perceived benefits of DLPs and the participants perceived challenges in implementing DLPs. Furthermore, I created three additional sub-themes under each main themes which are: (1) Competitiveness in a global economy; (2) Language and culture; and (3) DLPs as enrichment programs under participants perceived benefits of DLPs and (1) Finding qualified teachers; (2) Implementing DLPs in an English only state; and (3) Skepticism and push back for DLPs under participants perceived challenges in implementing DLPs. I will also utilize text examples from the interviews to support the different themes.

**Participants Perceived Benefits of DLPs.** Regardless of the participants DLPs’ ideals of globalization or heritage language rights, they all stood behind the implementation of DLPs in their schools and the benefits for their students in achieving bilingualism and bi-literacy. The benefits that the nine participants identified varied from positive cognitive development to being able to communicate with people in more than one language, but the commonality among all nine participants was the collective understanding that there is a plethora of research supporting dual language education. For example, participant one stated:

I do I feel like the brain research shows that it increases academic performance and the example programs that I have reviewed show a lot of progression from elementary through high school of proficiency in foreign language and that is a skill that is going to be a lifelong skill so I do think that it is effective.

Participant two was also aware of the research supporting the benefits of DLPs as shown in their statement below:
Well, obviously you have your cognitive strengths, we always track students on their AIMS scores and their benchmarks as well just to make sure that they are on track because they do their math here in Spanish but the testing is done in the English. I am in a lucky situation because I'm able to compare the dual language immersion kids with the non-dual language immersion kids in the district because we are very homogeneous so I can do that. So the graph starts with immersion and non-immersion at the same level but as the years go by the immersion students just the line just starts to go up a little bit. You have obviously social cultural benefits, the kids are so much more open-minded, they are much more accepting of things, they are risk takers, they have higher self-esteem.

Participant three was aware of the benefits of dual language education although the participant did not yet have the data for his/her DLP and did not yet know if the implementation of the DLP in the school was yielding positive results due to his/her recently hired status. Participant three stated “I don't know yet, I would like to think so and I think in the long-term the research and data has shown that, however, I don't know if that is happening in our program just yet.” On the other hand, there are DLPs that have been well established and the administrators have grown with the programs and have the data from their DLPs to prove the benefits of dual language education that is supported by research. For example participant nine stated:

   Definitely, I know that our data shows in regards to… And all the research out there, the brain-based research shows the benefits of bilingualism all the way to Alzheimer's you know having to prevent some of that and having… that is more of an enhanced learning experience... as we get some of our research we found
out that if you really want to reach those bi-literacy goals, immersion, especially in those primary years, when as you know kids are like sponges, that is where they really grasp that second language because their first language what they are hearing which English, they see it all around it is all around them.

The participants make it clear that the implementation of their programs was based on legitimate research that supported bilingualism and bi-literacy.

**Competitiveness in a global economy.** The context around the increase and support of DLPs’ in the state of Arizona has centered around the idea of preparing students to be competitive in a global economy by providing them with bilingual skills. Six out of the nine participants employed a globalism argument when talking about DLPs and its benefits for employable skills and economic reasons. Participant two stated:

Anything that is two languages in this day and age will put us on the same playing field as the majority of the other industrialized nations that are out there. They say that 21 out of the 25 top industrialized nations require early introduction of other languages and we don't, so we need to get on the same playing field. I would say in this day and age, how do you expect to prepare our students to be competitive in a global economy without having some type of level of global competence in another language. It's not just math, it's not just reading, it's not just science, globally means you have to be able to communicate in another language and you have to have a pretty strong sense of what we call today global competence.

Participant three stated:

If they have that focus and they have that emphasis, we are in a world today where we are competing in a world economy. What better way to provide the students
with a foreign-language aspect at a very young age? And to help them grow and to understand that culture and they can get into junior high school and high school and continue that and hopefully in college where they can find a career that does interact globally and internationally and they will be well prepared for that. So I think that's the whole idea around it and it's a very solid one, but again if you are from that mindset, the old-school way of thinking, our world has expanded our markets have expanded there are kids in other countries that know multiple languages and our kids will be competing with them for the same type of jobs, so we are doing our students a disservice by not having that available to them.

Participant five stated:

Yes, so that when they graduate high school, they have another skill and they are competitive in a global market and that is the way we sold it. One of the things was and why Mandarin? Why not Spanish because of our location you know? And we told them that by the time they graduate high school, the number one language in the world will be Mandarin.

Participant seven stated:

I think from what you asked before I think this is a real shortcoming in the American education system. We are often compared to the rest of the world and all of the other countries are teaching their students a second language and I think that it is a necessity when you are four hours away from another border that speaks another language and there is so much interaction, it makes it easier when it's a necessity but I think that we need to… when we look at education, a lot of it is what we expect of it and I think that we should expect our kids to be learning a second
Participant nine stated:

You look at our global society, the demographics, the geographic area that we are in as close to Mexico and the commerce, the way the economic situation is with the United States and Mexico and this is a global society and it is becoming more and more important to have a second and sometimes even a third language.

While the discourse of preparing students for a global economy might seem positive for education equity, it completely disassociate DLPs’ services from ELLs. This explicit disassociation purposefully ignores the ethics of equitable education for the high number of language minority and Latino students in the state and the priority given to their own cultural capital and academic achievement by denying them access to DLPs. This arranged marginalization is systematically excluding ELLs from participating in programs that yield high academic student achievement creating education inequity for language minority students. On the other hand, there is also recognition in the importance of providing DLPs for bilingualism and bi-literacy, as well as biculturalism, which is directly tied to language. The participants made it clear that the implementation of their programs was based on legitimate research that supported bilingualism and bi-literacy, but not all included biculturalism.

**Language and culture.** The biculturalism component of the programs varied in two ways. One way is in the importance of culture in the meaning that it is important to support individuals’ cultures through heritage language education for students to be biculturate as well as bilingual. The second way is identifying bilingualism as being culturally aware, however, with the focus and goal on students being bilingual without a
biculutrate focus. These two main ways of viewing and creating the ideals, goals, and focus of DLPs emerged from the interviews. Furthermore, those DLPs that had biculturalism as one of the main goals, were having to import international teachers from other countries in order to provide the students with the cultural component of the language they are learning. Seven of the participants recognize the importance of language and culture during the interview. Participant one said “making sure that they appreciate another language and that they communicate in that language and have a context in that culture helps to build confidence and self-motivation.” Participant two stated:

It's like language proficiency, so you have to have an understanding of the world and an easy way to do that is to teach another language because language and culture are just… you can't really separate them so if you're teaching another language, those students are learning a whole other set of skills culturally and ways of thinking.

Participant three stated:

I think the ability for students to interact with two different languages and understand the culture that they are learning, not only the language, but both of those; the understanding of those two main ones, culture and language, both of those are the primary learning targets.

Participant four stated:

I mean language is culture and that question is important and it's well researched I don't think I'd need to reiterate that I just know that language is culture and so if you do not have dual language kind of programs for students then having a
language other than English available, then you are making a choice to ignore
culture which means you are ignoring language and you are a ignoring the
potentialities of learning which is based on what we are.

Participant five stated:

When the program begun, I was not here this is my first year and so they wanted
to get, my guess, and I do not know if this is correct, but they wanted to get
people who were able to share the true experience from their country.

Participant six stated:

Also, there is the other aspect of the social and cultural awareness that the
students are truly not just bilingual but also bicultural. They have created an
environment where learning is very conducive because they have established a
culture within each classroom and within the program and I found out that that is
very conducive to learning and truly makes a difference when it comes to building
community amongst them and just having a complete education.

Participant seven said, “also, giving them insight into other cultures which is probably
one of the areas which we still need to work at in terms of that piece of the puzzle. This
dualism of views for the benefits of implementing DLPs speaks to the receptiveness in
implementing DLPs to provide students with bilingualism, bi-literacy, and biculturalism
from the DLPs administration’s perspective, so the question becomes why isn’t this
receptiveness translating into policy? Why are language minority students systematically
marginalized from obtaining bilingualism, bi-literacy, and biculturalism through DLPs?
Why marginalize ELLs who can directly provide real biculturalism in DLPs? The answer
is that the systematic marginalization and exclusion of Latinos in general and language
minority in particular through laws and policies is a testament to the continuous second
class status for working class Latinas/os living in the U.S. as a result of racist nativist
thinking.

**DLPs as Enrichment Programs.** Furthermore, all nine of the participants
mentioned DLPs as an enrichment program that added substantially to students’
education either by enhancing student’s school experience or by providing a long life
skill that has the potential of positively enhancing student’s academic achievement and
personal lives. For example participant one said “I think expanding student's horizons
making sure that they are, that they appreciate another language and that they
communicate in that language. Participant two stated:

The kids are so much more open-minded, they are much more accepting of things,
they are risk takers, they have higher self-esteem, you know we had to initially
track all of that for the grant with surveys and all that, they are very confident
because they spend half the day trying to figure out what the teacher is saying and
they are successful, obviously it takes good teachers but the kids they are not very
easily stumped. They don't give up, they persevere and I think they learn how to
test well, they learn how to problem solve and be good critical thinkers because
they are always having to think. There is always an extra layer of critical thinking
in an immersion program because the teachers do not use English to teach the
material or L1 with that student so they have to really pay attention with the
executive part of the brain function that has to do with attention span and in
bilinguals, it is a larger area.

Participant three stated:
Whether it's any language I think that having any foreign language available at a school I know… I just read an article today from East Valley Tribune on how Mandarin is becoming very popular in the East Valley and I know a few schools that have that so whether it's Mandarin, French, or Spanish whatever it is, having that option available to those kids I think it's crucial.

Participant three is referring to the popularity of DLPs growing around Phoenix and students having access to this “new” enrichment program. Participant four stated:

I can't tell you how many times if I'm writing something and I'll write it in English and then I'll write it in Spanish and there is something that comes out better in Spanish, so I go back and I write in English that I would never be able to do if I wasn't bilingual so it's in all the things that language does to open up the world.

Participant five also identified dual language education as an enrichment program by saying “Students walking away with a lifetime skill of being able to communicate in another language.” Moreover, participant six stated:

It's not just academics scores but in overall education. The opportunity for students to learn and to develop their two languages, so I mean the sky is the limit once you have open the door to a new language, a new culture, another way of seeing things. The students become well aware of who they are and what they are able to do and they become very resourceful and they become well rounded in more… They get to know themselves really well and they get to know their peers really well as well.

Participant seven stated:

For one thing, it provides students with an opportunity to become better listeners,
it forces them to be a little bit more critical when it comes to their thinking because they're trying to figure out what is happening and to acquire that language.

It is giving them a world of opportunity by being able to communicate with more people and its professionally, personally, and academically great for those kids.

Participant eight stated:

One of the moms said, even if my child does not go back and forth to…and doesn't make her daughter use bilingualism as an employable skill, just the fact that it will enrich her life is something that she is so extremely excited about.

And finally participant nine stated:

I know that our data shows in regards to… And all the research out there, the brain-based research shows the benefits of bilingualism all the way to Alzheimer's you know having to prevent some of that and having… That is more of an enhanced learning experience.

Education equity can be directly correlated to the access of programs that will add substantially to students’ school experience by providing long life skills that have a positive student academic achievement which can positively enhancing student’s personal lives. Such programs are identified as enrichment programs such as DLPs that were identified as enrichment programs by all nine participants. For this reason, excluding certain groups, such as language minority Latinos, is a direct violation of education equity, which is correlated to violations of students’ civil rights.

**Participants perceived challenges in implementing DLPs.** All nine participants identified challenges in the implementation of their DLPs. The challenges that the schools implementing DLPs are facing are different depending on the needs of the
community in which the school implementing DLPs is located, however, it seems that there is one common denominator in the challenges faced by the nine participants and that was finding curriculum and materials in the partner language as well as qualified teachers.

**Finding qualified teachers.** It is important to note the challenge in finding qualified teachers to teach in DLPs because this challenge directly speaks to the disconnection between the community need and education policy that directly affects teacher preparation and certification to work in DLPs.

For example, participant one stated:

> Staffing, to have highly qualified immersion teachers, they are very far and wide in between it seems…That's a challenge to find professionals that are well-versed in the model so I think training also can be a challenge to make sure that there is a clear understanding of what the model needs to look like in order for children to be successful for the program to flourish. The challenge was in the leveling of the material, I think that the initial quarter didn't align directly to the level of our students for those great levels so and we are still under… We don't have the amount of resources that we need to make sure that every grade level has everything they might need in the Spanish side so that's a challenge and finding quality resources, reproducible, and things that are part of that curriculum have been a challenge and a frustration for teachers that feel they have a large translating to do in the curriculum materials from the district.

Participant two stated:

> Yeah, I can’t find them. So the challenges that we have here in the school is
obviously staffing finding qualified certified teachers who have a high level of proficiency in Spanish or Chinese to be able to teach in an immersion style it has to be somebody with a really high level they really have to be an advance high or in a superior level, in my opinion of proficiency skill to be able to teach because if you are not able to say something in one way and the kids do not understand you, you have to know how to do circumlocution to come around and say that in a different way. I'd say staffing is probably an issue for everybody and finding teachers that are already trained in this specific model that is almost nonexistent so then you have to think about if you get someone who is not trained in this model, maybe they have a high level of Spanish proficiency, but they are not trained in this particular model so you need someone to train them most districts don't have the world language coordinator or so somebody who knows about this model and how to train and then you get people just trying to figure it out. When that happens, a lot of the non-negotiables are not maintained and there isn't a lot of program fidelity because they don't know so this is where if we had someone at the state level, at least that person could put out "this is the model" and some guidance in that is probably why this is a revolving door school I am always sharing with people are coming up to tour and it is a lot of extra time in marketing on my end but I feel like there is no where else for people to go so we just open our doors and we share everything we have with anyone wants to try and start a program.

Participant three stated:

Yes, challenges include staffing, that's probably the number one challenge finding
teachers that are able to teach, funding, we are the number one struggling in the
district, it's hard to pay for textbooks in English and in Spanish. We also have a
very difficult to set up that is not really attractive to a whole lot of teachers but
due to our budget restraints, we do what we can. For example, in our first and
second grade we have a one and two combo class, and then we have 3/4 combo
class and a 4/5 combo so not only is the teacher coming in and teaching different
grade levels but also different languages and then, there are other school districts
that are more competitive when it comes to salaries so we are often not the first
choice. During the summer I was trying to find a four and five teacher and I
couldn't find anything until like 2/3 weeks before school started and that is
because I was cult calling teachers that were in our system that had the bilingual
requirement, who had the bilingual certification. It just adds an increased amount
of responsibility on those dual language teachers and there's no stipend or
anything that they get, it’s just a pat on the back.

Participant three also shared their frustration in having parents understand that their
children are not going to be bilingual within a year, but that they really need to stick in
the program if they want to see long term results. Participant three stated:

Also knowing that it's not a microwave, it's a slow cooker. A lot of times parents
think that in kindergarten or first grade my kid should be speaking Spanish and
that's not the case, it takes time to really develop that language piece. So those
that are able to stick through it and work through the struggles with their child and
are committed to it, I think that leaving currently fifth grade with a nice
understanding base of the language, I think it’s really important.
Participant four alludes to the fact that there are many challenges in dual language education by stating “all of the above” when I asked him what were some of the challenges in dual language education, however, he did state a specific challenge by saying:

All of the above, and resource, the context in which the language exists in, if you are in a school and community in which there aren't any other languages than whatever the primary language is that is a huge challenge because if there aren't people outside of the classroom to interact with for real reasons in the target language that is the biggest challenge.

Participant five also expressed their challenge with finding appropriate curriculum materials in the partner language as well as staffing issues by saying:

Finding the curriculum, finding the resources in the partner language, that is a challenge. Those are the types of challenges that are hard and we want to know what is good, we do not know what is effective. Another challenge is when they get older, trying to figure out what kind of proficiency level they are at. Trying to find out what assessment is accurate, what is good, that is another challenge. Also, we are finding that those two native partner language speakers, do not speak English very well and they are learning as well when they are here.

Participant five did not identify finding qualified teachers in the U.S. as an issue, but he/she did state that the lack of English proficiency of their DLP teachers as an issue which is directly linked to not finding qualified teachers in the U.S. and as a result, having to bring teachers from other counties to work in their DLPs who might have low
oral English proficiency. The challenge of finding qualified teachers was stated by most of the participants specifically one through five, seven, and eight.

Participant seven identified the challenges in finding qualified teachers by stating:

The challenges are finding the resources, teachers in particular. It is very difficult to find a teacher that is a good teacher and bilingual, that combination is not easy to find. Also, our biggest challenge has been, well, I have been scratching my head for the past year and a half is how do you measure this? No one is placed in the program so they can talk about science and math and Spanish they want to be able to use it for conversation and so there's no curriculum for that that says, hey here is your math program and here is how you implement it, so we've been creating our own set of expectations.

Participant eight stated:

Finding qualified teachers for sure, developing what content we are going to be teaching and making sure that we are teaching it, I think that evaluating teachers as well because when they are speaking in the partner language I can't necessarily know what they are saying like I can evaluate an English speaking teacher. I am limited in the ability to support and be able to effectively evaluate a Chinese teacher without knowing the language so that would be a limitation. Now the teachers, I can say that one of the challenges has been the marriage, and I use that as a term for the teacher partnership, there has been tension for sure because the way that children are educated in the country of origin of our DLP teachers are so different, so we had to do a lot of work with our DLP teacher this year on management.
DLPs confront many challenges, from financial allocation of resources to fund their programs, to finding curriculum material in the partner language. But one of the main challenges that participants identified as big burdens were to find qualified teachers to fill the needs of their DLPs. Some of the programs had even build partnerships with local universities and foundations to bring teachers from other counties to teach the partner language in their DLPs (see Challenges section) because they could not find local teachers who were qualified to teach language learners. This lack of qualified teachers is due to two main reasons associated with the policies and laws in the state that then negatively affect teacher training and certification.

For example, Proposition 203 severely restricted the number of bilingual programs approved under waivers for ELLs (Jiménez-Silva & Grijalva, 2012), which significantly reduced the demand for bilingual certified teachers. For this reason, the number of teachers who have English as a second language or bilingual education endorsements significantly decreased. As a result, the number of teachers with expert knowledge regarding second language acquisition who would be qualified to work with language learners decreases as the demand dwindled down and the focus shifted and continues to be on SEI endorsements. Consequently, DLPs are having a hard time in finding qualified local teachers to be part of their programs.

Furthermore, not only are qualified local teacher hard to find as a result of the teacher training process attached to bilingual educators, but also because they have much more responsibility without any additional compensation. For example the translation of curriculum and materials for the students are left to the teacher and can be a huge burden especially because they do not receive compensation for their time translating. DLPs
administrators are having a difficult time finding qualified teachers, but also maintaining them because they do not have the resources or the support to incentivize bilingual educators to continue in DLPs. In addition, there is also the concern that teachers have in DLPs regarding their teacher evaluations attached to students’ scores because students state testing is in English, but students will also be learning curriculum in another language so their main concern is if this will negatively impact their state testing.

**Implementing DLPs in an English only state.** Two participants identified the challenges in incorporating ELLs into their DLPs as a challenge or an issue. Participants six and nine’s identification of the challenges centered more around the hardships of implementing DLPs in a state that strictly focuses on English only education and the challenges of having to deal with the ELD restrictions and the segregation of the four-hour block. Participant six shared the difficulty in keeping their DLP with a true 50/50 model because they do not have the “perfect marriage” between 50 percent English speakers, and 50 percent Spanish speakers, but they still call themselves a 50/50 model because they have Spanish and English teachers. The school that participant six is referring to is in a community with a high number of Latinos and ELL students, but they are not able to use this fact in a positive way to make their DLP follow a more authentic 50/50 model as result of Proposition 203.

Participant nine highlighted an extremely important factor in the support and implementation of DLPs in an equitable fashion for all students and that is the perception people have of such programs based on ignorance regarding bilingual education and the population it should serve. Participant nine talked about the challenge it has been to educate individuals who are not personally or professionally familiar with ELL education.
or with minority culture and language on the topic of DLPs. Participant nine stated that one of the main challenges have been to respond in board meetings to the questions: “Why are ELLs being taught in Spanish when they need to learn English?” or "why are all of your dual language programs on the west side where all the Hispanics are? They already know Spanish." This type of attitude in some communities makes it even more difficult for DLPs administrators to advocate for their programs and for the inclusion of ELLs in them for program fidelity, much less for social justice and civil rights.

Participant six also stated:

It was difficult to continue the program because one of the first obstacles that we had is that we could not have ELLs in the program anymore. So one of our obstacles became that our program became of children who spoke English, monolingual students who were learning Spanish and those few bilingual kids who passed the AZELLA test. This challenge identified by participant six makes it difficult to keep the fidelity of the 50/50 DLP model because the students might spend 50 percent of their time learning the curriculum in English and the other 50 percent learning the curriculum in the partner language, however, keeping 50 percent of the students from native Spanish speaking backgrounds and fifty percent of students from native English speaking backgrounds can be difficult as identified by participant six “we call it two way because we have Spanish and English teachers, but you know, it's not the perfect marriage of the 50% of the Spanish speakers and 50% of the English speakers.” Participant nine also identified the challenges of trying to incorporate ELLs in DLPs as an issue by stating:
It's just that there are many challenges especially here in our state, the law the way it's written for our ELL students and then, even then past that, the challenges of having the endorsed teachers to be able to do that. In our district unfortunately we do not have the money to be able to incentivize in any way with stipends or anything like that because we have, last time I checked, we had 120 teachers who had the bilingual endorsement that are not teaching in the dual language programs so trying to replace them and trying to find a way to incentivize them is a challenge.

Also, participant nine identified the erroneous perception of DLPs as a challenge by stating:

A lot of the perception is you know, why are we teaching kids two languages? For example when it comes to ELLs, the question is why are they being taught in Spanish when they need to learn English? Or I've had comments from community members on board meetings when I present on dual language, "why are all of your dual language programs on the west side where all the Hispanics are? They already know Spanish," so I think the educational part of what really is dual language is a challenge, and I think the perception is that we are just translating for ELLs because they do not know English when in fact you are really developing two languages so I think to have English only politics does not help any.

Three of the nine participants identified the negative connotations against DLPs to racial tensions. For example participant four stated:

I would say they are racist, I would say that they are ignorant, if I were being
direct, if I were trying to work the politics which is all about, I don't think individuals will say that, but I think that to me it is simple to see that you are dealing with racism, classism, and ignorance and that doesn't mean that people are evil or bad it just means that that is where you are starting and that is where you are at.

Participant six stated:

I think there should be plenty of education in terms of, and not just with words but actual statistics in terms of what dual language does and how it impacts students and once you put it in that sort of context of what the results are and what is then I think that if people still vote in favor of it just because of other reasons, you know, then if there's something that can be done legally to stop them.

Participant seven stated:

I know that there is a certain amount of it that, this is a strong term, but there is a certain amount of it that is racial. I know that we have dealt with that at a very minimal scale but I was ready to see it more with our choice being Spanish and English. In Arizona that is a really hot topic and a big issue and the thought of for some people who see other people not speaking our language, is insulting to them. Again, I don't know if that is truly racist but there is a certain hostility there that I don't think there is anything I could say to them that would change their mind… there is that piece of it being confused with bilingual education and the resentment of our state towards it, towards Spanish speakers, I'm worried that someone is going to shut it down, that they will come in and say you can't do this.
The three participants quoted above commented on the context of DLPs and ELLs in Arizona, stating that the pushback of DLPs has to do with racial tension specifically resentment towards Spanish speakers and the association based on ignorance that if an individual speaks Spanish they must be immigrants. This resentment is tied to the context of immigration in the state and the laws that have been enacted to demonize immigrants by making them all to be criminals. Because of the context in which DLPs are being implemented, some participants, especially those with high numbers of Latinos and ELL students do not feel the support from their districts in the implementation of their DLPs. This lack of support that the participants feel is highly correlated to the education policies and lack of financing for DLPs and as a result, some schools feel that their district administrators are not standing up for them.

Additionally, five of the nine participants stated that proposition 203 is affecting the implementation of their program and that they would like to see language policy reform to be able to include a broader spectrum of students. For example participant one stated:

I feel that the students that we have in the traditional tracks that are native Spanish speakers would benefit from being in the dual language program. I would rather see us be a school where everyone goes into that type of environment regardless of their proficiency and there are going to be times when the native English speaker and the Spanish native speaker learn from each other's strengths in the classroom. For other reasons as well, yes. I don't think that was a good law to begin with.

Another example is participant five’s statement:
I would say that Prop 203 creates a major obstacle for those parents and this is the way I see it: we are telling the parents that they can only choose to put their children in this one program, we are telling them this is the best option and you do not have an option or if you do have the option to take out your kid from an SEI, you still have to take the AZELLA because it is federal mandate so if you are the parent of an ELL child, who by the way you might have that child become ELL just because you write English/Spanish on the identification form and the parents are not well aware of what they are filling out and by law, we are not allowed to tell them what the implications of that form are so basically what it comes down to is not having the choice. Parents of English language children do not have the choice of choosing the appropriate program for their children, so that's what it does, it denies parents’ choice. Even if they withdraw them from the SEI they are still subjected to taking the test. Also, because of the law we are not able to access specific funding for dual language. There's nothing supporting dual language, so because it's the status of an English only state and unless you go to private schools where they can do pretty much whatever they want with their money, they do that, but when you are regulated by the state and by the department of education at the federal level, there isn't much we can do.

Participant five talks about the lack of funding for DLPs because of the elimination of bilingual programs since the passing of Prop 203 and the elimination of funding that went with it. On the other hand, participant one talks about the exclusion of language minority students. The exclusion of language minority students from DLPs cannot be denied. The Arizona Department of Education will tell you that the exclusion
of ELLs from DLPs does not exist because there are waivers available for parents who want their kids to participate in DLPs, however, the access to the waivers is not simple nor readily available for the parents since it is illegal for the schools to promote the waivers. Furthermore, the waiver could potentially result in the parent having to renounce ELL services to their children.

On the other hand, Proposition 203 is not a problem for those participants where the implementation of their DLPs is not in a community with a significant presence of language minority and Latino students. In fact, two participants who are top school administrators were uncertain of the implementation and reform of Proposition 203 or/bilingual education because their communities were not affected by it. Moreover, the main reason why these participants disassociate DLPs with bilingual education is because they confuse bilingual education with transitional programs for ELLs. For example, participant three said “I don't know a lot about the proposition.” When I asked “do you think Proposition 203, which is English for the children, do you think it would be easier for dual language programs if that proposition was to be eliminated?” For this reason I proceeded to explain by saying:

“So the proposition is English only so if you have English only and like you said you need to follow certain guidelines in order for you to be able to have Spanish speakers in your dual language program because of this proposition. So if the proposition was not being implemented then Spanish speakers would be able to be in the dual language programs with English speakers.”

To my explanation he/she then answered:

“I think a little bit but I also think that it's important for them to have that English
foundation as well. For example the twin girls that I told you about from California we move them to non-dual language classroom and they are receiving ELL services and I think they will be better off with that and they are going to be stronger when they get back into that dual language program.

Two of the participants stated that Proposition 203 is not affecting the implementation of their program and they do not care to see language policy reform, two of them stated that they would like to see language policy reform to be able to include a broader spectrum of students, but it does not currently affect the implementation of their DLP. For example participant seven stated:

The downside to it is that if you are not proficient in English in the oral portion of the AZELLA you can't participate in program and the downside to that is that… the people who have administered the test here have told me, if I were to give this test to all of your first graders, three fourths of them would not be proficient and so to have… It's not so much the law but the process that we use to identify kids that makes it difficult because we have a student who past proficiency in kindergarten but only in the oral part of it so he had to be retested at the end of the year and he did not pass it so he had to be removed from the program in first grade. He speaks as well as anybody else in the classroom so that part of it, that piece of identifying kids I think it's hard, it's difficult because there are more students that could benefit from the program.

Additionally, implementing DLPs in an English only state like Arizona with rigid language laws, limits the choices that communities have in implementing language learning programs that are catered to meet the needs of their students. For example, seven
participants recognized in their interviews that it is important for communities to have a choice in programs that are positive for their communities. They identified the importance for communities to select a DLP model that is good for their specific communities as well as having the choice to implement DLPs. For example participant two stated:

I respect that everybody should have a choice but I think that every school district should have at least one choice for this type of education and the more parents start to understand the purpose behind it and how it works, the more demand there will be.

Participant seven stated:

It's also a challenge to not have a cookie cutter approach to it, to not have a lot of models to really follow or to copy exactly… We do gifted pullout for example for math and reading and in our community in this part of the Valley we are in competition with a lot of high achieving type of schools so the parents that are placing their children here are expecting an accelerated curriculum and so how do we balance their expectations to keep the kids at par and challenged and also implement the language part of it so our schedule, we really cannot copy what other schools are doing because and our barring agreement with her teachers in terms of minutes and that kind of stuff, are all different so they are trying to figure that out every year as a new grade level opens up and how that will look for us.

To further support the lack of accessibility to DLPs due to English only law, six of the participants agreed that access to DLPs is a problem. For example participant four stated:
Absolutely, they almost don't exist. I can probably count them with my two hands and from those most aren't very real. It's hard and… I haven't… I am not really current in terms of being in places where dual language is implemented so what I have to say about that is really from reading or hearing but not from seeing. We know that there aren't many programs I know there was a move under Huppenthal's administration for dual language programs but it's so… I mean, it's just Chinese which is fine but, you don't see them running to south Phoenix with a Chinese program let me put it that way.

Participant five said “Yes…well…it is not a problem I just wish there was more of an opportunity. On the other hand, participant six stated:

   Oh yeah, because there aren't that many, and the ones that we have are made right now not to target the populations that we would really want to target. Kids that we would want to have them maintain their language. So it is a problem because it is not accessible to everyone right now. It's only to a selected amount of families.

On the other hand, two of the participants disagreed and said access to DLPs is not a problem while one of the participants stated that it was a problem in the state, but not in his/her area, so there was no issue of access for the students in his/her community:

   Well I mean it's not readily available, so that is a concerned. That's obviously limiting for people unless you are willing to drive to a school outside of your neighborhood or if you are lucky to live in a neighborhood that has it but I have a concern about policy you know the current superintendent who is on his way out, was finally on board of it because there is that piece of it being confused with bilingual education and the resentment of our state towards it, towards Spanish
speakers, I'm worried that someone is going to shut it down, that they will come in and say you can't do this. I know that we have a new superintendent and a new governor and they are not necessarily considered fans of public education. It makes me a little worried about what policies are coming and that might change it. You know Utah, there was a statewide initiative where they are embracing it, we obviously don't have that, it's growing but it's not embraced by anybody and I am comfortable enough now that if somebody were to try and shut it down, I think there's enough parents who are vocal enough and to have access through money, they are affluent parents, that it would probably be a difficult battle for them to truly shut it down but that is the part that I am most worried about when it comes to access.

The awareness that the participation to DLPs is beneficial for all students is placed under the challenges of implementing DLPs in an English only state because although participants would like to include ELLs in their program to increase the fidelity of their DLPs, they are not able to because the law denies it and as a result, it places a challenge for them. Five of the participants made it a point to state their awareness to the fact that the participation in DLPs is beneficial for all students including ELLs although it was not part of the questions included in the one-on-one interviews. For example participant one said, “I feel that the students that we have in the traditional track that are native Spanish speakers would benefit from being in the dual language program.” Participant two stated, “this type of the program is good for all children a you need to prepare all children for the global economy, one of the non-negotiables in my book, this should not be an elitist program this should be open to everyone.” Participant six stated:
It was difficult to continue the program because one of the first obstacles that we had is that we could not have ELLs in the program anymore which completely goes against what research will tell you, you know about what works in the program.

Participant seven stated.” I also think that from an instructional standpoint, because it is very visual to support the language I think that is good for all students anyway.”

Participant nine stated:

I have seen as a principal and a teacher for a dual language program what it does and the benefits of that and then looking at how you can support our English language learners and that is really, if we are trying to make a difference, the four hours of ELD is not going to have the impact as dual language can for ELLs and then again looking at advanced learning experiences for students, I think dual language is definitely one that would definitely meet that for kids that need the challenge.

Moreover, although Arizona is an English only state and as a result of the passing of Proposition 203, DLPs administrators are inclined to disassociate their programs from being associated with the bilingual education term, there was a high association of bilingual education with DLPs. Eight of the nine participants made a direct association of bilingual education with DLPs. For example participant two stated that they did identify DLPs with bilingual education:

Of course I do, bilingual education is obviously being able to speak in two languages if we boil it down to the basic definition, bilingual speaking is speaking two languages so I think it has been politicized in a lot of states and bilingual
education has come to refer to something that only ELL students only participate in, but I think it depends on what state you are in and what the political context is around that term.

Participant four identified DLPs with bilingual education, but not the bilingual education used as transitional programs for student to transition from their home language to English as opposed as to maintain and develop both languages:

Dual language education is a bilingual education concept. I don't support anything in bilingual education that is a transitional concept because it is another way of denying access and deciding who gets by and it establishing where the power lies.

Participant five said that he/she did not associate bilingual education with dual language education, however, they had a very difficult time identifying the reason:

When I think of dual language, I do not think bilingual because in bilingual they already know the language, well…see, I am not exposed to it because we only have a handful of ELLs so we are on the SEI Model the ILP so we do not need to do X amount of hours, we do not have the full set of classes to be in ELL, that is not that way we work. When I think of bilingual, I think of…you have a young bilingual student, they may or may not be proficient in either whereas in dual language, you may have… no this does not work either. I do not know, I just do not think that they are similar at all because, okay, here we go, I think that they… in bilingual you are trying to teach the student English by using Spanish or using the Mandarin to teach them, but so if they do not understand how to do this and it is all in English, they will use Spanish to try and teach them how to do it.
The context provided in which DLPs are being implemented in an English only state and the overwhelming awareness and acceptance of DLPs as bilingual programs proves that the law has not caught up with the people and their interest and it is not a representation of how people who are implanting DLPs feel in regards to minority language education and bilingual education. Most of them are aware of the negative connotations attached to bilingual education because of political reasons associated with the passing of Prop 203, but the majority of them do not support it. So if Proposition 203 is not supported by the people that are implement bilingual education programs, and it is not supported by research, and there is a push back from community members, parents, and students that are directly affected by the exclusion of ELLs from DLPs, than why is this law still in place? Where is the push back coming from?

_Skepticism and pushback for DLPs._ The push back for the implementation certainly does not come from people involved in the implementation of DLPs. Eight participants felt skeptics should educate themselves on what are DLPs because the pushback against DLPs is due to ignorance for example participant one stated:

I would say that they need to look at the research that shows the efficacy of doing a dual language program and to look at the research to see how the child development increases and is benefited by that program so I think that some people do not trust research and they have a very negative reaction to language being instructed and they don't understand how can my child be learning math in in a foreign-language and be expected to be successful in math but I think it's more missed information so it's helping parents understand what it all means.

Participant two stated:
I would say in this day and age, how do you expect to prepare our students to be competitive in a global economy without having some type of level of global competence in another language. Most of our districts will have that somewhere in there, in a mission or a vision statement.

Participant three stated:

Um, I think that is a very foreign way of thinking, Um its… It's… And you can look at probably, any new, any new strategy that is new or a different way of teaching, it needs to evolve with the times. In the past, maybe dual language wasn't a thing but we can't stay stagnant because our kids are different and having a dual language program within the school is meeting those needs of those specific students who can really benefit from that so maybe it's not right for one child but it might be the ticket for another child, for another family.

Participant four stated:

I would say they [Individuals that are skeptics and do not want DLPs in schools] are racist, I would say that they are ignorant, if I were being direct, if I were trying to work the politics which is all about, I don't think individuals will say that, but I think that to me it is simple to see that you are dealing with racism, classism, and ignorance and that doesn't mean that people are evil or bad it just means that that is where you are starting and that is where you are at.

Participant six stated:

Um… (laughs) I think people should be educated to understand what the proposition is and to understand what they voted for. I think there should be
plenty of education in terms of, and not just with words but actual statistics in terms of what dual language does and how it impacts students.

Participant seven stated:

There is that little pieces sometimes where you have to teach people who aren't totally opposed because those that hate it even if they would understand it there would not be okay with it, so yeah there's a little bit of confusion about that.

Participant eight stated:

I would say come and see it. I was a principal in the…district and my former school has a Spanish immersion program and it's interesting because when I was there, we pulled in a population to the school from a low income, high Latino community and the parents from the area that had kids in the school didn't want "those kids," being pulled in to the school. I shouldn't say all of them, but a good portion of my white Caucasian community-based families didn't want necessarily poor Hispanic kids coming to the school. As the most lower socio-economic status groups do, they tend to bring down test scores. Research will show that but it's interesting when they flipped it in the immersion program a lot of those white Caucasian kids plugged in to the immersion Spanish program and I think from what I've heard it's kind of a whole different outlook in language development now and I find that kind of comical because before there was this kind of hesitancy from those ignorant people who would say don't speak Spanish in front of my kid, if that makes sense.

Participant nine stated:
I think that the main thing is for them to educate themselves, to really… You have that whole English only push in our state about learning English and definitely, live in the United States and English of course is a very important language to know but when you think about the benefits of dual language, really when it comes to that group, is just to educate themselves look at where our society is heading.

Participant seven, when talking about how skeptics should educate themselves on bilingual education and DLPs, stated that he/she felt that for those who hate the program and what it stands for, even if they would understand it, they would still hate it. The example of participant seven shows how ideology, in this case racist nativist, drives education policy regardless of program benefits. Even though it has been proven that DLPs have positive academic achievement for all students regardless of English proficiency, and this is good for students and our entire society, the dominant culture and people who have power over education policy in Arizona, will not support minority language education through the inclusion of ELLs in DLPs.

Similarly, participant eight’s testimony supports the idea of racist nativist ideology through Proposition 203 and the exclusion of ELLs from DLPs by giving an example of how “a good portion of my white Caucasian community-based families didn't want necessarily poor Hispanic kids coming to the school.” However, since this same community is now interested in having native Spanish speakers come in to their DLPs so that their kids have practice in speaking and developing language from native speakers, they are willing to admit the same kids they rejected in previous years. Nevertheless, regardless of the interest convergence in which both groups would benefit from the
inclusion of language minority students into DLPs, the full inclusion is not occurring as the result of Proposition 203 and the four-hour ELD block which directly excludes minority language student from participating in DLPs.

In addition, only two participants identified teacher tensions with the implementation of their DLP, however, it seems that these tensions were cause at the beginning of the implementation when DLPs were new and the tension died soon after for example, participant two stated

Um, probably at the beginning, that tends to be more of the case. As time goes by people realize, wow, this really interesting concept seems to be working and the kids seem to be doing well so I think it evens out but I think that every school that starts up is going to have a lot of questions, a lot of attention on exactly what are we doing here? So that is why you need a strong principle to kind of address all of those questions and the principal needs to know all of this stuff as well they are the instructional leader of the school sometimes the principles don't have the background information.

Participant seven agreed that there could be tension at the beginning of the DLPs’ implementation. Participant seven stated:

By all means, at first. I have 100 kindergarteners and 80 of them are in the immersion program [meaning Dual Language Program] and 20 of them are not. I have in every grade level just one class that is not in the immersion model and everybody else's immersion so there has been some anxiety over that that you know, are we being squeezed out? So I work hard to not over emphasize… You don't see the immersion everywhere and I do that because it is important for everyone in here
to feel included. There are two programs here but I try to celebrate everybody but there's still a little bit of tension there. It's nothing between teachers, it's just more of the uncertainty of what is it is going to look like for us? I have also been very lucky that I've had some of them retire at the right time so I didn't have to move anybody but you know being in that English side teacher [teacher who teaches English outside of the Dual Language Program] where you have to switch during the half of your day there's a lot of work for people and some people love teaching math and science and that has been taken out of them so that has created some anxiety too.

The rest of the participants said there were no tensions or they were not there at the beginning of their DLPs, so they were not aware if any tension existed before their arrival.

On the other hand, seven participants identified the support they were receiving for the implementation of DLPs in different ways. For example, participant one stated:

We absolutely have the support. Our district has a history and having bilingual education and in having dual language programs in the classroom before the laws changed… I don't think there's the tension I think that they recognize the value of the program. They are happy that we have a successful school regardless of what the program is and they actually plan with their counterparts in the immersion program so even though we have the traditional track teacher, she will plan for math instruction with her Spanish immersion counterpart and her English instruction with her English language arts counterpart so there's still opportunities
for professional learning communities across with the regular track and immersion program teachers.

Participant two also stated the support of the district “200% I am really lucky. The school board does well. It is because we have been doing it for 12 years.”

Participant three stated:

We do have very supportive families which helps keep the program where it is and our teachers are extremely dedicated, however, we still have not seen very much support from the districts’ administration because there is so much new leadership over there that I mean everyone's districts office has change. I mean with my supervisors, we've talked about the dual language program and the effect of that and I think that with our new superintendent, it’s something that she is really going to like, really is going to move towards. I think it's a great selling point for families we just need the support from the district and we have not gotten there yet we really haven't talked to her about it which will be sometime at the beginning of February so…

Participant five said “Absolutely, yes, yes, there is a lot of interest. I know that one teacher moved over here because she wanted her son to come. We have other individuals within our school that come here specifically because of that.” Participant seven stated:

Kind of, when we first started it we were told to move forward with it but it could not cost this much amount of money and it cannot impact staffing so we were successful at that and they are very pleased with what we did but I don't, again, there is nobody over there overseeing my program and their snow resources for me to go to.
Participant eight stated:

If the state provided more support like Utah does, than I would say yes, but our state doesn't; our state passed a bill last year, a critical language bill but stripped it of its funding so I would say no, not under those conditions.

Participant nine stated:

There is definitely support all the way from the board to the superintendent level. The support from the top is there but there's always a concern from teachers that you know they say you can tell me that I have your support bout when the principal at my site is evaluating me based on my students test scores and they are not doing very well because they are being tested in English so we just have to make sure that we have the right people on board the right principles on board as we higher new principles and administrators to be supportive of those programs

This support demonstrates that there is a community need for DLPs and as the implementation of such programs increases and more people support it, the laws need to reflect what is happening at the school level and if change does not come from the top to bottom, from policy makers, then it must come from bottom top, from schools and communities.
CHAPTER 5
Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this research study was to gather information on existing dual language programs in order to identify the characteristics and implementation of such programs in an attempt to create a database with the K-12 public schools implementing DLPs in order to create possible networking resources for those existing programs as well as for future ones. Furthermore, the purpose of this research was to highlight language education policy in Arizona that systematically excludes language minority students, specifically Spanish speaking Latino language minority students who are considered ELLs. Moreover, this research examined the context within which DLPs navigate in order to explore the perceptions’ of stakeholders about how current language policy affects their programs.

As demonstrated through the research tool, which organized and highlighted the phone interviews and the information gathered in the pre-population process, 83 percent of DLPs are being implemented as soon as pre-kinder garden or kinder garden. This result supports the argument that in order for children to effectively learn a second language, they need to be immersed in the second language at a young age (Collier, 1992; Genesee, 1987; Thomas, Collier, & Abbot, 1993; Thomas & Collier, 2012). With Proposition 203 in place and the four-hour block, the late enrollment of students into their DLPs would avoid the exclusion of ELL students. By age 10, ELLs can participate in DLPs as long as the parents request a waiver for the student to be part of a dual language program and refuses the district’s alternative language services for ELLs which raises federal civil rights concerns. The inclusion of language minority students into DLPs
would allow the program to truly follow a two way model which is the most effective way to follow a bilingual education model. However, Proposition 203 and the four hour block model, is hindering language minority students’ full potential of developing their heritage language in par with their second language at an early age when it has the most cognitive benefits according to researchers. In addition, the systematic exclusion from dual language programs of minority language students who are fluent in their first languages but developing proficiency in English supports operation of the interest convergence argument. That is, the growth of these programs and the exclusion of ELLs from them signals an interest by the dominant culture in ensuring the development of bilingualism for white middle and upper class children, affording them further academic, social, and economic progress, while at the same time foreclosing this opportunity from language minority students. The perception of the participants with regard to this paradox is excluding native speaker ELLs from dual language programs is inefficient, unnecessary, and wrong. Nevertheless, they feel the need to abide by the restrictive language policies of Proposition 203 and HB 2064. As a result, these individuals are compelled to exclude a significant population of Spanish speaking students from participating in their programs.

In the U.S. there are roughly 40 million Latina/o foreign-born immigrants living in the country (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011b). Furthermore, roughly 22 percent of all 5-18 public school-aged students speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a). In Arizona, this converts to roughly 150,000 English Language Learners (ELL), which is 13 percent of all of the states’ K-12 public school enrollments, of which the majority speak Spanish (Arizona Department of Education, 2010). The significant
presence of Latina/os, as well as Spanish-speaking citizens whose home language is Spanish in Arizona and across the U.S., has the potential to negatively or positively influence and shape policy depending on the social and political attitudes of the dominant culture in regards to their presence. Because of Arizona’s high population of Spanish speaking students, the state could include them in the different two-way models. Dual language programs are by designed to serve two populations of students: those for whom the primary instructional language, like Spanish or Mandarin, for example, is a mother tongue and those who are addition this language to their linguistic repertoire. In their truest and most beneficial form, dual language programs regard their Spanish speaking students as a resource instead of a problem (Ruiz, 1984). The most effective programs do not separate and marginalize students through Proposition 203 and the four-hour block model. Eighty percent of DLPs in Arizona, as demonstrated in the findings, are Spanish as the partner language. This means that 80 percent of DLPs are teaching their students through Spanish and English. However, the significant number of Spanish speaking students who are not considered English proficient in the state cannot be part of the same DLPs that teach the curriculum in their own native language. Instead, they are pulled out of the classroom for four hours, which is about 60 percent of the school day to learn English. The systematic exclusion of language minority students from DLPs can be argued to be as the result of racist nativist sentiments that enforce racist nativist laws and education policy such as Prop 203 and the four-hour block since. These education policies and laws target and marginalize the Latina/o population in general and the ELL population in particular without having any logistical reason for the exclusion nor the support from the very people on the ground that are implementing DLPs and want to see
policy reform in regards to Proposition 203. As a result, racist nativist sentiments propel and maintain laws and education policy that prevent any progress for minority individuals setting from occurring, even through interest convergence. This prevention of progress is important to discuss when it comes to education and language policy specifically because racist nativist sentiments and context negatively affect the support for bilingual education, the education of immigrant populations, minority language students, and the education of Latinos.

Furthermore, race/ethnicity demographics in the schools implementing DLPs (see Figure 2) as part of my research shows that on average, there are more Latinos enrolled in DLPs than any other race or ethnicity. These results eliminate the possibility that there is a violation against education equity for Latinos in the access of DLPs. However, these results demonstrate a macro perspective of access to DLPs, for this reason, there are two things that need to be discussed in order to highlight the possibility that if we look at the access to DLPs from a micro level, the numbers can show us something different. First, the students’ race and ethnic demographics is extracted from the entire school population and not specifically from data about DLP enrollments. Since it is not a requirement for schools to provide DLPs students’ race and ethnic demographics for public access as part of Arizona Department of Education regulations, this information is rarely available (only the schools would have this information, not ADE) and, if it is, it is difficult if not impossible to obtain. This means that the demographics of the DLPs can be very different than the demographics of the overall schools since the demographic information is not disaggregated, but considered as part of the school’s entire population. This means that language minority Latino students will be counted in the overall school demographics,
but not necessarily in the DLPs. If the program is located in a school/community with high numbers of Latinos whose home language is Spanish, they will be scrutinized by the AZELLA and if given the ELL title, they will not be able to participate in DLPs. For this reason, schools offering DLPs might be forced to promote their DLPs for students outside of their communities to maintain the program while a high number of students already attending the school will not have access to DLPs do to the ELL classification.

Secondly, if the Tucson Unified School District is taken out of the DLPs enrollment, the Latino average percentage decreases from 51 percent to 34 percent and the white student enrollment increases from 38 percent to 53 percent (see appendix H). This is important to note because through my interviews and in working with this topic and with the language learners community, I have learned that Tucson Unified School District has a long history with bilingual education and language heritage programs. When Proposition 203 was passed and their bilingual programs came under attack TUSD managed to retain some of its bilingual education schools. Administrators and teachers defended the right of students to learn in their heritage language. Now that DLPs and the support for bilingual education programs is increasing in the state again, the growth of Tucson Unified DLPs is exponentially increasing as well. Tucson Unified has the most DLPs in the state and its schools include ELLs in their programs for most of the day, but still according to their district representative, adhering to Proposition 203 and the ELD block. On the other hand, the other 18 districts implementing DLPs, with the exclusion of Flagstaff Unified School District (it has a heritage language dual language program featuring three languages), are very new and their perspectives towards bilingual education are very different from those held by school personnel Tucson. Tucson’s DLPs
are centered around the perspective of providing curriculum to students in their heritage language, which is attached to culture. On the other hand, the other DLPs are more centered in providing English proficient students the ability to be bilingual for economic and globalization. For this reason, Tucson Unified might adhere to education equity for ELL and Latinos, but not all DLPs in the different schools.

Another important aspect of the findings to discuss is support for DLPs based only on the global economy argument where DLPs will prepare students to be competitive in a global economy because they will be bilingual. This focus on the globalization ideal is the commodification of language. The commodification of language is the exchange of intellectual competence where language can be directly exchangeable for material goods (money). The idea of globalization and the commodification of language can be exclusionary for language minority students because the system is set up for ELLs to be excluded from accessing DLPs and therefore access better economic opportunities. This view of language commodification can be a detriment to DLP access for ELLs because the argument behind the implementation of DLPs is not focused on heritage language rights, but is grounded in a neoliberal perspective about the globalization of education for English-speaking foreign language learners instead of language minority students. This globalization perspective detaches the issue of providing education equity for all students and instead focuses on providing a higher quality of education for those students who are already socially and economically advantaged, completely ignoring language minority students who are not as advantaged.

Moreover, the growth of DLPs around the country and in Arizona in particular is in a context in which DLPs are being promoted as growth in preparing students to be
competitive in a global economy; however, ELLs are excluded from participating in DLPs. This exclusion is a direct violation of student’s Civil Rights protected by the 14th amendment since the state is deliberately excluding ELLs from DLPs and preventing students from being part of educational programs that yield positive academic achievement. As indicated in the findings, the majority of the nine participants in the in-person one-on-one interviews knowledgeable about the implementation of dual language models (77 percent) are aware that ELLs would enhance the quality of their program model (55 percent) and they think that ELLs should not be excluded from participating in DLPs (22 percent). However, because they are obligated to abide the law, Proposition 203, they have to make English proficiency a requirement to be part of their programs. By making it a requirement for students to be English proficient for program admission, language minority students are excluded and marginalized. The only DLPs that do not require English proficiency as a requirement for enrollment are in the Tucson Unified School District. However, it too must abide by the law; if the Arizona Department of Education wanted to investigate the district’s procedures and implementation of DLPs in order to regulate the implementation of the four-hour block which is mandated by the state, ADE absolutely could and Tucson Unified would be obligated to make it a requirement for all ELLs.

Another exclusion happening in the DLPs conversation is the exclusion of bilingual education as a form of educating heritage language individuals whose ability to communicate with family, friends and community members in their heritage language may be limited. Heritage language students, being able to communicate in their heritage language has real language purposes also linked to their bicultural identity because
language is culture and it is important not just to earn more money as identified by participant four. The participants who are aware of the importance of biculturalism in DLPs for their heritage language students (the majority) understand the importance of adding biculturalism to the goal of DLPs. When the entire purpose of DLPs is focused on the idea of the commodification of language where language can be directly exchangeable for money in the work force, language rights linked to identity, self-esteem, and a sense of belonging for language minority students is lost creating an even more hostile environment for minority language education.

Also, the challenges DLPs are experiencing such as not finding local qualified teachers demonstrate how the state of Arizona is further providing an even more hostile environment for bilingual teachers and DLPs by implementing Proposition 203 and the four-hour block. Instead, the state legislature and department of education should allow communities to choose the best way to implement programs to educate students as indicated by participants under the challenges of implementing DLPs in an English only state. The ones that are highly affected by this hostile environment are communities with high numbers of ELLs because they have the numbers to constitute successful 50/50 DLPs models, but the law ties their hands and furthermore forces them to alienate a high number of their student population by denying them access to the DLPs. This alienation of students based on English proficiency reflects racist nativist education policy because students are excluded and marginalized based on their ethnic and linguistic minority status and the requirement of English proficiency. Furthermore, when members of the dominant culture ask, “why are ELLs being taught in Spanish when they need to learn English?” or "why are all of your dual language programs on the west side where all the
Hispanics are? They already know Spanish," it is very difficult to advocate in practical and realistic ways for the inclusion of ELLs into DLPs. Enrolling ELLs in dual language programs is challenging in Arizona, but particularly in an ideologically racist nativist context where English is viewed as the superior language, and white Americans are perceived as inherently “native” to the U.S., regardless of the opinions of professional people who work in the implementation of DLPs and do not want to exclude ELLs from their programs.

For this reason, Latino/a education has become a social justice issue since education policies and laws enacted in states such as Arizona further marginalize language minority and Latino students. It is a social responsibility to provide equitable education for all students regardless of English proficiency, race, ethnicity, culture and social economic status. Equitable education should be implemented through education policies that can support all of our students. We must reject those policies and laws that further marginalize those who are already living in the margins. In Arizona, individual communities should be allowed to choose the type of programs they believe are most effective as long as they follow equitable education measures for students. If school administrators, researchers, teachers, and parents support the implementation of DLPs for ELLs, these programs should be implemented.

Dual Language Programs continue to significantly increase (Howard & Christian, 2002) because they are seen to prepare students to be competitive and thrive in a multicultural global economy in the state of Arizona. However, language minority students are excluded from fully participating in DLPs. Restrictive language policies such as Proposition 203 and the four-hour ELD block are not effectively preparing linguistic
and ethnic diverse student populations for academic achievement and competitiveness in a global economy. For this reason, as demonstrated in the findings section as well as the analysis, DLP administrators are ready to move forward and eliminate racist nativist policies that marginalize ELLs. Policy reform needs to be constituted in the case of Proposition 203 or completely eliminated. As demonstrated through the finding and analysis section, access to DLPs is governed by English language proficiency and arguably by race as demonstrated by figure H. Without the Tucson Unified School District in the DLPs sample, these programs would be highly segregated by race and class. It is time for other districts to start following Tucson Unified School District in its inclusive goal of developing bilingualism, bi-literacy, and biculturalism for all students. Only then, Arizona will begin to rectify the years of marginalization and educational inequity for language minority students.

As shown in this study, Arizona has supported and passed questionable language/literacy policies that significantly impact educational equity for already marginalized groups – particularly English Language Learners (ELLs) (Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2010; Martinez-Wenzl, Perez, & Gándara, 2010; Rios-Aguilar, Gonzalez Canche, & Moll, 2012). These policies are driven by nativist sentiments (Perez Huber, 2010, 2011) which influence the political, social, and, therefore, educational climate against language minorities and Latinos in the state. Policy makers and politicians, who push for these exclusionary educational policies, must be held responsible for inequitably preparing students as future working citizens of Arizona.

Although the literature is expansive on the positive effects of well implemented DLPs that are based on bilingual education, on student achievement, language
proficiency, and cognitive development and learning, current studies that examine the implementation of DLP models at a micro level need to be implemented for further understanding of program success and implementation. Furthermore, additional studies that compare the differences in DLPs between low-income and middle class schools would shed light on the importance of funding allocation towards DLP implementation versus utilization of funds.

Regardless, this study highlighted language education policy in Arizona that systematically excludes language minority students, specifically Spanish speaking Latino language minority students who are considered ELLs. Moreover, this research examined the context within DLPs and English only education and the result of this study, although they pertain to the Arizona context, can be utilized accordingly by other states where inclusion of historically marginalized populations such as ELLs is desired in bilingual education. Readers and interested parties can read a case study and gain insight on the topics presented by the researcher in order to reflect and acquire the information that can be applicable to their own context utilizing a naturalistic generalization (Stake & Trumbull, 1982, p. 86). According to Stake (1994) the readers of a case study should be able to utilize their own experiences to determine how a particular case study can be utilized in the new context in question. For example, a super-intendant of education in Utah or in Nevada can utilize my case study in order to reflect on the differences and similarities of their state context compared to Arizona when it comes to bilingual education if they are interested in Dual Language Programs and student accessibility and equity. In this manner, naturalistic generalization urges the readers of case studies to utilize the ideas depicted in the studies and apply it to their own personal context in the
same manner that I know readers can use the case study represented in this case study and apply it in other contexts pertaining to the implementation of the growing DLPs.
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APENDIX A

RESEARCH TOOL (QUESTIONS AND INFORMATION COLLECTED)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School names (Column A)</th>
<th>What is the mission/objective of the DLP? (Column R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of program (Column B)</td>
<td>What is the student to teacher ratio in the DLP? (Column S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School website (Column C)</td>
<td>What is the number of students enrolled in the DLP? (Column T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (Column D)</td>
<td>What year was the program established? (Column U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District name (Column E)</td>
<td>What are the population demographics (race/ethnicity) of the school? (Column V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District phone number (Column F)</td>
<td>What is the SES of the school (defined by the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch price)? (Column W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District ELL coordinator (Column G)</td>
<td>How is language proficiency measured? (Column X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL contact information (Column H)</td>
<td>How is academic effectiveness evaluated? (Column Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status/Existence (Column I)</td>
<td>What is the school letter grade? (Column Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language Programs (DLPs) contact information if different than ELL coordinator (Column J)</td>
<td>What is the admission eligibility to be in the DLP? (Column AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLPs contact information (Column K)</td>
<td>What are the grades with DLP? How long is the program? (Column AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the DLP Languages? (Partner Language) (Column L)</td>
<td>Is there community support (parents, teacher, administrators) for your program? (Column AC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program one-way or two-way? (Column M)</td>
<td>In a scale from 0-3 (0 no growth, 1 maintaining, 2 minimal growth, 3 significant growth) Are DLPs increasing in your district or maintaining? (Column AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the DLP model 50/50, 90/10 etc.? (Column N)</td>
<td>What are the strengths of the program that you would like to share? (Column AE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much of their day is spend in the partner language? (Column O)</td>
<td>Where there any naming challenges when naming the program? (AF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the time split between the two languages? (If by subject, what subject?) (Column P)</td>
<td>Overall challenges? (Column AG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program connected to other schools?</td>
<td>(Column Q)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APENDIX B

CALLING SCRPT
Hello,

My name is Laura Gómez and I work for TL3C through Mesa Community College, which is a program developed to support teachers and paraprofessionals to work with language learners. I am calling you because I am gathering a list of the schools offering dual language immersion programs/dual language programs for our professional consortium which includes current and future teachers around the valley who are interested in working with language learners. Does your district offer any Dual Language Programs and if so, can I ask you a few question related to the dual language programs in your school/district?
APENDIX C

PHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the DLP Language? (Partner Language)</th>
<th>What is the mission/objective of the DLP?</th>
<th>How is language proficiency measured?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the program one-way or two-way?</td>
<td>What is the student to teacher ratio in the DLP?</td>
<td>How is academic effectiveness evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the DLP model 50/50, 90/10 etc.?</td>
<td>What is the number of students enrolled in the DLP?</td>
<td>What is the school letter grade?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much of their day is spend in the partner language?</td>
<td>What year was the program established?</td>
<td>What is the admission eligibility to be in the DLP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the time split between the two languages? (If by subject, what subject?)</td>
<td>Are DLPs increasing in your district or maintaining?</td>
<td>What are the grades with DLP? How long is the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program connected to other schools?</td>
<td>Where are any naming challenges when naming the program?</td>
<td>Is there community support (parents, teacher, administrators) for your program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a scale from 0-3 (0 no growth, 1 maintaining, 2 minimal growth, 3 significant growth)</td>
<td>Are DLPs increasing in your district or maintaining?</td>
<td>What are the strengths of the program that you would like to share?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the last 5 questions can be considered opinion based, without any identifiers of you or your school, could I use your quotes for future research presentations and/or publications?
APENDIX E

PARTICIPATION INVITATION

FOR THE ONE-ON-ONE INTERVIEWS (EMAIL)
Hello,

My name is Laura M. Gómez and I contacted you a few months ago regarding your Dual Language Program[s] (DLPs). To refresh your memory, I am working for TL3C through Mesa Community College, which is a program developed to support teachers and paraprofessionals to work with language learners. I called you because I was calling all of the public schools in Arizona to gather a list of the schools offering dual language programs for our professional consortium which includes current and future teachers around the valley who are interested in working with language learners. You answered a few questions regarding your program[s] and I am so very thankful for your time and participation. I am also a graduate student at Arizona State University and I would like to extend this study as my dissertation project. For this reason, I am contacting all of the schools offering DLPs in hopes that individuals who are involved in the development and implementation of DLPs in their institutions, and therefore are knowledgeable of DLPs, would be willing to participate in a one-on-one interview with me. The interview would take approximately 45min to an hour and your responses would be confidential. Your response would be utilized to investigate the potential benefits for Arizona’s students with the implementation of DLPs, the access to DLPs, and the discourse around dual language education. Attach is the consent form explaining the study in details, the process of your participation, and the potential benefits of your participation. Please let me know if you would be interested in participating by replying “Yes” to this email. If you would like to stop receiving these emails, please let me know by replying “Stop” to this email. Thank you for your time and I hope that you consider participating in this project to shed light in the importance of supporting programs that help the students of Arizona succeed academically.

Thank you,

Laura Gomez
Research Assistant
Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
Arizona State University
TL3C Mesa Community College
http://mcctl3c.org
laura.m.gomez@asu.edu
APENDIX F

CONSENT FORM
Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in Arizona

My name is Laura M. Gómez and I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Margarita Jiménez-Silva in the Mary Lou Teachers College at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate the potential benefits for Arizona's students with the implementation of DLPs, the access to DLPs, and the discourse around dual language education.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve a one-on-one voice recorded interview of approximately 45 minutes to an hour on the topic of Dual Language Programs. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop participation at any time.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty, for example, it will not affect your confidentiality in any way at any time.

Your participation in the study can give you the opportunity to build networks with schools that are also implementing DLPs in order to share or access resources and information on curriculum, DLPs implementation, and testing. For example, the information includes public schools in the state of Arizona that are implementing DLPs. This can potentially also be a great opportunity to network with programs that provide resources for schools working with language learners and teachers of language learners such as the Teachers of Language Learners Learning Community (TL3C). The response to your interview will be used to investigate the potential benefits for Arizona with the implementation of DLPs, the access to DLPs, and the discourse around DLPs. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation since your responses will be kept confidential.

The identity of the participants will be protected by assigning a code to the participants and their different responses through the transcribing and coding process as well as through the analysis and presentation of the results. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications, but your name or identifiers such as school name or district will be confidential.

I would like to audio record this interview. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be recorded; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at: margarita.jimenez-silva@asu.edu for Dr. Margarita Jiménez-Silva or lmgomez3@asu.edu for Laura M. Gomez. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.
APENDIX G

DISTRICTS IMPLEMENTING DLPs WHERE LATINAS/OS ARE MORE THAN
HALF OF THE STUDENT POPULATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Hispanic Average %</th>
<th>SES Average (F&amp;R Lunch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tucson</td>
<td>87.55</td>
<td>70.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vail</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Catalina Foothills</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Flagstaff</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Crave Creek</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Chandler</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Craighton</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>92.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Deer Valley</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gilbert</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>29.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Highley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kyrene</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Madison</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mesa</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Osborn</td>
<td>67.71</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Paradise Valley</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Peoria</td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>65.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Phoenix</td>
<td>92.04</td>
<td>85.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Roosevelt</td>
<td>82.28</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APENDIX H

STUDENT’S RACE/ETHNICITY AVERAGE IN SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTING DLPs
Excluding Tucson Unified

- Am Indian/Alaskan: 1%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 4%
- Black: 3%
- Hispanic: 34%
- White: 54%
- Other: 4%

206
APPENDIX I

COLOR-CODED CATEGORIES
Participants are aware of research supporting DLPs and its benefits: employ globalism argument, employable skills, and for economic reasons. Recognize the importance of language and culture. Recognize DLPs as an enrichment program.

Challenges:
- They feel skeptics should educate themselves on what are DLPs because the pushback against DLPs is due to ignorance.
- They believe the push back against DLPs has to do with racial tension.
- It is important to select a DLP model that is good for your community as well as having the choice to implement DLPs.
- Support from their district, teachers, colleagues etc.
- Teacher tension etc...
- Proposition 203 is affecting the implementation of their program and they would like to see language policy reform to be able to include a broader spectrum of students.
- Prop 203 is not affecting the implementation of their program and they do not care to see language policy reform.

Uncertainty of the implementation and reform of prop 203 or/and bilingual ed.

Access to DLPs is a problem:
- Access to DLPs is not a problem.
- Awareness that the participation to DLPs is beneficial for all students including ELLs.
- Association of bilingual ed. With DLPs (perceptions of bilingual education).
APPENDIX J

ONE-ON-ONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
1. What is/was your involvement in the creation/implementation of dual language education? (for example, teacher, principal, ELL coordinator etc.) What are/were your responsibilities within DLPs?

2. Do you think dual language education prepares students to be successful? Why or why not?

3. If you had the power to implement DLPs in all public schools would you? Why or why not?

4. What would you say to those skeptics who do not want dual language education in our public schools?

5. Do you associate dual language education with bilingual education?

6. Do you think it is negative or positive that bilingual education is associated with dual language education? Do you think it matters?

7. If you could go back to the beginning of the DLPs creation and implementation in your school/s, would you support it, or would you implement a different program?

8. In your opinion, what are the strengths of DL education?

9. What are the challenges of DL education?

10. Do/did you feel supported by your district’s administration in implementing DLPs in your school/s? What about by teachers, colleagues, co-workers etc.?

11. Do you think there are/were tension/concerns between teachers in DLPs and those that are/were not part of DLPs?

12. If you had unlimited resources to implement your DLP, what would you do differently?
13. Do you think that Arizona, being an English only state, is/was detrimental to your DLP? Why or why not?

14. Do you think proposition 203 (English only education) is affecting the implementation of your Dual Language Program? Do you think it should be eliminated?

15. Do you think access to Dual Language programs in Arizona is a problem? Why or why not?