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ABSTRACT

The current study examines English, Japanese dual language programs and how schools integrate language, culture, and environment in enhancing student learning among private, elite, early aged children. Two schools in Japan and one school in the United States made up the three case students in this cross-case analysis. By analyzing the data collected over a period of nearly 600 hours of classroom observations, and interviews with the subjects as well as reviewing documents, this study showed that student learning was enhanced through the birth and cultivation of a new, hybrid culture, the use of code-switching initiated by the students, and the influence that a native speaker of each language brought on a class-level scale. The results of this study add to the literature and research on early English, Japanese dual language education and the necessary components needed for optimal learning.
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CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

What are the goals for education? Some argue that one of its essential goals is for education to pass along and preserve information. Behind this way of thinking is the belief that with greater access to information, a student will have a higher likelihood to attain greater knowledge. With more knowledge, the student has a better chance of not only surviving, but also thriving in the community in which he or she lives. Greater knowledge also allows for increased opportunities for the individual to become a more productive member of society. Therefore, it can be said that education stems from the belief that students need the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed outside of the classroom.

A major component of acquired educational skills is the development of language facility, which is often referred to as literacy. Language is the primary medium of educational instruction. Through language, students are able to access information, as well as gain the knowledge needed to survive, thrive, contribute to the betterment of their society, and preserve information for future generations. Language is at the core of multiple subjects, and can also be found in many aspects of daily life. As a result, language should be a point of emphasis of education because of its high value and influence. In an increasingly global community, it can be argued that having facility in multiple languages is not only desirable but necessary. Currently, however, there are at least two conflicting ideologies when it comes to the study and promulgation of language within children’s early educational years: 1) monolingual education and 2) dual language
education. Monolingual education is defined as education in which only one language is used in the curriculum.

In contrast to this approach, the focus of this study is the acquisition of two languages during these early formative educational years. It focuses primarily on learning English and Japanese simultaneously among young students (3-year-olds to 7-year-olds). For the purpose of this study, dual language education (DLE) occurs when the language of educational instruction within formal educational settings consists of two languages. Generally speaking, there are two main types of DLE programs: 1) additive and 2) subtractive (Lambert, 1975). In an additive DLE program, students learn the target language (L2) alongside their first language (L1). A subtractive DLE program aims to cut the use of the students’ L1 in order to learn L2. When addressing DLE programs in this study, I am specifically speaking of additive DLE programs. These programs aim to produce students who are bilingual (speak fluently in two languages), biliterate (read and write fluently in two languages), and have a cross-cultural competence resulting in understanding, communicating, and interacting effectively with people across cultures. Monolingual education simply does not provide the exceptional language-rich learning environment that a DLE program can offer (Glenn, 1990; Glenn & LaLyre, 1991).

**Background of the Study**

It is said that DLE programs started in the United States roughly in the 1960s (Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005). Canada also had DLE programs, but unlike Canada where DLE programs have been highly regarded, most programs in the United States were created on the basis of helping struggling minority students (Swain & Johnson, 1997). The debate on the importance of DLE schools in the United States stems
from debate over many decades on how to treat students’ home languages. Should schools support students’ native language, or should schools mandate the usage of only the English language? In the early 20th Century, language diversity due to immigration divided the country, and one of the underlying tenets of the Municipal Reform in education was to impose English as the common language through proposing the view of the United States as being a “melting pot” of diverse ethnicities and cultural traditions (Crawford, 1995).

One recent variation on this monolingual education debate is that if students are not able to acquire English adequately, then this is the primary reason why all learning in the classroom should be conducted only in English—not another language as well. This belief is based on the impression that learning a language other than English threatens the national identity, and encourages immigrants to live in the United States. Some states have even tried to mandate the support of a single, dominant language by pushing to make English the official language of their state. Challenges to this belief of a dominant social and political system that marginalized the beliefs and democratic participation of other groups in American society were at the root of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, along with a number of important court decisions. These court cases ruled in favor of upholding the rights of diverse groups of students by ensuring that they be given equal educational opportunities regardless of their gender, social status, language background, and/or disability status. Students have a right to a meaningful and effective education, while at the same time maintaining their cultural identity, of which a major part is language. Furthermore, supporters of this argument claim the real reason students are unable to acquire English is because of the lack of qualified teachers available.
In contrast to the United States, Japan is a country bound to conventional cultural traditions with a homogeneous group of people. In the 19th Century, Japan managed to maintain relative political isolation from the western world. Growing nationalism, ideological differences, and economic competition among world powers led to the 20th century World Wars, and numerous regional conflicts. In the more than six decades since World War II, however, increasing globalization has fostered the need for greater communication and educational ties with other nations. According to the Congressional Research Service report for Congress (2011), today the United States and Japan are two large economic powers, and together they account for more than 40% of the world domestic product. Since both countries hold such a high international prominence, they have great influencing power over other countries.

In order to advance the relationship between the United States and Japan, a genuine understanding of cultures, traditions, and languages of the two countries must be established. Such would be possible through the promoting of an ideal education that would focus on strengthening cultural and language bonds. This would provide for a smooth, mutually beneficial understanding between the nations. In this era, bilingual, bicultural schools would not only be important to educate children, but also to help break the barriers of language and culture between the United States and Japan. These bilingual, bicultural schools would produce graduates who could identify with both the American and Japanese cultures and languages.

In Japan, however, the Ministry of Education tightly controls both curriculum and textbooks. This is done in order to provide an appearance of uniformity between the culture and language of the country. This image of uniformity was so strong that as
recently as 1986, the prime minister at the time, Nakasone Yasuhiro, denied any existence of minorities in the country. Therefore, to many, “bilingualism” is a foreign term not to be used in the Japanese vernacular.

This flawed view on language has been contested with the rise in the minority presence within the country. The breakdown of Japan’s monocultural image started around the 1990s when minority groups began to demand rights and to have a socially recognizable identity similar to disenfranchised groups in the United States. The economic boom of the period allowed for domestic change as minorities became established in the country. Moreover, millions of Japanese had the means and opportunity to travel outside of Japan. This phenomenon of Japanese nationals traveling and even taking up residence overseas became highly popular, and it sparked the increased need for facility in speaking foreign languages. Education in Japan soon had to accommodate this greater need to prepare students for a globalized and international world. Suddenly, there was a high demand for speaking the English language (Noguchi & Fotos, 2001).

Slowly, schools started to incorporate the teaching of English into their curriculum. This led to an increased interest in DLE programs, as well as increased interest by parents to enroll their children in those programs. The main objective of parents has become doing all that they can to ensure that their children will be able to succeed in a global community. And although the definition of success is highly subjective, and can be defined differently by many different people, success in Japan is commonly defined by gaining a high-level command of the English language (Yamazumi, 2006). Knowing English is also seen as a huge advantage because it expands an
individual’s social and economic horizon to a number of possibilities that potentially can lead to money and power.

The two options available for parents who want their child to become bilingual and biliterate in English and Japanese are to send them to a private school, or to send them to an after-school English program. What is notable is the absence of a public school option, which is a result of the public school system’s lack of a strong English language curriculum (Ikegashira, Matsumoto, & Morita, 2009). Therefore, many consider the option of enrolling their child in private international schools. There are over 110 different international schools in operation in Japan, and each school varies greatly because of the loosely defined term “international” (Pover, 2009). Some schools conduct their classes all in one language, while others use a variety of languages while instructing. Some schools follow a curriculum based on the British model of education, whereas others choose to utilize the American model. There are even other schools, which instead base their classes on a religious structure such as Catholicism. There are schools that only offer classes at the elementary level, and yet there are also schools that offer classes through twelfth grade. Another aspect to international schools is their appeal to temporary residents who are not interested in Japan, or its culture, because their children can continue to learn in their L1 in a familiar curriculum. Certain Japanese parents see value in educating their child in a private international school that teaches two languages, even though the Ministry of Education does not recognize these types of schools (Kanno, 2008).

Among all the debate about DLE in the public sector in the United States and Japan, private schools have surged ahead through elite international schools. These
schools, free from the public scrutiny and issues, have managed to create an atmosphere that provides students with a dual language environment. Private schools can incorporate research that has often been obscured behind political debates. Such research includes the finding that there are distinct advantages for students who are bilingual, including academic, intellectual, social, verbal, and cognitive gains. Although the following studies do not fully correlate, in a study of 13,200 third and fifth graders that took the Louisiana Basic Skills Test, the students who took foreign language classes, regardless of race, gender, or academic level, outperformed those students that did not study a foreign language (Dumas, 1999). Hakuta (1986) found that those that learn an additional language have greater cognitive flexibility, better problem solving, and higher order thinking skills.

The focus of this dissertation is to study how DLE is handled in the United States and Japan. Both countries have struggled traditionally with incorporating greater cultural and language diversity into its educational system. In recent years, however, both countries have begun to embrace the need for providing young students with access to multiple languages. As the benefits of knowing multiple languages become more widely known and accepted, different models have developed through which schools can deliver their curriculum using a multiple-language approach (Freeman et al., 2005).

**Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of this exploratory ethnographic study is to identify and describe the types of DLE models currently in use in the United States and Japan that teach English and Japanese simultaneously. Specifically, the intent was to describe several examples of schools in the United States and Japan that possess the shared goal of wanting their
students to become bilingual and bicultural. The focus of the study is on the classroom environments in these schools, as well as the respective cultures that influence how instruction within particular curriculum areas is handled. Qualitative data in the form of fieldwork descriptions of classroom environments and instructional practices, as well as similarities and differences that emerged among the programs within several schools were documented. From synthesizing the various sources of data collected, it was the goal of this research study that promising ideas about practices within English and Japanese DLE would emerge. These new ideas could then be used to further the policy advocacy of DLE, which would allow for greater affirmative reception, especially in the face of traditional unwillingness of certain cultures, namely the United States and Japan. This field of research is essential to help understand possible program models that would support English, Japanese bilinguals.

**Need and Significance of the Study**

There are many research studies that serve as stepping-stones to understanding DLE within the English and Japanese contexts. For example, Christian (1994), in her study of 160 schools within the United States over a period of three years, found that DLE schools provide effective features that support native and non-native English speakers’ language learning and cross-cultural understanding. By doing so, DLE schools help to expand the scale of language resources available. In another study, Bostwick (2001) researched a DLE school in Japan, where he observed the developmental process of the students attaining proficiency in English. At the same time, however, these same students still were not only able to maintain their L1, but also continued with their L1 development. Another study conducted by Tobin, Wu, and Davidson (1989) took into
account preschool settings in three contrasting countries: Japan, China, and the United States. Their study revealed unique cultural attributes that shaped the social patterns and beliefs that influence educational norms. A simple argument between students in class may be handled completely differently in each culture. Disciplinary techniques and views also differ between cultures.

All these studies, however, illustrate the dearth of comparative research studies available between DLE schools in the United States and Japan. Moreover, the research that is available, as shown by the studies conducted by Christian (1994) and Bostwick (2001), focus solely on the way DLE schools are managed within single countries and lack comparison of DLE in both the United States and Japan. Tobin, Wu, and Davidson’s (1989) study on preschools similarly only provides a perspective on regular school systems. With the United States’ and Japan’s high international standing, it can be said that there is an egregious lack of research comparing the two with respect to this type of educational model, which affirms the need for further, in-depth studies of educational processes within DLE schools to be conducted.

Although DLE schools reside and operate within both countries, the United States and Japan have cultures that are highly different from one another. Therefore, they have many different socio-cultural influences that affect how DLE is approached and implemented in school settings. Taking this into consideration, possible differences may be identified in order to attain an initial understanding of the contextual factors that DLE schools in the United States and Japan operate within, of which include locations, expectations, school missions and values, as well as the educational environment that the schools provide for their students.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that underlies the investigation is based on previous research on DLE in the United States and studies concerning L1 and L2 acquisition (Genesee, 1999). These findings have allowed for the many features of dual language programs to be showcased. A number of findings support DLE and its goal of proficiency in both languages.

Among them are first that language is best acquired when the language is used as the means of instruction rather than the focus of instruction. It is this theoretical position of communicative competence (Hymes, 1971) that language acquisition is best supported when the language is used as the medium for instruction as opposed to a separate subject area. This is especially important in order to ensure that the students gain fluency and accuracy in all four language modalities—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—in the content areas.

Second is the finding that within DLE the students’ academic knowledge in their primary language (L1) reinforces learning of the target (L2) language (Collier, 1989; Genesee, 1999). The linguistic interdependence principle (Cummins, 1998) suggests that although the surface aspects of languages differ, there is an underlying proficiency that is common across languages. This was formally stated as follows:

To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly. (Cummins, 1981, p. 29)
This principle conveys that the extent of students’ reading proficiency in their native language is a strong predictor for their potential L2 reading performance (August & Shanahan, 2006). Studies show that when English is being learned as the target language, it is best acquired when students’ primary language oral and literacy skills are strong (Saunders & Goldenberg, 1999; Lanauze & Snow, 1989). Moreover, studies also show that native English language learners advance their L2 skills without compromising their L1 or academic achievement in their L1 (Genesee, 1987; Swaim & Lapkin, 1982).

Third, the connection between language and culture has long been researched, with the result being the advocacy of the importance of teaching culture simultaneously with the learning of a targeted language. The question then becomes what is culture? The National Center for Cultural Competence: A Planner’s Guide (2000) defines culture as an “integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thoughts, communications, languages, practices, beliefs, values, customs, courtesies, rituals, manners of interacting and roles, relationships and expected behaviors of a racial, ethnic, religious or social group; and the ability to transmit the above to succeeding generations” (p. 1).

Communication is a central element in defining culture. One cannot participate culturally without the ability to communicate in some way this is understood. Yet in order for the students to communicate effectively, they need the tools to do so, which are more than just the linguistics of the target language. Linguistics alone does not encompass all the facets needed to master a language. An effective way that a student could do so is by being exposed to the target language and to have that exposure supplemented with learning the culture of the target language. Cultural learning is essential to the mastery of a language as it provides the opportunity for the student to
fully understand word meanings beyond a surface-level degree, as well as contextual significances of the language to be acquired. Without cultural knowledge of a language, students’ potential positive learning outcomes are greatly limited. This association dynamic of language and culture is crucial to the students’ ability to successfully communicate in the L2. Furthermore, by developing the connection between language and culture, it allows for the students to “act as anthropologists, exploring and understanding the target culture in relation to their own” (Peterson & Coltrane, 2003, p. 1).

Fourth, the environment in which language and culture learning occurs is another aspect that plays an important role for these DLE programs. The term “environment” is used in a general sense to include the learning contexts inside and outside of the classroom. Within the classroom, it includes how the room itself is set up, what language is used for labeling and charts, and what books are available. The environment outside the classroom includes how language is used when not confined within the areas of the class. The hallways, playground, and offices are possible homes to their own languages.

The manner in which the classroom is set up for language and cultural learning is not the only environmental focus that needs to be monitored for optimal language acquisition for students. Where the school is located physically is also a major factor to the concept of learning environment. Such can be seen in what language is considered the majority language beyond the school’s boundaries. In addition, when outside the boundaries of school, are both L1 and L2 accepted, and what are people’s perceptions about them? Therefore, in order to understand the position and content of DLE schools, it is vital to take all these aspects of multiple environments into consideration.
Finally, when identifying and describing DLE programs, it is imperative to understand the crucial points of learning an additional language that promotes bilingualism, the connections between language and culture, and how it all ties together in classroom and outside the classroom environments. Vygotsky’s (1978) socio-cultural theory that states language learning occurs through naturalistic social interactions also goes to reinforce this notion of language learning occurring when there are other factors aside from just the traditional in classroom learning. This core concept of learning within a socio-cultural context underlies the conceptual framework for understanding dual language education in this study.

**Research Focus and Questions**

Setting aside the political debates about which approach should be pursued, the focus of this dissertation is to explore varied models of additive DLE, and how they are approached in the United States and Japan. The goals of these DLE programs are to prepare students to be bilingual, biliterate, and cross-culturally aware of the respecting countries. This study focuses on three broad research questions. The first research question focuses on defining DLE education within United States and Japan settings.

What are the mission, purposes, structure, and program characteristics of DLE in private DLE schools in the United States and Japan? More specifically, this question focuses on describing the characteristics of the specific school settings, goals and features of the programs (e.g., how the curriculum is organized, the instruction presented), and the characteristics of the students, parents, and teachers involved.

The second question focuses on students’ general education received within the DLE environment. More specifically,
How does the school connect language, culture, and its environment to enhance students’ educational experiences in DLE schools in the United States and Japan?

In detail, the second question focuses on how students construct their educational experiences, as well as how parent processes (i.e., values, goals, behavior) may play a role in supporting student learning. It also examines how teachers structure and influence student learning activities in their classrooms, and seeks to identify other school features that may support the learning process in DLE environments.

The third question focuses on constructing an explanation of what types of experiences can be expected to result from DLE environments—that is, examining similarities that emerge from the fieldwork in several different settings:

Based on my observations, what would one expect from being in a DLE program in the United States or Japan?

**Scope and Limitations**

The scope of this research study is the following: data collection over a period of nine months, observations of students between the ages of 3-year-olds and 7-year-olds, the observations occurred in urban, private school settings, and schools whose curriculum is only in English and Japanese. The study consists of extensive fieldwork in a limited number of schools and classrooms. It focuses on in-depth description of classroom practices and educational processes that form the environment in which DLE takes place in the two countries and cultures under study.

The study focuses on in-depth description of a few representative dual language school settings, therefore it should not be considered as representative of all dual language programs, due to the purposeful selection of school settings, classrooms and teachers, and their individual students and parents of the children. Rather, its focus is in
constructing accurate description and explanation of the educational processes occurring within the specific school settings being examined by focusing on the construction of these experiences by their participants. The researcher was at times both observer and participant in the educational processes as they unfolded. Up-close involvement with the participants in their natural setting is the strength of ethnographic study, as opposed to the generalization of a pattern of observations across a large number of settings. Moreover, the study did not take into account public schools, schools in rural locations, students of all ages, and schools that utilized languages other than only English and Japanese. Finally, the study is not truly longitudinal, even through the fieldwork was over the course of an academic year (2010-2011), because the observation period within each school and classroom ranged over several months.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter outlines the current progress in the field relevant to the focus of this study on dual language education (DLE) and dual language learning among children ages 3-year-olds to 7-year-olds in formal educational settings. It is important to note at the beginning of this review that there are many available materials that cover ideas and theories related to DLE and language learning; however, many of them are decades old and are not necessarily supported by empirical research. In some instances, however, the ideas presented in older materials are still relevant and are referenced in newer empirical literature; therefore, the newer material is cited instead of the original source. The chapter is organized in five sections. First, I provide an overview of second language (L2) acquisition theories and hypotheses through stating the current research on language acquisition, attainment, and accuracy. Second, I examine general theories of language learning, including the behaviorist, linguistic, cognitive, pragmatic, and social approaches to language learning. Third, I discuss the bilingual education programs, focusing on the additive model of language learning and its benefits. Forth, I identify individual, pedagogical, and institutional factors that impact language learning. Finally, I provide a discussion of the effective features of DLE programs that are supported by research across a variety of settings to provide a reference to the study’s DLE programs.

Second Language Acquisition Theories and Hypotheses

Before considering contrasting theories about how students acquire an L2, it is important to clarify the meaning of terms such as language acquisition and learning, language attainment, and accuracy in using an acquired language. More specifically, what
criteria do we use in determining whether someone has acquired a language, how does he or she best acquire the second language, how long does it take to acquire the language, and how do we determine whether someone can use that language effectively in various situations? Each of these concepts possesses its own research literature, yet the general perception is that they are interchangeable in meaning.

**Language Acquisition, Attainment and Accuracy**

Language acquisition can simply be defined as gaining working command of the target language (L2). Gaining command of the target language can be interpreted in many ways. Krashen (2003) draws an important distinction between language acquisition and language learning in his Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis. He defines language acquisition as the “subconscious process identical in all important ways to the process children utilize in acquiring their first language” (p. 1). In contrast, learning is the “conscious process that results in ‘knowing about’ language” (Krashen, 1985, p. 1). Taking into consideration Krashen’s (2003) definition of language acquisition, one interpretation is that students acquire language through natural interactions that include meaningful communication. This is inferred to be similar to how a child learns his or her first language. This meaningful communication is said to be of significant importance, and that it can trigger subconscious processes and conscious attention to manifest. However, Krashen (2003) has been criticized for not providing exact definitions of conscious and subconscious processes. Critics argue that differentiating between conscious and subconscious language production, although sound in theory, is difficult to test in practice (Mitchell & Myles 2004). Although this hypothesis continues to be debated, it remains highly influential. Teachers incorporate authentic meaningful
interactions in their classroom to parallel the way in which L1 interactions take place in the real world. It is believed that this type of simulation can enhance learning.

Language learning through natural interaction contrasts with traditional school’s introduction of deliberate language learning in the classroom, which is generally presented by focusing on form and linguistic rules (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Krashen (2003) contends all students are capable of learning linguistic rules. However, when students are unable to apply the rules universally, they are viewed as not having acquired the L2. If the goal of language learning is to acquire of functional level of command of the target language, then Krashen (2003) states teachers must incorporate authentic, meaningful interactions in their classroom for students to learn linguistic rules.

Related to how students attain L2 acquisition is the length of time required for them to reach a similar level of proficiency as their native-speaking peers. This is often referred to as the rate of acquisition. In an early study of 1,210 six-year-old immigrants who had no prior knowledge or background in English, Cummins (1980) found they required approximately five to seven years to reach grade-level language norms. Attaining grade-level norms is referred to academic language ability, which is context-reduced and cognitively demanding. This deeper language acquisition is in contrast to the notion of conversational language ability, which is context-embedded and less demanding (Cummins, 1979). This distinction was made by Cummins (1984) using the term Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS are utilized when the context supports situations that provide non-verbal cues, such as movement in the eye and hand to support understanding. CALP is employed when the context of language delivery is reduced,
such as in academic situations. Understanding in this type of environment requires higher order thinking skills because the language is disembedded from the context (Baker, 2006). The difference between BICS and CALP can also be metaphorically expressed as an iceberg. The top layer above the surface is BICS, which includes pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. Below the surface is CALP that requires deeper skills for meaning making.

Based on Cummins’ (1979, 1980) research, Thomas and Collier (1997) studied 3,562 immigrant students who were at, or above, grade-level ability in their home country. They found that children who had two to five years of schooling in their home country took five to seven years to attain grade-level norms, whereas those students who arrived before age eight with little or no schooling took seven to ten years to achieve the same academic standard. This study revealed that the key variable in the rate of language acquisition is first-language (L1) schooling. L1 support is imperative for subsequent language acquisition. It is clear that without a strong support system in operation, students lag in achievement.

Language attainment refers to the end point of language acquisition (Birdsong, 1992). Language attainment is what a learner acquires through learning, and this is seen in the individual sense of achieving an accomplishment. This is not synonymous with being “native-like”; however, language attainment does feature language ability reflective of native-like characteristics, and the developmental progression of it can be observed. A key component in language attainment is accuracy, or how “grammatically correct” the learner is in using an acquired language. Accuracy should not be confused with fluency, however, which refers to the ability to read, speak, and/or write smoothly to relay
intended meaning. Although contextually different, accuracy and fluency in language attainment are both important in understanding the concept of language acquisition.

**General Theories of Language Learning**

After establishing some means for assessing language acquisition (i.e., how to acquire a language, how long it takes, and how well it must be learned), understanding contrasting theories about how students acquire language provides the necessary foundation for this research study on DLE programs. There is no one definitive theory that explains how children learn a language, let alone a second language. Instead, there are numerous contrasting theories that impact the field of DLE (Baker, 2006; Brisk, 2006, Lindholm-Leary, 2001). They can be broadly categorized into five general theoretical approaches that explain what we know about language learning: 1) behaviorist approach, 2) linguistic approach, 3) cognitive approach, 4) pragmatic approach, and 5) social approach. It is useful to draw some distinctions among these general theories of language learning that have been proposed in the literature

**Behaviorist Approach of Language Learning**

While behaviorists theory has traditionally been a primary way of approaching language learning, the approach has come under more scrutiny and criticism in recent decades due to linguistic and interactional theories. Based on Skinner’s (1957) general behaviorist learning theory, language learning is seen as a formation of habits developed through the practical application of the target language via speaking it as often as possible. These habits can then be used to bypass the notion that language rules are the main determining factor to language learning (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Behaviorists associate learning as being based on stimulus and response. The theory contends that one’s
environment is filled with stimuli, and when the response to certain stimuli is successful, habits will be set into place, which then in turn reinforce the learner’s progress. These habits can then be taught to others through copying and memorizing mechanics. Translated into learning another language in formal classroom settings, teachers use drill and memorization of phrases and sentences under the belief that repeated imitation and memorization facilitates language acquisition (i.e., practice makes perfect). This theory of learning impacted upon pedagogical approaches to second/foreign language teaching, and one of the major methods that resulted was the Audiolingual Method, which was formulated in the United States after the Second World War. Those that supported the Audiolingual Method, believed that students learn through continual practice of establishing automatic responses to stimuli. However, arguments have been made against this method because students were unable to communicate due to the lack of flexibility and creativity it requires (Tamura, 1980).

**Linguistic Approach of Language Learning**

Linguistic theory in L2 acquisition attempts to describe language produced by L2 learners, and to explain why the learner produced the language. In this way, linguistic theory focuses on the descriptive and explanatory view of L2 learning. There are other linguistics approaches, but here we focus on the Universal Grammar approach by linguist Noam Chomsky (1995), who suggested the concept that children internalize rules rather than simply stringing together words. This is in contrast to how the behaviorists view the process of language learning. An example of this linguist approach phenomenon is when children say *it broke* instead of *it broke*. Chomsky (1995) argues the point that individuals must have some innate predisposition to learn languages. He coined the term
“Universal Grammar” to describe this core instinctive knowledge that he believes everyone holds. The Universal Grammar approach states that there is underlying knowledge within each language learner, which is essential to his or her being enabled to learn languages. This is based on his belief that children would be unable to learn at a quick and effortless pace given the scenario where such a concept of Universal Grammar did not exist. The ideas of Universal Grammar affecting L2 acquisition still vary, however, even if it were to be proven true for L1 learning. This is because it is considered a property theory where the focus is to “characterize the underlying linguistic knowledge in second-language learners’ minds” rather than attempt to investigate the L2 learning process itself (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p 53). The linguistic approach interests lie in the linguistic competence and not with how learners access the knowledge, strategies they might need when their linguistic system is inadequate or why some are better than others at learning languages.

This linguistic theory has been influential because it has allowed researchers to create hypotheses. Although the idea of Universal Grammar is very broad, it is an essential aspect to helping in the description and explanation of the concept of a system underlying language learning. The lack of propositions about how language is learned has made this idea highly controversial. One criticism is that Universal Grammar does not address social aspects of language. Universal Grammar is instead more concerned with the minds of the language learners and looks for universal elements that all minds possess. Criticism also rises due to the incomplete nature of the grammaticality judgment tests used to only evaluate language competence instead of expanding the scope to include phonology, morphological and lexical aspects of the language. Another characteristic is
the separation of language knowledge and language use, a concept with which some linguist disagree (Mitchell & Myles, 2004).

**Cognitive Approach of Language Learning**

The cognitive approach to L2 learning puts an emphasis on the learning component, and believes a better understanding of L2 learning can be made through analyzing how the human brain processes and learns new information regarding the language. These fall into two main groups: 1) those who investigate how L2 learners process linguistic information and seek to develop processing theories, and 2) those who view competence and performance as the same and believe a usage-based view of language development can explain language knowledge and how it is processed. The first group is often referred to as the processing approach, and the second group is often referred to as the emergentist or constructionist approach.

When speaking about processing approaches, the focus is on how second language learners process the linguistic information that they receive, and how over time their ability to process the second language develops. Processing approaches focus primarily on the ciphering aspect of language learning. One notable branch of the processing approach is the information-processing approach, which associates language learning to the workings of a computer (McLaughlin, 1990). More specifically, bits of information are amalgamated and compiled into thoughts, which are then processed into language. Many connections are necessary to build language, and these connections are the result of analyzing patterns and predictive ability. It is this thought that language competence contains a knowledge component and a skill component and using the language is vital to developing the skill component (Mitchell & Myles, 2004).
Information processing theory is based on the idea that complex processes are built upon simple processes. Furthermore, these processes can be studied independently. Schneider and Shiffrin (1977) claim that the process can either be controlled or automatic. Learners of a language first learn the language through controlled processing and eventually move towards automatic production. It is thought that when a learner learns within the controlled processing realm, the individual’s short-term memory is involved. This contrasts with operating in automatic processing state, which instead utilizes processing within long-term memory.

Another type of processing approach is Pienemann’s (1998) processability theory where he claimed in order to understand L2 acquisition there needs to be a theory of grammar and a processing component. The theory of grammar stated here refers to the Lexical Functional Grammar (Kaplan & Bresnan, 1982), which differs from Universal Grammar, and focuses on representing linguistic knowledge and language processing (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). The processing component of language acquisition is believed to be a gradual acquisition of the necessary computational mechanism needed to process a language.

Constructionist views, on the other hand, are concerned with how language-learning and share a perspective on language development that revolves around the importance of communicative needs. Another defining characteristic of these views is that they contest the importance of possessing an innate, language specific, acquisition device. Learning is instead seen as a consequence of the countless associations and interactions that are made during language use. These association-based results thereby lead to set regular patterns that might on the surface appear to be following rules, but in
actuality are just the way the learner conducts his or her associations. The constructionist approach believes that language is acquired through usage (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Through this usage, strong associations in the brain are made to help acquire the L2. One specific approach, the connectionist approach, “applies computer modeling to investigate this process” (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 99). People that advocate this approach concur the human mind is wired to seek connections between elements and create links between them as part of learning.

These ideas of the constructionist view could be based on historical work by child development psychologist, Jean Piaget’s (1970) work that theorizes that in order for children to develop language, they must first construct their own understanding of the world through interaction with their environment. Once children are able to understand a concept, they can learn the language to express that concept. From this idea stems the notion that language acquisition is a process that requires the deliberate use of learning strategies. The knowledge system created is thought to become automatic through learning, processing, and comprehension. It is important to know that language is made of symbols and structures, and when learning a language the concepts behind it, such as its grammar, is also necessary to learn.

**Pragmatic Approach of Language Learning**

The pragmatic approach of language learning focuses on ways L2 learners take what is being learned and convert it into meaning. This also includes ways L2 learners achieve personal communicative goals. Analyzing the way the learners are hoping to perform, in addition to the immediate social, physical, and discourse content in which help them learn, allows for the creation of meaning when learning the L2. It is the
“explication and explanation of grammatical structure in which semantic and pragmatic constructs are integral” (Rispoli, 1999, p. 222). A longitudinal and cross linguistic project funded by the European Science Foundation studied adult migrants acquiring, English, German, Dutch, French, or Swedish over a six year period. This study found that all the learners “showed evidence of developing a rudimentary but systematic and fully communicative interlanguage system that was called the Basic Variety,” which are the manners to which utterances need to be structured, as well as the way components of language need to be organized along pragmatic and lexical resources while at the same time circumventing the use of morphology and subordination (Ortega, 2009, p. 122).

**Social Approach of Language Learning**

The social approach of language learning is concerned with explaining the role of language use in interlanguage development. Interlanguage refers to the idea that when individuals are not completely proficient in their L2, they compensate by approximating, or utilizing, features of their L1 and then incorporating them into their L2 learning, even when not applicable (Selinker, 1972). The social approach looks into the role of the environmental language through language input received by the language learner, output produced, and the interaction between the learners in conversation. This type of interactionist approach does not discredit the autonomous language module or cognitive mechanisms at work, rather it integrates the different approaches of language use and language development. Those ideas included in this social approach of language learning are 1) input hypothesis, 2) interaction hypothesis, 3) output hypothesis, 4) sociocultural perspective, and 5) sociolinguistic perspectives.
**Input hypothesis.** The input hypothesis, which was advanced by Krashen (1985), claims the only necessary learning condition for language is comprehensible input. He clarified that language learning only occurs when the learner is predisposed to pay attention to the comprehensible input. The input hypothesis also states that a learner is said to have acquired the language if they are speaking it, and speaking is not the cause of language acquisition. Another idea also associated with the input hypothesis is that the necessary grammar is automatically provided through sufficient comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985).

**Interaction hypothesis.** Michael Long (1996) argued, however, that to fully understand input for language learning, the focus should be on interaction. More specifically, when students negotiate meaning, the input becomes targeted for the learner. His thinking would lead to the creation of the Interaction Hypothesis. He studied 16 native speaker-native speaker and 16 native speaker-non-native speaker pairs having an informal conversation, giving out instructions for games, and other face-to-face oral tasks. There was no difference in grammatical complexity, however, the native speaker-non-native speaker pair were more likely to use tactics such as repetition, confirmation check, comprehension check, and clarification request to solve communication difficulties (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Those who support the interaction hypothesis believe these collaborative efforts to clarify understanding between speakers is a useful tool for language learning.

**Output hypothesis.** Another challenge to Krashen’s (1985) input hypothesis view was the output hypothesis, which was advanced by Swain (2000). From her research, she found that language production was the only way students learned to make the needed
grammatical processing. It is the increased mental effort needed when speaking or writing that stretches the learner to process language more deeply. This claim was based on her study on French immersion students who were exposed to French for an extended period of time, yet lagged behind in their productive ability of the language. She argued that only through L2 production, speaking and writing, are students able to truly complete grammatical processing.

**Sociocultural perspective.** The Soviet Union’s developmental psychologist of the early 1900s, Lev. S. Vygotsky, laid the foundations for this theory in which he saw that interaction was the key to language acquisition. The socio-cultural theory is comprised of the idea that learning is a mediated process dependent on face-to-face interactions (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). One idea that has been widely discussed regarding Vygotsky’s (1978) concepts is the idea that language is a tool for thinking. Lantolf (2000) advocated the socio-cultural theory and stated that it is though language the students can direct their attention and shape their thinking. Vygotsky (1978) also proposed the idea of the “zone of proximal development”, which describes the comparison between students’ ability to independently solve problems versus their potential to do the same while under the guiding influence of others. He proposed that it is in this zone of proximal development that the majority of learning occurs and children learn the skills to best make meaning of things by way of the social content they acquire through collaborative activities like mediated learning and scaffolding. Lantolf (2000) proposed the concept of mediated learning that goes to prove how an individual utilizes symbolic tools and signs he or she fashions from numbers and arithmetic systems, music, art, and language, to mediate and regulate the various relationships that he or she will have with the world. In
addition to this is Bruner’s (1986) concept of scaffolding, which is used to describe the interactions between an adult who possesses higher competence of the subject matter and a child, which mediates the learning process and enables that child to achieve more than if he or she were solely left to their own efforts. These Vygotskyan ideas go hand in hand with Lantolf’s belief in microgenesis, which proposes that language is a symbolic tool that puts the social aspect prior to the individual, and is capable of tracking the progress an individual makes through interacting socially.

**Sociolinguistic perspective.** Sociolinguistics, which is the study of language use, has many theoretical perspectives. One such perspective is focused on understanding variability in L2 usage. Towe\ll and Hawkins (1994) argued that the reason an individual under different social contexts alters his or her speech is due to the characteristics of interlanguage, and the propensity for variations within interlanguage. Interlanguage refers to the idea that when individuals are not completely proficient in their L2, they compensate by approximating, or utilizing, features of their L1 and then incorporating them into their L2 learning, even when not applicable (Selinker, 1972).

Although rooted in anthropological linguistics, the concept of language socialization of an L2 also holds relevance to the idea of sociolinguistics. Generally, language socialization refers to the concept of how individuals learn the language of the culture into which they are born via the use of that language and through socialization with others of their language group, which facilitates use of the language (Park, 2006), as well as the idea that language and culture are acquired simultaneously and the acquisition of one assists in the development of the other (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Translating this concept to L2 learning situations, however, has raised criticism due to a lack of attention
Bilingual Education

In the previous section, I provided an overview of L2 acquisition theories and hypotheses. In this next section, I examine the role of bilingual education in acquiring L2 skills and facility. The focus is on additive DLE programs that strive for a balanced language-learning approach.

For the purpose of this study, bilingual education refers to any and all education that uses two languages for instruction that helps to acquire both languages. There are numerous types of specific programs that are referred to as bilingual. Whether the school uses one language for only 10% of the curriculum, or the school uses it for 90%, I included them all under an all-encompassing umbrella of bilingual education. These types of programs are often referred to as partial immersion education. The types of programs that do not belong under this umbrella are monolingual programs that only use L2 for all instruction. These programs include all types of immersion education where language majority students are expected to naturally learn the L2 by being fully immersed into the language with no L1 support. These are often referred to as total immersion education. I also included submersion education where a language minority student is thrown into mainstream education where the student is expected to learn with no home language support.

Under the umbrella of bilingual education, or two languages of instruction, Lambert (1975) made two important distinctions: additive and subtractive programs. In additive programs, the goal is to continue development and value the students’ L1 and
home culture, while at the same time adding an L2 and culture. These include elite learners who are generally “highly educated” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981) and seek out contexts in which they can acquire a foreign language. These learners have the means to maintain their L1 and their L2. In contrast, in subtractive programs, the L2 and culture are added at the expense of the first language. These include folk learners, who are individuals that are forced to conform to the majority language. These are students such as those that speak Spanish at home, but learn English at school not because they want to, but because it is inevitable for them to survive in the American, English speaking society. This eventually diminishes the L1 and its culture to the point where they are forced to assimilate into the majority and the L2 becomes the predominant language and culture (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). These types of programs are also called transitional programs because the goal is to mainstream the child into the general educational classroom.

While the terms additive and subtractive are the two main adjectives used to describe programs, there are also those that refer to programs that fall between these two categories. One example is called the maintenance program. Maintenance programs refer to programs that maintain the academic level of the students’ L1, and introduce the L2 by cutting the amount of time spent learning on the students’ L1 (Baker, 2006). However, the L1 instruction continues, which is shown in Figure 2.1. As the figure suggests, students start out receiving almost all instruction in their L1. However, by the time they are at the end of their elementary school years, they receive instruction mostly in their L2. This model strives for their students to develop their L1 simultaneously with their transition to learning mostly in their L2.
When referring to bilingual programs, we must also include the terms early, delayed, and late (Genesee, 2008). These terms refer to the age at which a student starts the program. When students enter before the first grade, they are considered early starters of the program. When they start in the middle of elementary school years, it is classified as a delayed start. Finally, when students begin a program in high school, it is considered a late start.

Although there are no clear boundaries between simultaneous and sequential language learning, simultaneous language learning usually refers to when a child acquires two languages at the same time. This process of simultaneously acquiring languages can be started from as early as birth. In contrast, sequential language learning describes the situation where a child learns a language at home, and then another language when he or she begins school (Baker, 2006).

Recently, the terms “one-way” program and “two-way” program have been used to identify the population that the program serves (Thomas & Collier, 2004). In one-way programs, all students share their L1 and are striving to become bilingual in their L1 and L2. For example, around the Texas border, almost all the students speak Spanish and
learn English as their L2 in school. Another example includes the Canadian schools, where most of the students speak English as their L1 and are learning French as their L2.

In two-way programs, however, only half of the population shares the same L1. The other half of the students is comprised of native speakers of the L2 (Stern, 1963). The three main goals in a two-way program are that students will perform academically to their respective grade level, attain high levels of language acquisition and literacy in L1 and L2, and develop positive cross-cultural attitudes (Christian, 1994).

**Additive Models of Dual Language Learning**

In this study, I define DLE as bilingual programs that fall under the additive model. Additive bilingual programs are the most effective way to benefit majority and minority language students (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). It is through this type of community where students get together to help and collaborate on great ideas.

There are two recognized models for additive programs. They are referred to as the 90/10 model and the 50/50 model (Howard & Christian, 2002). The numbers in Figure 2.2 refer to the percentage of time spent on each language in the program. Within the 90/10 model, the program can be L1 dominant or L2 dominant as suggested in Figure 2.2. When the program is L2 dominant, it resembles an example of an immersion program where the students are immersed in the L2. Both models result in a 50/50 model by late elementary.
Figure 2.2. Example of two different types of 90/10 models.

In contrast, the 50/50 program has students beginning and maintaining the same 50% instruction in both languages from grade 1 through grade 6 as seen in Figure 2.3. Christian, Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Howard (2004) and Lindholm-Leary (2005) found short-term English academic advantage for 50/50 but the advantages disappear by age elementary.

Figure 2.3. Example of a 50/50 model.

Although these two previously mentioned approaches are currently popular in the United States, the distribution of language instruction varies from program to program. Some programs divide the language by content area; some programs divide by time; some programs divide by teacher. For example, school personnel can decide to conduct math and science in English, and all other subject areas in the L2. One possible
alternative is that they choose to instead conduct their morning lessons in English and then later in the afternoons to conduct lessons in the L2. Another alternative could be that they decide to have an English-speaking teacher and an L2-speaking teacher in the same classroom.

**Benefits of bilingualism.** Ramirez, Yuen, and Ramey (1991) conducted an eight-year longitudinal study on structured English immersion, early-exit, and late-exit bilingual educational programs for language minority children in the U.S. In a structured English immersion class, instruction is conducted only in the target language through an academic content area. An early-exit program refers to a program that allows for some home language support in the class, but that support is quickly faded out so students entering the program in kindergarten are able to exit the program by the end of first or second grade. A student in a late-exit bilingual program receives their education in their L1 for forty percent of the time, and continues through sixth grade even if they achieve fluency in English. They found that providing and supporting students’ L1 does not impede learning English. Even though the goal of each program is to have students gain English language skills needed to succeed in mainstream classrooms, results differed on a case-to-case basis. They also found that students who were able to develop their L1 while at the same time developing English outperformed the other students who did not have this L1 language support. Ramirez et al. (1991) concluded that L1 language development is needed for optimal L2 language acquisition and also that the growth of L2 aptitude, while maintaining a focus on a sustained L1 instruction, produces better academic performance by students in comparison to those who receive their instruction in English all or most of the time.
Subsequent longitudinal studies only go to further this idea that bilingual learning can produce greater classroom results. Thomas and Collier (1997) conducted a longitudinal, large-scale, comparative study to track the long-term educational outcomes of over 700,000 language minority students in kindergarten through twelfth grade across the United States for fourteen years. They analyzed over 700,000 language minority student records collected from 1982-1996. They wanted to know what instructional approaches help language minority students make and continue to sustain the gain in grade-level cognitive and academic development needed to be successful in using English:

In our research, we have found that children in well-implemented one-way and two-way bilingual classes outperform their counterparts being schooled in well-implemented monolingual L1 classes, as they reach the upper grades of elementary school. Even more importantly, they sustain the gains they have made throughout the remainder of their school in middle and high school, even when the program does not continue beyond the elementary school years. (p. 15)

English learners in monolingual programs received less access to standard grade-level curriculum because they were separated from the mainstream classroom for additional support, while the achievement gap increased as the native English speakers made progress. Therefore, the underachieving group continued to underachieve. However, after the creation of a special enrichment program where each student was intellectually challenged, and had their linguistic and cultural experiences valued, the program became successful.
Similarly to the motivation leading to Thomas and Collier’s (1997) research, Lindholm-Leary (2001), attempted to show the benefits of bilingualism through her observing of 6,209 kindergarten through second grade students’ outcomes in areas of academic language proficiency in reading and language achievement after being in a 90/10 high ethnicity program, 90/10 low ethnicity program, 50/50 program, transitional bilingual program, and an English only program, using three different academic achievement tests. Results showed that majority language students and minority language students in an additive dual language program both benefited from being in the program. The findings were true regardless of the students’ background characteristics. This meant that native English speaking students, even though learning in English and Spanish, outperformed their monolingual peers.

**Cognitive benefits.** According to Cummins’ (1980) Common Underlying Proficiency model of bilingualism, when a person is proficient in two or more languages it is proposed that there is a single integrated source of thought. This means that speaking, listening, reading, or writing in one language helps the whole cognitive system to develop. In turn, this system support helps the L2 develop. From this proposition, Robinson (1998) was able to conclude that children who learn more than one language at an early age seem to have cognitive advantages over monolingual children. Similarly, Buckwalter and Lo (2002) found some evidence to support the proposition that exposure to reading and writing in different languages at a young age helps to develop a deep level of basic literacy understanding. Their research question asked whether there is evidence that literacy developed in one language either hinders or supports the literacy development in another language. They concluded such a language background could be a foundation for
literacy development in other languages. Buckwalter and Lo’s (2002) results supported the view that promoting and continual development of L1 will allow for accelerated and improved development in the L2.

In a study of young children studying two languages, Kenner, Kress, Al-Khatib, Kam, and Tsai (2004) found that young children were able to comprehend principles of pictographic and alphabetic language systems, as well as differentiate between the two systems. Kenner et al. were able to find this through watching peer teaching sessions of the students. Through observing instances where children were talking about their views on each writing system, the researchers concluded that the children comprehended the principles of each language system. For example, in the case of a child learning Chinese and English, she expressed ease with the English language because she could associate each word with how it was spelled. On the other hand, she found Chinese more difficult because there are multiple meanings behind a single character. Kenner et al. (2004) noted “rather than being ‘confused’ by simultaneous input, the children were experiencing cognitive benefits. They were able to look for and comprehend the principles on which each system was based, clarifying differences between systems as their learning progressed over time” (p. 142).

**Social benefits.** Interactionalist theories suggest there are social benefits that are received from learning two different languages (Kenner et al., 2004). Kenner et al. explored how biliterate children have a range of alternatives available to them. They noted that biliteracy is a strength that enhances communication, thus allowing for more job opportunities in a multilingual world where these types of skills are becoming a necessity. In one Chinese-American family, the mother of one student stated that she
wanted her daughter to learn the Chinese writing system, so that when they visited Hong Kong or China, she would be able to use basic reading and writing to orient herself in the society. Kenner et al. also found that children who experience bicultural backgrounds when learning two contrasting languages can then understand different groups of people and how they view the world.

**Individual, Pedagogical, and Institutional Factors in DLE**

The next section summarizes research identifying individual, pedagogical, and institutional factors that affect L2 learning, with an emphasis on how they apply to DLE programs. These factors include the impact they have on L2 learning, as well as program features that affect language learning in the additive DLE setting.

**Individual Factors**

Over the years numerous individual factors have been found to influence second language acquisition (Clément, 1980; Gardner, 1985; McKenzie, 2010; Norris-Holt, 2001; Ortega, 2009). The impacts of these factors are hard to isolate one by one, since in any individual, it is a combination of several factors that may at least in part determine her or his language acquisition and fluency. The following individual factors are those thought to be most influential on language acquisition and fluency in this study, which are: 1) age, 2) place of residence, 3) previous schooling, 4) language background 5) cultural background, 6) motivation to learn languages, 7) attitudes towards language, 8) personality, and 9) milieu.

**Age.** Regarding age in learning a second language, some argue that starting the learning at a younger age produces results suggesting its benefits in the long run (Krashen, Long, & Scarcella, 1979). Proponents of this view tend to follow the Critical Period
Hypothesis (CPH), which proposes there is an optimal age period in any individual’s life where he or she is most favorably inclined to acquire a language. This thinking is analogous with how critical periods are integral to complete physical and neurological development, which has been observed in various biological studies (Ortega, 2009).

Although initially CPH was only thought of with respect to the individual’s fluency in acquiring L1, the concept was extended into the study of L2 acquisition after Penfield and Roberts’ (1959) volume *Speech and Brain Mechanisms* and Lenneberg’s (1967) book, *Biological Foundations of a Language*, where the term “critical period hypothesis” was coined. Through their research, these authors concluded that a child’s brain has a higher predisposition to learning a first language than older learners; however, they also provided empirical evidence that children were more adept at L2 acquisition than their adult counterparts (Ortega, 2009). Penfield and Roberts (1959) laid the foundation with their belief that the human brain becomes progressively less pliant with a diminished affinity to pick up a language after the age of nine years.

Lenneberg (1967) added to this line of thought with his contention that the critical period of language acquisition is tied to the lateralization process of the brain, which is where the specialization of language functions within the dominant hemisphere of the brain are developed. These findings became the foundation for the plausible hypothesis that a critical period in L2 acquisition is responsible for observed varying rates of L2 learning and attainment. This view has maintained its influence in L2 acquisition research since the late 1960s. With respect to learning rate, younger children potentially excel past their older L2 learning counterparts after longer periods of learning (five years and longer). In addition, L2 learners who begin at younger ages tend to develop levels of
morphosyntactic and phonological competency that rival those of native speakers of the L2, whereas those who start at later ages are less likely to attain the same level of fluency (Ortega, 2009).

This does not mean, however, that there are no exceptions to the CPH. Regarding rate of learning, when data has been collected over a learning period duration between 25 minutes to as long as three years, there are multiple instances where the findings indicate adults and older children outperform young children (Stern, Burstall, & Harley, 1975). This is thought to result directly from empirical tests of language learning based on individuals’ cognitive maturity and their metalinguistic skills. This favored the older participants of the study, who had greater levels of these skills than the young children. This allowed the older individuals to form strategies and more mature approaches to learning, which allowed for greater initial advantages. Furthermore, research also suggests there are certain adults that do achieve native-like fluency in their L2, as well as examples of L2 learners who began at early ages and do not attain native-like fluency (Oyama, 1976).

Although there are multiple arguments concerning why these differences may exist, two popular explanations advanced are the individual’s level of motivation and their level of use of L1 (Ortega, 2009). Individual’s level of motivation refers to their desire to initiate L2 learning and their efforts to sustain it. Young students’ level of L1 use also is a factor in individual differences. Moreover, Singleton (2005) concludes that due to the inability to defend the CPH consistently across previous studies, it should not be regarded as a scientific hypothesis. He uses the findings of multiple previous studies to argue that a plausible rival hypothesis is the manner in which the L2 is taught to a
specific age group that holds the greatest influence on L2 acquisition. Whereas children with their implicit learning skills are best suited for full-scale immersion, adults utilize their explicit learning skills best within a formal atmosphere (Singleton, 2005). With these varied results, it is important to keep in mind that age is a factor, yet somewhat controversial with respect to its influence on learners’ L2 acquisition.

**Place of residence.** The geographic location where the student and his or her family live impacts the student’s language acquisition. For example, if a student attempting to acquire Japanese as an L2 lives in Japan where the majority language is Japanese, the individual will be exposed to Japanese much more readily than if the same student lives in America, where the majority language is English. The exposure to the majority language of the surrounding society is greater, and therefore it could potentially impact the rate of acquisition of that language. In one recent study, Thordardottir (2011) studied children learning French and English and found a strong relationship between the amount of exposure to a language and performance in that language. This study controlled other factors such as the perceived social status of the language and socio-economic status, which improved the validity of the results. Thordardottir thoroughly documented the exposure the students were getting at home and then tested the students on receptive and expressive language. His findings suggested that the key to achievement was the amount of exposure to the language.

Similarly, Giagazoglou, Kyparos, Fotiadou, and Angelopoulou (2007) studied 800 preschool-aged children in rural and urban areas in northern Greece and found the motor development of children was directly associated with where they lived. Those who lived in the urban area performed better on fine motor activities than those who lived in rural
area. Tests for fine motor activities included building a tower of cubes, cutting with scissors, copying simple geometric shapes, drawing pictures, and threading beads on a lace. In contrast, children living in rural areas performed better on gross motor skills such as jumping, throwing or kicking a ball, and riding a bicycle. Giagazoglou et al. found that urban children did better on hand-eye coordination tests and concluded it was because most children attended daycare or some form of schooling from a young age, which allowed for daily opportunities to develop fine motor skills. The delays in gross motor skills in urban children were believed to be due to the lack of open space for playing and climbing apparatuses. Taking these findings into consideration, DLE schools in the urban area should incorporate the skill that students excel in, fine motor skills, when teaching children their L2, and DLE schools in the rural area should incorporate gross motor skills to help students learn the target language.

**Previous schooling.** Previous schooling affects individuals’ rate of L2 acquisition. When students are exposed to the target language prior to starting it in school, they will likely have an advantage over their peers that start after entering school. When dealing with even younger students, any type of schooling, not just in the target language, can give students an advantage needed to succeed in language acquisition. For example, Wylie and Thompson (2003) conducted a longitudinal study on the contribution that early childhood education makes on children’s competencies at age 10. They collected information on 500 children from 1993 when they were attending their last year at an early childhood education center. Their results indicated that children who had three or more years of early childhood education had higher average scores at age 10 on mathematics, communication, logical program solving, and reading age. These skills in
the previous mentioned areas help enhance L2 learning for students in the DLE program because they can transfer the necessary skills needed to focus and learn an L2.

**Language background.** Taking into consideration the language that is spoken at home is also very important in understanding students’ L2 acquisition. Whether the learner’s home language is the majority or minority language in the community can make a significant difference. It is not always the case, but the majority language usually carries a sense of prestige, while the minority language usually holds a sense of insignificance (Baker, 2006). Sometimes students come from an environment where there are already two or more languages spoken at home, and then another one or two languages are added while attending school. These situations all affect how the individual is able to learn a particular language, but the most important factor is whether the student is receiving support at home. This doesn’t necessarily mean that the parents must speak both languages, such as English and Japanese but, rather, that they value both languages and show support in learning both languages (Rodriguez, 1982).

**Cultural background.** Culture can be defined as a set of beliefs, values, and behaviors that are shared by members of society (Coon & Mitterer, 2006). A student’s cultural background has been noted to impact his or her language acquisition (Oxford, 1996). For example, the American culture is vastly different from the Japanese culture in terms of underlying beliefs, values, and behavior. Being aware of differences between American and Japanese cultures helps to understand the context of which the schools studied were located.

The cultural differences between the American and the Japanese are reflected in their education. The literature suggests that American education stresses for students to
be independent rather than interdependent (Marshall, 2001). Educators focus on teaching the individual child through giving her individual choices in addition to child-centered activities to complete (Hoffman, 2000). Classes are filled with learning centers and computers for individual students, and the teachers develop curriculum based on individual development (Nagayama & Gilliard, 2005). Nagayama and Gilliard’s research found American teachers more likely to allow their students to self-select their activities frequently, and they did not require their students to work in groups for long periods of time.

On the contrary, Japanese early care and education has been described as emphasizing how to live within the larger community. Group instruction is prominent, which can be seen in the weekly scheduled meetings in the gymnasium, opportunities in the school swimming pool, as well as instruction with the piano and television (Nagayama & Gilliard, 2005). Teachers develop curriculum based on promoting the idea of community and developing a higher regard for others (Nagayama & Gilliard, 2005). The curriculum includes giving children the opportunity to practice communal living (Matsumoto, 2002). Japanese schools emphasize building classroom community through strategies that include: 1) having higher child-teacher ratios, 2) assigning the students to small groups for an extended amount of time, 3) transitioning between activities with musical signals, 4) using toys that require more than one student, 5) giving students authority to correct another student when directed, and 6) directing teacher-dependent student to other students (Peach, 1994). The students in the Japanese schools are taught not to react independently, but rather to consult their peers first, build community, and then respond accordingly (Nordquist, 1993). The Japanese educators also pay little
attention to individual levels of child development (Hoffman, 2000), and they are described as more reluctant to discuss individual children’s differences and instead to treat all students the same (Tobin et al., 1989). Even the students react against the student-centered approach because it includes the communicative language teaching, which Japanese learners of English resist, since such strategies are not a part of examination requirements (LoCastro, 1996).

These basic differences between the cultures are just the beginning to understanding education within both cultures. There are also other variables to consider when it comes to cultural exposure in the classroom. For example, some students come from neither the American nor the Japanese culture. For students that fall under this categorization, it makes it even more imperative that the teachers are aware of those students’ situation, and therefore need to be conscious of those students’ home cultures in addition to the cultures of the languages being taught.


Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model first began with identifying four features [i.e., social and cultural milieu, individual learner differences, the context in
which learning takes place, linguistic outcomes (Gardner, 1982)] that affect L2 learning. The second stage of Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model included four individual differences that affect L2 acquisition. These include the individual’s intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety. In this second phase, Gardner (1985) differentiated between the formal instruction and unstructured natural setting and states that intelligence and aptitude affect the formal setting while motivation and situational anxiety affect both equally. The final stage of the model identifies the linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes. Learners who are able to integrate the language skills as well as the cultural values and beliefs of the target language are said to attain a higher degree of proficiency. More recently, Norton (2000) found motivation to learn an L2 was closely related to the social identities the learners were aiming to construct about the language. Furthermore, the motivational factor is said to compose effort, desire, and affect. Effort refers to the time spent, desire is indicated by how much the learner wants to be proficient, and affect is the learner’s emotional reaction to studying the language.

Clément’s (1980) social context model adds the psycholinguistic variable to the process of L2 acquisition via students’ adaptability to the target language group. The degree of adaptability is influenced by two sets of social motivation factors: 1) the primary motivational process, and 2) the secondary motivational process. The primary motivational process revolves around the relationship between integrativeness and the fear of assimilation. When referring to integrativeness, Clément (1980) means how well the individual can foster positive feelings towards the target language as well as its community and culture. This is stark contrast to his other key social motivational factor, the fear of assimilation, which suggests there are also individuals who, instead of
embracing the target language, fear that by learning an L2, they will involuntarily and unavoidably lose their L1 and its community and culture.

The secondary motivational process, on the other hand, is based on the idea that the individual’s self-confidence in his or her ability to use the target language is determined by the levels of anxiety he or she has with the target language, and the perceived level of L2 competence. Clément (1980) believed that a major influence on L2 competence is the self-confidence of the learner. Those who had higher self-confidence levels were likely to possess higher positive attitudes towards learning, which was reflected in the greater observed efforts being taken by the individuals in trying to learn the L2. Clément’s research allowed the connection to be made that when the learner possesses a high level of engagement towards the target language, he or she has a greater likelihood of practicing and using the language in as many occasions as possible (Kondo-Brown, 2001).

In addition to these two factors are the social interactions that Clément (1980) believed to supplement the learner’s competence of the L2. He argued that there are two specific scenarios that the learner could find him or herself in that would affect L2 ability. The first is when the learner finds him or herself within a unicultural context. This means that the learner is within a social setting where there is no direct contact with members of the target language. In situations like this, the learner is influenced directly by her own primary motivational process, and the L2 competence is therefore parallel to the learner’s motivation to learn the L2. In the other scenario, the learner finds him or herself within multicultural contexts; that is, where opportunities to interact with members of the target language group are available. This allows the learner multiple opportunities to use and
apply what they know of the target language, and it is this greater application of the target language that makes it possible to attain a higher proficiency of the L2 (Kondo-Brown, 2001).

The self-determination theory developed by Deci, et al. (1989) suggests that humans are growth orientated and hold a predisposition to lifelong learning and development. It is this innate human behavior that drives the choices made to initiate and regulate their actions. A few years later Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) stated that a motivated individual “is one who wants to achieve a particular goal, devotes considerable effort to achieve this goal, and experiences satisfaction in the activities associated with achieving this goal” (p. 2). Therefore motivation is seen as comprised from the “desire to achieve a goal, effort extended in this direction, and satisfaction with the task” (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993, p. 2). Researchers in this field distinguished two different kinds of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation refers to internal rewards such as joy, pleasure and satisfaction of curiosity that gets people to perform tasks or activities. Extrinsic motivation refers to external rewards such as good grades and praise from others that individuals expect when they perform a task or activity. Research by Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, and Ryan (1991) showed that outcome of the self-determination that is fueled by intrinsic motivation and autonomy is beneficial to the individual as well as society. However, many people have criticized this idea and noted how difficult it is to actually define “integrative.”

The willingness-to-communicate model refers to the probability a student would initiate communication. It is represented as the final psychological step before L2 communication in the proximal-distal continuum that was developed by MacIntyre et al.
Students who have a high probability of initiating communication in this model (which integrates motivation, communication competence, and perceived self-confidence) look for various ways to communicate. Therefore, one goal of language learning should be to cultivate the students’ willingness to communicate.

Dörnyei’s (2001) extended motivational framework divided L2 motivation into three levels: 1) the language level, 2) the learner level, and 3) learning situation level. Dörnyei (2001) argued that each individually affects motivation and, therefore, there was a need to separate the levels. The language level includes the students’ attitude towards culture, community, intellectual and pragmatic values of the L2 and learning it. This basically refers to the students’ reason to learn a L2. The learner level is divided into two aspects: the need for achievement, and self-confidence. Further, Dörnyei (2001) divided the self-confidence aspect into four categories: language use anxiety, perceived L2 competence, causal attributions and self-efficacy. Masgoret and Gardner (2003) also found a strong relationship between motivation and achievement when they studied motivation and an English Canadian school’s students learning French as their L2.

Baker (2006) categorized the motivation to learn languages into two basic groups: 1) the wish to identify with the language group, and 2) the purposeful use of the language to earn money. These two groups often are labeled integrative motivation and instrumental motivation, respectively. Arguments over which motivation leads to proficiency have been made for both sides, but some research also shows a mixture of both integrative and instrumental to be the result of language acquisition.

**Attitude toward language learning.** Similar to motivation, attitude also holds a strong influence over language learning. The functions of attitude are varied, and there
are multiple reasons as to why an individual may feel the way she or he does. Ideas of social identity and attitude as a determinant for knowledge and categorization of stimuli are only a few examples of these functions that have been associated with attitude (McKenzie, 2010). In addition, an attribute of attitude, intensity, is said to be the level of enthusiasm that an individual possesses (Oppenheim, 1992). These various factors (e.g., social identity, intensity of attitudes) affect language attitude, which with respect to second language acquisition, encompasses students’ outlook on language variations, their views on learning a new language, their views towards a minority language, how they perceive language communities, their willingness to participate in language lessons, the role of parents in the language learning process, and the formation of a language preference (McKenzie, 2010). Proficiency is also affected by attitude, as students’ potential L2 level is directly influenced by their language attitude towards learning (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003).

**Personality.** Although personality is difficult to define and even more difficult to measure, there have been studies conducted to show the impact of personality on language acquisition. For example, Brown (1987) found naturally outgoing learners were more likely to put themselves in situations that gave them the opportunity to use and practice their target language. Using the target language helped support their language development and excel over those that did not take the initiative to put themselves in those situations. Those with a stronger sense of self-esteem can bear the embarrassing moments that naturally occur. Individual personality, although difficult to measure, have an impact on learning a language.
**Milieu.** Students’ milieu includes their social environment in which they live with their family. Students’ milieu is proposed to determine their beliefs about other cultures and languages and to impact on language learning (Norris-Holt, 2001). As an example, Norris-Holt (2001) suggests that in monocultural settings where only one culture exists within the society, many do not see the benefits of learning another language and support the view that language minority groups should assimilate into the majority language mainstream. The opposite is true for bilingual, bicultural countries such as Canada, where it is the norm to allow more than one language to coexist. In Norris-Holt’s study, higher socioeconomic families were able to afford to live not only in the urban area, but in homes mostly close to the schools their children to attended, and they were surrounded by other families who are also doing the same. Those in this study were able to send their children to a private school because they received educational contributions from their company, or they could afford to pay the high prices out of pocket. In this way, a students’ milieu affects language learning by determining beliefs about other cultures and language and opening doors to schools that usually not readily accessible by others.

**Pedagogical Factors in DLE**

Pedagogical methods, approaches, and techniques implemented also affect students in a DLE program. There are methods that are currently not used in DLE programs, but have undeniably played a role in the development of current methods. These include the grammar translation method, direct method and the teacher-centered method. From these methods, the communicative language approach, and the student-centered classrooms emerged and are commonly used today. The manner in which students are taught determines the end goal of becoming bilingual and biliterate.
Grammar translation method. The most common way to learn English in Japan is through the grammar translation method. The L2, English, is taught in the students’ L1, Japanese. The task consists heavily of grammar and translations. The grammar rules are taught out of context, and the students are expected to learn the grammar through repetitive exercises on a worksheet. Then the students are given sentences to translate from English to Japanese based on the grammar that they learned. Even though there are arguments, which discredit this method as being wholly ineffective (Aslam, 2006), it continues to be the norm because the government heavily controls the school curriculum. On the contrary, private schools, which are free from government obligations, have mostly favored the direct method of teaching, where the L2 is used directly in the process of teaching the L2 to students (Pover, 2009). In other words, the teacher uses English to teach English. Recent research, however, has shown the importance of using the students’ L1; therefore, teachers have also endorsed using the L1 when teaching the L2 (Thomas & Collier, 1997), as is typical in DLE programs.

Communicative language approach. Due to the identified problems with the grammar translation method and the direct method, the communicative language approach (Hymes, 1968) has been adopted as an alternate means of teaching languages. The communicative language approach advocates that language acts as a medium for communication. Instead of focusing and using a traditional approach based on the grammatical system of the L2, the communicative language approach instead promotes the idea that learning is far more meaningful when the learner can be engaged in the learning process, and the learner can then apply what he or she knows while completing various activities that require communicating in the L2 (Swarbrick, 1994).
**Teacher-centered classroom.** In a teacher-centered classroom, the teacher is the authoritative figure that directs students’ learning through providing activities that the students complete. Students work through the provided materials and are usually powered by extrinsic motivation. Throughout the learning experience, the teacher records assessments of the students’ work. Most Asian countries are taught in this manner, and the teachers even favor this type of teaching. Students also prefer teacher-centered classrooms (Coleman, 1996).

**Student-centered classroom.** In a student-centered classroom, the students are the driving force behind what gets taught because teachers base what they teach on what the students are curious to learn more about. Individual needs are noted, and the students’ social needs of collaboration and communication are also a part of the teaching methods. Rather than teaching to the whole class, the focus is on individual students, where the teacher allows for greater individual choice and freedom in structuring learning activities. Students participate in evaluations of their learning. Often the result of the approach method is a student that is self-confident and a critical thinker.

**Formal intentional and informal incidental.** When researching a school, it is important to look into the school’s goals, teachers, students, and environment. This is because it is not an understatement when someone says, “Learning occurs every day and everywhere.” This idea can be dichotomized into formal intentional learning and informal incidental learning. Formal intentional learning is the organized, structured learning arranged by the school through the curriculum and taught by the teacher. Informal incidental learning is never organized and implemented through formal curriculum but, rather, is spontaneous and authentic. This type of learning is hard to quantify and,
therefore, it is difficult to document its importance in language learning (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007).

The formal intentional learning that occurs inside the classroom has structure and can be measured by tests. The school is able to set up its curriculum to meet the needs of a DLE program. However, just as important are informal, incidental learning occurrences. Students learn about things that are never explicitly taught in school. Cofer (2000) explained the difference between formal and informal as differentiating who sets the learning goals. In a formal setting, it is the school and teacher that set the goals. In an informal setting, it is the students that decide their individual goals.

**Institutional Factors in DLE**

In this section, I cover topics related to this study in terms of institutional factors. At times, they may not reflect directly on DLE programs. However, the cases researched in this study implemented programs that, although originally not designed for DLE, have adapted it to fit their DLE needs.

The school curriculum and structure play an important role in language acquisition. Depending on what the school decides to use as their curriculum, various experiences can be attained. The following will discuss the various program models and structures that DLE schools use. Although these were not created based on the DLE goals and objectives, the schools have altered them to fit their needs.

**International baccalaureate program.** One type of international curricular program gaining favor in many countries is the International Baccalaureate (IB) Program. A specialized curriculum generated by the IB Program called the IB Primary Years Program (PYP) is utilized for 3 to 12-year-old children. The goal of the PYP is to
continually develop its students for the classroom and the real world. This is done through a multistep fashion that promotes certain academic and practical applications. Amongst these are the encouragement of international-mindedness, the encouragement of a positive attitude towards learning through the creation of an environment that facilitates inquiries and the development of the students’ awareness, providing a real-life learning perspective that goes beyond just the traditional subjects, and the emphasis on the development of the IB learner profile.

The IB learner profile consists of a list of characteristics that the IB has deemed vital to academic achievement, and the development of students’ personal value systems via physical, intellectual, and emotional growth. Specifically, the IB learner profile promotes the ideas of increasing one’s abilities as an inquirer, thinker, communicator, and risk-taker, as well as promoting the benefits of being knowledgeable, principled, caring, open-minded, well-balanced, and reflective (International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d.).

The PYP teaches its curriculum through three interconnected methods. The first is its written curriculum, which utilizes its own transdisciplinary framework. This framework is founded on six transdisciplinary themes based on five essential elements—concepts, knowledge, skills, attitudes, and action—that in conjunction with the themes allow for students to go beyond just surface level meaning on classroom subjects. These themes are: 1) who we are, 2) how we are in space and time, 3) how we express ourselves, 4) how the world works, 5) how we organize ourselves, and 6) sharing the planet. Taken in a collective perspective, the purpose of these themes is to give students a basis for not only connecting what is being learned within the classroom to the outside world, but also
to foster a sense of responsibility. Students are broken into two categories based on age in regards to these themes. Four of the six themes are covered over the course of the school year for 3 to 5-year-olds. All six themes are covered only by the 4 to 12-year-old students. In addition to the PYP’s distinctive thematic facet, the program does not ignore traditional core subjects. Language, mathematics, science, social studies, art, personal education, social education, and physical education are all included in the curriculum (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2007).

The second way the PYP teaches is through its taught curriculum. This area of the program focuses on the teachers’ abilities to manipulate the six themes in ways that assist the creation of student inquiries on multiple subjects. While investigating their inquiries, which can be a multiple week, group or individual endeavor, this area of the PYP develops the students’ scholastic skills, as well as their interpretive skills (International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d.).

The third method is its assessed curriculum. The rationale behind assessing student progress is not definable by a single reason. Instead, there are multiple, distinctive points that go into showing how providing an assessment can be beneficial to the student and the program. The first point is that assessments can go to determining just what it is that the students now know, and how much they can understand about the world in which they live. Second is that assessments inform and differentiate the ideas of teaching and learning. Third, assessments can monitor students’ progress in regards to their ability to follow the guidelines of the IB learner profile. Fourth is that assessment provides necessary feedback to teachers, students, and parents. The fifth point is that these assessments present an adequate basis for monitoring the effectiveness of the PYP. And
finally, assessments can inform teachers of any professional development that they are allowing themselves to undertake. The methods of recording that are employed include analyzing writing samples, creating benchmarks and continuums, observations, anecdotal records, performance tasks, rubrics, conferences, and student work portfolios (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2007).

Reggio Emilia. From the city of Reggio Emilia in Italy came the Reggio Emilia approach to education. Many preschools and primary schools have adopted this approach. The founder, Loris Malaguzzi (1993), states the goals of the program are “to create an ‘amiable’ school--that is, a school that is active, inventive, livable, documentable, and communicative” (p. 9). It is also “a place of research, learning, revisiting, reconsideration, reflection” (p. 9).

The environment is committed to being beautiful and harmonious, while also supporting cooperation and interaction. It also makes a focus to contain cultures of the school and families. The class uses lots of natural light, gardens and open space. Even bathrooms are considered a special space and are decorated with artwork. Glass windows are used so that children can see what is going on in each room, including the kitchen. Each school has an atelier, which is an area where children can express themselves through media. It is similar to an art studio, but holds more meaning. It’s a place where children work with art materials, a place where adults can reflect and understand children’s learning, and a place to document what goes on in the school (Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1993).

The school schedule is loose and allows for flexibility, so that students are able to continue their work without time constraining disruptions (New, 1990). When students
first arrive, they are free to choose an activity. Then a morning meeting is held to talk about events at home, prior day activities, and the places for the day. Students are free to work until lunchtime. After lunch, they rest and continue their projects until they leave (Rosen, 1992). Small groups are used to provide organization for complex interactions, constructive conflicts and opportunity for self-regulation (Malaguzzi, 1993). It also provides scaffolding through the interactions between students (Malaguzzi, 1993).

The Reggio Emilia approach, which is based on constructivist theories, allows children to learn through working with the environment and explaining what they experienced. It is through short and long-term projects that the children learn to cooperate, collaborate, and develop socially and intellectually (Jaruszewicz, 1994).

**Multiage approach.** Another way to deliver curriculum is through the multiage approach. Jean Piaget’s (1976) Constructivist Learning Theory is highly dependent on the multiage approach, as the system incorporates the lessons on how children learn shown in Piaget’s (1976) work. Piaget (1976) popularized the thinking that children learn through a process, and this process is the basis to the multiage system. Multiage systems aim to engage the students in every domain of learning, while at the same time providing a risk-free and supportive learning environment that allows students to freely create knowledge through interactions and the teacher’s facilitation of learning respective to their students’ cognitive stage of development. Multiage systems recognize that students at any age may be relatively different in their development in one subject domain versus another. Learning is done within the context of the process and is done so by tailoring to each student’s personal needs (Stone, 2004).
In addition to Piaget (1976), Vygotsky’s (1978) Social Learning Theory also is instrumental in defining the benefits of a multiage classroom. Vygotsky’s (1978) “zone of proximal development” finds that children’s potential development can be improved when given the scenario that they are put among adults and highly-skilled peers. This is done because a child in this situation will have the opportunity to obtain greater cognitive growth. Prosocial behavior such as helping, sharing, and taking turns, as well as leadership abilities are social skills that are enhanced directly due to the multiage environment (Stone, 2004).

Taking this all into consideration, the multiage learning approach has evolved. In contrast to the traditional graded system, which organizes children into age-based grades, students in a multiage system are instead placed in heterogeneous family-like groups. In addition, the children stay with their group, as well as have the same teacher, over the course of several years. Teachers’ roles are to be facilitators of learning whose main goals are to instill a lifelong love of learning in their students. The multiage system see all children as being different with respect to their development and learning needs and, therefore, learning must be formatted to be child-centered rather than curriculum-centered. This allows the students to move through the system at their own continuum of learning without the rigid structure or the graded-system, or the sometimes unrealistic expectation of retention. The multiage system uses an integrated curriculum model that provides the opportunity for students to read, write, and solve problems. The classroom environment itself is also seen as a facilitator of learning. The class design is reflective of this as tables take the place of individual desks, and the openness of the classroom space is utilized to offer flexibly to the learning experience. The freedom students have to
engage in hands-on activities while in the classroom, as well as being allowed to learn at a pace that matches their own abilities, are catalysts to the construction of knowledge (Stone, 2004).

Teachers also have the responsibility to assess their students’ development throughout their time in school. Portfolios of the students’ work enable the teacher to communicate the growth of their students to the students themselves and their parents. This positive feedback is integral in developing high self-esteem and motivation, which is then shown in the students’ enthusiasm to learn. Along with the portfolio assessment, narrative report cards are given to each student. These report cards do not include any type of letter grade as each student is evaluated individually and to their own ability and potential. The multiage system views letter grades as having no value, as they evaluate students based on a set of impractical norms and expectation rather than as a unique, individual case (Stone, 2004).

Fosco, Schleser, and Andal (2004), explored multiage programs and traditional classrooms for differences in cognitive developmental level and reading achievement. Instead of only focusing on the reading abilities of the children, they additionally examined the cognitive developmental level. Fosco et al. made the observational connection between the students’ cognitive development level and then basing it to how it affected students’ reading level. The researchers recruited 212 students to participate in their study. These students ranged from kindergarten to second grade. They were given several tests to measure their cognitive developmental level and reading achievement respectively. The results found children in a multiage classroom reached a higher cognitive developmental level faster than their peers in the traditional classroom, and
they also found that children with a higher cognitive developmental level scored higher on reading achievement test.

Fu et al. (1999) described the first day of school in a multiage classroom, and documented the first week. This was done to explain what type of experiences a student in a multiage classroom would find on their first day of school, in addition to how the teachers of that classroom receive new kindergartners to their returning first and second grade students. They found returning teachers to be comfortable since they already knew two thirds of their class. Teachers expressed they were able to focus on teaching as opposed to spending time on rules and routine. The returning older students knew exactly what to do, and where to go that instead of having the typical first day anxieties that a new students acclimating to a new learning environment and teacher. These returning students instead were able to get straight to work. As for the new kindergarten students, although they were timid on the first day, they still were able to read, write, sing, learn about math, science and social studies, and make friends. By the third day, all the students actively engaged in their learning community.

**Student population.** In addition to the curriculum, the institution controls the population of the school. The ages of the students as well as their language backgrounds can be taken into consideration when enrolling them into the classroom. If the school is striving for a two-way dual language program, it can select the students based on the students’ L1. Schools can decide whether to add more children whose L1 is the majority language, or instead students whose L1 is the minority language (Torres-Guzmán, Kleyn, Morales-Rodríguez, & Han, 2005). The schools can also decide whether they will accept those with special needs, or refrain from accepting those students based on the perceived
inability to properly support their needs. Ultimately, in a private international school, it is
the institution that is able to control which students get accepted into the DLE program.

Summary of Factors

If the goals of DLE schools are to support students’ language acquisition and
attainment, while also acknowledging the needs outside of just language learning, then
the individual, pedagogical, and institutional factors must all be taken into consideration.
Each of these factors affects the DLE program in various ways; these are reflected on
daily activities as well as long-term activities and goals. The extent to which these factors
can affect the DLE program, however, differs from school to school depending on how
influential these factors can be with respect to administrative, classroom, and further
levels of decision making.

A major characteristic of DLE programs is the institutional factor of choosing a
curriculum approach. Most DLE programs utilize the student-centered approach, which
not only gives each of the students the individual attention that they require in order to
facilitate student development, but it also enables the students to become actively
engaged in the learning process. The students’ initiative then combines with a primary
individual factor, motivation, to become the driving force behind how DLE programs
conduct their curriculum, which is seen through the students’ interests being manifested
into the topics that the teachers use to construct their lessons. In other words, each of the
three factors discussed previously form the foundation for L2 learning and the
programmatic features of a DLE program.

Effective Features of DLE Programs

For the purpose of this research, I define DLE programs to be additive in nature. I
focus on programs for children in the early stages of sequential bilingualism, bilateralism, and where learning takes place in a near 50/50 elite model school. In two cases, the schools deliver their DLE program in a two-way style, while one school delivers its DLE program in a one-way style. It is believed that these types of DLE programs are best suited for individuals learning to be bilingual.

Knowing effective features of a DLE program is important so that the school can provide the best education for its students. Through previous research, certain features that have worked in DLE situations have emerged. These features are not guaranteed to work in all educational environments, but they form a useful baseline when observing DLE in various school settings. The following are summarized as key domains of effectiveness: 1) curriculum goals and assessment, 2) program structure, 3) instruction, 4) staff quality and professional development, 5) family and community, and 6) support and resources.

**Curriculum Goals and Assessment**

The DLE program’s curriculum is aligned with each institution’s meaningful and academically-challenging set standards, which allows for the students to use their higher order thinking skills (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). The curriculum is thematic, enriching, and aligned with the bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural goals that emphasize the value of students’ cultures (Lindholm-Leary, 2007).

Goals for the students must include: 1) language proficiency, 2) sociocultural integration, and 3) academic achievement (Brisk, 2006). Language proficiency includes the ability to be able to perform in school as well as in the world in both languages. Sociocultural integration of both cultures enables students to function in both cultures and
enhances academic achievement. Academic achievement goals for individuals must include thinking and problem solving skills. Schools must have all three topics as their goals for students to ensure that the students are able to perform at their highest capacity while maintaining their bilingual skills all while being socially accepted within the two contrasting cultures.

In an effective DLE program, assessment is used to shape and monitor the effectiveness of that program. These assessments are aligned with the curriculum, standards, and visions of the program, and are conducted in both target languages. Assessments are also used to track the progress of groups. It is carried out systematically and interpreted accurately to disseminate to the appropriate audiences (Lindholm-Leary, 2007).

Program Structure

In an effective DLE program, the duration the students are in the program is for a minimum of four to six years. The research (Thomas & Collier, 2002) shows that this is the average amount of time it takes for a student to gain the needed grade level norms. This is an important factor because the goal of the DLE programs is for their students to achieve bilingualism and biliteracy.

Another feature of an effective DLE school is having an orderly and safe climate (Montecel & Cortez, 2002). There needs to be respect for language and culture, and both languages and cultures must be of equal status. To ensure this, the school must: 1) foster positive attitudes towards students’ home language, 2) encourage positive attitude towards English, 3) nurture positive attitudes towards cultural background, and 4) confront linguistic and cultural conflicts (Brisk, 2006). This includes the freedom for
students to use their home languages, and libraries are required to be equipped with an abundance of books in target and home languages. In addition, an environment where the students feel safe and willing to take risks is important when learning an L2 (Asher, 2000). An orderly and safe climate is essential for language proficiency, sociocultural integration, and academic achievement.

The program must also provide instructional focus on the set goals of the school, which include bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism. The educational model of the school upholds the principles of L2 development, bilingual theory and research, effective instructional methodologies, and the commitment to the DLE model. This is all done through the effective leadership of the principal or headmaster, program coordinator, and management team that communicates, develops, plans, and coordinates the program (Lindholm-Leary, 2007).

**Instruction**

Research (Beardsmore & Swain, 1985) indicates students need an environment where the language of instruction is not mixed in order to efficiently learn both languages. Schools often split the languages by time, location, or by teacher for a clear separation of the languages.

Effective instruction includes structured and unstructured opportunities for the students to learn in cooperative learning or group work situations (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). These scenarios allow for the students to work individually, interdependently, or through extensive interactions with their classmates, which promotes the development of bilingualism.
Effective instruction is also based on the teachers’ knowledge of their students. This is then functionally transformed into a sense of security that the students can attain via the association of their teachers personalizing the learning experience to meet their own individual needs. Individual students’ attitude toward language and motivation to learn language also need to be taken into consideration (Brisk, 2006). Through the knowing of their students, teachers are able to respond accordingly to different learning styles and language proficiency levels (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Furthermore, the teacher-learner relationship inside the classroom, as well as the more personal adult-child relationship, need attention and focus to help bridge the gap between school and the world (Brisk, 2006). Equipped with this knowledge, teachers are able to understand and better support their students.

In successful schools, the teachers and other school personnel have high expectations for students. Teachers must believe that regardless of students’ personal circumstances they are still capable learners (Brisk, 2006). Therefore, the teacher delivers his or her instruction in a manner that aims to keep the curriculum challenging, incorporating strategies to foster critical thinking, promotes grouping the students heterogeneously, and allowing for students to use their native language. Teachers understand that students’ language ability does not reflect their students’ intellectual ability, and therefore teachers engage students regardless of their language proficiency. The curriculum is never watered down, and instead teachers assume all students can grow and learn. Often teachers start with whole group lessons and then work with smaller groups based on their individual needs. Teachers who have high expectations recognize their students’ accomplishments and congratulate them.
Just as teachers must know their students, students must also have opportunities to learn about each other. When students know each other and create a working classroom community, everyone is equally important, valued, and less likely to misbehave (Brisk, 2006).

**Staff Quality and Professional Development**

The quality of teachers and staff also affects the effectiveness of the program. Effective programs select and train high quality teachers that have teaching certifications and are fully credentialed bilingual teachers with knowledge of bilingual education and second language acquisition. These high level qualifications are because the students are not just learning in a normal monolingual, monoculture environment. Multiple languages and multiple cultures are being learned in the school environment, which require more care and attention. Teachers need to know when the students need to be pushed, and on the other extreme, when to take it easy when teaching. In addition, the teachers have knowledge of the subject matter, curriculum, technology, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). The teachers and staff monitor the quality of instruction, embrace innovation, and keep up their commitment to the students (Brisk, 2006). Skilled teachers are always looking for new ways and take initiative to improve the program.

Although these types of qualified teachers are ideal in the DLE program, the current problem is finding these teachers. Due to this dilemma, schools tend to hire teachers that are capable of teaching one language and then have these teachers work in pairs with a teacher of the other language. Whatever the case, teachers must be open to learning about how students learn and how to best instruct in these special situations to
create an effective environment where students are able to make the most out of their
time in school.

On-going professional development for the staff is also a key feature of effective
programs (Genesee, 1999). These are aligned with the goals of the program, and focus on
language education pedagogy, materials and resources, assessment, development of
language skills, educational equity, dual language theory, and L2 acquisition (Lindholm-
Leary, 2007). The staff members are always encouraged to examine their beliefs and
practices, as well as conduct teacher research for reflections and improvement to better
serve the children they are teaching. Other types of professional development
opportunities include mentorship, partnerships with universities, study groups, retreats,
training, and collaborations with other schools (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). DLE programs
must have these options easily available to the staff to ensure effectiveness and growth.

**Family and Community**

Parents play a critical role in their child’s education, too. Communication between
teachers and staff improves students’ reading achievement (Snow, Barnes, Chandler,
Goodman, & Hemphill, 1991), helps students stay connected with their education, and
help teachers better understand their students (Ruiz, 1993). In an effective school, home
and school communication is done to let each know what they are doing for the students’
education. This is done through both languages to ensure that the parents are aware of
what is going on at their child’s school (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Signs in the school are
also posted in both languages. School’s goals and purpose are continuously
communicated to the parents. Cultural rules also must be taken into consideration (Brisk,
2006).
Having parents participate through volunteering in school activities helps their understanding of the school’s educational goals and practices, and gets parents involved in sharing their knowledge to other students, teachers, and staff. Effective schools also encourage parents to get involved with their child’s education at home through collaboration activities (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Creating a solid home-school connection is crucial for the student as well as the parent. Another way parents are involved is though participating in school governance. It is seen as a crucial way to help monitor the quality of bilingual education (Arvizu, Hernandez-Chavez, Guskin, & Valadez, 1992). The effective school keeps a welcoming environment community as well as has community-based organizations “provide health and counseling, tutoring, employment opportunities, and ESL classes for adults” (Brisk, 2006, p. 133) to provide a community of support within the DLE program.

**Support and Resources**

Support and resources are an integral part of an effective DLE program. The program must be supported by the community, the local Board of Education that oversees the school, and the district in which the school is located (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). This ensures that resources are allocated equitably, and that the program is a permanent, enriching part of the district to all stakeholders involved. The school and program administrator must actively advocate for the program and encourages families and its surrounding communities to also advocate on its behalf to ensure the longevity of the program. This joint participation is integral to the permanence of any program, as the support on behalf of the institution and the communities provide the necessary backing essential to keeping the program running.
Research on an Effective DLE Program

In this next section, I examine a school that has been identified as having an effective DLE program. This school and its features can be useful in forming a baseline when observing other DLE schools.

Quintanar-Sarellana’s (2004) study on a successful DLE program identified factors previously pointed out by Lindholm (2001), and supplemented those factors with indicators from Genesee (1999) and Senesac (2002) that analyze the achievements and academic accomplishments of Monteverde, a school based in northern California. Only 1% of the students enter bilingual in English and Spanish, but by the time they exit fifth grade, 99% of the students are bilingual. Here are some of the features of the program that the researcher considered: 1) duration of the instructional treatment, 2) high-quality instructional personnel, 3) separation of languages for instruction, and 4) ratio of English to the non-English language use (Quintanar-Sarellana, 2004). Previous research (Thomas & Collier, 2002) shows a minimum of four to six years in a DLE program needed to acquire grade level norms in the L2. At Monteverde, the attrition rate is low because parents are initially informed that it will take five years for their child to learn both languages. Most teachers at Monteverde hold bilingual cross-cultural language ability and academic development credentials that ensure teachers have native-like proficiency, and are also able to teach language development. Research shows students learn efficiently when the languages are not mixed (Beardsmore & Swain, 1985). Therefore, at Monteverde, the language learning is separated by teachers and time. When the teacher in the classroom changes, so too does the language. Another factor to consider is the ratio of English to non-English language use (Lindholm, 2001). Monteverde incorporates a 90:10
model that places an emphasis on Spanish learning within a curriculum that is weighted heavily on Spanish during the early years of schooling. This is due to the students have the high likelihood of being exposed to English on a consistent basis outside the school.

**Summary of Literature for Framing the Proposed Study**

Past research in L2 acquisition theories and hypotheses cover a wide range of ideas from clarifying the meaning of language acquisition, attainment, and accuracy to explaining how language is learned through behaviorists, linguistic, and interactional theories. The ideas most relevant to framing this proposed study on schools that provide DLE were the socio-cultural theory and social interaction theory, which were parts that branched off from the larger set of interactional theories. When examining the role of bilingual education it is important to recognize the significance of the additive program model, where the L2 is learned in addition to developing the L1. Specifically, DLE programs are additive in nature and provide an enriched learning environment for the students to become balanced bilinguals, while maintaining two unique cultural identities within themselves.

A number of factors related to individuals as well as their classrooms and schools influence success in helping students acquire a second language in formal educational settings. Regarding how individuals acquire a second language, the literature suggests the most prevalent individual factors are age, cultural background, and motivation. Under the pedagogical factor category, it was noted that student-centered classroom, where students are the driving force behind what is taught, provides the necessary component for the creation of self-confident and critical-thinking learners. The institutional factor that holds the most influence on DLE programs is the multiage approach where students are
grouped with peers that maybe older or younger than them. This provides an avenue for the students to learn prosocial behavior, which enhances cognitive growth.

Several features of effective DLE programs were also identified in the literature (Brisk, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001), which the most integral part associated with this study being school climate and knowledge of student needs. Having an orderly and safe climate, which allows the student to use their home language encourages positive attitudes, and nurtures language development. Teachers, who personalized their teaching style to meet student needs, helped bridge the gap between school and the outside world. This in turn helped their students to be equipped with the necessary knowledge to better perform in the classroom as well as society. These ideas are all based on the fundamental concept of identifying and addressing student learning needs. Finally, when all these aspect are taken into consideration, they provide the foundation for an effective DLE program to produce students who are bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural.

In this study, I focus on additive DLE programs for children in the early stages of sequential bilingualism, biliteraism, and are learning in a near 50/50 elite model school. Two schools deliver their DLE programs in a two-way style, while one school delivers its DLE program in a one-way style. The terms used in the field were defined to make clarifications for common misconceptions. This proposed research study is on early, partial immersion, sequential DLE programs that have an additive perspective towards language learning. When referencing DLE programs in this study, I specifically mean programs that meet these characteristics. Theories associated with this research were also briefly presented as a background and framework for understanding. Knowing what has
been said and done previously helps to move forward with research in these DLE programs.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter articulates the research study’s design and research methods. The design of the study includes the purpose, research questions, theoretical formulations, setting, units of analysis, subjects, data collection, criteria and methodology for interpreting the findings and assumptions within this research study (Heck, 2004). The primary objective of this research study was to identify and describe DLE programs in United States and Japan. The objective does not include rating or evaluating the schools involved. To fulfill this objective, I conducted a comparative research study that is unlike any other in the field. I conducted a multiple case ethnographic study of three school sites that had dual language programs for young students (3-year-olds to 7-year-olds).

Qualitative Focus on Research

Qualitative research is a type of research that “help[s] us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (Merriam, 1998, p. 5). The study’s methods are consistent with Merriam’s (1998) description on the five characteristics of qualitative research.

First is that qualitative researchers “are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). This outlook is interested in determining how the participants being observed perceive how the world around them works, while also understanding their own personal experiences. Second is that the “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). Merriam uses the analogy that the researcher becomes the “instrument for data collection” (p. 7) because all data that is recorded and then analyzed must first be filtered
and then organized by the researcher. The third characteristic is that qualitative research involves the incorporation of fieldwork (or ethnography). Usually a substantial amount of time is spent in the field to observe those being studied while they interact and function within their natural setting. In fieldwork, the researcher is often both participant and observer. Fourth, is that qualitative research “primarily employs an inductive research” model in its methods (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). This means that rather than testing theories, qualitative research is conducted to describe and explain relationships in the data. In this process the research often builds hypotheses and new and/or supporting theories to explain what is observed. It is through the researcher’s observations and intuitive understandings that he or she is able to construct an explanation about how and why the particular phenomenon being studied is occurring. The final characteristic is that the study must be “richly descriptive” (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). This element goes beyond professional thoroughness. The goal of the analysis is to convey a thorough description and understanding of the phenomenon that is the focus of the research. This adds to the credibility of the account as an explanation of the phenomenon studied. Ultimately, it is the detailing of the conduct of the study (i.e., its methods, data collection, weighing of the evidence, and interpretation) that determines its scientific merit.

Taking these five characteristics into consideration, it was my responsibility to detail the study’s methods regarding the study of DLE in the three chosen school settings. Initially, this research study was going to solely focus on schools located in Japan. However, a little more than halfway through observing the second of my selected schools in Japan, circumstances out of my control forced me to alter the scope of the study. The tragic earthquake and tsunami that devastated Japan on March 11, 2011 made remaining
in Japan through the completion of my research unsettling, and I made the decision to leave.

At this point, however, I did not have enough observational data to complete my study. Therefore I began searching for DLE private schools in the United States that also fit the same criteria that I used in selecting the school sites in Japan. After weighing my options, I decided on a private school that offered an English and Japanese bilingual, bicultural program located in the northwest of the United States. After introducing myself and my research objective through email correspondences with the school’s headmaster, I was granted permission to continue my research there. In the end, although I had to relocate myself from Japan in order to finish gathering the necessary observational data, the addition of a school from the United States allowed me to add further to my study in a way that would have been impossible had I conducted my fieldwork entirely in Japan.

**Multiple Ethnographic Case Studies**

In an ethnographic study, the researcher observes the behaviors of a group over a period of time to provide a detailed description of the group and to identify themes about the group (Creswell, 2007). In the present study, the phenomenon being studied is DLE programs in Japan and the United States. Multiple case studies focus on cross-case comparison. Three schools comprise the individual cases investigating how each implements its DLE program. Multiple case studies are appropriate when the purpose is to provide validation of important parts of a proposed theory or conceptual model, of which relates to my study’s intent to provide in-depth analysis on effective DLE programs. The goal is to build a general explanation that fits the individual cases, although there will inevitably be variation present in each individual case (Heck, 2004).
One strength of conducting an ethnographic study is that the data collected come from more than one source. Cases are often selected to reflect either similar or predictable results (Yin, 2003). It is important to think about common elements that might be compared across cases in order to facilitate making valid comparisons (e.g., time, population, and learning environment).

Geertz (1973) noted that ethnographers "inscribe" social discourse; that is, they write it down so it is turned from a passing event into an account. There are three characteristics of ethnographic description: it is interpretive; it is interpretive of social discourse; and the goal is to capture the essence of the discourse from its perishing occasions so it can be used to partially represent complex social worlds (Graue, 2011). The account becomes a version of social reality as the actors are represented by the ethnographer (Atkinson, 1992).

Wolcott (1999) suggested that researchers should not merely strive to present an “objective” account about a society or setting, its organization, customs and shared beliefs (in the sense of being “detached”). Instead, he advised to attend to what individuals would need to know to be successful as a member of the group—that is, the purpose in providing the account is to present the insider or participant view of the social setting as understood and related by the researcher. Without an identifiable group of people, there would not be an account.

To satisfy the need for context, the researcher may build the account around an event. The description can be linked to particular individuals or activities so that attention is directed at “somebody’s enactment of culture rather than everybody’s enactment of it.” (p. 142). Keeping the focus on particular individuals or events can accomplish that
purpose (Wolcott, 1999). The researcher can add to their explanations through excerpts from informants. If the researcher has not collected lengthy narrative accounts, brief quotations can serve as chapter or section headings so readers are reminded of the translation occurring as the researcher interprets the story (Wolcott, 1999).

In order to conduct my proposed multiple ethnographic case study, access to each school was required, due to the amount of time needed in the field at each location in order to develop a credible account of educational life within each setting. The specific role that I had at each school was that of a participant-observer. Participant-observation utilizes methods that have their roots in traditional ethnographical research. The underlying basis of a participant-observer is that the researcher functions under the belief that “there will be multiple perspectives within any given community” and the focus of the researcher is learning “what those diverse perspectives are and in understanding interplay among them” (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005, p. 13).

Participant observation, or ethnographic fieldwork, forms the foundation of cultural anthropology (Bernard, 1994). It involves entering a social setting and getting close to the people so that they are comfortable enough with the observer's presence so that he or she can observe and record information about their lives (Bernard, 1994). It involves establishing rapport, learning to act so people go about their business as usual, and removing yourself each day so you can consider what has been observed, put it in perspective, and write about it (Bernard, 1994). According to Bernard, a strength of participant observation is that the researcher becomes both the instrument for data collection and data analysis through her or his own experience. One strives for an objective account (i.e., asking whether we have seen what was really there or what we
wanted to see). Objectivity does not mean neutrality; that is, the power of the
documentation is in its objectivity but not in necessarily being neutral (or uninvolved in)
about what is observed (Bernard, 1994). As Bernard notes, it gets the biggest test
when one studies his or her own culture.

The data collection techniques of participant-observation include taking field
notes in a notebook while in the research setting and also conducting informal
conversations and interactions with the study’s participants. The benefits for conducting
ethnography is that it encourages “subjective reporting” (Mack et al., 2005, p. 14); that is,
obtaining a greater grasp of the physical, social, cultural, and economic contexts of the
community; observing the relationships between the people, contexts, ideas, norms, and
events within communal settings; and facilitating familiarity with the cultural or social
group by participating in its daily activities, rituals, and ceremonies. All these benefits
aside, the major drawbacks to conducting research as a participant-observer is the large
commitment of time needed to conduct the research, as well as the challenges the
researcher faces in trying to note all that is observed in the field, and the subjectivity that
can enter into interpreting what is observed (Mack et al., 2005).

Although I played the same role of being a participant-observer, the way I
participated varied greatly at each school. The first school, I spoke English on English
instruction days, and Japanese on Japanese instruction days. At the second school, I was
instructed to only use English with the students. At the third school, I used only Japanese
by request from the principal of the school.

With respect to subjectivity, one possible influence is my social constructivist
worldview. More specifically, social constructivism is a perspective that assumes that
“individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work” (Creswell, 2009, p. 8). Due to this assumption, a social constructivist observer may tailor what she is looking for to focus on the views of the participants, as well as the interactions among individuals. By doing so, it allows the observer to “make sense of (or interpret) the meanings others have about the world” (Creswell, 2009, p. 8) but, at the same time, the researcher must acknowledge that her interpretations are shaped by her own personal, cultural, and historical experiences (Creswell, 2009). In particular, I acknowledge that I attended a dual language school as a high school student, and this previous experience and the value I attach to this type of educational experience may interact in various ways with what I observed in the DLE settings. Although this is always a concern in any study, it can be reduced by careful attention to the conduct of the study (e.g., checking perceptions with participants, weighing of evidence and providing discussion of how various conclusions were reached, considering other possible explanations).

From the notes and data that I was able to record, a description of the phenomena, themes, and overall interpretations was formulated. In the end, this research study depicts the phenomena from the perspectives of being an insider as well as an outsider (Creswell, 2007).

Researching of the phenomenon of DLE in three sites within the United States and Japan provides a preliminary means of including cultural contexts within the study, which has the potential to expand the knowledge gained about the learning of English and Japanese simultaneously among young students. The three case studies showcased in this research study furthermore help to describe how broad the appeal for DLE programs is within the two countries currently. This multi-case study brings together information
from a variety of data sources that include observations, surveys, interviews, and
documents. The variety in schools helps to describe and explain DLE and allows for the
examination of possible patterns that may emerge across multiple settings. This is useful
in identifying common practices across both schools and cultural settings, in a
preliminary way.

Selecting the Study Sites and Participants

The purpose of this study is to describe how DLE programs structure and
implement classroom educational experiences in two languages for young students.
Therefore, when selecting schools for the research, careful consideration was needed in
deciding which schools to include as the “sample selection in qualitative research is
usually (but not always) nonrandom, purposeful, and small” (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). The
schools selected for this research study all met the following criteria: 1) described itself
as DLE program, 2) provided instruction in English and Japanese, and 3) allowed me
entry and the opportunity to study DLE processes within their school and classrooms.

Before beginning my research study, I received approval from the Institutional
Review Board at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. The process included ensuring that
the means of research I would conduct would make certain that the participants of the
study would be protected from any type of harm. Participant protections included
maintaining their privacy as the primary concern and creating notification forms that I
had all participants fill out and sign.

Site selection and gaining entry. Initially, I selected a handful of schools based on
information available online and through consulting Pover’s (2009) reference book,
Guide to International Schools in Japan. This book contained information on 111
different international schools operating in Japan, and it gave me published information that could be used as part of the basis for selecting which schools to include in the study. The process that I used to locate potential schools started with grouping together all the schools that had full day programs with instruction in English and Japanese. This yielded a pool of seven schools that I emailed to schedule appointments in order to express my interest in them for my research study. Of the schools that I emailed, four responded back to me, and I visited each campus in May of 2010. In accordance with traditional Japanese customs, at each school visitation I also brought with me a small gift (a box of cookies) to express my gratitude for allowing me entrance to the school. During one of these school visitations, one of the school’s principal informed me of two additional schools that offered DLE programs that would also fit the requirements to be included into my research study. After acquiring the information on both schools, I was also able to schedule visits to their campuses during the same trip. At the end of my deliberation to select the schools I would include in my research study, I decided on Apple Tree International School (AIS), Creative Hearts International School (CIS), and Starlight Academy (SA). However, due to the unforeseen circumstances that forced me to return to Hawaii from Japan, I was unable to conduct observations at SA. Instead, I contacted and was granted entry to Rose International School (RIS), located in the northwest United States, to continue my research.

The schools selected in no way represent a complete range of international schools in Japan or the United States. They were selected solely based on information available. Based on initial interviews, however, I concluded they were well suited to the goals of the study.
Selecting participants. This research study focused on DLE learning for students between the ages of three and seven years old. The first school I conducted observations at was AIS, which consisted of only two DLE classes. Of these two classes, the head of the school suggested that I observe just one of the classes, since the students in the class I would be omitting had not yet had sufficient time—in her opinion—to settle into their DLE curriculum. The students in the approved class were between the ages of three and five years old, and this represented the youngest set of students within the three schools I included for my research. The second school, CIS, had students between the ages of five and seven years old. The DLE class at CIS consisted of the oldest students that I observed across the three settings. The final school I conducted observations at, RIS, consisted of kindergarten students who were all 5-year-olds.

Data Collection

The data consisted of documents, interviews, direct observations, and participant-observation. To increase the credibility of the study’s findings, I followed Merriam’s (1998) six basic data collection strategies, which include 1) triangulation, 2) member checks, 3) long-term observation, 4) peer examination, 5) participatory or collaborative modes of research, and 6) accounting for possible researcher biases. Triangulation is perhaps the key determinant to verifying the credibility of a case study. It refers to accessing multiple sources of data in order to confirm what participants say and do. One aspect of triangulation is member checking, which refers to the researcher returning to individual participants to check whether their words and actions were accurately recorded and whether the researcher’s interpretation was plausible. This should be done on a continual basis throughout the duration of the study. Long-term observation refers to
spending a significant amount of time observing the same phenomenon in order to increase the credibility that it has been fully observed. This is especially important since classroom instructional processes (e.g., a specific unit of instruction), often take several weeks to unfold. Peer examination refers to having knowledgeable colleagues take a look at the findings as they emerge. Participatory or collaborative modes of research refer to involving the participants of the study until the final writing stages. Finally, concern with possible researcher biases refers to the importance of stating possible assumptions and views prior to the study and taking steps to reduce their possible influence in data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998).

**Ethnographic Approach to Data Collection**

When deciding on the means to best approach the collection of data to describe and understand DLE programs, many points of view were considered. However, after much deliberation, I decided that an ethnographic approach would best suit the goals of my case study research. One of the strengths of case studies is the ability to integrate multiple sources of data to develop a complete picture of life within each case setting. Having identified the nature of the study, Creswell (2007) suggests the next step is gathering pertinent data from areas where the group works and lives. For this study, I concluded that the best course of action would be to conduct observations and interviews within each school environment.

*Interviews.* Interviews are an integral tool for the ethnographic researcher and, therefore, many interviews were conducted as part of the data collection. There are a number of different approaches for conducting interviews. One common type is the informal interview. A major characteristic to an informal interview is the foregoing of
any structured, set interview guide/questions. Instead, informal interviews are conducted in the field without any scheduling and are done so in a manner that would mirror a casual conversation. This casualness is an intentional quality of informal interviews, as it fosters a level of low pressure for the interviewee, as well as helps to build rapport. The informal interviews went hand-in-hand with my role as a participant-observer. Among those I interviewed were staff, teachers, parents, and students. These informal interviews were done either prior to the start of school or at the end of the school day. The goal of these interviews was to capture the interviewee’s views and opinions. The responses that I received were then recorded in my field notebook.

*Document review.* During the course of my research, I was able to obtain various documents that were relevant to the study. These documents included flyers, pamphlets, and other miscellaneous publications that were made available to the general public or provided to me directly from the schools where I conducted my research. There were also other documents that the schools distributed that were included as data. However, these were intended for private use only, and were for teachers, staff, and parents exclusively.

*Observations.* The bulk of my data comes from the daily observations of the class and schools. The strategy that I followed was to utilize the skills of a participant-observer, and by doing so, I would be able to 1) observe people as they engaged in the daily activities, 2) engage in the activities taking place myself, 3) interact socially with people outside the controlled research environment (school area), and 4) identify and develop relationships with participants through interaction on an ongoing basis (Mack et al., 2005). Having observational access to the students from before the start of the day and
then throughout their daily educational experiences provided me with a great way to fully understand what learning experiences the students encounter each and every day.

**Summary of data collection.** By operating as a participant-observer, the primary means of documenting and recording everything I saw and heard was done through keeping a field notebook. Within my notebook, I recorded various notes of my observations to capture information and personal reflections about what occurred during the observation process. I revisited these notes each day to reflect on what I had seen and to focus on questions that might arise and issues that needed further clarification and attention as the field experience was unfolding at each site. Records of the informal interviews that I conducted with the staff, teachers, parents, and students were also kept within the pages of my field notebook.

**Data Analysis**

The following describes the way I analyzed the data for this research. This includes the organization process of coding the data to look for themes and reporting what has emerged from the collected data.

**Organizing the Data**

After collecting the data, I used a multiple-step process to analyze what I had acquired. Preliminary steps included organizing and preparing the data in a manner that enables analysis. This included things such as typing out all the field notes I had recorded in my field notebook. Next was to read through all of the data thoroughly in order to gain a general impression of the data.

**Coding.** At this point, coding the data becomes the primary focus, and in doing so, organizing and labeling segments of the data into different categories based on themes or
descriptions. This step can be accomplished by either hand or computer. An example of coding by hand would be color-coding each segment to designate a specific theme or description. Although hand coding is a successful method, there is a negative aspect that researchers encounter when coding in this manner. This major drawback is the amount of effort and time it takes to complete this step when done by hand. The other coding alternative is to code by computer. Coding software can speed up the process by coding, organizing, and sorting whatever data one inputs into the program. However, like hand coding, there are also drawbacks to computer coding. These drawbacks are 1) the researcher must successfully use the computer software, and 2) the researcher must still go through the data and assign codes for the computer to use before it can produce the output. After some consideration, the method I chose to use was to code manually on the computer. Although as mentioned it did require a great deal of time and was quite labor-intensive, I favored this method because during this process I could visually see and sort the themes by relevance. This facilitates the researcher being able to interact with the data at each step in the analytic process.

Refining categories and themes using the comparative method. After completing the coding, the next part of the data analysis process was to frame how the themes and descriptions would be represented within the study. I had to determine how to interconnect narratives and figures successfully in order to convey my findings appropriately. Linking the data to theoretical propositions about the phenomenon being studied represents one primary goal of qualitative inquiry (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Yin, 1989). The comparative method is often used when conducting multiple case studies (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This represents an inductive process where the data gradually
evolve into some type of theoretical propositions that guide the further analysis of the data. This process involves refining the emergent themes and their properties, developing a conceptual framework for making comparisons between cases, and formulating hypotheses (Merriam, 1988).

*Constructing the narrative and comparing DLE across sites.* The final step, then, was to include my interpretation of the data in a way that allowed the meanings I felt most imperative to be expressed through constructing a narrative. This allowed room for further discussion and theoretically-based questions to be raised. In the end, a rich description of each case was depicted and themes emerged from the cross-case analysis of the schools.
CHAPTER 4. DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOLS

Chapter 4 presents a description of the three dual language schools where the study was conducted. This chapter is organized by school, which is organized into three main sections, with each section describing a different school setting in detail. Within each separate case, descriptive information about the school is presented in the following subsections: mission and purpose, structure, environment, teacher profile, student profile, and a typical day at the school. I have chosen these subsections as a way to give a complete overview of each school, beginning with an idea of where their core values lie, then expanding to how their day-to-day activities are shaped through the given circumstances. Table 4.1 shows a quick glance of the following three schools described below. Throughout the chapter, it is important to take note of the age of the students in each setting, opportunities for educational output, the integration of culture within students’ educational experiences, and how the schools separated the languages, as these were identified subsequently as factors that play a key role in the implementation of dual language education during students’ formative years of schooling.

Apple Tree International School (AIS)

Apple Tree International School (AIS) provides an early, partial DLE program for children 2.5 years old and above. I was a participant-observer at AIS from September 2010 to December 2010. During that period, I spent over 250 hours in the classroom collecting data about daily school life. AIS is located in an upper-class residential area of Japan. The annual tuition at AIS is above $26,000. Therefore, only children whose families can afford to send their child, or have parents that work for companies that are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIS</th>
<th>CIS</th>
<th>RIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>3-year-old and 4-year-old students</td>
<td>5-year-old to 7-year-old students</td>
<td>5-year-old students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 English home language</td>
<td>8 Japanese home language</td>
<td>6 English home language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Japanese home language</td>
<td>5 Korean home language</td>
<td>2 Japanese home language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Mandarin home language</td>
<td>2 Russian home language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cantonese home language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical</strong></td>
<td>Theme-based approach following the play-based Reggio Emilia method</td>
<td>Theme-based approach using group and individual projects</td>
<td>Curriculum based on national and state standards and delivered through six inquiry units using the Primary Years Program of the IB curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings</td>
<td>Physical education, music, and art conducted in English</td>
<td>Physical education, music, and art conducted in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday afternoon</td>
<td>Language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies conducted in English and Japanese</td>
<td>Language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies conducted in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The English teacher and the Japanese teacher are both in the classroom at all times.</td>
<td>The English teacher and the Japanese teacher are both in the classroom at all times.</td>
<td>The Japanese teacher is in the classroom at all times. Students had other classes in English in a different room with a different teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student learning needs were determined through observations and one-on-one oral and written tests.</td>
<td>Student learning needs were determined by their social and academic performance.</td>
<td>Student learning needs were determined through observations and academic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>Elite, private school located in Japan.</td>
<td>Elite, private school located in Japan.</td>
<td>Elite, private school located in the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-way DLE program</td>
<td>One-way DLE program</td>
<td>One-way DLE program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are provided with a computer with internet access.</td>
<td>Teachers are provided with a computer with internet access as well as an interactive SMART board.</td>
<td>Teachers are provided with a computer with internet access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
willing to pay for their child’s tuition, can attend the school. Like the other teachers in the classroom, I played a bilingual role of being able to speak English and Japanese. This decision was made by the director of the school, who believed that keeping with the currently used format would help the students in the class adjust well to an outsider.

**Mission and Purpose**

The AIS handbook given to parents states that the school’s goal is to strive for its students to be well-rounded global citizens who respect diversity. In addition to this goal, educators are committed to the objective that students in the DLE program will embrace two or more languages, which will provide an advantage to them in communicating in their future. The school’s director believed that children learn through exploration and hands-on experiences, and have therefore created a play-based learning environment for this to occur.

**Structure**

AIS delivers its DLE program through a content-based instructional approach organized around learning projects. The teachers in the classroom determine the themes and the students generate their own learning projects. In addition to this content-based instructional approach, which includes the concept of theme-based instruction, the school is committed to Reggio Emilia’s play-based learning system. The school’s handbooks make references to research about the advantages of bilingualism as summarized by Baker (2003), which includes the value of starting bilingual instruction early, focuses on students acquiring the ability to transfer knowledge in one language to another, and emphasizes monitoring the progress and levels of bilingualism. The handbook also cites Johnson and Swain (1997) and the core features of an immersion program. These
research references become foundations for how the dual language program unfolds within the classroom. AIS personnel believe that one key to a successful DLE program is establishing clear boundaries for the students. The use of each language during the school week is divided by days. More specifically, instruction on Monday and Wednesday is conducted only in English, instruction on Tuesday and Thursday instruction is conducted only in Japanese and, on Friday, half the instructional day is conducted in English and the other half in Japanese.

**Environment**

The classroom was split into four learning stations: 1) dramatic play, 2) table work, 3) circle time in the main floor area, and 4) library (Figure 4.1). The dramatic play area changed from a Western theme to an Eastern theme depending on the language of

*Figure 4.1. Physical layout of the AIS classroom.*
the day being used. The books in the library also change to reflected the language of the day. The students’ cubby labels were also changed accordingly as well. On English days, their names were written in English, and on Japanese days, their names were instead written in Japanese. The entrance to the classroom was also tied in with the language of the day. When it was a Japanese day, the teachers placed a Japanese shop curtain outside the entrance to the classroom to designate the language being used for that day.

**Teacher Profile**

There were two teachers and one assistant teacher in the classroom. The two teachers took turns teaching the class. One primarily instructed in English and the other in Japanese. On Mondays and Wednesdays, the English lead teacher used only English to teach the children. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, the Japanese lead teacher only used Japanese to teach the children. On Friday, the morning was spent with the English teacher taking the lead. Then there was a switch done before lunch, where the students would spend the rest of the day using Japanese with the Japanese teacher as the lead teacher. The two teachers, including the assistant teacher, were bilingual in English and Japanese and stayed for the entire duration of the class and spoke the language appropriate to the time and day.

**Student Profile**

As shown in Table 4.2, the 3-year-old to 5-year-old students consisted of English-dominant children, Japanese-dominant children, and English-Japanese bilingual children. From my observations during the course of my stay at AIS, out of the fifteen students in the classroom, there were eight English-dominant children, one Japanese-dominant child, six children that were fundamentally bilingual. This was based on their use and
confidence when using English and Japanese, as well as their frequency in using the languages. In addition to learning English and Japanese, there were students in the class who were also exposed to, or were learning, a third language. These languages included Spanish, Swedish, Chinese, and Hindu. Conversations before and after school with the parents of these students confirmed their children had a strong command of their home language and were able to make daily conversations and express their needs and wants. For some of the students, this was the first year in a DLE classroom. For others, this was the second and final year in the DLE program before switching to another school to continue their education.

Table 4.2

Description of Students in the AIS Classroom Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA/India</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Canada/Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazuki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naoko</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japan/Sweden</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keisuke</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoru</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L1 = First language

Typical Day at AIS

Every morning the teachers prepared learning activities for the students. The activities varied from day to day and included things such as working with play dough,
Lego, puzzles, board games, dry erase marker tracing sheets, beads, listening centers, free art, painting, origami (folding paper), building blocks, counting blocks, and pattern blocks. When students arrived, they were supposed to change into their indoor shoes, choose a job for the day, and then sign their name on a designated paper. Once all that was completed, they were then free to explore the different areas of the room, as well as begin any of the activities the teachers had chosen for them. Children had a clip with their English and Japanese names written on it and were instructed to take the clip to the area they wanted to explore. The students worked at their own individual pace and decided when they wanted to finish one activity and move on to the next activity that caught their interest. Conversations between the students were in the language they felt most comfortable speaking; therefore, children often played with those classmates who shared their same L1. When the children spoke to their classmates that they knew did not understand their L1, they would do their best to use their L2 to converse with those peer. These remarks usually consisted of one word commands and responses.

When it was clean up time, the class was notified by two students who had chosen to be the clean-up leaders for that day. The student clean-up leaders rang the bell to indicate to the other students that they had five more minutes to play. When those five minutes passed, they rang the bell again to signal the start of clean up. Students moved about the classroom cleaning the toys and materials they had used. The teachers thanked students they saw helping and encouraged other students who were not as motivated to help clean the classroom by putting away activities that were used.

After clean-up time, students gathered in a circle to sing their morning song. This group song was led by the daily song leaders, two students who chose that role for that
given day. These two students joined the teacher up in the front of the classroom in the main floor area and picked a “good morning” song to sing. Next, two calendar leaders, another role that two children could pick at the beginning of the day, went to the front to go over the calendar with the class. The teacher went through the “days of the week” song with the students. The lyrics of the song changed from English to Japanese, depending on the language of the day. Simultaneously with the song, the leader pointed along the classroom calendar as the class counted the days. Then one of the students who volunteered to be at the head of the class announced to the rest of his or her classmates the month, the day, and finally the day of the week. The teacher then held up different pictures of weather. The pictures depicted sunny, cloudy, rainy, and snowy days just to name a few. The other student who was up front chose the appropriate card and announced to the class what the weather was for that day.

After circle time, the teacher discussed with the students what activities they were going to do that day. She talked about what they had been working on and reviewed anything else that they had learned about previously. The teacher then engaged the students to discuss collectively what they needed to do next for their special-themed activity.

Once they were finished doing that activity, the students got ready for snack time. The students’ snack consisted of things such as carrots, bananas, or rice crackers. The carrots and bananas were cut and prepared by the teacher’s assistant every morning. Similarly to the day of the week song, students sang a snack song in the language of the day before eating their snack.
After they finished, it was time for them to get some exercise to help develop their gross motor skills. The class would either go outside to a nearby park or one of the two indoor school gyms to play. Usually if the weather was nice, the teachers would take the children out to the park to play. On occasions, the teachers would take the class for a long walk around the neighborhood to explore their environment.

When the students returned to their class, it was time for them to get ready for lunch. Each student brought lunch from home. However, there was also a food delivery service for parents who were too busy to make lunch for their child. Again, they sung a lunch time song in the language of day before eating their meal. When the students finished eating, they were free to draw pictures or read books in the classroom library.

After lunch, the children got ready for quiet time. The older students stayed in the class, while the younger students went next door to the other classroom for quiet time. The class next door did the same and sent the older students over to join the other students. The reason for this was because the older students typically did not need to nap as long and, therefore, they were given the opportunity to participate in a learning activity after quiet time. The younger students did not have time for a learning activity after their quiet time, due to their extended nap period; however; if a student did not nap, she or he was free to read a book.

The older students’ afternoon learning activity consisted of language arts based assignments where they would work on familiarizing themselves with English and Japanese letters and words. For example, during English language arts time, they would sing phonics songs about alphabets and work on writing letters in their workbook. For the
Japanese language arts time, they would play with *hiragana* (one type of alphabet in Japanese) and *katakana* (another type of alphabet in Japanese) stamps.

When the younger students woke from their nap next door, they would then come back and join the class for the good-bye circle time. This good-bye circle time consisted of activities such as students’ show and tell, or the teacher reading a story to the students. After they sung the good-bye song, it was time for them to go home. Parents came to the classroom, and the teachers would call individual students to the door to meet the person picking them up from school. For some, it was their parent, while for others it was their nanny. They would sign a sheet to record that they picked up the student. During this time, a white board with students’ name and their naptime length was written, so that the person picking up the student would know if they were well rested or not. Small talk was done between the parents or nanny to let them know how the day went for the student.

**Creative Hearts International School (CIS)**

Creative Hearts International School (CIS) serves children from preschool through tenth grade. This consists of students as young as three, all the way up to fifteen. This school uses a team-taught approach, with one teacher who uses only English and another teacher who uses only Japanese. This idea is based on the one teacher, one language approach. It is also a multiage classroom that uses a thematic-based learning approach where students would work on one over-arching topic to teach project-based activities. CIS’ multiage approach is to have all preschool age children together in one class. More specifically, kindergarteners to second graders are grouped in one class, third to fifth graders are in one class, sixth to eighth graders are in one class, and eighth to tenth graders are in one class. Although there are some overlaps in ages, the classrooms
are structured so that students of three different ages are grouped into one class. After a discussion with the head of school, it was decided that I would only speak English while on the premises in order to stick with the school’s policy, as well as to give students an additional opportunity to use the English language.

I was a participant-observer at CIS from January 2011 to March 2011. During that period, I spent nearly 150 hours in the classroom collecting data about daily classroom life. CIS is located in a commercial and entertainment district of Japan. The annual tuition is over $23,000; therefore, students who attend CIS come from families that can afford to send their child there, or from families whose company pays their child’s tuition.

Mission and Purpose

The handbook provided to parents states that CIS strives to create an environment free from discrimination based on race, sex, or place of origin. The personnel believe that every child can become bilingual over time and support students’ academic and social skills in English and Japanese. This is why CIS provides a multiage classroom environment where students can learn without the rigidity of a fixed age-grade system.

Structure

CIS delivers its instructional program through a developmentally-based multiage classroom environment that is conducted simultaneously in English and Japanese. The school structure is based on the director of the school’s experience that follows the belief that the monolingual, age-grade, fixed curriculum is out of sync with the post-industrial age in which we currently live, as well as research done by Stone (2004), which shows the benefits to a multiage classroom. Teachers use a thematic-based approach using the Scottish curriculum, which includes a combination of whole group, individual, a center-
based approach where small groups of students work together independently from a teacher, and project-based activities. The Scottish curriculum recognizes that learning is life-long, and it aims to help every learner develop the needed knowledge necessary for life and work based on four capacities: to be a successful learner, a confident individual, a responsible citizen, and an effective contributor. The teachers at RIS incorporated these ideas when planning their lessons.

**Environment**

The classroom had five main learning areas: 1) the floor, 2) the tables, 3) dramatic play area, 4) science tables, and 5) the classroom library (see Figure 4.2). In addition to those areas, there was an English table as well as a Japanese table where each teacher could meet with small groups. Classroom labels were both in English and Japanese. The library consisted of both English and Japanese books that were displayed every day. The classroom was equipped with computers and an interactive SMART Board that the students used on a daily basis. The classroom layout in Figure 4.2 emphasizes that the right half of the room was for English language learning, while the left half of the room was for Japanese language learning.

**Teacher Profile**

Throughout the day, there were always two teachers in the classroom. The school operated on a one-teacher-one-language system. Therefore, one teacher used only English, and the other teacher used only Japanese. The classroom was team-taught, and the teachers discussed beforehand who would teach what and when. Both teachers were bilingual in English and Japanese, but refrained from speaking the language they were
not responsible for in the classroom. The school did its best to keep students with the same teacher for three years.

**Student Profile**

This multiage class consisted of 5-year-old to 7-year-old students (see Table 4.3). There were sixteen students, of which three students received Japanese as an Additional Language (JAL) support, two students received English as an Additional Language (EAL) support, and three students received both JAL and EAL support. These were supplementary instructional supports outside the general education that the students received to build the necessary language skills needed to participate in whole group instruction. In addition to learning to speak English and Japanese at school, some
students spoke a different home language. Those languages included Korean, Russian, and Chinese. From the table, it is evident that there were no students whose native language was English. This type of classroom closely resembled the one-way DLE classroom where there is no representation of English native language speakers. The students’ main language was Japanese. However, the students at CIS had a variety of different cultural background, which was shown in the informal language exchange between the students. Lisa shared Russian stories, and Yue shared Chinese traditions informally to their classmates.

Table 4.3

Description of Students in the CIS Classroom Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyegyong</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayato</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinhwan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>United Kingdom/Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangwoo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryoma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaewoo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masato</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L1 = First Language.

**Typical Day at CIS**

Students arrived and changed into their indoor shoes at the door before heading into the classroom to turn in their communication book and homework. Once they turned
in their homework, they put their snack and lunch in the appropriate baskets. After they did that, they sat on the floor rug and waited for the teacher to start the class.

Once most of the students arrived and settled onto the rug, the teacher began class. Sometimes the teacher started the day by reading a book. Other times, the teacher would just share a story with the students. When the teacher finished, two student leaders went to the front of the room to announce the beginning of their morning meeting. Morning meeting was held sometimes in English and sometimes Japanese, depending on what the teachers decided that day. In morning meeting, they went over the date, weather, temperature, how many days they have been in school, and finally the schedule for the day.

After the meeting, students were then given a water and bathroom break and then returned for Japanese language arts on the floor rug. The leaders for the week led the class in singing the hiragana song that helped the students remember the sound as well as the order. When they finished this routine, the teacher initiated the Japanese language arts for the day. Typically, the class did a whole group lesson first. Afterward, the class split to go to learning centers to complete tasks. Students knew that when they were studying Japanese, they could do any of the Japanese centers and activities when they were done with the task for the day. They would do their best to use Japanese while completing the activities. The same held true when they did English language arts. The teacher would remind the students to use English. It was during these times that the teachers would call a small group of students over to work with them on tasks that were appropriate to their learning level at their respective tables.
Student leaders stood in front of the classroom and had the responsibility to lead the class in singing the snack time song. Then the students enjoyed their snack and were free to play in the classroom when they were done. Some students played with Legos, while others played with ramps and marbles. Some students played in the dramatic play area, while others were in the library reading. There were even some students who chose to do language-related games at the tables with their classmates. Japanese was the dominant language during recess, although there were a group of students that would use Korean. Even those students whose L1 was not Korean would take part in the group of students’ speaking Korean. The Korean-speaking students enjoyed teaching words and phrases to their classmates.

After recess, they worked on environmental studies. During this time, the students explored thematic ideas with the teacher’s guidance. At one point their theme was outer space; at another point it was learning about folk tales. Typical social studies and science topics were covered during this time. This was also when JAL or EAL students were pulled to a learning area in the back of the classroom to receive their extra support. When their thirty-minute session was over, they again joined the rest of the students.

Lunch time was next for the students. The students brought lunch to school, and on occasions parents were able to order lunch for their children. Students were free to sit wherever they wished to sit in the classroom to have their lunch. They were free to chat in any language they wished to use. The dominant language was Japanese during lunch. Sometimes they sat by other students who shared the same L1, and sometimes they sat with peers of the same gender. In other occasions they would sit with other classmates that were at the same developmental level. Students often teased each other using both
English and Japanese, and the teachers redirected the students to apologize and work out their issues between themselves.

After lunch, students had special activities. On Mondays, they had P.E., music or Chinese, and math. On Tuesdays they had math, music, and park time. On Wednesdays, in addition to Taekwondo in the morning, they had buddy reading time with an older class, art or Chinese, and math. On Thursdays they had math, P.E., and library time. On Fridays they had park time, art, and heritage time. Music, P.E., and art classes were held in English in a different location at the school.

When it was time for the students to go home, they sung a song to say good-bye. While the students were waiting in the classroom for their parent to pick them up, an older student often read a book to the class. About half the class had their parent come and pick them up from the classroom. Teachers would inform parents of any announcements they had for future activities. Two students walked home on their own after school. The other students were then taken to the school bus stop where they would board the bus that would take them home.

Rose International School (RIS)

I was a participant-observer at Rose International School (RIS) from April 2011 to May 2011 in a kindergarten classroom where they all started the school year at age five. However, it is important to point out that the research occurred when all students were 6-years-old. During that period, I spent over 150 hours in the classroom collecting data about daily educational life in this classroom while also noting activities that surrounded the classroom. RIS, which educated students from preschool to fifth grade, is located on the West Coast of mainland United States. Annual tuition is $13,000, which is below the
national average for private schools. The head of the school had me use only Japanese, so the students would have an additional opportunity to use Japanese.

**Mission and Purpose**

The RIS informational pamphlet states RIS strives to inspire its students to become global citizens through a comprehensive education program in a multilingual and multicultural environment. The educators believe that learning a second language at a young age truly enhances a child’s mental development, cognitive skills, and critical thinking.

**Structure**

In a discussion with the teachers at RIS, they clarified that RIS delivers its program through the International Baccalaureate’s Primary Years Programme (PYP). Through PYP (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2007), the students come up with questions about the topic that they would like to investigate further. This includes researching, experimenting, and problem solving in order to get the answer they are looking for. Students learn through strategic thinking and hands-on learning instead of the traditional passive education style.

Traditionally the school only accepts students ages three, four, or five. However, in a discussion with the teachers, they shared that as long as the new incoming student had a command of the Japanese language, they would accept the student in any grade level. One of the school’s operating principles is that there is ample exposure to the English language in and out of school, and that fluency in English is not a requirement for students who enter in the middle of their elementary schooling because of their potential ease in picking up the languages. These teachers have personally seen how these
students quickly acquire English language skills and become a part of the mainstream classroom within their first year.

The classroom that I mainly observed was the kindergarten classroom. However, I also spent time observing the two classes below these students, the 3-year-old class and the 4-year-old class, as well as the classroom above this class, the first grade classroom. Normally, the school would continue to have separate classes for each grade. But due to the small number of students enrolled in the second through fifth grade, they combined the second and third grade classes, and they also combined the fourth and fifth grade classes. I also spent a week in each class to understand the role kindergarten played in the school.

Environment

The classroom at RIS housed the eight students perfectly; there was just enough cubby space, and just enough tables and chairs for the students to be accommodated comfortably. The PYP learner profiles were posted in Japanese as well as the other labels in the homeroom classroom. Since this classroom was designated a classroom where Japanese would be used, there were only Japanese books in the classroom library that students could pick and read on their free time. English books were only available to the students when they visited the school library. The large table was used as the main area for group desk work, while the floor area was used for group activities on the floor, which including morning circle and lessons (see Figure 4.3). Educational toys such as building blocks, counters, and activities to enhance fine motor skills were kept on the shelves, and students were free to explore them quietly when they were done with the
given assignment. Students would also use the floor or the two available tables to draw pictures or write notes to each other.

**Teacher Profile**

The homeroom teacher was a native Japanese speaker. The teacher spoke and understood English but only used Japanese with the students. The homeroom teacher was responsible for Japanese language arts, math, social studies, and science. The students had a separate native English-speaking teacher for each of the following subjects: art, music, and physical education.

**Student Profile**

As shown in Table 4.4, the class consisted of eight students. These students all started the program at the age of five. However, at the time of observation the students were six-years-old. Out of the eight students, two had a parent who spoke Japanese as their first language. And although they had a parent who spoke Japanese, each child’s dominant language was English. The other six students do not have parents that speak
Japanese at home. Therefore, their exposure to Japanese was limited to the time they spent at school.

Table 4.4

*Description of Students in the RIS Classroom Observed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuuto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koki</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L1 = First Language

**Typical Day at RIS**

Students arrived and settled in by turning in their homework, putting their lunch into their cubbies, and hanging their bag. Once they were settled, they grabbed their calendar to do calendar work with the teacher or volunteer. After that, they went immediately to work on review worksheets. Usually, this consisted of one page, front and back, of the hiragana they learned the previous day. The students were capable of finishing this worksheet on their own. When they finished the worksheet, they read it to their teacher to get approved to move on to the next task. The next task consisted of writing the hiragana they had learned onto practice sheets of paper. Again, it was a task they were able to complete on their own without the teacher’s help. The teacher dismissed them to play quietly in the classroom until all students had completed their morning work. Students played with blocks, toys, drew on paper, and even read books from the classroom library.
Once everyone in the class finished the morning task, the students lined up to go use the bathroom. When they returned, they sat in a circle for morning meeting. In morning meeting, the students went over the date, how many days they have been in school, weather, and jobs for the day. The teacher then went over the day’s schedule. She asked the students questions about the previous day or weekend and used lots of gestures for the students to understand.

Then the students had mathematics with their homeroom teacher in Japanese. Each day the teacher prepared some activity for the students to do in order for them to learn their number concepts. These activities involved lots of hands-on learning activities. The teacher used lots of hand gestures, so that the students would understand her and the concepts being taught. After math, it was time for them to wash their hands and get ready for snack time.

At snack time, the student leader led them in singing a snack song, so that they could begin eating. The school provided the students with snacks. A typical snack consisted of a banana, crackers, or chips. When they were done eating, they lined up to go outside to play.

When they returned to the classroom, it was time for Japanese language arts. The students learned a new hiragana each day. They learned how to read it, write it, and words that include the new hiragana. If students finished their work, they were free to read a book quietly from the library.

For lunch time, the students brought a packed lunch from home. Parents also had the option of ordering from the daily delivery services offered. In the afternoon, the students went out to recess and returned for a quiet time where they lay down or read a
book. After a quiet rest, they had their inquiry time, where they followed the PYP guidelines. Students were asked what they knew about a topic and what they wanted to learn about that topic. The teacher prepared materials and activities around what the students were interested in learning. Each unit would run for two to three months depending on what the topic included. In addition to PYP, students had music in English on Mondays, P.E. in English on Tuesdays, art in English on Thursdays, and library time on Fridays.

The day ended with circle time where they discussed what they learned and how the day went for them. They sung a greeting song and were then dismissed. Some students stayed for afternoon snack, while others took the snack with them when their parents came to pick them up. The teacher would inform parents about how their child’s day was at school and any announcements they needed the parents to know. For those parents that did not come to pick up their child after school care was available. The teacher would walk those students to the school gym where they would wait with the other students.

**Summary**

This chapter presented a description of learning in each school setting, organized around the school’s mission and purpose, structure, environment, teacher profile, student profile, and their typical day at school. These descriptions differed from monolingual schools where students only learn and use one language. In addition, due to the incorporation and usage of two languages, the schools needed to put extra thought into their structure. The differences in the classrooms were also apparent due to the language switch that needed to occur. There needed to be conscious efforts on behalf of students
and teachers to conform to the language restrictions surrounding usage in and out of the classroom, as well as maintaining performance in both languages. The descriptions in this chapter also provided information about each school to allow for constructing single-case analysis of dual language learning within each school, as well providing data for a cross-case analysis of the schools. These aspects will be explicated further in subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER 5. INDIVIDUAL CASE RESULTS

In the previous chapter, the schools’ goals and how they structure their program to deliver DLE were identified. The schools’ environment, teacher, and student profiles were also described to provide a view of each school setting. Then a typical day was constructed from my collective observations in each classroom to provide a description of what students’ educational experiences would look in each school. In this chapter, data from my field notes compiled from each of the three schools were analyzed to illuminate ways in which each of these DLE programs connected environment (e.g., school and parent factors), culture, language, and educational pedagogy to provide students’ daily educational experiences. I describe and examine educational experiences within each school setting along several dimensions that emerged from the field notes including the environment, curriculum, teaching practices, students, and parents.

The research purpose of these three individual cases can best be described as descriptive, in that each focuses on providing a description of the manner in which dual language education unfolded daily for the students as I observed their educational experiences over time within their classrooms. Each constructed case resulted from spending nearly 600 hours in classrooms observing teachers, students, and parents engaged in their routine work. These types of observations provide important indications of how dual language objectives were implemented in a day-to-day manner in different school settings. They result from the empirical process of sense making about what participants do and what they say they do (Everhart, 1982). Observing a variety of events, interactions, and educational activities allows the researcher to perceive how values and
norms are displayed (Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987), in this case regarding how
dual language education values are incorporated into teaching methods. Of course,
putting these various observations together into a holistic view of education in each
setting depends on the researcher’s interpretations and understandings of the subjects’
words and actions (Heck, 2004). Credibility of the data was ensured through three design
features: (1) long-term engagement in the field to overcome possible bias associated with
short-term fieldwork observations; (2) using other colleagues and members of the
dissertation committee to critique the case study analyses, and (3) obtaining feedback
from teachers and others at each of the sites during the data collection process (Corbett et
al., 1987; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Students’ Daily Educational Experiences at AIS

AIS provides a two-way DLE program which enrolled native and non-native
speakers of both languages with a goal of achieving equal representation of both types of
language backgrounds. Therefore, teachers delivered their instruction to fit the learning
needs of both types of students.

AIS Environment

The AIS classroom consisted of 3-year-old to 5-year-old students. The main
classroom building was formerly built and used as a housing structure before the founder
renovated the building to fit the needs of a school. Therefore, the classrooms were a bit
amiss in a sense that bathrooms were not always conveniently located nor were the
classroom doors placed appropriately. At AIS the students had two indoor gym areas.
Both were used frequently to assist in the students’ gross motor skills. In addition, the
students would walk over to a nearby park where they were able to play on swings, slides,
and in a sand box. The park had enough space for the children to run and chase each other. Although, they did not have an official outdoor play area that belonged to the school, they were able to use this nearby park as if it were their own playground.

**Language boundaries.** At AIS, entire days were dedicated to a single language. In other words, on days where the chosen language of the day was English, the teachers would conduct their instructions only in English. The opposite of this is also true, as on days where the language of the day was Japanese, those same teachers spoke only in Japanese instead. When queried about why this approach was taken, teachers explained that instruction was implemented in this manner because it enabled them to be seen as role models for language acquisition, since they could use both languages interchangeably. Another reason provided was so that students could spend the entire day conversing in one language in hopes of reducing confusion.

Due to the very young age of the students, visual and audio language boundaries were clearly marked. These audio and visual cues for a clear language boundary were a necessity to keeping the languages separate. I observed that this type of clear boundary formation appeared to facilitate student learning efficiently, as students were able to concentrate on speaking one language at a time. For example, when students arrived in the morning, they immediately knew what the language would be used during the day by looking at the sign on the classroom door. Teachers wore a culturally-appropriate apron and greeted the students in the appropriate language according to the day’s designation. Although speaking the required language of the day was not forced upon the children, these visual and audio cues encouraged the students to speak the language of the day.
Students who were able to did so with ease, while those who did not received extra assistance from teachers to construct what they wanted to say in the appropriate language.

**Educational continuity.** There was also continuity within the classroom. Unlike some other schools where the children would physically move to Teacher 1’s classroom for English-speaking days, and then Teacher 2’s classroom for Japanese-speaking days, in the AIS setting, students were in the same classroom, with the same teacher, everyday. For young students at such a developmentally significant age, continuity with the teacher and classroom appeared to decrease possible confusion associated with switching classrooms everyday. Although it is true that the lead teacher changed from Teacher 1 to Teacher 2, depending on the language of the day, all adults were in the classroom every day, so each teacher was well aware of any incidents that a child might have had on a previous day. For example, when Kenta had a difficult day, the teachers were able to make adjustments in the activity planned for the next day, and they held different expectations for him when he had a good day. The teachers suggested that they were well cognizant of the progress all students made from day to day, and they could adjust accordingly. Therefore, they were able to respond accordingly to children’s different learning styles, language proficiency levels, and their social emotional needs.

**Safe, supportive educational environment.** AIS also provided an educational environment where students were in a position to feel safe at trying new things. For example, in the gym, one activity consisted of maneuvering through an obstacle course the teachers constructed for the students. For some of the students, it was a new environment where at one juncture they were instructed to hop on one foot, and at another, they tried to kick a ball into a designated box. The teacher first modeled for
students how to complete all the obstacles within the course. Additionally, the teacher also demonstrated for students that it was fine to only be able to hop once or twice or to miss the box when kicking the ball. Each student was encouraged to do his or her best regardless of skill. I observed this was an important point that the teachers tried to get across to their students consistently in different learning situations, both in the gym and in the classroom, because the teachers felt feeling safe to try new things, as well as having repeated opportunities to learn a skill correctly, were important when acquiring new skills. With respect to language learning, more specifically, teachers indicated and expressed in a discussion that students need to know that making a mistake when speaking English or Japanese is all part of the learning process. I observed that students’ personal confidence supported by teachers’ values, attitudes, and daily behavior was displayed on numerous occasions in the classroom environment when students took the initiative to create sentences or use words that did not fully make any sense, but used English and Japanese as best as they could.

AIS Curriculum

AIS was research-oriented in terms of institutional outlook toward the curriculum. Research-oriented meant that the school based its curriculum on past and present research on education and, more specifically, DLE programs. Professional development was a valued part of this orientation. For example, teachers were encouraged to attend conferences on best practices in a DLE classroom and returned to their school to share their ideas with the teachers and staff through special meetings that were held specifically for professional development.
**Theme-based curriculum.** The curriculum at AIS was a theme-based approach following the play-based Reggio Emilia method. Theme-based in this regard meant that there was an overarching idea that resonated throughout the duration of the exploration. In this class, I specifically observed their learning theme on houses. The program followed the National Association for the Education of Young Children’s (2012) guidelines that are based in Washington, USA. These guidelines were supplemented by second language development guidelines for English and Japanese. Although the school had these guiding principles underlying its instructional approach, I did not observe high levels of continuity between individual classes and grade levels. More specifically, each class had different activities and projects from those educational experiences of other students in the school. Classes individually selected the theme for their classroom, which would then last a few weeks. Therefore, the students had an opportunity to learn the concept on English days as well as Japanese days. I concluded that discretion about classroom activities was left to the teacher teams. Incorporation of themes into the classroom curriculum allowed students an easy way to relate and find interest in learning. Students’ comprehension of the learning themes was aided by the teachers using ample pictures and gestures.

**Output opportunities.** Even fun activities were also incorporated into the curriculum. Students had an opportunity for a show and tell presentation once a month, which consisted of sharing an item brought to school with their class. This sounds like a simple activity, yet there were many parts to the presentation. Classmates first had the opportunity to guess what their classmate brought to class. Then the presenter would give hints about the item in questions to help his or her classmate make the correct guess.
Once the item was guessed correctly, the presenter would share the item. After each presentation, the floor was open for any questions about the item. The students were always excited to ask their classmates about their items.

Another activity that was part of the AIS curriculum was their monthly visits to a nearby senior citizen care home. Students were able to interact and share stories with senior citizens in Japanese. Students would also sing Japanese songs, create crafts, or even take a walk through the park with the senior citizens. They enjoyed the time spent, and were always prepared with pictures and stories to share with the senior citizens for their next visit. This was a fun activity where the students had the opportunity to use Japanese and interact with older people who genuinely looked forward to their arrival.

**Cultural emphasis.** Culture played a major role in the AIS classroom. This was most clearly seen when the class celebrated American and Japanese holidays. On each occasion, the teacher would explain to the students the holiday and the meaning behind their celebration. Teachers also incorporated foods, clothing, and other cultural aspects of the holiday along with sharing stories with the students. For example, the Japanese moon festival was a special occasion that had significant cultural opportunities. Students learned the history behind the moon festival, learned about the moon cycles, and even made dango, which are small rice cake balls to signify the moon. This was also in addition to the American holiday, Halloween, which also found its way into the classroom. The students got to wear a costume, take pictures, have Halloween-inspired snacks, and join the school costume parade. Both of these holidays allowed the teachers to incorporate cultural ideas and values into their lessons, while at the same time being a fun medium for learning.
Evaluation. The students were evaluated through anecdotal records, which the English teacher and Japanese teacher wrote based on student observation and performance. The students were not graded, but instead the assessment noted whether they achieved certain milestones set by the school. The milestones tracker differed from whether the language was the child’s native language or target language. Specifically, there were three stages of learning (language acquisition?) that students worked to achieve. A few one-on-one tasks were completed with the students to record their progress. These were then shared with the students’ parents, as well as kept on file as part of their permanent record. The evaluations were also sent out as part of students’ application for their next school of choice.

AIS Teaching

Primary focus on holistic education. First and foremost, the classroom was a DLE classroom. However, given the age of the students, three to five years old, the teachers were well aware that the classroom was not merely about having the students learn the English and Japanese languages. In fact, the teachers’ primary objective was to educate the child holistically. The child’s social emotional, self-help, cognitive, fine motor, and gross motor skills were emphasized over language acquisition. This did not mean, however, that they disregarded the English and Japanese language skills. Instead, the teachers at AIS made it a point to respect students’ developmental need to go through the “silent period.” The silent period is the stage that children who are in the process of acquiring a second language go through, where they refrain from speaking the L2, because they are in the process of learning the language through actively listening and processing what is being said around them in an attempt to better comprehend the L2.
This was clearly apparent when English dominant students such as Sonia would converse on numerous occasions during English days, and on Japanese days she would be actively listening and observing rather than taking part in the group discussions. The same held true for Kenji who participated and communicated well on Japanese days, but would be quiet on English days because Japanese is his dominant language. I observed that the teachers did not force their students to speak their L2 when they concluded the students were not ready developmentally. Teachers knowing the individual students well played a big role in their decisions as to which children were ready. In this supportive environment, the children naturally gained language ability through classroom activities, interacting with classmates, and their learning environment.

**Role models.** The students also had multiple role models within the school setting. In the classroom, three adults who were bilingual in English and Japanese surrounded the students on a daily basis. The students saw these adults speak one language on one day, and a different language the next. Through their daily activities, students also witnessed the other teachers and staff members who were also bilingual as well. I concluded that having bilingual teachers and staff members was one way that the school ensured quality in having a teaching staff that had high levels of fluency in each language. Parents also played an influential role, as they also portrayed the bilingual role model for the students. They would use the language of the day to communicate with the teachers during drop off and pick up from the classroom. In this environment where students consistently listened to these role models using multiple languages, it was easy to see how it would help foster the will and motivation for students to develop their own bilingual language abilities. Keisuke’s parent further explained in the parental survey that having two lead
teachers to facilitate the program helped in having him understand that although one
teacher took the lead on English days, that same teacher was able to speak in Japanese as
well.

**Instruction emphasized student choice.** Another noteworthy classroom
observation was the amount of choice and freedom the students were allowed in the
classroom. The first thing on the students’ daily agenda consisted of arriving to school
every morning, changing into their indoor shoes, choosing what jobs they wanted to have
for the day, and finally signing in their attendance. Once this was all taken care of, they
were then free to explore the different areas of the room, as well as take a look at the
various activities that the teacher had chosen to put out on the table for them. However,
there was room for flexibility. If by some circumstance a child should forget to choose a
job for that day, or sign in once he or she arrived, the child was still free to do so during
the morning activity time. Furthermore, if there were activities on the shelf that the
teacher had not put out intentionally, but if the child, after taking notice of them, wanted
to explore their potential, he or she was welcome to do so. For example, Samantha and
Keisuke enjoyed playing with number tiles. However, even if the teacher did not
intentionally put it out for the students, they would pull it off from the shelf to play with
it themselves. Also, if a child showed an interest in wanting to create something, he or
she only needed to approach the teacher with the idea, and the teacher then did her best to
courage the student’s imagination.

In addition to the free choice and freedom students were provided regarding
choosing their activities, they were also free to use whatever language they felt most
comfortable using when talking to their classmates and teachers. In other words, if a
teacher spoke to the child in Japanese, but the child’s only language was English, the student was free to respond in English. The teachers did their best to communicate and facilitate comprehension of their words through situation, gestures, and repetition. One example was that teachers might use a shopping situation as a means to get the students to interact and to increase their understanding. They would sing a song about people going to the store to buy bread. The song involved the teacher being the bread shop and having the students as customers. The students were to ask for the bread being sold. While singing the song, the teacher used lots of gestures and repetition, which facilitated students being able to anticipate and understand the task and song. I observed that during classroom activities, bilingual children were not required to speak in English on English days and vice versa. They were given the same freedom to choose their language of choice to speak.

Another conclusion I came to hold was that through the use of repetition of songs or storybooks, the children gradually learned English and Japanese over time. Initially, the students would not know the meaning of a new song that the teacher introduced to them. However, after a few days, the students would sing along with the teacher, and with the help of the gestures and intended props, the students actually came to understand the meanings of the words they were singing. This was possible because the teacher would sing the same songs over and over with the students, so they would memorize the lyrics. The same storybooks were also read numerously, so the students were able to recite the words while the teacher read the book. One example was observing an English-dominant student mimic the teacher’s reading of a Japanese book with Japanese-like intonations and mumbles which had no real meaning. She was able to replicate the
intonations, and mumble Japanese like words just as though she was reading the book herself.

**Varied instructional groupings.** The classroom curriculum was based on a theme in which the teachers gathered ideas from each student in the class regarding what their next project would be to ensure everyone had an input. The teachers would introduce the ideas to the whole group using pictures and gestures to help the students understand the theme and project. The project was then executed through individual and small group activities. Teachers worked with the individual students who needed extra help in completing tasks. A close observation of the students and their work was done to discover what their interests were, and to build upon those interests for the next activity. Pictures were constantly taken to document student progress and accomplishments throughout the process. The project would continue for days, and students had the opportunity to work on the project in both languages.

One example project was spending a few weeks organized around the theme of houses. The students were able to explore the theme on both English days and Japanese days, which allowed for them to be exposed to the vocabulary associated with the theme in both languages. Teachers shared books on houses; students learned the different shapes that make up a house; they voted on their favorite type of house; and they even created a house right in their classroom. The students discussed with each other what items were necessary in a house, as well as how they were going to build each item. In the end, it was apparent that the students really enjoyed what they made together. When it was time to take the items home, they all eagerly wanted to win the *jan-ken-po* (i.e., rock, paper, or scissors game) to take home a prized possession that they created in class. Having the
curriculum organized by a theme helped the students make personal connections and gain a more in-depth knowledge of the subject.

**Regular team meetings.** The teachers had an official meeting every Thursday. At these meetings, all three teachers would gather to review and reflect the past week and prepare for the upcoming week. I observed that discussions at these meetings included what was working in the classroom, as well as things that needed to be adjusted to fit the needs of the students. For example, the teachers found that the students were really interested in creating the pool for their classroom house project. The teachers discussed that they would allow more time for the students to create, explore, and play in the classroom pool that they made which filled the main floor area for group work. They also discussed individual student progress. For example, Kenta still had a difficult time adjusting to school, so they came to the consensus that they should use more Japanese, his home language, until he was able to join the rest of the class without disruptions.

**AIS Students**

The class that I observed at AIS taught boys and girls between the ages of three and five years old. Throughout their stay in the class, students remained with the same teacher for two years until they advanced to the next class. The students in the class who had the same teacher for more than one year showed stability within the classroom because they were familiar with the daily routine, and they knew what to expect from the class and teacher. All student-teacher relationships were meaningful and shown through numerous drawings and letters the students would write to their teacher. Samantha would always write a note or make an origami art piece to give to the teachers, and Kaoru would bring flowers she picked on the side of the street for the teachers, too.
**Informal language learning.** Even with the teachers explicitly stating the situation and using gestures, there were still instances where that may not be enough to fully convey to students the meaning of what they were saying. This was observed numerous times when the teachers spoke to one of their students in Japanese, but the child did not understand, even through context or with the aid of gestures. In these situations, it was not rare to find a bilingual classmate translate for the child. These were great opportunities for the students to learn because they were able to learn the word and meaning in a context-embedded situation that facilitated their classmates understanding as the need arose. In one situation, for example, Kaoru asked the teacher, “**Nihongo de, eigo de**” (in Japanese, in English)? The teacher responded, “**Nanndemoiyyo (Whichever).**” Sonia, who was sitting near Kaoru, didn’t understand the question and looked to Kaoru for help. Kaoru then translated the teacher’s response for Sonia, so that she would understand what the teacher said to them. In this way, having a multiage classroom with varying levels of language ability facilitated these valuable opportunities for students to learn from each other. What was even more impressive regarding this type of informal learning situations was when the situation found an English-dominant child translating from Japanese to English for another English-dominant classmate. Although a level of fluency in Japanese had not been attained yet, the child still had a general grasp and understanding of what was being said in Japanese and, therefore, was able to help English-dominant classmates when they were having trouble understanding the question or learning situation.

In this particular classroom, it was interesting to see how on English language days the children were very talkative and energetic, whereas on Japanese language days,
the children were quiet and reserved. This may have been because the natural culture of the Japanese language brings a more reserved nature to the classroom. It may have also been because for the majority of students, Japanese was not their stronger language. Therefore, the students turned to the utilizing an attentive, passive listening mode where they actively tried to decode what was being said to understand what was happening. Through this observation, the students were shown to be capable differentiating the languages, and they clearly identified one language from the other.

Learning situations emphasized student social exchange. Students in this two-way DLE program had many opportunities for informal exposures to L2 structures through interacting with their classmates. From the classroom observations, I came to understand that the children at this age were naturally very social, and learning from their peers was just as important as learning from the teacher. At AIS, the classroom environment facilitated students learning from their peers. This was often done through mimicking. Children are said to acquire behavior through observing and subsequently mimicking of that behavior. Students were often seen repeating after one another in an attempt to better comprehend and pronounce the L2 words that were being used by their classmates. One illustration was during story time. Kenta said, “Mienai (I can’t see).” Keisuke followed with, “Mienai,” during story time, as they were both unable to see the pictures clearly. Keisuke’s dominant language was English, so mimicking his classmate to say that he could not see the picture book was one way he learned through listening to his peers.

Students’ initiative. It was also interesting to hear a Japanese-dominant child sing English songs, or when an English-dominant child requested to sing a Japanese song
during group activities. Even though they did not particularly know the language fluently, they still had interest in singing songs and saying the words they knew in the song. This showed initiative and personal interest in the languages, and helped the students become more accustomed to the languages. These actions were done proactively without any instructions from their teacher to do so. The students’ initiative was on account of their own personal aspirations and desires to learn.

**AIS Parents**

**Parent goals.** Through the parent surveys I conducted and informal talks with parents, it was evident each parent had a different end goal in mind regarding their children’s DLE. Some parents hoped their child would become balanced bilinguals. It was as though they perceived bilingualism as not only an advantage, but also a necessity for their child’s future. For example Arisa’s parents wrote, “We would like to see Arisa further develop her strength in both languages.” Adam’s parents, who spoke to him in Mandarin at home wrote, “Besides learning English, we would like Adam to pick up Japanese as we foresee that we will be residing in Japan for a considerable period of time.” Samantha’s parents, who only speak English, wrote:

> We feel strongly about our mother tongue, and having a child who is confident and comfortable speaking in English at a young age. That said, we’re guests in Japan, and feel that acquiring language capability of our host country is important for our child to clearly understand the world around her including culture and languages especially because she needs to communicate locally at times.

On the other hand, some parents just wanted to expose their child to English and Japanese. The parents believed that the exposure to the two languages would benefit the
child in the long run cognitively and academically, but not necessarily a long-term goal for their child’s education. For example, Shelly’s parents noted in their parent survey that they would be sending their daughter to an English dominant or English only school when Shelly finished her two years in the DLE program. Keisuke’s parents, who spoke to him in English at home, also indicated their preference for sending Keisuke to a school that uses mostly English, but also would allow him to continue to learn Japanese via accessibility to a few classes in Japanese. However, all parents wanted to send their child to a reputable grade school, preferably one that supported both languages, except for one English-dominant parent of Alex’s who wanted to send her child to a local Japanese school so that the child could solidify his Japanese during the family’s stay in Japan. Alex’s parents wrote, “After this program I intend to send Alex to a Japanese kindergarten. I will continue to teach him English at home, and he can learn Japanese at school.”

**Language separation.** When asked in parent surveys about how the teachers promote bilingualism, seven out of the fifteen parents stated that the clear separation of language based on the days, and the teachers strict protocol to stick with speaking only in the designated language, helped with their child’s language learning.

When asked why they chose to enroll their child in this English, Japanese program, Arisa’s parent wrote:

> Since the age of one, Arisa has attended AIS on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and a Japanese school on Tuesday and Thursday. Hence, she has developed a very good balance in her command of both English and Japanese. The reason we did not enroll her in a DLE program was because we felt that that would create
confusion, especially during the age of one to three when they really learn to talk. Learning the two languages on alternate days in completely separate environments has been the key to our kid’s bilingual ability. This year, for the first time, we chose a DLE program because we felt Arisa was ready and fully capable without getting “mixed up” in her languages.

In this way, Arisa’s parents understood the importance of having a clear separation to facilitate the learning of two languages. Therefore, she took the added initiative to send Arisa to two different schools, but only now, when Arisa was 4-years-old, they thought she was ready to be in the same environment learning two languages.

**Parent classroom involvement encouraged.** Parents were also involved in various classroom activities. A different parent would read a book to the class each week. Before the parent would arrive, the teacher had the students make predictions about which parent would be coming to engage the students’ interest. Parents also assisted during special activities and field trips. For example, when students were learning about planting and growing herbs, parents came to help the students plant herbs for their school garden.

**Students’ Daily Educational Experiences at CIS**

What helped most to enhance students’ educational experience at CIS were the interactions with students of varying ages. Within the classroom, there was a three-year age span. This multiage feature was a vital part of the school, and the school personnel strongly believed the multiage system benefits the student. The students did not need to be pressured into fitting into grade level norms, and they were all able to work at their
own learning pace and acquire language facility through natural classroom interactions with teachers and peers.

**CIS Environment**

The classroom was located in a former business building, which the school had converted an entire floor to be used strictly for their classrooms. The floor plan consisted of two classrooms, which were divided by a wall partition. The two classrooms shared a single bathroom area, which was located parallel to the classrooms in a hallway that stretched across both classrooms. Although the building was not originally designed to be a school, it was neatly converted into an appropriate space for children to learn. Once students arrived, there were designated areas where they put their outdoor shoes, bags, homework, snacks, and lunches. They greeted the English lead teacher in English, and the Japanese lead teacher in Japanese. The spacing of the classrooms was done in order for ample amount of space to be available for the students to run around and chase each other. The running and chasing, however, were done with the disapproval of the teachers, as they always reminded their students that there was no running permitted in the classroom.

**Classroom separation by language spoken.** CIS used the one teacher one language approach in their classrooms. The English teacher only spoke English, and the Japanese teacher only spoke Japanese. Even though the teachers were bilingual, and could teach in a bilingual manner much like AIS if they chose to do so, they were instead encouraged to use only the language they were appointed to teach in order to create a clear distinction between the two languages. In the classroom, the teachers encouraged the students to use their L2 during instruction in L2; however, they never reprimand any
of the students if they fell back into the habit of using their L1. Instead, they would guide the students to construct and communicate what they want to say in the L2, so that in future instances they would be a higher penchant for their students to say what they intend to in the desired L2 rather than their more familiar L1.

With regard to the observations of the classroom itself, the right side had an area designated for English. The English teacher conducted small group learning on her group table, and all the English learning activities were located in the bookcase next to the English learning table. Similarly, the left side of the classroom had an area designated for Japanese learning. The Japanese teacher also used her table for small group learning and allowed the students to play with Japanese language activities that were kept in the drawers near the Japanese table during free play. The separation in area created a language boundary and helped the students to develop a distinct understanding that they were learning either English or Japanese within the classroom, depending on which teacher and which side of the room they occupied. It also promoted the students to use the appropriate language when working at the respective tables. I did not observe any students particularly avoiding either area, but rather equally enjoying activities on both sides of the room. Teachers openly welcomed the students to explore any activity, and they would support those that took the initiative to do so.

The center floor area served as a home base for the students. It was where the students started the day, as well as ended the day. It was also an area where they came together to discuss future projects, and conducted whole class activities. Although it was a common area where the students were free to use English or Japanese, there was always the encouragement for the students to use the language that fit the activity being
presented. When the English-language teacher was teaching math, for example, the students were expected to use English and vice versa.

Within the classroom, the teachers make the students feel welcomed through their conscious efforts to look out for their needs. When new students arrived in the middle of the school year, they would partner the new student with an older student to help them get adjusted and better acquainted with the classroom routine. This was one apparent advantage of the multiage classroom settings.

**School facilities.** Art, music, physical education, library, and the main office were located in different buildings that, similarly to the classrooms, were not originally intended for such purpose. Therefore, when walking to these locations, the students would have to cross a busy street. Even with this unusual situation, the students seemed well-adjusted to the reality of walking between the office buildings to get to the different places on campus for their various classes. One teacher would lead the class, while the other teacher would ensure that all the students were in line and following the leader from the back of the line.

The school did not have an official playground for the students to play in, and instead they would play in the classroom during recess. Occasionally, the teachers would walk the class to the nearby park where the students were able to run and play outside. The lack of an official playground kept the class contained, so the teacher would be able to keep an eye on the students. However, this also made it difficult for the students to fully run and use their gross motor skills. One former parent who previously sent their child to CIS said one of the main reasons why she pulled her children out of the school was because of the lack of facilities for her children to play in an open space.
**Student work displayed.** The hallways and staircases were filled with student work. The written work was done in English and Japanese. Having visual cues in the school hallways showing student work in both languages encouraged positive attitudes towards both languages. Many of the younger students, while passing by the hallways and staircases, would frequently stop to read what was written and would also talk about the different projects displayed with their classmates.

**CIS Curriculum**

In a conversation with the head of school, I was told that the curriculum at CIS was research-oriented, and was based on recent literature on DLE and multiage schooling. School personnel were always looking for new research to incorporate into their classrooms. They even had informational sessions to the public about their curriculum at their schools, so that others would understand their direction and they would seek opinions from those that attended the meetings. In this way, the school had a welcoming environment for individuals of the community, like me, to enter and add to the existing chemistry of the school and classroom.

**Theme-based curriculum.** CIS used a theme-based approached curriculum incorporating group and individual projects. The curricular themes that I observed were money and fairytales. The teachers would spend a few weeks on each theme and teach subjects based on ideas related to the specific theme. The English and Japanese guidelines were based on public school guidelines, but modified to fit the school’s specific needs. In a discussion with one of the teachers, she expressed that the math curriculum was based on the Scottish Curriculum Guidelines where the teachers believed that every learner is capable of developing the necessary knowledge for life and work.
Although the school has been in operation since 2001 and has come a long way since in terms of the implementation of this specific curriculum, and school personnel remarked that they were still reworking and solidifying the curriculum to fit the needs of the school and students.

To allow for comprehensible input, the teachers at CIS often drew pictures, used gestures or had other students translate the necessary information to students’ native language. The teacher utilized a phonics program that used the SMART Board and taught students the sound of letters through gestures that followed the phrase of the day. The program included phrases such as, “Once there lived a quiet mouse, in a quiet little house. When all was quiet as can be, out popped he!”

Culminating presentations of learning projects. Through the culminating presentation of their theme-based projects, the students were able to formally display the languages they were learning. This was because parents, teachers, staff, and students were invited to their presentation. Each group did their presentation according to the audience’s native language. When the audience consisted of English speaking people, they would do their presentation in English. When the audience consisted of Japanese speaking people, they spoke Japanese. Parents of students whose first language was neither English nor Japanese were also in attendance. Therefore, the students would use their home language, Korean, Chinese, or Russian, to do their presentation as well. This was a very interesting phenomenon to observe as the students were able to differentiate between the languages and easily turn off and on the necessary language.

Multiage classroom interactions. The students at CIS also had the opportunity to meet weekly with an older student from the 9, 10, and 11 year-old class for buddy
reading time. These pairs were carefully crafted by all four homeroom teachers of both classes to ensure a match that would benefit both students. During this period, students chose a book to read together. The younger student would choose the book, and the pair would read it together. This buddy reading program was crafted as a time where the students could work with more capable peers in a relaxed, fun environment. The older students acted as leaders, and they would help their younger partners fill out their worksheet on what they read, what it was about, and what they thought about it. The teachers did not force students to pick an English or a Japanese book, but instead allowed for each buddy pair to make their own choice. Since books other than English and Japanese were available in the library, students also were able to choose books in their native language as well as books that were foreign to both students.

**Culture.** At CIS, time was set aside every Friday afternoon for culture studies. The academic year was divided by the number of different cultural heritages represented within the class. For this classroom, they had designated time for the following cultures: American, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Russian, British and Australian. The class then spent the Friday culture studies time learning about the heritage that was featured for the month. In addition, different activities were prepared, and the students’ parents were encouraged to take an active part in these activities.

**Evaluations.** The students at CIS did not receive number or letter grades. They were instead evaluated based on class observations and progress, which were then documented in their individual portfolios. These portfolios were a reflection on what the student accomplished in the previous year and would be filled with materials and evidence of any future achievements. I observed students being directed by the teacher to
put certain worksheets that they did into the portfolio. Since Jaewoo had a difficult time completing assigned work, it was when he completed an assignment that the teachers would instruct him to put it in his portfolio. Most other students would put worksheets into their portfolio when they did an excellent job. Due to this type of evaluation, the students were never tested on their core academic knowledge. However, some teachers would conduct tests to help them identify students’ weaknesses, and make lesson plans accordingly. However, the test results were never reflected on students’ anecdotal evaluations. These portfolios were then taken with them to the next year.

CIS Teaching

**Pull-out language support.** Students' English and Japanese language facility and their cognitive levels were all taken into consideration when planning the lessons. Some students had English as an Additional Language (EAL) support, while some others had Japanese as an Additional Language (JAL) support. These classes were support classes for those who were still at the beginning stages of learning the language. When students entered the program without English conversation capability, they were assigned to the EAL class. The opposite was also true for Japanese. If students entered the program with neither English nor Japanese conversation level, they were placed in the EAL and JAL class. For the younger students, the pull out occurred in an unused part of the classroom. For the older students, the pull-out occurred in a completely different classroom. Those students in both support groups missed whole class instruction and activities because they were pulled out of the class for support. Through these pullout support classes, the students were taught according to their academic level rather than their age. Students knew whether or not they were part of EAL or JAL and would attend sessions without
hesitation. However, Sergey and Jaewoo, who had a difficult time in whole group activities, also had a difficult time focusing, completing tasks, and staying with the language support group.

**Using the appropriate language.** Students were encouraged to speak the language used during the lesson, and teachers responded to students’ questions in the lesson’s language. However, if a student was unable to construct comments or questions in the appropriate language, the teacher would help him or her create an appropriate sentence. It was only during library time that they were free to choose any book regardless of the language. This library time was separate from students’ weekly buddy reading time with the older students in the school.

During centers time where the teacher would put different learning activities on the table, the students moved freely around the room completing the activities that were required as well as optional activities that sparked their interest. During Japanese language arts, the Japanese language arts center was also open to students. Activities ranged from hiragana puzzles to kanji games. During English language arts, the English language arts center, as well as the SMART board was open to students. Activities ranged from alphabet magnets to board games. The classroom library, which was different from the school library, was open to the students and included both English and Japanese books, as well as books written by their classmates and former students. In this way, the students were given many different activities to choose from, and had the freedom to complete those activities that interested them.

Although the school favored a policy of one teacher and one language, the students knew that the teachers understood both English and Japanese. The bilingual
teachers and staff of the school served as role models for students. Students were able to see the teachers and staff using English and Japanese, and saw that it was possible to learn both languages as well.

Teachers asked those students who were capable of saying what they wanted to say in the appropriate language to do so because it stimulated the other students who were listening. This engaged the overall class to exercise its ability to use the L2. In addition, this conscious decision to use the L2 was in attempt to wean the students off from their dependency of their L1.

**Focus on educating the whole child.** The school held an institutional aspiration for their students to become bilingual in English and Japanese. However, fostering the whole child took precedence. Students’ social and emotional needs were handled in either their native language, or a simplified version of the target language with gestures, so that the student could understand. Teachers took turns in handling children that needed the extra support by removing them from the classroom setting and providing them with extra support in assimilating to the school’s bilingual environment. For example, the teachers expressed that Jaewoo had a very difficult time adjusting to the school. Getting Jaewoo to participate and understand what was going on was a challenge. Furthermore, the teachers explained that after three to four months in the DLE program, students are usually more capable of picking up basic, necessary language. However, Jaewoo still had a difficult time understanding and communicating in English and Japanese. In these situations, the teachers would use many pictures and gestures to help him understand what was going on and what he needed to do, or they would have a native Korean speaker who had a good command of both languages translate the information to Jaewoo.
Focus on cultural heritage. Every Friday, the class had a special designated heritage time that was incorporated into the daily schedule. During this period, the ethnicities and cultural backgrounds of the students in the class were celebrated. The class spent at least a few weeks exploring each heritage. Students not only talked about their heritages, the students' parents also came to share about their particular background. The school also had a whole week dedicated to the same idea of heritage appreciation and recognition called Heritage Week, where students did projects relating to their cultural heritage in order to further understand their heritage as well as their classmates heritage background. In this class, students picked a folktale from their heritage and created projects based on their chosen story. Some students created puppets to retell their story, while others decided to retell the story through a play. Other students even created items from the story that did not exist in the current time period. For example, Mayumi recreated a fish net which was used during traditional times, by using paper and weaving it in and out to replicate the net’s shape. As a final culmination of the project, the class invited teachers, parents, and staff to come and see what the students had created. For this event, students used English, Japanese, and their native language to communicate. There were also library books available in languages other than just English and Japanese to promote the valuing of each student’s unique heritage.

Teacher communication. The communications between the two teachers were constant, and they occurred before, during, and even after the actual classroom time with the students. Every morning they would review what activities the students had for each lesson. During the lesson, they often confirmed with each other to ensure they were doing what was planned. The language used was often mixed, where the two teachers used both
languages to communicate with each other. This was done to establish understanding between the two teachers. This was unusual to observe, since the school had the policy where each teacher would use only one language. After each day, the teachers would also discuss what went well in their classroom and how they could improve the lesson for the following day.

**Student choice included in planning.** The English teacher and the Japanese teacher worked together to come up with a topic. The topic they decided on was money. From there, they sought student input on what their project would be. Based on their ideas, teachers had multiple activities available from which the students could choose. Ultimately, as a class, they decided they wanted to know how and where money was made. Teachers’ expectations towards students’ outcome also varied. If the teacher felt that the student was not ready for a task, she did not require the student to complete it. Center activities were wide ranging, so that students of all levels could participate. Some students took tasks that were easier for them, which reinforced previous learning. Other students took tasks that were above their language level, which the teacher saw as good stimulation and motivation for those students. For example, Lisa, whose first language is Russian, still could not read or write hiragana, yet she grabbed a worksheet that needed those skills. The teachers did not deny or take away the worksheet from her. Instead, they had her work with Yue, who had the necessary skills to help Lisa. Having multiple levels of activities was a way that teachers ensured that all students were being academically challenged and stimulated. The core topics would alternate between teachers and languages, so that students were exposed and able to express ideas in the L1 and L2.
Routines emphasized. Over time, it became clear that teachers provided consistent classroom routines. For example, the students had a routine schedule where they would do the same morning meeting with the same questions posed to the class. This repetition allowed for the students to know exactly what they needed to say when the student leader prompted them. They also repeated the same songs for the learning of their days, months, and days of the week. This type of prompting where the student leader was to memorize the prompt and the class responded through memorization closely resembled the elements of the behaviorists theory.

CIS Students

The students in CIS used a multiage system that grouped the same students who were between the ages of five and seven years old for three years. The teachers expressed that having each student for more than one year allowed for the students who need a bit more time to gain a grasp of the material the chance to learn at their own pace without the stress of pushing them on to the next grade if they are not ready, or in the worst case, facing the possibility of grade retention. The family-like atmosphere made the classroom a welcoming space for the students to learn comfortably with familiar faces and provided students the feeling that they were free to be themselves without having undue pressure put on them.

The students in the mainly one-way DLE formatted CIS class primarily spoke Japanese as it was the dominant language for the majority of the students. Therefore, students whose home language was not Japanese were able to hold a conversation with their peers in Japanese after only being in the DLE program for two years. On the contrary, students’ English conversation levels varied greatly, and many were not capable
of holding an English conversation with their peers or teacher. This is probably the reason why the school designated my language use to be English, so that the students would have an opportunity to use English.

**Informal language learning.** Students in the class acted as language teachers for their classmates who were learning their native language. Aside from when teachers specifically assigned a student to help another student, students regularly taught and helped their classmates understand and learn language. Often this was done intentionally. However, there were just as many instances where this occurred unintentionally. Students were perceptive to their peers around them, and those students who possessed the capability to assist their classmates did so when the opportunities presented themselves.

I also observed students regularly mixing English and Japanese, known as code-switching, in conversation. While two girls were working on a worksheet, they wrote the letters “q” and “Q” and noticed it sounded like a Japanese word they knew, so they wrote *sha* after to make the word “qQsha” which when read, makes the same sound as the word for ambulance in Japanese. Another instance observed was when a student was at the computer and said, “Zenzen work shinaiyo,” which means that it does not work at all and included English and Japanese words mixed within the same sentence. Older students were able to separate English and Japanese but still needed assistance in English grammar. For example, the sign for their fishpond, which they made in the classroom said, “*kowashichadamesu*” and “do not broke it” to tell their classmates that they were still playing with the fishpond they made.

Students also had many informal incidental learning opportunities for the Korean, Chinese, and Russian languages. During recess, the students would teach their classmates
words and phrases in their native language. These included phrases like “baegopayo,” which means “I’m hungry,” or “gamsahamnida,” which means “thank you.” The students would repeat these Korean words in the correct context with each other and have fun using another language.

It was not uncommon to see a student translating an L2 word or phrase into another student’s home language. At other times, students would help their classmates with writing words in the L2’s written script, but at the same time coaching them in that student’s L1. An example of this could be seen when Sangwoo would help Jaewoo write hiragana while explaining it to him in Korean. Another example occurred when Jaewoo and Lisa were playing with a hiragana puzzle. Jaewoo was still learning his hiragana, so Lisa would help him identify the necessary pieces to complete the puzzle.

**Empathy towards classmates.** Empathy was shown in this class through the students taking care of the younger students in this multiage class, guiding them to what they needed to do, and assisting them during activities. I regularly observed many simple acts such as tying their younger classmates’ shoelaces. When the students needed to cross the streets to get to the other school buildings, the older students ensured that the younger students were in line and paying attention to the road.

**Initiative.** The students at CIS were free to choose non-educational activities during recess, yet they still were inclined to grab educational learning activities during this free time. These educational learning activities ranged from writing a story book based on pictures they copied from a book they read, to playing with alphabetic magnets and putting them in order or categories. The students were often seen working in pairs
with a fellow classmate on these activities, where one would take the lead and show the other how to do the task at hand.

During free play time, the students brainstormed multiple topics and would narrow down from their list one in particular that they wanted to do as a recess project. These ideas mainly included things students wanted to build such as towers, roller-coaster, and castles. In the end, they decided they wanted to build a pond with lots of fish. Once this idea was decided upon, they sought out their teacher for assistance with how to get started with their project. However, aside from the initial guidance that they received from their teacher, the students continued with the rest of the project with just teacher facilitation until they reached completion. They had an area in the classroom where they set up their pond, and inside of the pond they had fish, octopus, squid, crab, and other water creatures.

CIS Parents

Parent views. There were two contrasting reactions about parental views on having their child in the DLE program. The first was some parents’ rationale for placing their child in an English and Japanese DLE program, because the child was born in Japan and lived in Japan, Japanese was essential to learn. These parents felt that it was imperative for them to continue supporting their child’s quest to learn Japanese. This was especially apparent in Miwa’s parental survey, where they wrote, “Miwa is Japanese, therefore learning Japanese is important.” Some parents also believed that having their child acquire English and Japanese would lead to further education and economic benefits and, therefore, they enrolled their child in the DLE program. They felt that without learning English and Japanese, their child would miss out on important
opportunities later in life. This was especially apparent in Hyegyong’s parent survey where the parent wrote, “I wanted my child to learn Japanese because we live in Japan. But also English because of its global significance.” On the other hand, a few had contrasting views. Some parents felt the continual learning of two languages was not an appropriate long-term course of action for their children and, instead, they hoped to place their children in an English-only instructional program in the near future. For example Jinhwan’s parent wrote, “I feel as though Jinhwan’s English and Japanese language development are slow, so I am thinking of changing to an English only program.”

Classroom participation encouraged. Regardless of what the parents’ views were on the DLE program, they continued to show support in their child’s learning, and participated in class presentations and shows. As previously mentioned, Fridays were designated for the class to have weekly heritage time where their unique cultures and stories could be shared. Parents came and did a few sessions on Japanese calligraphy writing as a way to expose the students to the Japanese culture. On Chinese New Year, Yue’s mom came to the classroom to share stories about Chinese New Year and brought Chinese New Year snacks for the students to experience. This gave the students the opportunities to actively participate with their peers, and when the class showcased their folktale project, they even had the chance to interact with their parents while they listened and even joined in at times with the presentations if desired. Parents not only listened to their child’s presentation, but also actively participated in other student’s presentations.

Students’ Daily Educational Experiences at RIS

In this study, RIS is the only school located in the United States. The small class size of eight accounted for enhanced educational experiences at RIS. The specific class
observed was English dominant with two students’ parents capable of speaking Japanese. The teacher was able to make accommodations for each of the students and met their needs accordingly. Since the number of students in the class was small, the students were also able to create strong bonds with each other. They also developed empathy towards each other and understood if somebody was having a difficult time with a task or situation.

**RIS Environment**

**Facilities.** The school started operating from a building that originally was used as a radio station. The school expanded over the years, and now consists of five buildings in total. Aside from the original radio station building, the other buildings were all built to be used as classrooms. The class that I observed was located in the original building, but had been renovated to fit the needs of the school. It allowed for ample hallway areas for the students to line up and access the bathroom. The gym was located in the building, and the children had a playground equipped with slides, swings, and a jungle gym, in addition to abundant space for running around to play soccer. The school even had an area for the children to play basketball. The hallways were decorated with the students’ work, and they included English and Japanese words to go along with the artwork. The school’s student values were also posted so that they students could reflect on what’s expected.

The classroom in which I did my observations perfectly accommodated the number of students in the class. There was just enough space for each student to have a cubby to place her or his lunch and other belongings, and just enough seats at the main table to comfortably fit the eight students in the class. The floor area was also just the
right size to have the students create a half circle around the teacher for group instruction. The students also had a play area equipped with age-appropriate toys within the classroom, as well as a library filled with Japanese books. English books were not present in this classroom library because of the school’s clear intentions of keeping the language separate based on location. Both of these areas were used for free play whenever students finished their work early. The walls were covered with the students’ work, and they also included pictures that were related to the theme they were working on.

**Playground language interactions.** The playground was a valuable informal learning opportunity for all students. Students would use English and Japanese when on the playground. This playground was shared amongst the various classes, some which were focused on other target languages. Therefore, it was common for the students to socialize with others who were learning Chinese and Spanish. They exchanged ways to say commonly-used words such as “Hello” and “Thank you.” Although these were only simple words, the interaction between the students seemed valuable for both children asking and learning about languages other than the two they were actively learning. The exposure to other students and teachers talking in different languages was a great example for the students to see that they were not the only ones learning a different language. In addition, it also informed them of the reality that there were other languages that children were learning at their school. Students saw the other language teachers and staff and, as a result, they were able to soon recognize the different language teachers and associate them to the different languages being taught at the school.

The school set clear boundaries regarding what language should be used when and where. In the homeroom classroom, only the target language of Japanese was
supposed to be used. In any other classroom, such as art, music, or physical education, students were expected to use English. These clear boundaries helped the students understand what was acceptable. On the playground, however, they were free to use whatever language they desired.

**RIS Curriculum**

In a discussion with the head of school, he stated that RIS had a research-based curriculum that sought current findings for a DLE school. They were always looking into new and improved ideas and contemplated whether it was something that the school could incorporate into their curriculum. In addition, they were supportive of my presence in the school as a researcher and always wanted to know if there was anything they could do to accommodate me. It was a win-win situation because I was able to conduct my research all while being an extra pair of hands and eyes in the classroom for the teachers. The school’s teacher and staff thoroughly showed interest in my research and findings and were eager to assist me with any questions that came up during my observations.

**Uniform school curriculum.** The curriculum at RIS was based on national and state standards, and delivered through six inquiry units using the Primary Years Program of the International Baccalaureate curriculum (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2007). The PYP teaches its curriculum through interconnected methods. One method is its written curriculum, which utilizes its own a transdisciplinary framework. This framework is founded on six transdisciplinary themes based on five essential elements—concepts, knowledge, skills, attitudes, and action—that in conjunction with the themes allow for students to go beyond just surface level meaning on classroom subjects. These themes are: 1) who we are, 2) how we are in space and time, 3) how we express ourselves,
4) how the world works, 5) how we organize ourselves, and 6) sharing the planet. Taken together, the purpose of these themes is to give students a basis for not only connecting what is being learned within the classroom to the outside world, but also to foster a sense of responsibility. Students are broken into two categories based on age with respect to these themes. Four of the six themes are covered over the course of the school year for 3 to 5-year-olds. All six themes are covered only by the 4 to 12-year-old students. In addition to the PYP’s distinctive thematic facet, the program does not ignore traditional core subjects. Language, mathematics, science, social studies, art, personal education, social education, and physical education are all included in the curriculum (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2007). This curriculum helped the entire school have a uniform curriculum from pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. It allowed all the teachers to comply and follow set skills and themes that the students needed before going on to the next grade. The teachers were all aware of what the students learned in the previous years and, as a result, they were able to build on the knowledge by further researching in depth the same topic at a higher cognitive level.

The major pedagogical factor, which RIS incorporated into its language curriculum, was the IB program’s PYP curriculum style (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2007). Originally, the PYP program was not designed to be used in a DLE program. There were set learning outcomes, but they were not translated to Japanese so that the students could learn and understand the outcomes in Japanese. Therefore, the characteristics laid out in the IB learner profile were translated to Japanese, so the teachers could use and refer back to them in class. The themes and elements also used to frame the curriculum were translated to Japanese. From there, the teachers would
configure their lessons based on the themes the students covered in class. In this way, the school needed to adapt the program to fit the bilingual, bicultural goal of the school. Through this curriculum, students had a chance to incorporate culture into their learning at their winter festival held each year.

**Theme-based classroom instruction.** The school allowed for comprehensible input through spending more than half the time in Japanese, while learning through the theme-based instruction. Learning through the theme-based instruction allowed for the teacher to use pictures and related ideas to help students understand what they were learning about. During my observation, the theme was climate. The students learned about the different climates on this planet and what characteristics each possessed. A minimum of a month was spent on each theme, which provided ample time for the students to get acquainted with the topic, words, and ideas related to the topic.

The students had numerous opportunitities to produce concrete products from what they learned through making various presentations. These presentations were made to other teachers as well as other students in the school. For example, I observed a lesson where students adapted a well-known Japanese song using their own lyrics to create a story of their own. These were then drawn out on paper to supplement their singing while performing for their audience. This was based on one of the six transdisciplinary themes regarding how we express ourselves. The first grade class of 6-year-olds that I observed also had a formal presentation of their projects. They described their presentations to older students in the school, teachers, staff members, and parents. Their projects were based on an endangered species of their choice, and they were able to do the entire presentation in Japanese.
**Language separation by teacher.** RIS used the one-teacher, one-language approach in their classrooms. In the kindergarten class I observed, the languages were separated by location. The teacher explained that she would tell the students that they were only to speak Japanese when they were in the classroom, but free to use English outside of the classroom. Even though there were two students whose parents spoke Japanese, this group of students’ dominant language was English, however, they would frequently fall back into the habit of using English in the classroom. This would compel the teacher to give the students constant reminders about using only Japanese in the classroom instead.

**Integration of learning.** The school also had a garden where they would grow and sell vegetables to help maintain the school. Approximately once or twice a month, the students would join the 6-year-old class to have a garden lesson in English, where a teacher would teach the students about how to grow vegetables and what they needed to do that day to help maintain the garden.

There were also opportunities for the students to be exposed to the Japanese culture though a field trip to a near by museums where they were doing a presentation on the Japanese drum, *taiko*. At this event, the presenter asked the students whether they could speak Japanese, but it was interesting to see how none of the students raised their hand even though they were all learning Japanese at school. The school also held a yearly cultural festival where students perform a cultural dance, instrument, or song to parents, other students, and the public.

**Differentiated language study by grades.** The students in the 5-year-old class did not have any formal English language instruction. However, when students moved on
to first grade, they began their formal English language arts class. They were tracked into four different levels based on their reading skills, and everyday they had one hour of English language arts with a separate English teacher in a separate classroom from their Japanese homeroom. They worked on typical skills to enhance their reading, writing, speaking and listening ability. The English teacher did express, however, that even though tracking the students based primarily on their reading level resulted in the class being divided into multiple classes of readers, this alone was not encompassing enough to be the only determining factor in regards to the students’ abilities. There were other variables such as writing ability and listening ability, which also were distinct factors.

**Culture.** At RIS, a cultural festival was held to celebrate and inform the students about the Japanese culture. This not only was done to provide a fun activity for the students, but it also showcased certain cultural aspects of Japan. The fun nature of the festival engaged the students, and once engaged, students were eager to learn about cultures. They also went on a field trip where they learned about the history of Japanese people in their area, as well as informative facts about the Japanese drum, *taiko*.

**Evaluation.** Each student at RIS had a portfolio that consisted of materials that documented their progress throughout their years at RIS. The materials consisted of projects the student did that showed what they had accomplished, and what they were capable of doing in English and Japanese. In addition, anecdotal records done by the teacher was also included. In this way, the students were not given any letter or number grades but, rather, were evaluated on their progress. These portfolios were shared with the parents in a student led conference, which was held twice a year. During these
conferences, the students were responsible for showing their parents what they had done in school.

**RIS Teaching**

*Teachers taught separate languages.* Since the school operated under a one teacher and one language policy, the homeroom teacher was required to use only Japanese when teaching. Although the students seemed to understand what the teacher was saying in Japanese, they had a difficult time using only Japanese when speaking. The teacher needed to give the students constant reminders to use Japanese. These reminders took the form of her telling the students that since they were in the classroom, they needed to use Japanese. They were informed, however, that they were free to use English outside on the playground.

The original school intent was that all classes in English were to be held in separate classes from students’ homeroom, since only Japanese was used in homeroom. Due to space limitations and scheduling conflicts, however, the students had to have their art and music class in English within their Japanese homeroom. This may have partially accounted for students’ difficulties in distinguishing when and where they could use each language.

*Gestures and meaning prompts.* When the teacher felt as though a student was struggling to understand what was being taught, she used gestures to help the student understand inquiry units. She also used simplified words that she knew the student already knew from previous activities to create the necessary connection needed for that student to fully grasp the task at hand. Pictures were also printed out so that students were able to visually see what the teacher was talking about. These types of tactics used by the
teacher generally allowed for a comprehensible input regarding the meaning of the formal learning.

**Student input in unit projects.** The Japanese lead teacher had students give their input on what they wanted to do for their classroom unit project. From there, the teacher would plan lessons around student interests that would ultimately lead them to the end goal of answering questions regarding the six inquiry units. The lessons were identical for all students, and the teacher would help those that needed the extra assistance, while others were capable of completing the task individually. One way the teacher would help students learn Japanese was through responding to that student in only Japanese. For example, when the teacher asked what animal she was pointing to, and a student would respond, “Seal!” the teacher would respond in Japanese, “Soune azarashi,” which meant, “Yes, seal.”

**Varied learning strategies.** During math, the teacher would introduce ideas through tangible objects such as tiles to teach students addition. The students would also draw pictures and color the appropriate amount of necessary tiles on their worksheet to represent the equation they were working on. The teacher would repeat this exercise repeatedly until all the students understood the concept being taught. This type of repetition closely resembled the behaviorists theory of using repetition to get the students to learn. In the 6-year-old class, the students learned about American money through the Japanese language. Although learning about American money using the Japanese language has its complexities, the students did well in understanding the concepts and learning the appropriate names of each coin.
Once students were finished with the task the teacher had planned for them, they were free to quietly play with the indoor toys and activities. This allowed for the teacher to focus her attention on those students that were struggling with the given task. The teacher would also supplement tasks with more difficult items when a student would constantly finish early. She would provide the student with additional items to solve during math, or additional items to read or complete during other learning periods. In this way, the teacher was able to keep all the students actively engaged in their learning.

**Weekly teacher meetings.** Every week the teachers had a meeting with the other teachers in the school to discuss future events. It was also an opportunity for professional development because new ideas to incorporate into the classroom were given to the teachers. This was done through the teachers sharing how they structured the lesson plans and how the students interpreted the task and completed the project at hand. For example, the first grade teacher would share how she delivered a successful lesson to her students through preparation, delivery, and reflection.

**RIS Students**

**Age grouping of students.** In contrast to the previous two schools, RIS maintained the traditional groupings of students by keeping students of the same age together. All eight students in the kindergarten class at RIS were five years old when they started the program. It was a coed class, where the teacher was able to make connections with each student even though they only had a year together. Furthermore, the teachers from each grade level had a close-knit relationship with each other, and they often shared information about their students with one another. This helped each teacher with getting a general idea of the students who were coming into their classroom, as well as being able
to check on and see how former students were doing in the next grade. However, in this single-age class, although the degree of variability was less, the teacher still needed to make adjustments according to each student’s academic level in L1 and L2.

**Language use.** The students had a variety of backgrounds, and although some did have a parent that spoke Japanese, the students’ dominant language was still English. This resulted in students’ tendency to speak English more often than their target language in this one-way DLE program. They needed constant reminders to use Japanese in the classroom. Furthermore, once their main Japanese teacher left the room and a different adult helper who didn’t speak Japanese stepped in, the students would only use English.

**Classroom interactions.** Within the classroom, children repeated what they heard their classmates say during group discussion. Simple words such as *aka* (red) and *ao* (blue) were repeated during math when the students had to guess colors of the tiles they were going to use for their number sentence. Each longer phrase, such as *watashi no jyanai* (It is not mine), was repeated by classmates when the teacher was asking the students whose worksheet she was holding up. Verbal outbursts also included colloquial Japanese that classmates had previously used. An example would be the word *dassai*, which means “uncool” in Japanese. Typically, adults do not use this word. Therefore, the students learned the word and meaning through their peers in an informal, incidental learning environment.

**Students varied by class.** Since each class was composed of different students whose home and dominant language differed, each class had its own dynamics. For example, the class that I mainly observed was very English dominant, whereas the 4-year-old class was very Japanese dominant because of the students’ backgrounds. There
were more students whose L1 was Japanese. Therefore, Japanese was more often used in and out of the classroom compared with the kindergarten class. The teachers at RIS often discussed their classroom dynamics and individual students with each other, so that they were able to accommodate and prepare. In addition, the teachers mentioned that students who had received prior DLE education in English and Japanese were at an advantage compared with students who did not participate in previous programs. These differences were apparent when the children did activities that required a more complex knowledge of the languages.

One particular student at RIS that stood out was a Chinese boy in the 4-year-old classroom. He was doing his morning activity, which consisted of coloring. I asked him in Japanese what color he was coloring his picture. He looked at what was written on the crayon, which said “red orange,” and replied to me in Japanese, “Aka to orenji ga mazatterun date,” which translates to “It says it’s a mix of red and orange.” I was so surprised that this young child, whose home language was Chinese only, was able to understand my Japanese question, read the English words, and respond appropriately in Japanese. It was even more interesting when he noticed the kanji characters for the word “name” in Japanese. He explained that those were Chinese characters. The teacher and I told him that in Japanese, we use some Chinese characters as well. I asked him what did those characters mean, and he was able to respond, “name.”

**Minimal empathy.** Possibly due to the fact that the students were all the same age, whenever a student in the class was having a difficult day, the other students tended to ignore that student rather than to comfort the student. Often, Iris would cry when she could not complete or understand the task at hand. The other students would give her the
needed space and allow for the teachers to handle the situation. This was not done with any mean intention but, rather, it appeared that students did not know how to approach a classmate that was having a hard time. The students just simply allowed the teacher to handle their classmate while they continued on with their business. However, when the students played a Japanese word game called, *shiritori*, the students were often seen helping their classmates when they could not think of a word to say.

**Initiative.** The classroom’s library consisted solely of Japanese books that were illustrated with vibrant pictures. However, many students were unable to read the captions and explanations of the pictures even though the books were age appropriate in content. In these instances, it was common to see the student take the book to the teacher and ask to have the story read and explained. This held intrinsic value, as the student initiated the learning of the material in the book regardless of his or her reading level.

**Code-switching.** Through my observations, I concluded the students at RIS code switched when they lacked the necessary vocabulary needed to complete a whole sentence, or thought in their L2, as well as making accommodations for people they were speaking to in their conversations who were unable to fully understand the utilized language. The students in the DLE program used what they knew in the L2, and then supplemented the sentence or idea with their native language. For example a student at RIS said, “My *monosashi,*” because she was did not know the English word for ruler so she supplemented the Japanese word in place of the English word she did not know. Another example from RIS was when a student said, “We found a *tentoumushi,***” at recess. The girl did not know the word for ladybug in English, so she substituted it with the Japanese word.
RIS Parents

Parents’ purpose. The parents of the two students who could speak Japanese expressed their need for Japanese language in their child’s educational composition. For example, Yuuto’s parents wrote, “It is important to our family that our children become fluent in their father’s native language, and this is the only Japanese language program available to us in this area,” and Koki’s parent wrote, “Kids have to be able to communicate with their grandparents.” Hanna’s parents wrote they chose this DLE program to “challenge her.” However, the other parents expressed that they just love the Japanese culture and its people, and that was the strongest motivating factor in their decision to enter their children into a DLE program. Therefore parents at RIS chose to have their child learn English and Japanese not because they believed learning those languages would lead to success, but because of their interest in the Japanese country and culture. They felt that having their child exposed to an additional language and culture would lead to cross-cultural competencies that would help them associate with people from many different backgrounds. They also thought learning an additional language would boost their child’s self esteem. The parents had a relaxed approach towards learning English and Japanese. For example, Adrian’s parents wrote, “We were interested in foreign services for Adrian,” showing a mere interest was what motivated them to chose this DLE program. They felt learning Japanese was an additional academic and social advantage, yet not a real necessity for their child’s future. This didn’t mean that the parents in the school from the United States did not care about their child’s education or did not get involved in their child’s learning. They were fully active in taking part whenever they could, whether it was volunteering, or helping to raise funds for the school.
**Parent communication with the teacher.** The parents of RIS communicated with the teacher daily during drop off and pick up. Although it was brief, the parents were able to communicate to the teacher how their child was last night and/or in the morning and the teacher was able to share how their child was during the day when it was time for the parents to pick their child up from school. One or two parents joined the class whenever they went on field trips. The parents’ responsibility on these field trips was to help watch the students.

**Other types of parent involvement.** However, tagging along on field trips was not the only way the parents got involved. Tuition covered only 90% of the school’s expenses. Each year, the school and parents got together to think of different fundraising idea to help keep the school running. The biggest event was their auction where something as simple as front row parking to the school was auctioned off. All the proceeds were used to benefit the school. Another way they helped to generate funds for the school was by helping the kids grow and then sell vegetables after school to other parents. All these fundraising events were possible because the parents got involved.

**Summary**

This chapter presented an analysis of educational activities that occurred within each school setting. The emphasis was primarily on describing how each school implemented its DLE vision within its classroom settings, including its curricular underpinnings, favored teaching strategies and assessment, and its learning activities as they were experienced by students. This provides a situated understanding of how dual language education unfolded on a day-to-day basis in each setting. In the next chapter, the cross-case analysis of these educational practices is conducted.
CHAPTER 6. CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I present the cross-case analysis of the individual cases. Multi-site case analyses involve selecting several settings for cross-case comparison (Yin, 1989). This is appropriate when the purpose of the research is to bring together a range of cases to provide a description and explanation of a general educational approach such as DLE. More specifically, the data were summarized, categorized, and interpreted apart from the data from each other site, after grounded case studies were written for each school. Choosing three schools enabled me to conduct intensive research in each setting and maximize depth of understanding at the expense of breath (Corbett et al., 1987).

The goal of the cross-case comparison is to build a general explanation that fits the individual cases, although there will be variations in the details of each case (Yin, 1989). The key concern in such analyses is to develop a set of criteria that can be used to select, describe, and then compare the different cases according to some common elements. Linking the data to underlying theoretical propositions, or to empirical patterns or regularities in studied processes, represents the core of the data analysis phase (Yin, 1989). This cross-case analysis focuses on three aspects of the schools’ DLE programs that emerged from an analysis of each case study presented in Chapter 5. These include emergent themes regarding their DLE classroom settings and day-to-day educational practices (i.e., program structures, instructional practices, and relationships with parents and families), their underlying theoretical approaches to DLE as it was implemented (i.e., theories in use), and their curricular approaches. This analysis is constructed from the
patterns of educational practices within each DLE classroom and school setting from my observations in classrooms, interviews, and evaluation of program documents.

The analysis presented is structured in three parts. First, the comparison of students’ daily educational experiences within each classroom is presented (see Table 6.1). Second, the various learning theories which underlie these dual language education programs and which formed the basis for their implementation (as highlighted in the literature review in Chapter 2) are described (see Table 6.2). This represents a type of pattern matching (Yin, 1989), in that it discusses the instructional strategies for language learning that I observed were used on a day-to-day basis within the classrooms and which are connected to the underlying philosophies expressed by personnel within each school. Third, the comparison on the basis of the curriculum approach is presented with respect to addressing students’ learning needs (see Table 6.3). Through my daily conversations with the teachers and staff before and after school, I was able to pose questions regarding the classroom curriculum and how teachers decided to deliver it based on the outlines given by the school. During these conversations, the teachers were able to explain their curriculum and offer insight on individual children and their unique learning needs. However, first a description of the cultural settings of the schools will be presented for context.

**Cultural Settings of the Schools**

A cultural perspective on education provides a lens to examine differences in ideological principles, expectations, and processes that are constructivist in nature; that is, it focuses on how people create shared meanings about societal beliefs and values and the formal role of the educational system in transmitting cultural principles and knowledge to
the young. Culture can be defined as a collective set of beliefs, values, and behaviors that are shared by the members of society (Coon & Mitterer, 2006). Being aware of these beliefs, values, and behaviors of the American and Japanese cultures helps to understand the broader surrounding contexts in which the schools in this study operated.

Merelman (1984) concluded there is no single cultural perspective that binds the American people; rather, there are several principles and values that have shaped American culture over time including individualism, economic self-interest, personal freedom, and equality. These underlying principles of American culture contrast considerably with Japanese cultural principles. There are at least three major cultural differences between the United States and Japan that can be observed even in the educating of young children that may be relevant to DLE.

The first and foremost is hierarchy. In Japan, hierarchy is of the greatest importance, so much to the point that there are different words used when addressing those who are older and/or in a higher position than each individual speaker. One way this can be seen is in workers’ loyalty to their workplace in terms of years of service and the respect offered to the company’s hierarchical leadership, as well as the extent to which respect is paid to the elderly. For example, when one is newly hired into a company, all instructions given to the new employee by anyone that entered the company before the new hire must be obeyed without question. The Westernization of companies has alleviated some of these traditional pressures, but the hierarchical structure still remains strong today. Another example is in terms of interacting with older members of society. Talking back to elders is seen as disrespecting them and should never be done. The right thing to do on a crowded train or bus is to give up your seat to an elder. Bowing
to elders is also a way of showing respect, and is done often when any interaction is made between two or more people.

Second, unlike the United States, Japan is a group collectivist society where being thought of as part of the group is imperative. Having uniformity amongst the members within a group is a necessity. There is even a Japanese saying that goes, “The nail that sticks out will be hammered.” Conformity is the norm in Japan, whereas in the United States, the individual is often given praise. In the United States, children are taught to be different and to have their own opinions—individualism is valued in many ways. In fact, being just like everyone else can be interpreted as a sign of a lack of originality and looked down upon.

Third, personal and group respect and reputation are important in Japan. Causing shame to oneself or one’s family is avoided at all costs. This is because one’s reputation is something of extreme value, and once ruined, it is nearly impossible to regain. Furthermore, an individual’s actions reflect on the group of which the individual is a member; thus, bringing shame to the group if those actions are perceived to be negative or unbecoming. In contrast, in the United States, the media will seek out those who have “fallen from grace,” but Americans are soon to forget, and one’s reputation can be regained or forgotten easier than in Japan.

These three basic differences between the cultures are just the beginning to understanding both cultures. Thinking about these and other cultural differences between the United States and Japan helped in my understanding of the school environments within the study. Each school was located within these two contrasting cultures (i.e., two school settings were in Japan and one in the United States), and these broader cultural
settings did shape the schools and their classrooms that I observed in various ways including interactions between students and teachers, teachers and parents, and school leaders and their external communities. It also shaped the different ways in which I was viewed as a “visitor” and researcher. Based on these understandings, I examined the dual language educational practices within the schools and classrooms I observed.

Comparing Classrooms in Terms of Emergent Themes (Table 6.1)

There were multiple themes that emerged from the data that I collected over the nine-month period. From the gathered information, certain themes recurred. When reflecting and rereading the field notes from my observations, these themes were observed on a daily basis and played an important role in shaping the students’ learning. These included the underlying assumptions I deduced about the particular dual language approach within each school (i.e., what we might refer to as the values and goals of each program), the particular curricular approach and its implementation within each setting, and the particular program structure, teacher instructional styles, and family-school relationships that formed key components of students’ dual language educational experiences. As there was an abundance of information that was observed that directly related to dual language theories, curriculum, and curricular implementation within each program, these two aspects are discussed in greater detail in the subsequent sections of the chapter in order to showcase the depth and relevance that they brought to this study.

In this first section, I focus on program goals and structure which include empathy between students, teachers’ instructional style, and family as major categories through which to differentiate the three dual language programs. These aspects played a prominent role in making DLE programs where students learn and grow to be bilingual,
Table 6.1

*The Analysis of Each School Based on Emergent Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goals and Structure</th>
<th>AIS</th>
<th>CIS</th>
<th>RIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School emphasis on supportive, holistic type of learning environment, where risk taking and creativity were emphasized.</td>
<td>3 year program.</td>
<td>11 year program.</td>
<td>8 year program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-age grouping and intended flexibility of social interactions to promote natural language learning.</td>
<td>Strong school commitment to multi-age learning environments, supported by the value structure of the school, and incorporated in various ways into the classroom learning environment.</td>
<td>Divided space to separate languages in classroom, consistent with school mission of language separation. Students adapt to this physical boundary and move freely between the language-related spaces in the classroom.</td>
<td>Commitment to small class sizes, which interacted with the students’ educational experiences in various ways. It facilitated building student bonds and empathy toward each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school uses a program pull-out approach for students who are having some difficulty being on a par with their classmates.</td>
<td>Students were with a particular teacher only for a year (not multi-age).</td>
<td>Language boundaries were fairly clearly drawn in this school (e.g., there were a number of norms and rules that supported one language at a time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language boundaries were fairly clearly drawn in this school (e.g., there were a number of norms and rules that supported one language at a time).</td>
<td>The playground served as an informal language learning laboratory that brought together students learning a variety of different languages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 6.1 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>AIS</th>
<th>CIS</th>
<th>RIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher teamwork</strong></td>
<td>Teacher teamwork that addresses student learning needs and makes</td>
<td>Integrate social and emotional progress in addition to language</td>
<td>Small class size influenced student educational experiences. E.g., it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student input</strong></td>
<td>adjustments based on individual student needs.</td>
<td>acquisition.</td>
<td>resulted in somewhat idiosyncratic learning environments, since each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student input in instructional topics, collaboration on projects,</td>
<td>The school creates instructional situations that facilitate multiage</td>
<td>class was subject to its own unique set of language dynamics,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition of key learning aids that emphasize the naturalistic</td>
<td>interactions and informal learning across ages. Enters into selection</td>
<td>depending on the specific language backgrounds of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acquisition of language.</td>
<td>of developmentally focused learning tasks, since students remain</td>
<td>Tracked by reading ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of role modeling throughout learning environment</td>
<td>with teachers over time.</td>
<td>Students had input regarding learning, but had to address the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite the formal curricular structure, student interests are</td>
<td>school goal of answering a set of questions on curricular units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incorporated into lessons and theme-related projects.</td>
<td>Students did not perceive themselves as “Japanese language speakers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presentations.</td>
<td>community invited to learning sessions where projects were</td>
<td>Parents were involved in school improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presented. Attended community meetings where educational ideas are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shared and input is valued. Parents encouraged to volunteer in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bicultral individuals who take the initiative and responsibility for their learning, different from traditional early-education school settings.

**Program Goals and Structure**

Although on a broad level each school made some similar adaptations to incorporate dual language instruction (e.g., teacher qualifications, time allocated to instruction in both languages), there were a number of notable differences in how the programs were specifically structured. Prominent differences emerging were the length of time students were enrolled in each program, language boundaries (e.g., physical separation of languages, daily separation of languages), and the relative focus on multiage versus single-age grouping. From my observations, I concluded AIS had a program structure that emphasized a supportive, holistic type of learning environment, where student risk taking and creativity were emphasized. AIS teachers nurtured the idea of safety and freedom to make mistakes, which was the fundamental basis for their program’s value structure. Most important, AIS had a strong commitment to multiage grouping, which supported the school’s intended flexibility of social interactions to promote natural language learning. The school nurtured these student interactions, which enabled the students to use the language frequently, thus allowing them to learn the new language in a natural way.

CIS had an eleven-year DLE program where the classroom environment supported a high level of student regard for their classmates’ academic and social needs. Similar to AIS, this was likely due, as least in part, to its multiage structure. The students were encouraged to be more aware of their classmates and therefore took a more active role in assisting them. In contrast to the other two settings, the physical space in the
The classroom was divided to separate languages, which was consistent with the school’s espoused mission of language separation. I observed that students were able to adapt to this physical boundary and moved freely between the language-related spaces in the classroom. Another sharp contrast, however, in program structure was the use of a pull-out approach for those students who were having academic difficulties in staying on par with their classmates. This structure appeared to result in many missed opportunities for the students separated for language instruction in joining the rest of their class in whole-group learning activities.

The eight-year DLE program at RIS clearly had a different type of language classroom boundary from the other two schools concerning where each language was acceptable. Although the 5-year-old students had a difficult time keeping to strictly Japanese in the classroom in which I observed, they understood the rule and did their best to follow through. The playground at RIS served as an informal language learning laboratory that brought together students learning a variety of different languages. The school's commitment to small class sizes also impacted the students’ educational experiences. It facilitated the building of student bonds and empathy toward each other in this classroom, which showed daily through students’ interactions with each other. RIS also contrasted with the other two settings by having a philosophy of grouping students of the same age within the classroom, as opposed to the cross-age groupings and associated interactions in the other two schools, which seemed to have benefits in facilitating student learning. The advantage to this single-aged classroom was the fact that each student completed the same activities as every other student in the classroom. This meant that teachers did not need to create multiple lesson plans for the different levels in the
classroom, and were able to focus on teaching one level. In this way, the teacher was able to direct her attention to individual students who were struggling.

**Similarities in program structure.** The analysis revealed that all three schools incorporated a dual language program where the end result for the students was for them to become competent in English and Japanese, along with appreciating the cultural values that each respective language entailed. However, each school also ensured students’ social and emotional needs were met first before the language and academic stringency were incorporated into the students’ learning. When students were having a difficult time, the teachers communicated with students in the language most comfortable for them. This type of response is consistent with the view that social emotional development is part of the student’s whole development and is needed for them to succeed in school. This appears to be an important characteristic of effective dual language instruction regardless of specific program structure.

**Empathy.** The age of the students in each classroom varied. When students were grouped with peers that did not share the same age, empathy was more apparent. When a younger student was crying, an older student also showed signs of sadness and comforted their classmates. Older students were helpful and assisted younger students in classroom activities as well as daily life routines such as helping them put on their shoe. Students were often seen collaborating with their peers and were understanding if their peers were not at the same cognitive level as their self. Classrooms where the ages of the students were the same provided some contrasting features. Instead of being helpful, students were seen understanding their peers, but not necessarily reaching their hand out to help. Knowledge was not often shared among the students. Instead, students kept to themselves.
It is difficult to say whether students learned more in a multiage class as opposed to a traditionally class. However, it was clear that students in a multiage class were more understanding and social with their peers than students in a traditional classroom setting.

**Instruction**

Prominent instructional features emerging from the separate classroom case studies included the importance of teachers’ teamwork (e.g., planning, adjusting to student needs), a focus on student collaboration in their choice of learning activities, and modeling of intended behaviors (e.g., pronouncing words, providing verbal and nonverbal cues). The instruction at AIS was based on the teachers’ teamwork, which put at the forefront assessing students’ learning needs and making adjustments based on individuals’ needs. At AIS, students’ direct input in the instructional topics helped them make the necessary connections to help understand the language. Collaboration with classmates on projects and repetition of key learning aids that emphasized the naturalistic acquisition of language were frequently used instructional techniques in the classroom. In addition, I concluded that teachers and staff portrayed role models of bilingual individuals within the daily earning environment, which reinforced for students the advantages of being bilingual.

RIS integrated social and emotional progress in addition to language acquisition through its multiage grouping structure as well as through guidance by the teachers. I observed on numerous occasions that teachers would request for older students to help younger, incapable classmates in informal settings in addition to the planned formal instructional activities taking place. The ability to make learning tasks developmentally focused was in part because students would stay with the same teacher for three years. In
this type of instructional program, teachers appeared to be more understanding of individual needs and delivered instruction focused at each student’s unique level. Despite formal curricular structure, student interests were also incorporated into lessons and theme-related projects.

The small class size at CIS appeared to influence student educational experiences in both expected and unexpected ways. More specifically, the small class size resulted in a somewhat idiosyncratic learning environment, since each class was subject to its own unique set of language dynamics, depending on the specific language background of the individual students. For example, the specific group of students that I observed viewed themselves as only English speakers, although they were learning Japanese. This class contrasted considerably with the class for 4-year-olds, where the majority language in the classroom was Japanese.

On the other hand, small class size facilitated teachers’ ability to adjust their instruction based on the students’ backgrounds and abilities. When the students advance to first grade as 6-year-olds, they are tracked by their reading ability. However, teachers expressed that although the students were tracked, they still needed to provide differentiated instruction, since the students still had a variety of different ability levels. I also observed that students in this setting had some input regarding their learning activities, but the teacher ensured that they addressed the school’s goal of answering a specified set of questions regarding each curricular unit.

**Similarities in instruction.** Aside from teacher teamwork in planning and adjusting instruction based on student needs in each classroom setting observed, one additional similarity that emerged across the programs was the particular way in which
the schools evaluated their students’ learning. In each setting, student assessment was conducted via a system that tracked student academic progress through a portfolio that documented student work, rather than grading students on a traditional grading scale (e.g., A – F) based on an accumulation of tests and classroom assignments. Student work was stored in these portfolios over their course of the DLE program, and the contents of them were then passed along to the next teacher. Anecdotal records for each student were written by their teacher or teachers, and they were also kept in the student portfolios as an additional way to evaluate each student’s progress. These assessment practices seemed consistent with Brisk’s (2006) guidelines for dual language instruction. She notes that a “valid assessment of bilingual students includes background information, performance in both languages, academic achievement, and ability to function in both cultural contexts” (p. 159). She further clarifies that “ideally each student should have one portfolio where the assessments carried out by the various teachers in English and in the native language are collected” (p. 162).

**Family**

The analysis also revealed the importance of teachers’ frequent communication and efforts to involve parents in the education of their children. Based on observations of school performances, teachers’ informal interactions with parents, and their presence in the classrooms in various ways, it was clear that all three settings valued communication with parents and their direct involvement with their children’s educational experiences. There were many activities in and out of the classroom that needed parental assistance. AIS constantly sought parents for help in ensuring that the learning activity was carried out for optimal learning. For example, parents were observable in the classroom on a
weekly basis to read a book to the class. Indubitably, the parents joined the students on off-campus field trips, which included even a trip to the potato farm to dig potatoes for further exploration in the classroom, and for cooking activities. They also took potatoes home to their families. The young age of the students in this classroom, as well as the parents whom were involved in the classroom, created the necessary home-school bond that enhanced the students’ learning experience at school.

CIS emphasized public input and involvement through its scheduled public meetings to inform the community about their school, curriculum and progress. Parents and the community were invited to attend the meetings where projects and reports were presented. The input gathered from these meetings was valued by the school in helping it make changes to its educational program that would enhance student learning. Within the classroom, the parents were invited to share their heritage background with the students. Through this, the students had invaluable opportunities to learn first hand about cultures of the classmates.

Field trips were a valuable learning opportunity for the students at RIS. The parents volunteered to help escort the students on and off public transportation in attending shows and visiting sites of educational experiences. Parent volunteers even used their own car to take the students. Aside from field trips, parents helped in selling vegetables from the school garden to help raise money for the school. This helped connect the parents to the school in a way that was beneficial to the school and the students because of the learning opportunities that were given in selling the vegetables.

As previously discussed, each of the three schools that I conducted my research had a highly diversified group of parents. Some parents spoke only English, some spoke
only Japanese, some spoke both. There were even certain parents who spoke natively neither of the languages being taught at the schools.

From the interviews and conversations I had with them, the parents of AIS and CIS students enrolled their children into the DLE program because they believed that having their child acquire English and Japanese would lead to further education and economic opportunities down the road. They also believed that exposure to the two languages would benefit their child in the long run cognitively and academically. This corresponds to previous research that shows the link between bilingualism and better student performance in school, and greater success in their future careers in the working world (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Parents at RIS, on the other hand, chose to have their child learn English and Japanese not because they believed learning those languages will lead to success, but rather due to the interest they had with the Japanese country and culture. They felt that having their child exposed to an additional language and culture would lead to cross-cultural competencies that would help them associate with people from many different backgrounds. They also thought learning an additional language would boost their child’s self esteem and pride.

The differing reasoning for enrolling in a DLE program notwithstanding, there was a unifying theme that communication between parents and the program is an important part of making the students experiences within the program flourish. Informing parents about what their child has accomplished in the class allows for the opportunity for them to openly speak with their child about their experiences in school, as well as about any current and future events. This intimate candor furthers the connections between
students, parent, and school, and is why it is vital to keep the channels of communication between the class and parents free from impeding obstructions.

At AIS, a newsletter was sent to the parents on a daily basis via email. These newsletters were also posted outside the classroom so parents with limited access to the internet could also read the messages. Each day pictures were taken and included in the daily newsletter, which gave a vignette into what the students were able to do that day. In addition to informing of that respective day’s events, parents took the content of these newsletters seriously as they often referred the content in their discussing with the teachers their thoughts and concerns on the program. For example, when their child’s name was not shown as having been a participant in that day’s show and tell even when previously scheduled, one mother voiced her disapproval due to feeling her child lost out on his opportunity.

At CIS, there was also a class newsletter. However, it was not as frequently distributed. Instead, each student had a small communication notebook that they would take home every day. Inside their notebook, parents were able to find notes about upcoming class activities, as well as notes on their child’s progress. Certain parents would also comment back in the notebook, and used it as their own correspondence tool with the teacher. Other parents, however, chose not to interact with the teachers in such a manner.

At RIS, although the school as a whole had a newsletter that regularly was distributed, the DLE class I observed did not have their own class-specific newsletter. Instead, the teachers used emails to communicate their comments to the parents. In all correspondences, pictures were included. If any parent had something to say that was
pertinent to the day’s activities, they would relay these important messages to the teachers in the morning when they dropped off their child at school.

The findings across the cases are thus consistent with previous research that has identified parental support and involvement as an important part of DLE programs. This is because “families provide for the basic emotional and physical needs of their children” (Brisk, 2006, p. 128). Therefore, as Brisk concludes, “They should be encouraged to contribute to the formation of bilingual-bicultural individuals” (p. 128).

**Comparing the Schools in Terms of Learning Theories (Table 6.2)**

I found the following six concepts highlighted in Table 6.2 to be most prominent in students’ daily classroom learning experiences. First, the techniques of language mimicking and memorization were observed frequently. These common language learning techniques reflect the “post method” era, which emphasizes the eclectic use of language learning methods. In all three cases, teachers consistently were observed to require students to repeat words and phrases. For example, at CIS the Japanese teacher had the students mimic tongue twisters day after day, slowly adding more and more words each day. Two weeks later, students were able to say the tongue twister by memory and were subsequently observed to say it over and over for further practice.

Second, the input of each language played an important role in shaping the curriculum to allow for ample comprehensible input. This comprehensible input, which stems from the input hypothesis advanced by Krashen (1985), shaped the way in which the teacher delivered the curriculum. Gestures and pictures were a common tool used in all three cases to provide students with a comprehensible input. At AIS, for example, the teacher would write the word in hiragana for those that were able to read, but also drew a
Table 6.2

The Analysis of Each School Based on Relevant Learning Theories from Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIS</th>
<th>CIS</th>
<th>RIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input Hypothesis</td>
<td>Teachers used pictures, gestures, and situations to assist in comprehensible input.</td>
<td>Teachers used pictures, gestures, and situations to assist in comprehensible input.</td>
<td>Teachers used pictures, gestures, and situations to assist in comprehensible input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Hypothesis</td>
<td>Show and Tell presentations were formal, language production opportunities.</td>
<td>Project presentations were formal, language production opportunities.</td>
<td>Project presentations were formal, language production opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural</td>
<td>Interaction opportunities with senior citizen at a care home. Prosocial interaction with peers.</td>
<td>Interaction opportunities with 9, 10, and 11-year-olds. Prosocial interaction with peers.</td>
<td>Interaction opportunities with 6-year-olds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Motivational</td>
<td>Teachers incorporated the celebration of American holidays and traditions, as well as Japanese holidays and traditions.</td>
<td>In addition to celebrating American and Japanese holidays and traditions, teachers also incorporated the celebration of holidays and traditions of their students’ cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Teachers incorporated the celebration of American holidays and traditions, as well as Japanese holiday and traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Incidental</td>
<td>Children repeated what they heard their classmates say during group discussion.</td>
<td>Children taught each other languages other than English and Japanese during recess.</td>
<td>Children learned colloquial, informal language from classmates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
picture by the word to help those still learning the Japanese language make the connection between what was being said.

Third, opportunities to use the language formally varied from school to school, but were always a part of the lesson plan. This type of formal use of language follows the output hypothesis proposed by Swain (2000), which suggests that language production is increases the mental effort needed to process language. This idea also connects with code-switching, which occurs when students switch, deliberately or subconsciously, between languages (Baker, 2006). Students’ perception of what it is to be accommodating, or what they interpret to be prestigious, is what drives them to code switch (Baker, 2006). The majority language is often used to gain acceptance or status. In addition, the majority language can also be used to gain a sense of belonging to a group (Baker, 2006). The act of code-switching can therefore be interpreted as the student taking the initiative for their learning, and their wanting to gain acceptance into the L2 community.

Fourth, interaction with others varied. The students in the multiage classrooms showed more prosocial behaviors in comparison to their single-age classroom counterparts. Such was seen in the empathy shown to their classmates, especially in the scenarios where an older student would assist a younger student with his or her difficulties. Although this demonstration of empathy was not unique to the multiage classrooms, students in the traditionally single-age classroom, although understanding, were observed to be less likely to take the initiative to help their classmates in need. Interactions also occurred between students and people other than their classmates. These included those interactions with senior care homes, and older schoolmates. This resembled the sociocultural perspective that was laid out by psychologist Lev S.
Vygotsky, who thought that language learning depends primarily on face-to-face interactions (Mitchell & Myles, 2004).

Jean Piaget’s (1976) concept of cognitive conflict was frequently seen in the interactions between the older and younger students within the classrooms. Cognitive conflict is when the differences between students’ perspectives compel the student with the higher comprehension of the L2 to explain himself or herself to the student who does not yet possess that same level of language acquirement (Palincsar & Brown, 1986). This is done in an attempt to dispel any potential discord that could potentially develop between the two. Through this process of cognitive conflict, development and growth occurs once any sense of confusion a student might possess is resolved through the cooperation between students, and the collective whole has gained a sense of mutual understanding on the subject. Additional benefits from these interactions between older and younger students include the development of the students’ communication skills, social skills, prosocial skills, and leadership skills (Stone, 2004). This idea of social learning, which is based on Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of the zone of proximal development, suggests that children’s potential development can be improved when they work with adults and in the presence of more capable peers. This improvement is said to be on account of the cognitive growth that the students experiences when placed in circumstances where they are put around those who possess greater cognitive ability than themselves.

Fifth, the idea of connecting culture to language learning was inevitable. Linguistics alone does not encompass all the facets needed to master a new language effectively. The only effective way that a student can do so is by being exposed to the L2,
and to have that exposure supplemented with learning the culture of the L2 simultaneously (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1999). Cultural learning is essential to the mastery of a language, as it provides the opportunity for the student to fully understand word meanings beyond just a surface-level degree, as well as provide contextual significances of the L2 that would be impossible to comprehend without an adequate cultural basis to relate what is being said against. For example at CIS, the students celebrated the Japanese tradition of throwing beans to ward off bad spirits and welcome only good spirits. They would yell out the phrase, *oniwa soto, fukuwa uchi*, which is what people say when throwing the beans. This provided a great opportunity for the students to not only use the Japanese language, but to also understand the meaning in context. This was done by taking the students to a nearby park, and allowing them to throw beans at teachers and other students who were wearing masks to physically represent bad omens. Students and teachers took turns being bad omens, while the others would chase and throw the beans at them.

Without the cultural knowledge of a language as their foundation, students’ potential positive learning outcomes are greatly limited. This association dynamic of language and culture is crucial to the students’ ability to successfully communicate in the L2. Furthermore, by developing the connection between language and culture, it allows for the students to “act as anthropologists, exploring and understanding the target culture in relation to their own” (Peterson & Coltrane, 2003, p. 2). These ideas of having students interested in the languages culture builds motivation to learn the language, which follows the extended motivational framework laid out by Dörnyei (2001). Capturing the students’ interest through the use of culture was a way learning was enhanced in these classrooms.
This type of intrinsic motivation results in joy, pleasure, and satisfaction of curiosity (Deci et al., 1989). Moreover, Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci (2006) found students with intrinsic motivation are more engaged in learning activities, had better conceptual learning abilities, and had higher persistence at activities for learning.

Finally, the interaction between the students that led to informal learning opportunities was prominent across all schools. Most importantly, the students acted as language teachers for their classmates. This informal, incidental learning that was spontaneous held value to both students (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). The above-mentioned themes are valuable discussion topics to consider because of the important role they played in shaping the classroom learning environment and student learning.

**Comparing the Schools in Terms of Curriculum Implementation (Table 6.3)**

Looking further into the idea of curriculum implementation, I identified three distinct levels. These included the curriculum used in each case, recognizing student learning needs, and techniques used for implementation.

**Curriculum**

All three schools used a student-centered approach to teaching as the basis for the learning experience they offered to their students. This constructivist view of learning, which is based in Piaget’s (1976) findings, promotes the idea of students’ learning through working with their environment, as well as explaining what they experienced through short and long-term projects. This engagement with the environment itself promotes intellectual development, cooperative skills, collaboration skills, and social skills, which were great mediums for the students to learn the skill of taking initiative.
Table 6.3  
*The Analysis of Each School Based on Curriculum and Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIS</th>
<th>CIS</th>
<th>RIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Two-year multiage, theme-based approach following the play-based Reggio Emilia method.</td>
<td>Three-year multiage, theme-based approach using group and individual projects.</td>
<td>Traditional, single age classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program followed the National Association for the Education of Young Children’s guidelines that are based in Washington, USA. These guidelines are supplemented by second language development guidelines for English and Japanese.</td>
<td>Teachers created the Japanese curriculum based on public school guidelines.</td>
<td>Curriculum based on national and state standards and delivered through six inquiry units using the Primary Years Program of the IB curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Needs</strong></td>
<td>Students were at varying levels of English and Japanese.</td>
<td>Students were at varying levels of English and Japanese.</td>
<td>Students were at varying levels of Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students were at varying developmental levels.</td>
<td>Students were at varying developmental levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Teachers gathered student-generated ideas for classroom projects.</td>
<td>The English teacher, Japanese teacher worked together to come up with a topic. From there, they sought student input on what future projects would be.</td>
<td>The Japanese teacher had the students give their input on what they wanted to do for their unit project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers used pictures from the internet and gestures to help the students understand the theme and project.</td>
<td>Activities based on these parameters ranged in level, so that all students could participate.</td>
<td>Lessons were planned around student interests that would ultimately lead them to the end goal of answering questions regarding the six inquiry units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects were done in individual and small group settings, while utilizing L1 and L2.</td>
<td>Multiple levels of activities were available to ensure that all students were academically challenged and stimulated.</td>
<td>The lessons would be identical for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual help was done on a need basis.</td>
<td>The core topic alternated between teachers and languages, so students were exposed and able to express ideas in L1 and L2.</td>
<td>Individual help was done on a need basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pictures were taken to document student progress and accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive use of the SMART Board technology and its available resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
towards their learning (Jaruszewicz, 1994). The students were given some parameters from the teachers, but nonetheless, it was the students that got to choose what they wanted to learn and explore. Since the learning was based on their interest, students remained engaged with their learning experience, and also retained a sense of responsibility towards their learning. Students often would return the next day eager to continue the work they started the day before, and they would remind teachers that they needed extra time to work on unfinished projects. The way this student-centered approach is reflected in the classrooms is shown through the process of how learning activities are decide on, as well as the interactive nature that this process entails. This process starts with the teachers asking the students what they want to learn or explore. Once a topic was chosen, the teachers would then facilitate their students’ motivation towards learning by tailoring the learning activities to those interests. The teacher would assess student needs and then deliver the curriculum based on these needs.

Although all three schools had a student-centered approach to instruction, the curriculum and approach they used varied by school. AIS had a theme-based curricular approach using the Reggio Emilia method, which reflected on the young students they had in their program. Play and exploration were the key aspects in the delivery method of the curriculum. The teachers were keen on student learning needs and interest, and they were always flexible and adaptable to whatever changes that needed to be made in order to meet student needs. These were seen in the individualized attention and care given to the students. Projects were sometimes done together as a class group, while at other times the students were divided into small groups, which allowed them to work at their own level and pace.
Like AIS, the DLE program at CIS also used a theme-based curricular approach. The teachers introduced projects, and it was up to the students’ discretion as to what they wanted to do and how they were going to interpret the given theme to their complete projects. Due to the three-year age difference between students, teachers always ensured that there were multiple levels of activities available. This made for an interesting dynamic, as although the students were learning the same concepts, depending on their level, they would approach the theme from a different angle. The teachers took all these aspects into consideration when planning. They discussed with each other what would be ideal for each student, and allowed for those activities to be a part of the learning process. The SMART Board in the classroom was used to the teachers’ advantage, as it allowed for an activity suitable for students who need the kinesthetic movement in picking letters and putting them together to create words.

At RIS, the relatively structured curriculum allowed for continuity throughout the school. This aided in a smooth transition for the students as well as the teachers. Student needs and academic levels were communicated clearly between the teachers from the previous year, and these communication channels continued to be open throughout the year. Although the lessons revolved around student interests, due to the class consisting of only a single age group, variation in activities was minimal, and most were expected to do the same activity as everyone else. Modifications were made on a case-by-case basis.

**Deliberate language learning.** Most students enter the DLE program already speaking one of the target languages of English or Japanese. Their home language consists of either English or Japanese, and therefore they are able to converse in their home language comfortably. However, given their young age, the students are actually
still learning their home language as well. Reading and writing are both taught during the course of the year. Students as young as three at AIS were able to distinguish between the two languages. They knew exactly what was English and what was Japanese just by hearing the languages. Older students were able to distinguish between written languages as well. At CIS, students were learning how to read and write in both languages. Due to the flexibility of having three grade levels in one class, teachers were able to work with small groups that consisted of students at the same level. This ensured that each student was given appropriate instruction geared towards their level. Although English and Japanese were used simultaneously within the classroom, the students did not seem fazed at all. In fact, hearing both languages in the class was the norm. Students code-switched between languages to do their best when communicating in their L2. At RIS, formal reading and writing was done only in Japanese. English was used only as the medium of instruction for art, music, and PE.

The students are immersed in English and Japanese during the day. It was not uncommon to find a student or two in each class that checked out during group work. Checked out students refer to those that looked away from the group, played with their hands and feet, and talked to their peers instead of paying attention to the teacher. From my observations, I concluded that it was because the students did not understand what was being said and could not contribute to class discussions. However, once the teacher used pictures and gestures to help struggling students understand, they were more alert and willing to participate. The teachers in all three schools used pictures and gestures when teaching. The students were still learning the target language, so the easiest way for the teachers to get the students to understand was to emphasize the target language with
the usage of pictures and gestures. At AIS, the word was written and the teacher would draw a picture of what the word meant. This helped the students who were still learning the language to follow along in group discussions. At CIS, gestures were often used to get students who did not understand either language an easier time with comprehension. The teacher would show the students what they needed to do through examples. The students were usually able to understand what they were supposed to do because of these gestures and examples. At RIS, pictures were used to help the students understand what the teacher was talking about. At all three schools, the use of pictures and gestures enhanced student understanding and helped to keep them engaged in class discussions.

**Technology use in implementation.** Schools also used technology as a way to implement their curriculum. New technologies have influenced the ways that language learning can be done at all levels of schooling. This is on account of how integrative technology can be when used in accordance with the cognitive and sociocognitive approaches that language learning entails. Technology can amplify the available opportunities that students have to be exposed to the L2, as well as create opportunities for the process of learning to be social and communicative. This in turn would potentially allow for the students to have the language tools to further their social, cultural, and linguistic explorations as they progressed through the programs (Warschauer & Meskill, 2000). Although it was reflected to different degrees, technology was seen in each of the three schools where I conducted my research to have had an impact on the students’ experiences.

The school with the greatest integration of technology into their DLE program was CIS. Within the classroom, there were four computers that were open-access to all
students to use during their individual work time. Software installed on these computers included games that incorporated math lessons, as well as drawing programs that supported the students’ creativity. Students were able to work at the computer at their level and advance to the next level at their learning pace.

In addition to the four computers in CIS, the classroom was also equipped with a SMART Board, which is an interactive whiteboard that utilizes touch screen technology. Due to the availability of the SMART Board in the classroom, the English lead teacher and the Japanese lead teacher were able to generate lessons and daily activities that took advantage of the extra functionality of the additional technology. Aside from the functional benefits that these technologies brought with them to the classroom, they also provided an extra benefit in regards to maintaining student attentiveness, and countering the checking out effect that sometimes afflicts students. Although already free to discover and satisfy their inquisitiveness towards the topics that they wanted to delve further into, the available computers enabled the students another avenue for their curiosity to be answered. This freedom to get up and learn the way they wanted to minimized the potential times where students could find themselves checking out from the day’s events and activities. The SMART Board’s interactive touch screen feature and novelty also deterred any possible checking out as the students were observed to be more attentive to what each teacher was speaking about due to the interweaving of speaking and visual aids, and their ability to manipulate the teaching materials on the SMART Board.

The other two schools, AIS and RIS, did not have nearly the same level of integrated technology available in the classroom. Both schools refrained from making computers available in the classroom. That did not mean, however, that computers and
technology did not play a role. If what the students were trying to learn about was unable to be found via the available resources already within the classroom or the library, the teachers would access the internet, and then pull information for the students. They would then print out what the students needed, and bring it with them to the next class. Although rudimentary in comparison to the large scale technological integration at CIS, technology was still a valuable aspect to the students’ experiences at AIS and RIS. They were all well aware of the capabilities of the computer and internet, and were clear in what they needed or wanted to do when asking their teacher.

Even with these benefits taken into consideration, however, it is important to also note that there are still potential disadvantages that could be associated with technology. Most notably are the investments in money and time that any new technologies would require before being able to be used in the classroom. Although it can be said that investing in technology could lead to greater effectiveness in teaching languages, in order to even attempt to utilize any technology there first needs to be the willingness and availability of resources to cover startup costs. These startup costs include things such as hardware, software, and training. Adding to this is the time commitment that the teachers would be obligated to give in order to effectively operate the new technology in the intended manner (Warschauer & Meskill, 2000).

It could be said that the administration at AIS and RIS found that additional technology was not needed in the classroom, and that their DLE programs would still produce students that would be fundamentally sound in their basis for being bilingual and biliterate. The administration at CIS, on the other hand, had a different perspective on technology as their classroom’s inclusion of computers and the SMART Board reflected
the school’s view that given a technological advantage, their students could reach greater levels of language proficiency and ability. However, since there is no definitive answer as to whether either perspective results in a greater probability of producing fully bilingual, biliterate students, it is impossible to say if all DLE programs need to bolster their current classrooms with the newest technology.

**Evaluation.** Student evaluations are an inevitable aspect of the learning process and ensuring the curriculum was implemented as planned. Having the ability to monitor and track each student’s abilities and progress is an imperative part of creating a learning environment that promotes progress and growth. Traditionally, such evaluations are done based on a percentage scales (ex. 0% - 100%), the letter grade scale (ex. A - F), or having letters indicate levels of proficiency (ex. “S” for satisfactory). Comments from the teacher regarding the student’s performance may also accompany the used evaluation method.

Variations of this type of grading have been the standard for schooling for generations. Horace Mann introduced the graded system of education to the United States in 1843, which organized children into different grades based on the students’ ages, and who were then made to progress through subsequent sequential grade levels and curriculums (Stone, 2004). But even though this school system alleviated some of the convolution that was developing at various schools, it still was not enough to identify student needs and keep track of academic achievements. However, things started to change in the late 19th Century with the adoption of offering a number/letter grade, which corresponded to a student’s performance. At first, only a percentage scales were used. However, there was a lack of consistency and too much subjectivity. This therefore led to
the development of the 100 point scale, which would then be paired with the five point letter scale. These alterations to how grading was done was in direct correlation with the schools needing to have a better way to keep track and differentiate between students of varying academic abilities in response to the massively higher levels of enrollment (Brozo & Hargis, 2003).

Similar to the United States, grades are traditionally disseminated as ranked grades in Japan, where the majority of elementary schools use a three-tiered system. Some schools use a two-tiered system, a five-tiered system, or even a combination of the two. These are represented through letters, numbers, or even symbols depending on the schools preference.

On the contrary to these standard norms, some schools have opted out of these traditional grading systems and instead use only an anecdotal record keeping system to track student progress. DLE schools often choose to evaluate their students using these anecdotal comments rather than the traditional grading system. There are various rationales and reasoning to why this is done. One such reasoning behind choosing to use anecdotal comments is the notion that students’ language acquisition rates are all unique to each individual. Therefore each student can only attain the L2 at a pace respective to their own level, which may or may not be on a comparable level to his or her peers. These DLE schools and their teachers believe that keeping anecdotal records of student progress produces an even more accurate evaluation of the student than a letter or percentage grade. An additional benefit to keeping anecdotal records of each student is that it allows for that student’s progress over the course of their school career to be seen in much greater detail. In comparison to having only letter or percentage grades to look
over, observations and narratives provide teachers with actual stories and examples of student progress.

However, some teachers have expressed concerns regarding the scenario in which students are not given a grade, and instead only have anecdotal records for their performance evaluations. These concerns rise from the growing habitually that students from DLE programs can foster in which not receiving or having grades being given to them becomes the norm. This can lead to a difficult transition and integration once they transfer into a school that functions in a more traditional schooling system. It can be extremely complicated for a student to conceptualize the need, and necessitate obtaining high grades when they have not had the pressures of maintaining a certain level of performance, or meeting certain required academic benchmarks before. Parents have also expressed difficulty with the anecdotal record keeping method because they have no grades that they can submit to the school administration when their child is ready to progress to their next grade level.

**Similarities about curriculum.** One similarity in the three cases was the relative emphasis on using the language that was not the majority language outside of the school. The schools located in Japan stressed English, and the school located in the United States put importance on incorporating Japanese into their curriculum. From my observation, this was an important value position in getting the students to learn both languages. Once the student stepped outside the school, the community surrounding the school was a monolingual society. It was important for the schools to take this factor into consideration when planning the curriculum. Students’ exposure to one language is increased due to their time outside of school. Having the curriculum reflect this, and allowing extra time
and effort on the language not used by the surrounding community, was an important factor for the schools to take into consideration.

**Summary of Results**

Individually analyzing the schools helped to describe understand the detailed aspects of dual language education that each setting emphasized as part of their mission, approach, program structure, as well as how teachers worked day-by-day to implement the schools’ DLE approach. Although the schools all operated an English-Japanese DLE program, the location of the schools, how the specific school environments were set up, as well as the specific curriculum and teacher implementation of the curriculum all differed on a day-to-day basis within each school. Therefore, a good portion of the information collected was case specific, and the dynamics that each school operated under was unique.

The cross-case analysis of the schools, which attempted to illuminate some similarities, as well as distinctions between the individual cases, added additional depth to the individual case studies. While certainly not indicative of a full range of educational possibilities, they help illustrate some of the range of mission, program structure, and curriculum implementation associated with dual language education in English-Japanese programs for young children. The first perspective of analyzing the field notes based on dual language theories and hypotheses laid out in Chapter 2 showed that the data connected directly and paralleled previous research findings, as well as illuminating how these types of schools operated on a daily basis over an extended period of time. This type of continuity is important for understanding how students experience their early educational experiences in learning two languages simultaneously. The second
perspective viewed the data from a curriculum and instruction point of view, where the idea of incorporating student needs into the lesson plans was revealed to be a consistent practice in these types of educational settings.

Important to note is that regardless of the geographical location differences, curriculum differences, or student population differences, the social learning aspect was prominent throughout all three schools. However, the language use of the students varied greatly, and a large determinant of this was the location of the school. For example, CIS was located in Japan and, therefore, naturally the stronger language of many students was Japanese opposed to English. Most students’ less proficient language, English, was used during physical education, music, and art. The opposite was true for RIS, where because it was located in the United States, it was only natural to have students whose stronger language was English. Therefore, English was used during physical education, music, and art instead.

Based on the findings discussed, the last chapter will delve deeper into the points made in this chapter to gain a further understanding of the DLE programs observed. This final chapter discusses the findings in relation to the purposes of the study and research questions, considers some implications for practice and further research, considers some limitations, and draws several conclusions which aid in building the foundation needed to understand English, Japanese DLE programs.
CHAPTER 7. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter, I discuss the major findings of the study related to its purposes and research questions, draw conclusions about the DLE schools I observed, and highlight what might be expected when enrolling in such a program. Implications and recommendations for practice and further research are also presented.

The objective of this study was to look at DLE schools in the United States and Japan and thereby better understand DLE schools that teach English and Japanese to children. Specifically, I focused on how language, culture, and the environment played a role in enhancing student learning. The research questions posed in the beginning of this study were as follows:

1. What are the mission, purposes, program characteristics, and structure of DLE in private DLE schools in the United States and Japan that teach English and Japanese?

2. How does each school connect language, culture, and its environment to enhance students’ DLE experiences?

3. Based on my observations, what types of educational experiences would one expect from being in a DLE program in these two countries?

Data were gathered through being a participant observer in three schools, two of which were located in Japan, and one, which was located on the West Coast of the United States. These schools were chosen based on their school structure in delivering instruction in English and Japanese and their goal in supporting their students to become proficient in English and Japanese while maintaining the cultural values of the respective languages.
Chapter 1 provided an overview of the problem, relating the brief history of DLE schools in general, and the current state of DLE in the United States and Japan. Chapter 2 reviewed previous theories, research, and ideas relating to DLE. Chapter 3 laid out the method used to investigate the phenomenon of DLE schools in the United States and Japan. The analysis of the fieldwork was developed in several chapters. Chapter 4 provided a narrative, which detailed a typical instructional day within each of the individual schools. Chapter 5 then provided three single-case analyses of each school setting which described how teachers worked to implement and connect the school’s particular environment and dual language approach (e.g., program structure, mission, goals), valued cultural aspects of education, and dual language instruction on a daily basis to enhance students’ learning experiences. After these single cases were presented, Chapter 6 provided the cross-case analysis of the settings based on the dual language theories, concepts, and previous research developed in Chapter 2, as well as the themes, which emerged from the fieldwork. Finally, in Chapter 7, I discuss the major findings of the study and draw several conclusions about the DLE schools I observed and what is to be expected when students attend such a program.

**Discussion of Findings**

The idea of DLE is not a new phenomenon, yet the research on English-Japanese elite, private, international DLE schools is extremely limited. The findings of this study add to the current knowledge about what is known about these types of schools. In addition, the results provide information about how the schools approach instruction in English and Japanese simultaneously, as well as introduce students to the respective cultures. In the following section, I revisit the research questions initially posed through
the emergent themes in Chapter 6, while making the connections to the key components of what I found to be of importance through this research. The discussion of the findings is organized around four broad themes that dominated the various analyses in Chapters 4-6: the dynamics of multiage settings in a DLE school, the importance of utilizing appropriate output in regards to being comprehensible (including the use of code-switching), the emergence of hybrid culture, and the need for distinctive language separation including the effects of the two-way DLE program.

**Multiage**

Two out of the three classrooms observed in this study delivered their curriculum though the multiage approach. At AIS, the age span amongst the students was two years. At CIS, however, the age span was three years. In both cases, the schools recognized that students’ development varied, and that a multiage setting provided a risk-free and supportive learning environment that nurtured the students’ progression.

What was prominently noticeable in these multiage settings was Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal development. This is the notion that children’s potential development can be improved when given the scenario that they are put among adults and highly-skilled peers. It is within this “zone” that a child is able to perform activities on his or her own, and at the same time may experience certain frustrations in result of his or her attempts at those activities. In these scenarios, the adult or more capable peer is able to offer guidance, which is often referred to scaffolding. Interrelated with the zone of proximal development is the phenomenon of scaffolding, which was observed more frequently in the multiage classrooms than the single-aged classroom. The teachers in the
classroom were more aware of the varying levels of their students, and they were able to assist them appropriately.

Furthermore, the more capable peers in the classroom also acted as agents for scaffolding. This was seen between students at AIS where the English-dominant 4-year-old child, Samantha, would translate what the teacher said in Japanese to English to her English-dominant 3-year-old classmate, Sonia. At CIS, Korean-dominant 5-year-old, Unmi, often assisted Korean-dominant 6-year-old, Jaewoo, in understanding what was instructed to be completed as the lesson task. Although Unmi was younger, she understood the Japanese instructions and was able to relay the information to Jaewoo who was still struggling with learning the Japanese language. This type of collaboration and facilitation between students occurred more often in the multiage setting.

Additionally, in both schools the teachers knew which activities suited the academic and developmental levels of each child in the classroom and provided the appropriate tasks for them to complete. These academic and developmental levels of the students were not bound by the students’ age. Instead their performance as a whole was taken into deliberation. These individual expectations per student were discussed between the two teachers after careful considerations of their abilities.

Output

The output hypothesis, which was advanced by Swain (2000), stated that language production was the only way students learned to make the needed grammatical processing that occurs only through the increased mental efforts used when speaking or writing. All three schools had very distinctive ways in which they incorporated this idea of students’ formal output. AIS used the traditional show and tell format where each
student would bring an item from home to share with the class. The teachers would coordinate so that the students would alternate presenting in English and Japanese. On days which the students had trouble presenting, the teachers would help students construct sentences to present to the class.

At CIS, the students prepared a presentation on a folktale of choice. This presentation was then given to other students, parents, and staff members via a poster presentation style where the listeners would walk around listening to presentation to presentation. Students adjusted their language use based on their audience which was quite a unique phenomenon to watch. Lisa used Russian for her parents, Japanese to her peers, and English for the English speaking staff members.

**Code-switching.** When learning English in a typical classroom in Japan, students are forced to use only English through regurgitating phrases the teacher taught them. A similar phenomenon can be observed in a classroom in America where the students are learning Japanese. It is rare to see any code-switching in these types of classrooms. I was somewhat surprised to observe that in a DLE classroom, however, code-switching was common. The students in the DLE program never felt restricted to only use one language, and they freely constructed sentences with words they knew. This feature greatly differed from a monolingual class, where students do not take the initiative to use the language. Therefore, language acquisition was often delayed.

The students in the DLE programs in this study took the American culture of being actively engaged with respect to taking initiative to undertake an assertive and deliberate learning style. This was manifested in this code-switching feature, which was common across all three schools and served as a useful learning mechanism for students
to convey their thoughts to their teacher and classmates. I concluded that code-switching was a vital aspect of learning within DLE programs to enhance student learning and to help the students gain the confidence in learning language. Therefore, the act of code-switching should be supported in the classrooms.

**Hybrid Culture**

In a DLE program, culture plays an integral part and can be viewed as one of the things parents can expect from this type of education. The students are often encouraged to take an active role in bringing their culture to the classroom through activities, presentations, and through the celebration of holidays. Similar to how the students mix their use of English and Japanese, students showed signs of having both American and Japanese cultures within them.

At AIS and CIS, the students were assertive and clearly expressed their thoughts and feelings, but they also showed signs of being reserved and disciplined. Teachers expressed the same observations I made as well at RIS. For example, one teacher expressed how even though the students were living in the United States and the majority language outside the school was English, the students still picked up on the Japanese mannerisms such as bowing to show respect and being humble about their work.

All schools incorporated culture into their classrooms and curriculum. The importance of having culture as part of learning the languages has already been previously documented (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1999). Naturally, when exposed to only one type of culture, it is easy to fall under the false pretense that a particular set of values, beliefs, and behavior represent the only way in which things are accomplished. Fortunately, for the students attending a DLE program,
more than one culture is incorporated into the curriculum. In this study, some students even had the opportunity to explore cultures other than American and Japanese, due to their classmates coming from cultural backgrounds outside of the two focal cultures being studied. It is through this exposure to different cultures that the idea of a hybrid culture is manifested and shared among the students in the classroom.

A hybrid culture takes the best part of each culture and blends them together to create a new, amalgamated culture. The term hybrid comes from biological studies, “where it refers to the offspring of two different races, breeds, varieties, species, or genera. But the word is freely used for people whose background is a blend of two diverse cultures or traditions” (Gramley & Gramley, 2008, p. 334).

As previously mentioned, the students observed in this study were able to learn both cultures through the school environment and formal curriculum. Through my observations and experience, not only were the students able to learn about, and fit into, the American and Japanese cultures, but they additionally picked up new norms that the hybrid culture incorporated. These norms included using English and Japanese simultaneously in a code-switching manner. Communication with parents was direct and personal, which parents of American cultural background preferred. However, communication also incorporated the use of a communication notebook, which the Japanese parents preferred.

Further examples of a hybrid culture could be seen in the schools’ planned functions for special holidays. Halloween and tsukimi (Harvest Moon Festival) were two celebrated holidays of both cultures that I observed. One aspect of these celebrations that the schools use to convey cultural aspects is foods from both cultures, which were
explained and then eaten. Students were served burgers and fries, as well as traditional Japanese bento box lunches, which included food items such as *tonkatsu* (breadcrumb-crusted deep fried pork). Through allowing this hybrid culture to flourish, these DLE programs and schools were promoting growth in communication, efficiency, and effectiveness. In addition, this type of hybrid culture built cohesiveness that allowed the students to feel welcomed and subsequently helped them to succeed.

**Language Separation**

After observing and analyzing all three cases, an idea that was prominent across all three schools was language separation. AIS separated the languages by time with respect to where and when a specific language would be used. Mondays and Wednesdays were designated English days, and Tuesdays and Thursdays were for Japanese. Friday was the exception, where they would use English in the morning and Japanese in the afternoon. CIS chose instead to separate the languages by teacher and location. Each teacher was responsible for one specific language, and an assigned area of the classroom was devoted to one of language. Students would also move to different classrooms when it was time for physical education, art, or music. While in these classrooms, the subject matters were taught solely in English. At RIS, aside from one exception, language was separated by teacher and classroom. Each classroom had a designated teacher and a designated language.

Although each school made it an active process to separate the two languages, there was a perceived superior method with regard to keeping English and Japanese clearly defined. There were distinct advantages noticeable in the AIS classroom and RIS classroom where the languages were clearly separated. Students knew what was to be
expected, and this knowledge of when and where allowed for a decrease in confusion. There was no uncertainty as to when and why they were expected to use one language or the other. Even at AIS where half the day on Friday was spent in English, and half the day was spent in Japanese, there was a clear line of demarcation to help the students understand it was time to use Japanese. The teachers would change from their English classroom apron to their Japanese classroom apron, and they would all announce together, “It is now Japanese time.” The assistant teacher would even change all the labels in the class, including the students’ name on their cubby to their Japanese names. The physical boundaries in RIS created by having separate classrooms also aided in making a clear distinction for the students in understanding which language to use.

The opposite could be said about CIS, where in the classrooms the students heard English and Japanese all around them at any given time. The languages often changed from moment to moment depending on which teacher was taking the lead. In addition, signs and labels in the classroom were written in both English and Japanese. Therefore, students gravitated towards reading the words that they were comfortable with, instead of challenging themselves to read their non-dominant language. And because of the lack of clear language separation, students seemed to not know which language was the correct one to use in a given situation.

**Student population.** The mission, purpose, and characteristics of each school were detailed in Chapter 4 and analyzed in Chapter 5. In each case, as we might expect, the nature of the student population influenced each school’s DLE program structure. More specifically, although the split between English dominant students and Japanese dominant students was not equal at AIS, the school still had a considerable number of
students from both backgrounds. Therefore, AIS most resembled a true two-way DLE program. In contrast, at CIS, although not all the students came from native Japanese speaking families, the dominant language in the classroom was Japanese, and there were no native English speakers in the class. Therefore, CIS actually had a one-way, Japanese dominant, DLE program. The student composition at RIS was the opposite of CIS where the students’ dominant language was English. Although there were a few students whose parents spoke Japanese, the dominant language in the household was still English. This made RIS a one-way English dominant DLE program. As it turned out, therefore, I was able to observe considerable DLE program variability across these three school settings.

As previously mentioned in the definition section of this dissertation, one-way DLE programs consist of a student population comprised of students who all share the same L1. This is done via the program operating under a strict demographic context, which allows for only one language group to be enrolled in the program. This structure allows for a homogeneous student population whose goal is to strive to become bilingual, bicultural, and biliterate through learning activities in the L1 and L2. Besides this goal, the one-way DLE program is operated in a way that best serves its basic principles. These basic principles are as follows: 1) to provide a learning environment that clearly separates, yet instills value in both languages, 2) to focus on the core academic curriculum of the school, 3) to provide needed cognitive support to each of the students, and 4) to support collaborative learning activities that engage and challenge the students (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

At the other end of the spectrum, two-way DLE programs consist of a student population comprised of half the students who are native speakers of the L1, and the
other half who are native speakers of the first group’s L2. This is done by the program instituting its own demographic context, which is guided by the need for an equal number of students of both language groups. These students are then integrated into the same classroom, where it is the goal of the class to create its own bilingual, bicultural, and biliterate students. Although fundamentally different in its class composition, the two-way DLE program shares the same basic principles as its one-way counterpart (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

However, besides the fundamental difference between the types of student enrollment permitted, there is a noted benefit to implementing DLE as a two-way program. This significant benefit is the two-way program’s functional ability to allow for a more enhanced probability of second language acquisition (Collier & Thomas, 2004). Students are innately social, and possess a great need to communicate and learn from one another. Through my observations as a participant observer, I witnessed how the dynamics of the classroom changed greatly, even if there were only one student in the class who was a native speaker of the L2. This was apparent in the AIS classroom, where two students had a strong Japanese background but a weak English background. Therefore, their classmates would help them understand English lessons. The students who did not possess a Japanese language background demonstrated initiative by regularly communicating with these two children in Japanese in order to bolster their own speaking ability and comprehension. The frequent opportunities to interact also helped those students whose native language was not English to use practice using English to communicate with their English-dominant peers. Although at times communication between the students was impeded due to being unable to fully comprehend what was
being said, proactive efforts on both sides aided in their attempts to convey the messages they intended to give. When words were not enough, students would add objects or gestures to try and assist the student in understanding the speaker. This active learning between the students helped to stave off possible instances where students would revert back to only using their L1, since there was no social prompt to use their L1.

From my observations, one conclusion that could be drawn is that students from two-way DLE programs tend to out-perform those in a one-way DLE program. The students at AIS had a better command of English and Japanese; daily conversations could be held without much difficulty and teacher assistance. The students at CIS and RIS needed more gestures and pictures to help them understand daily tasks instructed or requiring usage of their non-native language. Although previous research indicates that students in either two-way or one-way DLE program outperform their monolingual peers on tests of academic achievement due to the cross-language transfer of skills between languages (Gottardo, Yan, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley, 2001), the available research clearly indicates this observed gap between the two methods of DLE, with respect to language acquisition. If this is the case, then why is it that not all DLE programs are operated as two-way programs? One explanation is that ensuring that the student population will approach the required equal distribution of L1 language backgrounds within the two-way DLE program model is not an easy task. If students from one of the language groups do not apply in sufficient numbers, the school will be short on required enrollment and, therefore, will not be able to achieve the needed 50:50 ratio that the two-way program requires. In the schools I observed, it was rarely ever the case that the program represented a true two-way DLE program, as the circumstances outside of the school’s
direct control often determined what the school population would be and, subsequently, what kind of DLE program could be implemented.

No matter how much control a private, DLE institution has over its student population, and no matter how much the hope that half of the students will speak one target language and the other half will speak the other target language, there are always circumstances out of the institution’s control. In order for schools to operate, there first must be students enrolled at the school. Although the school might want to restrict enrollment to meet an ideal 50:50 home language ratio, if there is not an equal amount of students for each language, the school is left with no choice but to enroll those students in order to maintain a student population that will enable operations to continue and keep the school running. However, from my observations, even having one student that spoke the target language made a significant difference in classroom dynamics. This was both a statement made from numerous teachers, as well as an observation that I made while studying the interactions between students.

Implications

The dissertation research opportunity allowed me to do thorough classroom observations, which consisted of daily school visits, and resulted in multiple, and ongoing, interactions with the students, teachers, and staff members. This immersion in classrooms gave me a realistic, naturalistic, up-close perspective on the DLE programs being studied. This approach is in contrast to a study that depends solely on interviews with the teachers and surveys. It is through the countless hours spent in the schools in addition to the interviews and surveys that I was able to reflect on the following implications from my study.
The schools I observed all taught English and Japanese, and hoped that their students would become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. It was interesting to see, however, how English equated to British English at AIS, and Australian English at CIS, due to the teachers’ backgrounds. Interestingly, even though at CIS they used an English handwriting book that was published in the United Kingdom, students used the word “lorry” instead of the common, colloquial word, “truck.” However, the American holidays were celebrated at both schools, which contrasted from the type of English they were learning. Notable too is the difficulty to define what exactly American English is, since someone from New York has a difference accent from someone from Hawaii, who in turn sounds different from someone in Louisiana. As for Japanese, the standard Tokyo dialect of Japanese was used in all classrooms. AIS and CIS were both located in Tokyo, and the teacher at RIS was originally from Tokyo. Therefore, the type of Japanese being taught was consistent throughout the three schools. The Japanese culture incorporated into all three schools were also consistent as in they celebrated the same holidays, and shared the same folktales stories and sang the same traditional children’s Japanese songs.

The discussion in the previous section also shows the importance of having a diverse student population for DLE programs. Furthermore, having even one child speak the non-dominant language made a difference in the classroom, in the sense that it made students more aware of the need to use their nonnative language to communicate with their classmate. When assigning students to classrooms, schools should consider enrolling at least one student (or more) to allow this type of dual language phenomenon to develop between the students. Although it would not be a two-way DLE program
without at least half of the students speaking each of the target languages, it still created a valuable learning environment for the students.

Learning two languages and cultures, however, can provoke confusion for students. Therefore, having a clear, consistent learning environment for students was an essential aspect of keeping the learning experiences positive, as well as separating the two languages in their intended manner. However, the act of code-switching, where students used both English and Japanese, was actually observed to be a great learning tool for the students to make the connections and eventually to make the leap to using only their target language. Allowing students to code-switch should be seen as a stepping-stone that the students progress through in order to attain the final goal of fluency in each language.

Finally, incorporating American and Japanese cultures into the classroom through the parents was vital in building multicultural learning experiences. Through the activities, the students were able to learn both cultures and furthermore create their own hybrid culture that had both American and Japanese influences. Schools should consider embracing this hybrid culture as their own and support students through acknowledging the differences and accepting the new morphed culture that the students hold.

Traditionally, DLE programs have used the idea of taking the target and home languages and using them together to foster the development of students by supporting learning in an environment of hybrid literacy, which enables both languages to coexist with each other (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Alvarez, and Chiu, 1999). Taking what has come out of this study, it can noted that the next step should be emulating the practice with culture as the focus, in order to create a hybrid culture that would enhance students’
social and cognitive development, as well as serving as a diverse approach to learning language and culture.

The key concepts, stated previously, on successful DLE programs must be in place for students to have an enhanced learning environment. This study reinforces those key components of successful DLE programs and builds upon the current knowledge. Included in these key components are the importance of language separation, home language support, and parental communication (Quintanar-Sarellana, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2007; Rodriguez, 1982). These are the essential aspects that make the program beneficial for the student, and enable him or her to succeed at learning two languages simultaneously at school. Separating the languages allows for students to make the distinction between the languages. Supporting the home language does not only mean that the school deliberately teaches the students’ L1. It means that the school acknowledges students’ language and culture, and incorporates those into the curriculum when possible. Finally, the parental communication between the student, parent, and teacher is essential in ensuring that the student is performing at their ability in and out of the school setting. It is through this communication that the teacher is able to further understand each of the students and make necessary changes and adjustment to fit their needs. Making the connection between previous research and knowledge on DLE programs along with the findings of this study is vital in creating a DLE program to benefits all students.

**Recommendations**

This research has explored characteristics of DLE schools in the United States and Japan through participant observation in order to investigate the essential characteristics
of such learning environments. With a greater emphasis on global understanding and participation today, schools, teachers, and policy makers may desire further knowledge about how to incorporate DLE program features within their educational programs.

The exploratory nature of this case study raised several questions for further investigation. Research shows that it is important for student’s L1 be used and taught in the school to help promote the learning of L2 (Buckwalter & Lo, 2002). Then what about those students who are in programs where neither language being taught in the DLE program is their L1? A topic of study for further research should be on those children in DLE programs whose L1 is not supported at school. Another topic of study is the student’s perception of language use. This idea sparked from a conversation with a parent who said her 4-year-old daughter was in shock when she went to the United States, where everyone around her spoke English.

**Overall Significance and Contribution of the Study**

The findings of this study add to the existing knowledge on DLE schools and programs from the standpoint of being a participant observer in English-Japanese classrooms in different school settings. This specific type of cross-country study comparing the different DLE schools allows for further understanding on the different means of delivering a DLE curriculum, as well as how the surrounding environment, teachers, and students themselves influence the learning dynamics observed daily in the classroom. The data and analysis from this research can be used by existing or new DLE programs to reflect on their method and curriculum to improve and develop their program.

This study has new ideas to offer to the current literature and research on English, Japanese DLE programs. Through referencing the old ideas and understanding how DLE
programs are constructed, my study was able to transcend previous conceptions, perspectives, and ideologies to bring about a new perspective on these specialized DLE programs. This was done through the descriptive explanation about what the daily routine consisted of in each of the classroom and how the students progress through the prescribed curriculum for their language acquisition. To the student, it was an opportunity to learn English and Japanese with their peers through a fun and interactive environment where their development was fully supported by the school and teachers. The teachers held the difficult task of understanding that students all learn at a different pace, and that although language acquisition might seem like the ultimate priority, taking into consideration their social and emotional needs were just as important as their academic achievements. The parents need to entrust the school and teachers that in the end, their child will benefit from being in a DLE program and understand that progress in language acquisition may not be as quick as they hope.

With the ever-evolving global landscape bringing peoples and cultures closer together than ever, it is a possibility that knowing only one language might someday prove to be insufficient. It is imperative in understanding that there are more than one’s own way of thinking exists for things to happen. With each culture comes a unique language and perspective. Therefore, schools that adopt these most effective DLE practices, where developing the command of more than one language and culture becomes the norm, will enable their students to thrive in this ever-expanding global society.

A Final Reflection on the Study

Although there were unexpected obstacles that arose that potentially could have
hindered my research, the tribulations that were faced only served to enhance the content of the study. Being able to collect data in both the United States and Japan added a perspective that would not have been possible had I only collected data in Japan. Through this study, I observed ways in which schools operate, as well as varies styles of teaching English and Japanese simultaneous. The students that participated added an element to my research that turned out to be most vital in my findings.
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Appendix B

Surveys

Student Survey

With this survey, we hope to understand more clearly your views of learning Japanese and English by asking some questions about whether you speak different languages at home, at school and with your friends.

This questionnaire aims to gather insights into your understanding of Japanese and English education by inquiring about your experiences with speaking different languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name なまえ:</th>
<th>Age ねんれい:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Your Background あなたについて

1. Were you born in Japan? 日本で生まれましたか。

☐ Yes はい Skip to question 3
☐ No いいえ

2. How old were you when you first moved to Japan? 何才の時に日本に引っ越して来ましたか。

☐ Less than 6 years 6才以下
☐ 6-8 years 6〜8才
☐ 9-12 years 9〜12才
☐ more than 12 years 12才以上

3. Do you speak Japanese? 日本語を話しますか。

☐ Yes はい
☐ No いいえ Skip to question 10

4. How did you learn to speak Japanese? 日本語はどのようにして学びましたか。

5. I am comfortable speaking Japanese. 日本語を話す自信があります。

☐ Strongly disagree 自信が全然ない
☐ Disagree 自信が無い
☐ Neutral どちらともいえない
☐ Agree 自信がある
☐ Strongly Agree とても自信がある
6. How often do you use Japanese when talking to your parents?
親とはどれくらい日本語を話しますか。

☐ Never
全然話さない

☐ Once in a while
時々

☐ Most of the time
ほとんど

☐ All the time
いつも

7. How often do you use Japanese when talking to your school friends?
学校の友達とはどれくらい日本語を話しますか。

☐ Never
全然話さない

☐ Once in a while
時々

☐ Most of the time
ほとんど

☐ All the time
いつも

8. I enjoy learning Japanese.
日本語を学ぶのは楽しいです。

☐ Strongly disagree
思わない

☐ Disagree
やや思わない

☐ Neutral
どちらともいえない

☐ Agree
やや思う

☐ Strongly Agree
思う

9. It is important to learn Japanese.
日本語を学ぶことは大切である。

☐ Strongly disagree
思わない

☐ Disagree
やや思わない

☐ Neutral
どちらともいえない

☐ Agree
やや思う

☐ Strongly Agree
思う

10. Do you speak English?
英語を話しますか。

☐ Yes はい

☐ No いいえ Skip to question 17
いいえの場合は質問17へ

11. How did you learn to speak English?
英語をどのようにして学びましたか。


12. I am comfortable speaking English.
英語を話す自信があります。

☐ Strongly disagree
思わない

☐ Disagree
やや思わない

☐ Neutral
どちらともいえない

☐ Agree
やや思う

☐ Strongly Agree
思う

13. How often do you use English when talking to your parents?
親とはどれくらい英語を話しますか。

☐ Never
全然話さない

☐ Once in a while
時々

☐ Most of the time
ほとんど

☐ All the time
いつも
14. How often do you use English when talking to your school friends?
学校の友達とはどれくらい英語を話しますか。

- □ Never 全然話さない
- □ Once in a while 時々
- □ Most of the time ほとんど
- □ All the time いつも

15. I enjoy learning English.
英語を学ぶのは楽しいです。

- □ Strongly disagree 思わない
- □ Disagree やや思わない
- □ Neutral どちらともいえない
- □ Agree やや思う
- □ Strongly Agree 思う

16. It is important to learn English.
英語を学ぶことは大切である。

- □ Strongly disagree 思わない
- □ Disagree やや思わない
- □ Neutral どちらともいえない
- □ Agree やや思う
- □ Strongly Agree 思う

17. Do you speak any other language(s) other than English and Japanese?
英語と日本語以外の言語を話しますか。

- □ Yes はい
- □ No いいえ

If Yes, what language(s)?
どの言語を話しますか。

If Yes, how did you learn it?
どうやって学びましたか。
Your Home あなたの家について

1. What language(s) do your parents speak? あなたの親は何語を話しますか。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother or Guardian 母親又は保護者</th>
<th>Father or Guardian 父親又は保護者</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. What language is most spoken at home? 家では何語が一番使われていますか。

Your School あなたの学校について

1. Do learn to read, write, speak and listen in Japanese at school? 日本語ので読み書き、聞き取りと会話を学校で習いますか。
   □ Yes はい  □ No いいえ  Skip to question 4

2. What subjects are taught in Japanese?
   どの科目を日本語で教えていますか。

3. Do you have native Japanese speakers at school? 日本語を母語とする先生はいますか。
   □ Yes はい  □ No いいえ

4. Do learn to read, write, speak and listen in English at school? 学校で読み書き、聞き取りと会話を英語で習いますか。
   □ Yes はい  □ No いいえ  Skip to question 7

      いいえの場合は質問7へ

5. What subjects are taught in English? どの科目を英語で教えていますか。


6. Do you have native English speakers at school?
英語を母語とする先生はいますか。
☐ Yes はい ☐ No いいえ

7. In what language(s) are school announcements made?
学校からの通知は主に何語でされていますか。
☐ Japanese 日本語 ☐ English 英語 ☐ Both 日本語と英語両方

8. What language(s) fill your classroom?
教室では主にどの言語が聞こえますか。
☐ Japanese 日本語 ☐ English 英語 ☐ Both 日本語と英語両方

Thank you for helping us understand more about learning Japanese and English in schools. If there is anything else you would like to share, please do so in the space below.
ご協力ありがとうございます。お陰さまで学校での日本語と英語の教育方法が研究出来、より良く理解できると思います。以下に追加のコメントをお願いします。（日本語または英語で回答）
Parent Survey
保護者のアンケート

With this survey, we hope to understand more clearly your views of learning Japanese and English by asking some questions about whether you speak different languages at home and with your child.
このアンケートで自宅で子供と外国語を話しているかどうか問い、日本語と英語教育についての研究をしたいと思います。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s Name お子様の名前:</th>
<th>Child’s Age お子様の年齢:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality of Child お子様の国籍</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality of Mother/Guardian:母親の国籍</th>
<th>Nationality of Father/Guardian:父親の国籍</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Home あなたの家について

1. What languages do you (and your partner) speak? 何語を話しますか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother or Guardian 母親又は保護者</th>
<th>Father or Guardian 父親又は保護者</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What language is the dominant language spoken at home? 家では何語が一番使われていますか？

3. How long have you been in Japan? 日本には何年住んでいますか？

4. How many speak English at home? 家では何人英語が話せますか？

☐ 0  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4+

5. How many speak Japanese at home? 家では何人日本語が話せますか？
Your Child あなたのお子様について

1. Where was your child born? お子さんはどこで生まれましたか？

2. I speak to my child in Japanese. お子様とは日本語で話します。
   □ Yes はい □ No いいえ Skip to question 5
   いいえの場合は質問5へ

3. I am comfortable helping my child with his or her homework in Japanese.
日本語で宿題のお手伝いをするのは苦ではありません。
   □ Strongly disagree 思わない □ Disagree やや思わない □ Neutral どちらともいえない
   □ Agree やや思う □ Strongly Agree 思う

4. How would you describe your child’s Japanese language ability? Check one.
お子様の日本語力はどの程度ですか。一つ選んでください
   □ Conversation 会話 □ Classroom Participation 授業への参加程度
   □ Reading/Writing in academic subjects 教科の読み書き

5. I speak to my child in English. お子様とは英語で話します。
   □ Yes はい □ No いいえ Skip to question 8
   いいえの場合は質問8へ

6. I am comfortable helping my child with his or her homework in English.
英語で宿題のお手伝いをするのは苦ではありません。
   □ Strongly disagree 思わない □ Disagree やや思わない □ Neutral どちらともいえない
   □ Agree やや思う □ Strongly Agree 思う

7. How would you describe your child’s English language ability? Check one.
お子様の英語力はどの程度ですか。一つ選んでください。
   □ Conversation 会話 □ Classroom Participation 授業への参加程度
   □ Reading/Writing in academic subjects 教科科目での読み書き

8. What other language(s) do you use to speak to your child?
子供とは他に何語で話しますか？
Your Child’s School あなたのお子様の学校について

1. How do your child’s TEACHERS help to promote bilingualism?
お子様の先生はどのようにしてバイリンガルになるように教えていますか？

2. How does your child’s SCHOOL help to promote bilingualism?
お子様の学校はどのようにしてバイリンガルになるように心がけていますか？

3. Are there any specific ways that the SCHOOL lets parents know that learning languages is important?
お子様の学校では言語を学ぶ大切さをどのようにして伝えていますか。

Thank you for helping us understand more about learning Japanese and English in schools. If there is anything else you would like to share, please do so in the space below.
ご協力ありがとうございます。お陰さまで学校での日本語と英語の教育方法が研究でき、より良く理解できると思います。以下に追加のコメントをお願いします。
Teacher/Staff Survey
教職員のアンケート

With this survey, we hope to understand more clearly your views of learning Japanese and English by asking some questions about how you teach or see people teach Japanese and/or English, and what you believe are the school’s mission and views about language learning.

このアンケートを通して教職員方々の日本語と英語の教育方法や学校の視点を集め、よりよい教育ができるように研究しています。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name 名前:</th>
<th>Your Native Language 母国語:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position at School or Subjects Taught 学校での役職／教科:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Background あなたについて

1. Were you born in Japan? 日本で生まれましたか。

☐ Yes はい Skip to question 3
☐ No いいえ

2. How old were you when you first moved to Japan? 何才の時日本に引っ越してきましたか。

☐ Less than 6 years 6 才以下
☐ 6-8 years 6 〜 8 才
☐ 9-12 years 9 〜 12 才
☐ more than 12 years 12 才以降

3. Do you speak Japanese? 日本語を話しますか。

☐ Yes はい
☐ No いいえ Skip to question 10

4. How did you learn to speak Japanese? 日本語はどのようにして学びましたか。

5. I am comfortable speaking Japanese. 日本語を話す自信があります。

☐ Strongly disagree 思わない
☐ Disagree やや思わない
☐ Neutral どちらともいえない
☐ Agree やや思う
☐ Strongly Agree 想う
6. I enjoy teaching Japanese. (Skip to question 7 if not a teacher.)
日本語を教えるのは楽しいです。(先生ではない方は質問 7 へ)

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree
思わない やや思わない どちらともいえない やや思う 思う

7. It is important to learn Japanese.
日本語を学ぶことは大切である。

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree
思わない やや思わない どちらともいえない やや思う 思う

8. Do you speak English? 英語を話しますか。

☐ Yes はい ☐ No いいえ Skip to question 12
いいえの場合は質問 12 へ

9. How did you learn to speak English? 英語をどのようにして学びましたか。

10. I am comfortable speaking English.
英語を話す自信があります。

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree
思わない やや思わない どちらともいえない やや思う 思う

11. I enjoy teaching English. (Skip to question 14 if not a teacher.)
英語を教えるのは楽しいです。(先生ではない方は質問 14 へ)

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree
思わない やや思わない どちらともいえない やや思う 思う

12. It is important to learn English.
英語を学ぶことは大切である。

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree
思わない やや思わない どちらともいえない やや思う 思う
13. Do you speak any other language(s) other than English and Japanese?
英語と日本語以外の言語を話しますか。

☐ Yes はい ☐ No いいえ

If Yes, what language(s)?
どの言語を話しますか。

____________________________________

If Yes, how did you learn it?
どうやって学びましたか。

________

About the School 学校について

1. In what language(s) are school announcements made?
学校の行事はおもに何語で報告されますか。

☐ Japanese 日本語 ☐ English 英語 ☐ Both 日本語と英語両方

2. What language(s) fill your classroom?
教室では主にどの言語が聞こえますか。

☐ Japanese 日本語 ☐ English 英語 ☐ Both 日本語と英語両方

3. This school offers special classes or training sessions for teachers to increase their skills in teaching two languages.
この学校は先生がよりよく二カ国語で教えられるようにトレーニングがあります。

☐ Never ない ☐ Seldom ほとんどない ☐ Sometimes ときどき ☐ Always いつも

4. How do YOU help to promote bilingualism?
あなたは、どのようにしてバイリンガルを普及させていますか。

______________________________

5. How does the SCHOOL help to promote bilingualism?
学校はどのようにしてバイリンガルになるように心がけていますか？

______________________________

6. Are there any specific ways that the SCHOOL lets parents know that learning languages is important?
学校では言語を学ぶ大切さをどのように伝えていますか。

______________________________
Thank you for helping us understand more about learning Japanese and English in schools. If there is anything else you would like to share, please do so in the space below.

ご協力ありがとうございました。お陰さまで学校での日本語と英語の教育方法が研究できより良く理解できると思います。以下に追加のコメントをお願いします。
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