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Abstract

This dissertation comprises of a literature review on the common practices for teaching English Language Learners (also known as Culturally and Linguistically Diverse learners) in bilingual education. This dissertation also comprises of a brief quantitative research study that takes what literature deems as common practice in bilingual education and uses it to survey a small participant pool of former bilingual students and their parents. This survey seeks to reveal if whether or not common practice in bilingual education was observed in the experiences of the participants and their parents.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Summary of Dissertation

This dissertation will focus on the practices and models in place for bilingual education, as well as briefly investigate whether or not said surveyed bilinguals and parents of bilinguals experienced those practices and models. Bilingual education is defined by Bigelow and Ennser-Kananen (2018) as, "The use of two languages in the instruction and assessment of learners… Bilingual education programs vary in their goals, language use, and students served, and are shaped by sociocultural and sociopolitical factors, historical contexts, and the power of speakers and languages" (p. 10). In other words, bilingual education is when students whose first language differs from that of the language of instruction are taught and integrated into the mainstream. This integration is done through a variety of programs and methods, depending on the specific student and the specific school. This dissertation will discuss said various programs and methods and review the necessary literature that details which practices are identified in the literature as effective forms of bilingual pedagogy.

"There are anywhere between 6,000 and 7,000 languages spoken in the world today, and only about 190 countries in which to house them, which suggests how widespread bilingualism (or multilingualism) must be” (Shin, 2013, p. 1).

In other words, bilingualism and multilingualism are continually growing, even here in Ireland. It is no secret that Dublin and Ireland are on their way to becoming a massive international and global hub. Each year, more people from all
over the European Union and the world are moving to Dublin to live and work. More often than not, these people are coming from countries where English is not one of the primary languages, let alone the language of school instruction. According to the Central Statistics Office (2016), "In 2016, there were 535,475 non-Irish nationals living in Ireland… Just over 17 percent of the resident population of Dublin City were non-Irish with Polish, Romanian, UK nationals, Brazilian, Italian, Spanish, and French making up more than half of the total 91,876 non-Irish in the city in 2016. One in six Fingal residents was a non-Irish national with Polish, Romanian, United Kingdom, and Lithuanian nationals combined accounting for 53.8 percent of these" (p. 1). Also, more often than not, these working professionals have children. These children need to go to school, which means they need to learn English. More than likely, these children will have to learn English from the new school in which they will attend. My aim here is to see what research says are the best practices and strategies to teach these students, and then take that research and see if that is what is occurring in the classroom. Is the mainstream teacher heavily involved? Are the students left to "sink or swim"?

1.2. Vocabulary Terms

Throughout my research, a variety of key vocabulary terms have been identified, and they will be touched on here and then more fully detailed in the following literature review:

- “Just Good Teaching” (JGT): an approach to teaching developed for a diverse group of native English speakers, such as activating prior knowledge, using
cooperative learning, process – writing, graphic organizers, and /or hands – on activities (de Jong & Harper, 2005).

- Culturally and Linguistically Diverse learners (CLD): a preferred term for English Language Learners (ELLs) in that it recognizes that the needs of diverse students are broader than just needing to learn English and /or a new language (Gonzalez et. Al, 2011).

- Sheltered Instruction: a research – based instructional framework that provides clear and accessible content and academic language to English Language Learners (AKA culturally and linguistically diverse learners) in pre – k through 12th grade level classes (Hansen – Thomas, 2008).

- Scaffolding: process in which teachers model and /or demonstrate how to solve a problem, and then step back, offering support as needed (Firestone, 2008).

- Learning Log: used to help learners practice writing as they collect and organize information, pose and solve problems, and think visually about any and all matters concerned with their content area subject matter. Efficient way for learners in general, not just culturally and linguistically diverse leaners, to communicate what they do and /or do not understand. They are also a way of allowing teachers to monitor the vocabulary and the writing development of their students (Gonzalez, 2011).

- Submersion Approach: children are thrown to the mercies of the teacher, classmate(s), and instructional materials in English, with no concessions to their language and /or cultural needs (Temple et. Al, 2014).
• Additive Program: children add a new language and its accompanying culture to their mother tongue and culture, along with a positive self image (Temple et. Al, 2014)

• Subtractive Program: English, and it’s accompanying culture, are substituted for the mother tongue and culture (Temple et. Al, 2014).

• Basic Interpersonal Communications Skills (BICS): skills that permit ELLs to carry on a simple conversation in the new second language, and they appear to be proficient (Temple et. Al, 2014).

• Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP): required for the student to learn to read in the L2, learn math, etc… A higher level of language proficiency (Cummins via Temple et. Al, 2014).

• Mother Tongue: an individual’s first language.

• Cooperative Learning: a teaching strategy in which teams of students with different levels of ability use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject (US Department of Education, 1992).

• Professional Development: a wide variety of specialized training, formal education, or advanced professional learning intended to help administrators, teachers, and other educators improve their professional knowledge, competence, skills, and effectiveness (Great Schools Partnership, 2013).

1.3. **Bilingualism as an Asset**

> “Bilingualism is a resource to be cultivated for all kinds of populations, not a problem to overcome” (Shin, 2013, p. 3)
In other words, bilingualism is an asset in education and should be treated as such, especially in the classroom and in school settings, as there are many benefits of knowing more than one language. For example, according to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2019), "People who speak more than one language have improved memory, problem-solving and critical-thinking skills, enhanced concentration, ability to multitask, and better listening skills. They switch between competing tasks and monitor changes in their environment more easily than monolinguals, as well as display signs of greater creativity and flexibility. If that were not enough, as we age, being bilingual or multilingual also helps to stave off mental aging and cognitive decline" (p. 1). In other words, being bilingual truly feeds your brain and has a plethora of cognitive benefits, from the primary age to adulthood. In addition, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages goes on to state that, "Language is the most direct connection to other cultures. Being able to communicate in another language exposes us to and fosters an appreciation for the traditions, religions, arts, and history of the people associated with that language. Greater understanding, in turn, promotes greater tolerance, empathy, and acceptance of others – with studies showing that children who have studied another language are more open toward and express more positive attitudes toward the culture associated with that language” (p. 1). In other words, having another language under one’s belt promotes awareness and acceptance of other cultures, and allows one to communicate on a broader level. This can help in business and school alike. These are just a few of the benefits of
knowing more than one language, which will be detailed and discussed in the following chapters.

1.4. **Research Questions**

Now knowing that bilingualism is a positive asset and should be cultivated, recent research in the area of bilingual and multilingual education has demonstrated particular practices and methods that are recommended in the classroom for these students. However, there is a question of whether or not those best practices and methods are actually in place in the classroom. My study will acknowledge and address these practices, and then my research will see if that was the experience of the English language learners and their parents. As will be demonstrated in the literature review, recent literature in this area indicates that a variety of programs and methods are deemed "best" for bilingual education, and which specific one works best depends on the school and the student. No program or method is perfect; each has its own set of pros and cons. It is up to each school to figure out which program or method is best for its students. The following three research questions have been identified in order to investigate this topic:

- What does literature reveal as common practice in bilingual education?
- What is the extent to which the participants felt that their own experiences were in line with what is found in the literature as common practice in bilingual education? In other words, was common practice observed by the participants?
• What are the experiences of parents of support for the bilingual development of their children? Did they feel the bilingual education their child/children received was adequate?

1.5. Motivation Behind This Research

“The failure to include bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) courses as an integral part of teacher preparation stems, at least in part, from the assumption that teaching English Language Learners is a matter of pedagogical adaptations that can easily be incorporated into a mainstream teacher’s existing repertoire of instructional strategies for a diverse classroom” (de Jong & Harper, 2005, p. 102)

One common trend that I noticed in the literature was the lack of teacher preparation, hence why I chose the above quote. In other words, de Jong and Harper are saying that not preparing future teachers, specifically to best teach and help English Language Learners (also known as culturally and linguistically diverse students) in their classroom is the result of the common and unfortunate misconception that incorporating good teaching practices is enough. There are a variety of challenges that culturally and linguistically diverse learners face both in and out of the classroom. To start in the classroom, according to School Specialty (2018), “The challenges of learning a new language, the many exceptions in the English language, and differences in regional dialects – they are all overwhelming factors that can frustrate your ELL students. This frustration can lead to a lack of motivation, or even to an over-dependence on teachers or peers to assist them. Your ELL students who lack the vocabulary that their peers have struggled with
concepts like homonyms and synonyms, and can suffer from poor communication in the classroom. As a result, they may continue to speak more often in their native language, or be fearful of participating and speaking out in a classroom setting – all of which negatively affect their overall learning in the classroom” (p. 1). In other words, these students face the typical academic challenges that come with learning in school but also face a unique, specific set of challenges that come with learning a new language. Their learning is not as straightforward or as standard as that of their peers, meaning that just good teaching is not enough.

Firsthand experience with a teacher who did believe that just good teaching was enough is what sparked my interest in this research area. When I was doing my student teaching experience, there was an ELL (English Language Learning) student in our class. This student was a six-year-old from Paris, France, and he did not speak any English at the beginning of the year. As the year went on, his English did improve, and his reading and writing skills grew strong. However, since this French student was now in an English school learning to read and write in English, he could not read and write in French. His family had plans to move back to Paris in the coming months. They were concerned about his reading and writing development for when they would return to France, where instruction would be in French. It was so exciting to me that this student could be fluent in one language but not know how to read or write and not fully understand another language but be able to read and write it. To be frank, the main classroom teacher was not that involved in his learning experience, and he was always pulled out of the class for English class. Since my encounter with this young student, I
have been very interested in the realities of bilingual and multilingual education in monolingual schools. How can mainstream classroom teachers best help these students? More specifics will be detailed in the literature review, but to start, the mainstream classroom teacher can read to students daily, choose appropriate material, encourage and support comprehension, promote cooperative learning, and use multiple assessment practices (School Specialty, 2018, p. 1).

1.6. Conclusion

“In the year prior to April 2016, 82,346 persons arrived to live in Ireland, of which 53,708 were non-Irish nationals... Among the non-Irish nationals, 11,262 were couples with children” (Census of Population 2016 –Profile 7 Migration and Diversity, Recent Immigration, p. 1).

As this quote from the 2016 Census reveals, Ireland is becoming more and more international, with more and more groups immigrating and moving here. Of the people immigrating here, 11,262 of them were families with children. These children will more than likely attend school here in Ireland and will be placed in some sort of bilingual education program.

“A bilingual is not the sum of two monolinguals” (Shin, 2013, p. 4).

In other words, there is no set definition for this complicated term. As Baker (2014) famously said, "Bilingualism is a simple term that hides a complex phenomenon." There is no set definition, and it does not mean that an individual is perfectly fluent in two languages; while bilingualism could mean that, it could also mean that an individual is fluent in one and literate in another. Or that they are fluent in one and conversational in another. Maybe they are not fluent in
either. For the context of this dissertation, being bilingual will be defined as the ability to communicate (even the bare minimum) in more than one language. This will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter, the Literature Review. The Literature Review will focus on the various definitions of bilingualism, the “bilingual advantage”, the programs in place in bilingual education (how they work, strengths, limitations, etc.), current teacher training and preparation programs, as well as the various outcomes and challenges of bilingual education.
2. Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the background, purpose, and context of the study. This chapter aims to provide a comprehensive review of the relevant literature on bilingual education. The literature review will be divided into four main sections. The first section details the different misconceptions of bilingualism, a complex and positive phenomenon that does not have a set definition. The second section of the literature review outlines the various models of bilingual education, of which there are many. The third section considers teacher training and preparation programs, and the fourth and final section will detail the outcomes and challenges of bilingual education.

2.2. The Various Definitions of Bilingualism

It is important to note that there is not a set definition for the term “bilingualism.” Various scholars and researchers have varied opinions and ideas on what it means to be bilingual. These will now be explored and explained.

2.2.1. The Definition of Bilingualism

A common misconception about bilinguals is that the individual is completely fluent in both languages, (Grosjean, Li, & Bialystok, 2013). It has also been argued that bilinguals are two monolinguals in one person. However, this thought has been debunked by many researchers, including Shin (2013), who states, “A bilingual is not the sum of two monolinguals.” In other words, a bilingual individual is oftentimes not fully fluent in two languages, contrary to popular belief.
2.2.2. Opinions of Different Researchers

Bilingualism is interpreted in a number of ways by researchers. For example, Grosjean (2012) believes that “bilinguals are those who use one or more languages in their everyday lives.” Valdés (2015), on the other hand, believes that “bilingual/multilingual individuals… have more than one language competence. They are able to function (i.e. speak, understand, read, or write) even to a very limited degree in more than one language.” In other words, bilingual individuals are able to function and communicate to some degree in more than one language. Further, Stavans and Hoffman (2015) define bilingualism as “a situation where a person has competence in more than one language, can use each of his/her languages in appropriate contexts and is able to alternate between languages.” In other words, a bilingual individual is able to switch between his/her two languages and speak one or the other when necessary. In addition, according to Grosjean, Li, & Bialystok, “The definitions of ‘bilingual’ and ‘bilingualism’ vary depending on the context. They can include the knowledge and use of two or more languages, the presentation of information in two languages, the need for two languages, the recognition of two or more languages, and so on” (2013). For the purpose of this dissertation, bilingualism will be defined as the ability to speak and/or understand two languages, whether that be fluently, competently, or for conversational purposes. That part is not fixed.

2.3. The So-Called Bilingual Advantage
It is important to note that various researchers differ on whether or not being bilingual is ultimately advantageous, disadvantageous, or a bit of both. This section will discuss those views.

2.3.1. Bilingualism: Advantageous or Disadvantageous?

According to Baker, “Bilingualism is to intelligence as food is to human fitness. The relationship between the two is both central and controversial” (2014). In other words, bilingualism is a very complex and controversial topic. Research has shown that many parents are wary of having their children be bilingual, as they believe it will have damaging effects on a variety of aspects, such as cognitive and intellectual development and language acquisition. For example, in King and Fogel’s (2006) study, “Raising Bilingual Children (Common Parental Concerns and Current Research),” they found that many parents, “Believe that their children were likely to experience language delay… and fear that using two languages will result in confusion for their children,” (p. 2). However, on the other hand, Bialystok argues that some misconceptions and worries surrounding bilingualism, particularly in literacy acquisition, are actually more concerned with related issues and not bilingualism itself.

For example, Bialystok states, “Many, for example, address the problem of learning to read in a second language… The matter is complicated by the logical confound that being bilingual makes it inevitable that learning to read includes learning to read in a second language. However, if we are to isolate the role of bilingualism in acquiring this particular cognitive skill, then the
concern must be with reading, not with the language in which literacy is acquired” (2007). In other words, the root of the concern is really with learning how to read, not bilingualism. Bilingualism has been proven to have a variety of positive effects. For example, bilinguals find it easier to focus and can avoid distractions (Willis, 2012). Their executive function, which is used for staying focused, has been proven to be stronger in bilinguals. According to Blin (2018), “Every time a bilingual speaks, both languages are actually active, and the brain has to work to suppress one language while the other is being used. The mechanism employs the executive function of the brain more regularly in bilinguals, which makes it become more efficient” (p. 1). In addition, the effects of bilingualism are proving to be far more positive than negative, even though this point is constantly being disputed in the research community.

A research study done by Dick et al. (2019) would agree that learning a second language in childhood is “inherently advantageous for communication” (p. 692), but there is little evidence that shows additional benefits to executive function development. According to the same study, “A question commonly asked by parents, educators, and scientists are whether the benefits of learning a second language outweigh the potential costs” (p. 692). This question drove the research, as the researchers state that, while positive benefits of bilingualism have indeed been revealed by various studies, they are called into question because of several failures to replicate them. However, this study does, in fact, conclude by stating that, “These results should not be
taken to endorse the idea that learning a second language is disadvantageous – it is, in fact, advantageous in a number of domains” (p. 698).

Overall, there is more research that shows that being bilingual and acquiring a second language have a variety of positive effects on an individual. Whether or not it is completely advantageous, more so than being monolingual, is still up for debate, though.

2.3.2. The Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) and Language Learning

The critical period hypothesis (CPH) states that there is a set, limited developmental period for people to acquire a language and that once this period is over, people are less able to learn a language (Birdsong, 2014, p. 1). However, although it can be argued that it is easier to acquire a second language while growing up, specifically between the time one is born and the onset of puberty, as the brain is more flexible, not all are in agreement with this hypothesis. Bialystok (2010) states, “Children are given the opportunity to learn languages in a way that supports every part of this very difficult task. It’s all they do for the first five years; everyone they interact with interacts with them for the purpose of helping them learn language. If adults had that opportunity – quit your job for five years, [and] here is a mentor who will speak to you at exactly the level you need and only talk about things that the mentor already knows you are thinking about — they would be very successful, but life does not give us that chance. So, the main differences between learning languages as a child, and as an adult are life” (TVO). In other words, children have very different circumstances when it comes to
language learning and second language acquisition. If adults had the same circumstances and a supportive environment, surely they would be able to acquire a second language just as well. With a similar stance, Baker and Wright (2017) believe that those who begin earlier are at an advantage for language development, but there is not necessarily a critical period.

Bley-Vroman (1990) formulated the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis, which states that whereas children are known to learn language almost completely through (implicit) domain-specific mechanisms, adults have largely lost the ability to learn a language without reflecting on its structure and have to use alternative mechanisms, drawing especially on their problem-solving capacities, to learn a second language (DeKeyser, 2000, p. 499). In other words, though adults are just as capable of acquiring a second language, they have lost the ability to ‘dive right in,’ so to say. A child learns as they go and does not think about the appropriate way to learn something, for they do not know, whereas an adult will feel the need to draw on problem-solving skills and things of that nature. Ultimately, the acquisition of a second language comes more naturally to a child. For the context of this dissertation, we are to assume that anyone at any age is capable of acquiring a second language, especially in terms of the culturally and linguistically diverse students placed in mainstream classrooms. All students must be positioned as capable, no matter what the context.

2.3.3. Demographics
Samway and McKeon (1999) wrote a book about the different myths surrounding bilingual education in which they argue that there are more students with home languages other than English than one might realize and that schools need to realize that those students have particular abilities and needs. The book is formatted in lists of myths, and this section will now address two of these myths:

1. “The number of students who don’t speak English is going down.” The reality of this myth is that the number of students who don’t speak English is actually going up (Samway & McKeon, 1999).

2. “L2 students need only about one year in which to learn enough English to be able to succeed academically. Therefore, the emphasis should be on transitioning students out of special programs as quickly as possible.” The reality of this myth is that there is great variability in how quickly L2 students learn English and in the type of proficiency they reach in conversational and literacy situations. However, most L2 students need about 7 to 10 years in order to acquire academic English on a level comparable to their native-speaking peers. Based on research, bilingual education programs are effective in helping students learn English and academic content.

Bilingual education comes in a variety of formats, as explored, and it has been shown to facilitate bilingual development to varying extents. Research on program effectiveness specifically tells us that transitional
bilingual approaches appear to work more effectively than English-only approaches (Baker & Wright, 1999).

2.4. The Various Models of Bilingual Education

There are a variety of models, methods and practices in place for bilingual education. No one school follows the same exact program, as which one works best for one school may not necessarily work best for another. This next section will detail a variety of the models that were frequent in the literature – how they work, their features, strengths, and limitations will be detailed.

2.4.1. The Submersion Model

The submersion model mainstreams non-native English-speaking students into regular English-speaking classrooms. Submersion is often referred to as the sink or swim method for learning a second language because students who have acquired the language naturally and those learning the same language are put in the same learning environment. There is no structural support provided for learning a second language, hence the term “sink or swim.” Cummins (1981) argues that subtractive bilingualism leads to negative cognitive effects, such as having difficulty with succeeding in school. It has even been argued that students enrolled in the submersion model feel marginalized and drop out before finishing secondary school (Roberts, 1995, p. 372). In reality, few schools actually participate in submersion because they realize that if you put a culturally and linguistically diverse student into a classroom where they don’t speak the language, and then expect them to access the content independently, that isn’t feasible (Innovative Language, 2009). This “sink or
swim” idea is not suggested by many linguists as being the best method for bilingual education.

2.4.2. The English as a Second Language (ESL) Pullout Model

ESL stands for English as a Second Language. In the ESL Pull-Out model, students are literally pulled out of some of their classes in order to receive an English as a second language class - hence the term “pull-out” (Roberts, 1995, p. 373). Basically, the pull-out model consists of the ESL (English as a Second Language) teacher pulling ESL students out of their mainstream classes to learn English, either one-on-one or in a small group setting (Mills, 2019, p. 1). The pull-out model is beneficial in that it “provides more individualized support, a low-risk setting, the ability for teachers to closely assess student progress, and flexible grouping opportunities for enhanced support” (Mills, 2019, p. 1).

Though there are plenty of benefits to the pull-out method, there are challenges as well. Since the pullout method is normally used in schools where the students speak a variety of different languages, it can be hard to find teachers (Roberts, 1995, p. 373). The teachers that are there face a variety of challenges themselves. For example, if the teacher has access to a resource room (which is rare for ESL teachers), the culturally and linguistically diverse students are coming and going all day long at different times (Ovando & Combs, 2018, p. 29). This may not seem like an issue, but culturally and linguistically diverse students are not placed into their ESL classes in consideration with their age or class – usually they are placed in consideration
with their language proficiency level or what time is a good time for them to leave the classroom. This means that the ESL teacher could have a class full of different students from different years, making lesson planning challenging as it is difficult to generalize and make accessible for all types of learners and all ages of learners. Further, according to Ovando & Combs, “Many ESL teachers are itinerant teachers who have to travel to several schools in one week,” (p. 30). This could lead to inconsistencies across lessons because not every school has the same resources. In addition, with this model, the culturally and linguistically diverse students loose valuable time needed to access the full curriculum, thus leading to the issue of which class to pull the student from. Which class(s) to pull the culturally and linguistically diverse students from is often difficult to decide; it is not recommended to take children from “content classes or from classes in which they can form friendships with native speakers of English, such as physical education (P.E.), music, or art” (Roberts, 1995, p. 373).

To combat the issue of physically leaving and being pulled out of the classroom constantly, some schools have attempted to use a team-teaching model where the mainstream classroom teacher and the ESL teacher split the role of teaching the entire class (Ovando & Combs, 2018, p. 30). The pullout method of bilingual education is also the most expensive of all of the programs. This is largely due to the fact that the program requires the hiring of more teachers (particularly teachers who are trained in second language acquisition) (Ovando & Combs, 2018, p. 30). While the ESL Pullout model is
one of the most widely implemented practices in bilingual education, it is also one of the least effective. Ovando & Combs (2018) state the reasoning behind its ineffectiveness as, “Problems with this model are lost time in students’ access to the full curriculum, lack of curriculum articulation with grade-level (mainstream) classroom teachers, and no access to primary language schooling to keep up with grade-level academic work while learning English. The social assumption is that the language the child speaks is a problem to be remediated, and students often feel that they are stigmatized by attending what is perceived to be a remedial class,” (p. 29).

2.4.3. The Sheltered Instruction Model

The Sheltered Instruction Model is when ESL and content area classes are combined and taught by either an ESL-trained subject area teacher or by a team. According to Ovabdo & Combs (2018), “In the 1980s, the field of [bilingual education] began to move away from models that taught only the English language, recognizing that students inevitably get behind in their schooling while they are learning English, so language and academic content should be taught together,” (p. 30).

These classes are designed to deliver content area instruction in a form more accessible than the mainstream. They may use additional materials, bilingual aides, adapted texts, and so on to help students of diverse language backgrounds acquire the content as well as the language. Sheltered instruction is research-based and has a variety of features, according to Hansen-Thomas (2012): “It incorporates the use of cooperative learning activities with
appropriately designed heterogeneous grouping of students, places a focus on academic language as well as key content vocab, makes judicious use of ELL’s first language as a tool to provide comprehensibility, incorporates the use of hands-on activities using authentic materials, demonstrations, and modelling, and it incorporates explicit teaching and implementation of learning strategies” (p. 165). Basically, sheltered instruction takes all the ideas that "Just Good Teaching" has and then expands on them, making it more applicable and helpful for teaching ELLs.

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model is one of the most well-known models for Sheltered Instruction, arguably because of the focus it places on language and content objectives (Moore & Sayer, 2009, p. 87). The SIOP Model is a research-based instructional model that consists of eight components: lesson preparation, interaction, building background, practice and application, comprehensible input, lesson delivery, strategies, and review and assessment (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2018, p. 1).

Similar to the issue with the Pullout Method, sheltered models are often perceived as remedial, and carry with them a sort of social stigma. However, according to Ovando & Combs (2018), “Enrichment bilingual programs and other such innovations have successfully transformed the school’s community’s perception of [bilingual education] classes into “gifted” or “accelerated” curricula,” (p. 31). Sheltered instruction has proven to be very effective when it is delivered by an actual ESL trained teacher who has access to all the necessary resources (Ovando & Combs, 2018, p. 30) and, as
previous literature has now revealed, that is a rarity. However, according to Ovando & Combs, “Sheltered instruction is much more effective than ESL pullout because students have access to more of the curriculum while they are learning English,” (p. 31).

2.4.4. The Model of Transitional Bilingual Education

Transitional Bilingual Education provides content area support in the native language while teaching the student English. Initially, the learner is taught content classes in the native language and is taught English as a second language. The transitional model works by helping culturally and linguistically diverse students move from their native language to the English language. These programs are often found in communities with significant populations of non-native English speakers, particularly of one or two language backgrounds (Roberts, 1995, p. 374). This makes it easier and more desirable in terms of community attitudes to find bilingual teachers. The United States government, through Title VII of the Civil Rights Act grants, funds transitional programs.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is, according to the American Association of University Women (2019), “A federal law that prohibits employers from discriminating against employees on the basis of sex, race, color, national origin and religion” (p. 1). This act protects bilingual teachers. Transitional Bilingual Education is effective, but has many problems. Similar to the other programs previously mentioned, this model is often looked at as a remedial program; just like the Pullout method, transitional bilingual education is
separate education which in turn grants limited success in raising student achievement (Ovando & Combs, 2018, p. 32).

2.4.5. The Immersion Model

Immersion is the most commonly used practice in Europe (Beardsmore, 1993, p. 30), though it was originally developed in Canada, and was and is still used successfully with English speakers learning French, as well as with growing numbers of minority language children (Taylor, 1992). Immersion is a type of language teaching where the new language is the medium of instruction. In other words, you learn the language by receiving instruction in it (Gardner, 2018, p. 1). There are three main immersion models: total immersion, where 100% of the school day is taught in the new (it is important to note here that this model is similar to submersion, but different because students actually receive support), partial immersion, where half of the school day is taught in the new language and the other half is taught in the native language, and two-way immersion, where students are taught in both their native language and the new language (Gardner, 2018, p. 1).

2.4.6. In-Class Supports

A model as simple as utilizing in-class supports is helpful for bilinguals, and a change in focus from models of bilingual education to in-class practices will be detailed in this section. Two helpful in-class supports are scaffolds and learning logs. Scaffolding is more of a process, while a learning log is a practice. Scaffolding is, according to Firestone (2018), “A process in which teachers model or demonstrate how to solve a problem, and then step back,
offering support as needed” (p. 1). I think that this is a great way to help culturally and linguistically diverse students access content, as well as non-CLD students. Learning logs are used to help learners practice writing as they collect and organize information, pose and solve problems, and think visually about all matters within their content area subject matter (Gonzalez, 2011). It is an efficient way for learners to communicate what they do or do not understand, as well as for letting teachers monitor vocabulary and writing development.

Example of a Learning Log:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>My Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was the most important thing you studied today?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My thoughts and notes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.7. Legislation

It is important to note that the literature reviewed is somewhat US-centric, though my participants are Irish, because this literature provides helpful insights to the field. This section on Legislation will explore both American and Irish literature.

2.4.7.1. In the United States

Ohio was one of the first states to authorize bilingual education (German-English) in the public school system (Education Corner, 2019, p. 1). In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed by President Johnson. The Act provided funds for educational programs that were deemed necessary for children and public education, and bilingual education was one of the programs (Preceden, 2019, p. 1). In 1967, the Bilingual Education Act became a federal statute under Title VII of the Elementary And Secondary Education Act Amendment of 1967 (ESAE, Title VII) and provided funding for the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (BEA). This Act was proposed, and it allocated funds for English language programs (U.S. Legal, Inc., 2019, p. 1).

In 1974, the Supreme Court ruling in Lau vs. Nichols was a unanimous decision that further established the need for bilingual educational programs (Bon, 2019, p. 1). This ruling claimed that the lack of supplemental language instruction in public schools for culturally and linguistically diverse students violated the Civil Rights
Act (Bon, 2019, p. 1). Districts then became mandated to provide “appropriate relief” for these students, giving school districts autonomy over which program was appropriate for their school and the program’s specific needs and students (Bon, 2019, p. 1). In 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act replaced the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and mandated that all teachers teaching in bilingual education programs be fluent in English and any other language used in the classroom (Duignan & Nolen, 2017, p. 1). The act gave parents the choice to enroll their children in a bilingual education program, but put a three-year time limit on bilingual programs, meaning that after a student had been in school for three consecutive years, English-only instruction must commence, regardless of the student’s English speaking ability (Duignan & Nolen, 2017, p.1).

2.4.7.2. In Ireland

According to Devitt (n.d.), “In Ireland, bilingual education is usually understood as relating to all-Irish schools in the non-Irish-speaking part of the country. This is quite a restricted view of bilingual education. Such schools would be more accurately described as immersion since all subjects are taught through Irish. However, they are bilingual in the sense that many of the textbooks are in English, and the language of the playground is generally a mix of Irish and English” (p. 2).
2.4.7.3. General Education Primary School Teachers

Further, according to Devitt (n.d.), “The legislation for primary school teachers dictates that they follow a concurrent program, leading to a B.Ed (Bachelors’ of Education), with education and academic subjects being taught over a period of three years. There have been some occasions in which programs for primary school teachers were set up in order to meet a shortage” (p. 2).

2.4.7.4. General Education Secondary School Teachers

According to Devitt (n.d.), “Qualifications for secondary teachers is regulated by the Teachers’ Registration Council, which requires (a) a university degree, which includes a three years’ study of at least one of the approved subjects taught in Irish second-level schools, (b) a higher diploma in education awarded by a university,” (p. 2).

2.5. Teacher Training and Preparation

After touching lightly on language teacher training, in relation to bilingual education in Ireland, in the previous paragraph, this paragraph will now provide more details on the current state of the matter in both the United States and Ireland.

2.5.1. In the United States

Collier (1989) states, “For many years, educators have focused on the acquisition of English as the primary goal of special programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students. We have assumed that the development of English proficiency would result in our students’ eventual attainment of the
academic skills needed to succeed in school in a second language, at levels comparable to native English speakers” (p. 509). In other words, mainstream classroom teachers have been mainly focusing on having the culturally- and linguistically-diverse students acquire English under the false pretense that, if they attain proficiency, they will automatically succeed in all other academic domains.

2.5.1.1. Just Good Teaching (JGT) and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Currently, according to Pérez Cañado (2014), “Teachers come across as involved, committed, and eager, and the challenge of [bilingual students] is seen as a source of professional satisfaction, as it is impacting on methodological innovation and level of reflection” (p. 3). In other words, current teachers believe that just being a good teacher is enough. The “But That’s Just Good Teaching!” Theory (JGT) is a development in the field of bilingual education research by Ladson-Billings, and it is a campaign of sorts to incorporate culturally relevant pedagogy into the classroom that reveals that just being a good teacher is not enough. Ladson-Billings (1995) defines culturally relevant teaching as “specifically committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment… Culturally relevant teaching requires that students maintain some cultural integrity as well as academic excellence” (p. 160). In other words, the focus should be on whether all of your students are feeling supported and capable, not just the
mainstream students, and these students should be able to maintain their sense of identity throughout and not feel ashamed.

To further evidence that just good teaching is not enough, de Jong & Harper (2005) state: “Mainstream teachers must develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that reflect an awareness of three dimensions: 1. The process of learning a second language, 2. The role of language and culture as a medium in teaching and learning, and 3. The need to set explicit linguistic and cultural goals” (p. 104). In other words, by supporting each language individually, we support overall language development. Mainstream teachers must understand and be cognizant of the fact that culturally and linguistically diverse students have needs far greater than just learning another language. These teachers also must be culturally aware in order to best reach bilingual learners.

In addition, Bustos-Flores further evidences this need for a specific awareness by stating, “The academic performance patterns of bilingual learners as a whole cannot be adequately understood without considering their social and economic characteristics in comparison with native English speakers” (p. 3). In other words, culturally and linguistically diverse learners cannot be understood in the same way that mainstream students can. Therefore, mainstream classroom teachers should not approach them in the same way; they need to reflect that awareness. Furthermore, research tells us that as schools
are presented with more and more linguistically diverse learners, a “just good teaching” (JGT) approach will not be enough. To further evidence this fact, Bustos-Flores (2011) states, “It strikes me as quite odd that some teachers of bilingual learners can have no formal preparation and minimal workshop training and yet obtain a state-issued credential… Overall, too many bilingual learners have teachers who themselves admit that they are not prepared to teach these students” (p. 3). In other words, the mainstream classroom teachers are even admitting to being unprepared to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Teachers need better training, a case that will now be outlined.

2.5.1.2. **Current Teacher Preparation**

The models in place in bilingual education are oftentimes not executed properly, or to their full potential, and that is mainly a result of the fact that mainstream classroom teachers are not typically properly trained or prepared to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners in their mainstream classrooms. Jackson and Davis (2000) stated, “Teachers cannot come to expect more of their students until they come to expect more of their own capacity to teach them.” The National Center for Education Statistics reports, “One-third of teachers lack college preparation in the main subject areas they teach, and even fewer have preparation in their subject areas using ESL techniques” (Rodriguez & Villarreal, 2005, p. 1). As it stands today, teacher
candidates for general/mainstream education are taught to be inclusive, but specifics are rarely given, and many states allow emergency or “exam-only” credentials to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Téllez & Waxman, 2005, p. 15). In Texas, for instance, any teacher with a standard elementary certificate can request that the bilingual or ESL endorsement be added by passing a single paper-and-pencil examination and teaching in a classroom with at least one ELL student for one year. No field supervision is required for the exam-only option. Such a system promotes a climate where teachers quickly receive their initial certificate to begin their careers and then simply take tests to add endorsements (Téllez & Waxman, 2005, p. 15). The mainstream classroom teachers receive Professional Development (PD) for supporting the culturally and linguistically diverse learners throughout the year.

However, Téllez & Waxman (2006) believe that “[t]he professional development of mainstream classroom teachers must be addressed to improve ELL Education” (p. 9). Bilingual teachers also believe that the professional development is not enough and that it further employs misconceptions in mainstream classroom teachers’ minds about bilingual education (Téllez & Varghese, 2013, p. 130). For example, Calderón’s 2002 study reports the results from a national survey in the United States of 100 bilingual teachers on their specific professional concerns. Among these, they noted that mainstream
teachers developed misconceptions about the bilingual program; there are few opportunities for bilingual and mainstream teachers to discuss, plan, and address the needs of individual students after their transition; and mainstream teachers always blame the bilingual teachers if a student does not do well after transition; 4. each year there are “silent and not so silent battles” over resources between bilingual and mainstream teachers (Téllez & Varghese, 2013, p. 130). In other words, the mainstream classroom teachers are somewhat unaware of the specifics and necessity of a bilingual program and bilingual teachers. It would appear they believe that their job is to teach the whole class and that the bilingual teacher will support the bilingual students.

According to Schwartz, Sommerfeld, and Leikin (2010), “Teachers without such training believe that for schools, parents, and communities, English (L2) must be the first priority. Conversely, trained teachers reported that encouraging literacy in L1 enriches children’s cognitive and linguistic development, and prevents them from full acculturation into the host society” (p. 189). In other words, mainstream classroom teachers with proper training and preparation understand that in order to truly succeed, the first language of the culturally and linguistically diverse learners must be encouraged. Mainstream classroom teachers without this training and preparation are not aware, and the students are at risk.
2.5.1.3. Standards

According to Téllez & Waxman (2005), “The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has developed standards for the purpose of awarding board recognition for exemplary practicing teachers. The NBPTS standards for teachers of English as a new language represent a set of ideas similar to those articulated by other professional organizations, but also include expert knowledge in the teaching of ELLs. Briefly described, the four NBPTS standards specific to ELD require teachers to have a deep knowledge of: “1. how development, language, and culture affect students’ knowledge, skills, interests, aspirations, and values 2. language and language development; 3. culture and diversity; and 4. subject matter” (p. 12). Téllez & Waxman (2005) go on to state, “Interestingly, the major teacher-education organizations have been largely absent from the discussion on the preparation of quality teachers. The two primary teacher-education organizations in the United States – The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) and the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) – have devoted great attention to preparing teachers for culturally diverse students while paying little attention to teachers who will face language diversity. Indeed, AACTE has commissioned no less than six reports or books (e.g., Smith, 1998) on the preparation of teachers for cultural diversity, but not one focuses on language diversity” (p. 13). In other words, the
standards and preparations for the main classroom teacher tend to strongly focus on the cultural aspect of learning, and not as much on the linguistic one.

2.5.2. In Ireland

According to Devitt (n.d.), “During the compulsory period of education (6-16 years of age) pupils must study two languages, Irish and English. Outside the Gaeltacht the language of instruction is mostly English, except in all-Irish schools, Gaelscoileanna, in which all subjects are taught through the medium of Irish. The fact that all pupils must study Irish and English from entry into Primary school until the end of compulsory schooling has profound effects on the issue of the teaching of other languages” (p. 1).

2.5.2.1. Current Teacher Preparation

According to Devitt (n.d.), “Most teachers in second-level schools follow a consecutive model of training, a University degree, followed by a one-year University post-graduate course leading to the Higher Diploma in Education. This programme includes the history, philosophy, psychology and sociology of education, curriculum theory and development, as well as courses in the teaching of the different subjects taught in Irish secondary schools. Student-teachers also spend a minimum of 100 hours in classroom teaching practice. Future language teachers are not absolutely obliged to take a course in the methodology of teaching that language, nor to do teaching practice in it, but in practice the vast majority do” (p. 4).
2.5.2.2. **The Teacher Candidate Curriculum**

According to Devitt (n.d.), “All student-teachers of modern languages other than Irish receive a common program consisting of a lecture of one hour per week on general principles of language teaching, followed by a one-hour workshop in language groups. They also meet their supervisor[s] of teaching practice for one hour each week. The general lecture is delivered in English, [and] the workshops are conducted in either the target language or English. Student teachers of Irish [language] are dealt with as an entirely separate group and receive a similar program, but [it is] delivered entirely through Irish. Student teachers of English as a foreign language are also dealt with as a separate group. Assessment is by examination (half a paper) and one assignment” (p. 3). Devitt goes on to state, “All student teachers on Higher Diploma programs have to do at least 100 hours of teaching practice in a recognized second-level school. Teaching practice is generally sequential, carried out throughout the school year. In Trinity College, students teach on Monday mornings, all day Thursday and Friday, and come to the University on the other two and a half days. Students are supervised in their teaching practice by full-time and part-time members of staff. The number of visits varies between four and five per student, according to the university” (p. 4).

2.6. **The Various Outcomes and Challenges of Bilingual Education**
There are a variety of outcomes and challenges with bilingual education. The key ones that were recurrent in the literature will now be discussed in this section of the literature review.

2.6.1. Bilinguals in the Mainstream

Linguistic barriers to learning in mainstream classrooms put these culturally and linguistically diverse students at risk of poor education outcomes (Chin, 2015, p.2). Franson (2010) suggests that for culturally and linguistically diverse learners, equality of presence in the classroom does not necessarily mean equality of access to educational achievement. In other words, having them in the mainstream classroom might not be the best for them in terms of their academic achievement and helping them access the curriculum. Baker (1997) argues that monolingual children and bilingual children have different needs and different language starting points, making a complex teaching and learning situation for both the teachers and pupils when such children are unavoidably mixed in the classroom. Further, as previous literature by Téllez & Varghese (2013) has shown, “There are few opportunities for bilingual and mainstream teachers to discuss, plan, and address the needs of individual students after their transition, and mainstream teachers always blame the bilingual teachers if a student does not do well after transition. Each year there are ‘silent and not-so-silent battles’ over resources between bilingual and mainstream teachers” (p. 130). Once the culturally and linguistically diverse student has transitioned out of bilingual education and is fully immersed into the mainstream, they receive little to no support, and their English teacher and
main classroom teacher do not collaborate, more or less leaving the student to sink or swim.

2.6.2. **Strengths**

More often than not, students in bilingual education will outperform their monolingual peers on general measures of executive function. Culturally and linguistically diverse students can pay close attention without being distracted and also improve in their ability to switch from one task to another (Kamenetz, 2016, p. 1). Bilingual education may help culturally and linguistically diverse students keep up in other subjects while they learn English (Chin, 2015, p. 1). In addition, bilingual education helps culturally and linguistically diverse students develop language skills in their native (non-English) language.

Further, skills in the native language of culturally and linguistically diverse students may facilitate their development of skills in English. Bilingual education also supports cultural inclusion and diversity (Chin, 2015, p. 1). In addition, learning one new language makes it easier to learn more; bilingual education opportunities encourage brain growth, trigger student concentration, and reduce the amount of time required to transition between tasks (Ayres, 2019, p. 1). In addition, working memory is also improved. This improvement provides for better processing capabilities when exposed to new sounds, new concepts, and new experiences (Ayres, 2019, p. 1).

2.6.3. **Limitations**
By reducing exposure to English, bilingual education may slow the acquisition of the English language. A shortage of certified bilingual education teachers makes it difficult to implement bilingual education programs as intended. Appropriate teaching and learning materials may not be available in all native languages. Bilingual education has a tendency to oftentimes separate culturally and linguistically diverse students from other students, which may have social and academic impacts (Chin, 2015, p. 1). Further, education in a second language can be inconsistent, and in order for bilingual education to be effective, it must continue on throughout the career of the culturally and linguistically diverse students (Chin, 2015, p. 1).

In addition, foreign language programs are being cut around the world because of their cost. Unless a course is mandated, it is often removed. A single-language program is easier and cheaper to operate and can still provide the essential skills that a student may require. Many schools are already cutting artistic and creative classes, so the cost of adding a bilingual component is something that many schools just cannot do (Chin, 2015, p. 1). In addition, bilingual education can shift a student’s focus. If a bilingual education program is broken into a 50/50 split during the school day, students who do struggle with the new language may find themselves focused only on the second language. Lastly, there may be a lack of qualified teachers and assistants. For bilingual education to be effective, it must have teachers and teaching assistants who are fluent in both of the languages that are being taught. As previous research has shown us, the proper teacher preparation is
lacking, and certain states and countries allow this to occur because there is such a high need for teachers at the moment.

2.7. Conclusion

Through this literature, we can see that there are a variety of methods and practices for bilingual education and teaching culturally or linguistically diverse learners. Through this literature review, it is also evident that mainstream classroom teachers are not adequately trained, and even the ESL teachers are often not adequately trained. The literature reviewed in this section is what drove my research and allowed me to create research questions as well as survey questions for participants.
3. Methodology

3.1. Introduction

As is evident from the previous chapter, bilingual education is a controversial topic with a multitude of positives and negatives. As discussed in chapter two, the models in place in bilingual education are oftentimes not executed properly, or to their full potential, and that is mainly a result of the fact that mainstream classroom teachers are not typically properly trained or prepared to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners in their mainstream classroom. Many mainstream teachers are increasingly concerned about being held accountable for their students’ progress as measured by standardized tests. Clearly, mainstream teachers with bilingual students need the appropriate training to be able to meet their students’ language and learning needs and to facilitate academic growth, yet most teachers lack this training. Oftentimes, as seen in the previous section, general education teachers can apply for a license or simply take an exam, and that will deem them certified and capable of teaching and/or have culturally and linguistically diverse learners in their mainstream classroom (Samson and Collins, 2012, p. 8).

Similar to other studies done in this domain, the aim of this research is to investigate the experience of the culturally and linguistically diverse learners in mainstream education. The methods for this research study are the focus of this chapter. When considering methodology, first of all, qualitative and quantitative measures were considered. Previous qualitative and quantitative studies conducted in this domain were reviewed. In this section, the methods used to
address the identified research questions will be outlined, the research design (methodological considerations, qualitative vs. quantitative research) will be discussed, the approach adopted will be rationalized, the chosen form for data collection will be explained and rationalized, the pool of participants will be detailed, the data collection will be explained, the validity and reliability of the research will be discussed, and ethical considerations will be explored and detailed along with advantages and limitations.

3.2. **Research Questions**

The following research questions that were presented in the introduction chapter have been restated here. These questions were identified in order to investigate this topic of the bilingual experience in a monolingual context:

1. What are the experiences of bilingual and/or multilingual students of educational support for the development of their linguistic repertoire across named languages?

2. What is the extent to which the participants felt that their own experiences were in line with what is found in the literature as common practice in bilingual education? In other words, was common practice observed by the participants?

3. What are the experiences of parents of support for the bilingual development of their children? Did they feel the bilingual education their child/children received was adequate?

3.3. **Research Design**

The following will discuss the input that went into the research design.
3.3.1. Methodological Considerations

When selecting a methodology for this study, different types of research were considered, and the various paradigms were described. Possible qualitative and quantitative approaches were considered in relation to the suitability of the methodology to answer the research questions.

3.3.2. Distinguishing Between Basic and Applied Research

According to Phakiti and Paltridge, “The key distinction between basic and applied research lies in what researchers aim to achieve in their research. Basic research aims to produce fundamental knowledge about something that we currently lack, to refine or fine-tune current knowledge, so that explanations of a phenomenon are meaningful, sufficient, or robust. Applied research is related to situations in which researchers or practitioners aim to make use of or apply knowledge or theories from basic research to address a problem by systematically applying them through activities with a group of individuals and observing how they work to, for example, enhance learning or improve a process. In applied research, therefore, researchers aim to seek solutions to a problem” (p. 11). In other words, the main difference between basic and applied research is the goal of the research. If the researcher(s) seek to gain new knowledge of a subject, then the research is deemed basic, but if the researcher(s) seek to solve a problem, then this is deemed to be applied research.

3.3.3. Research Paradigms Described
According to Phakiti & Paltridge (2015), “A research paradigm is the underlying philosophical view of what constitutes knowledge or reality as the researcher seeks to gain an understanding of a particular topic. The paradigm directs researchers to collect data and/or evidence that can be viewed as valid, legitimate, or trustworthy” (p. 15). In other words, a research paradigm is a philosophical stance taken by the researcher. There are four key theoretical orientations to research, which will now be outlined: positivism, post-positivism, constructivism, and pragmatism (this is not an exhaustive list). These will be subsequently explained in terms of qualitative and quantitative research.

3.3.3.1. **Positivism**

According to Phakiti & Paltridge (2015), “Positivism is a research philosophy that believes that reality can be understood objectively. There is a set of immutable laws or theories that govern reality. Reality is seen as quantifiable and measurable” (p. 16). In other words, positivism is based on facts and data and believes that results should be numerical and set. Positivism is quantitative.

3.3.3.2. **Post-Positivism**

According to Phakiti and Paltridge (2015), “Post positivism is a modified version of positivism that believes reality can only be approximated and cannot be perceived with total accuracy” (p. 16). In other words, post-positivism believes that results should be numerical;
however, they are not always exact and are usually just estimates.

Post-positivism is also quantitative.

3.3.3.3. **Constructivism**

According to Phakiti and Paltridge (2015), “Constructivism is a research philosophy that views social realities (e.g. cultures, cultural objects, institutions, values) as multiple and dependent on who is involved, what is being studied, and the context in which a study takes place” (p. 16). Constructivism is qualitative.

3.3.3.4. **Pragmatism**

“Pragmatism is a pluralistic approach to research that stresses the importance of problem-solving over the adoption of a particular approach to research methods. Pragmatism is not a paradigm in the traditional sense. This research approach adopts methods (quantitative and/or qualitative) that work best to address a particular research problem, rather than committing to a particular research philosophy which may have a specific view of what constitutes reality. Pragmatism seeks an application of multiple methods, types of data, and data analyses that can fully provide answers to research questions or problems” (p. 17).

In other words, pragmatism does not take a specific stance until the research is actually being carried out. It adopts whichever stance or method is appropriate and best suited to the work being done. As
stated, pragmatism can be qualitative and/or quantitative. It is not
fixed; simply put, it is what works.

3.3.4. Qualitative Research

According to Hogan, Dolan, and Donnelly (2009),

“Qualitative research is a multifaceted approach that investigates culture,
society, and behavior through an analysis and synthesis of people’s words and
actions. Generally speaking, qualitative research has ‘traditionally’ been
conducted through direct observation of a sample, case studies, personal
experiences, introspection, an examination of relevant texts, interviews, focus
groups, life stories, and the researcher’s own participation in the settings that
she or he is researching” (p. 3-4).

The key types of qualitative research are the phenomenological model,
the ethnographic model, grounded theory, case study, the historical model, and
the narrative model (again, this is not an exhaustive list. These types were
chosen for the purpose of being related to the paradigms previously
mentioned). All of these models were considered for this research (Leonard,
2019, p.1). Types of qualitative data include: audio recordings and transcripts
from interviews or focus group sessions, structured interview questionnaires,
field notes, video recordings, case study notes, images, documents,
diaries/video diaries, observation notes, press clippings, or photographs

3.3.4.1. Strengths and Limitations of Qualitative Research
To begin with, the strengths of qualitative research methods will be discussed. One of the most apparent strengths of qualitative research is the fact that the data can be examined in great detail and depth; for example, interviews do not have to be specific questions, and questions can be amended and probed with ease (Anderson, 2010, p. 1).

The limitations of qualitative research are as follows: There is much room for bias, as the researcher is usually present during data gathering, and that can affect the subjects’ responses. Furthermore, according to Anderson (2010), "Issues of anonymity and confidentiality can present problems when presenting findings" (p. 1).

3.3.5. Quantitative Research

According to Albers (2017), “A quantitative research study collects numerical data that must be analyzed to help draw the study's conclusions” (p. 1). In other words, quantitative methods examine the effects of specified circumstances (independent variable) on an outcome of interest (dependent variable) in ways that can be explained numerically (Lakshman, Sinha, Biswas, Charles, & Arora, 2000, p. 1). Data analysis seeks to reveal the patterns of a study’s contextual situation (Albers, 2017, p. 216). Quantitative methods are more widely used because data that can be measured or counted is looked at as more credible (p. 1).

There are four main types of quantitative research designs: descriptive design, correlational design, quasi-experimental design, and experimental
design. All of these types of quantitative research were considered for this research (Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching, 2019, p. 1).

3.3.5.1. **Strengths and Limitations of Quantitative Research**

First, the strengths of quantitative research will be identified. Quantitative research allows for rapid data collection, because “the data points of quantitative research involve surveys, experiments, and real-time gathering, [so] there are few delays in the collection of materials to examine. This means the information under the study can be analyzed very quickly when compared to other research methods” (Ayres, 2019, p. 1). Further, the samples of quantitative research are randomized, it offers reliable and repeatable information, the findings can be generalized, the research is anonymous and can be performed remotely, and information from a larger sample size can be used (Ayres, 2019, p. 1).

The limitations of quantitative research are as follows: the researcher cannot follow up on any of the answers, the characteristics of the participants may not apply to the general population, and it is not as in-depth as qualitative research (Ayres, 2010, p. 1).

3.3.6. **Qualitative Research vs. Quantitative Research**

According to Phakiti & Paltridge (2015),

“The key distinction between quantitative and qualitative research lies in the types of data collected by the researchers. Quantitative data are numerical data that researchers obtain to answer research questions, such as test scores, Likert
scale questionnaire responses, and academic grades, whereas qualitative data are data that can be described or conceptualized in words, and these include data collected through interviews, observations, texts, or pictures, rather than in numbers” (p. 12).

In other words, the difference between qualitative and quantitative research is whether or not the data collected can be conceptualized or if it is numerical. If the data can be described and detailed, then it is qualitative, and if the data is numerical, then it is quantitative.

3.4. **Approach Adopted**

In order to decide which research approach would be adopted for this dissertation, a variety of factors were considered, and various studies were looked at. For example, Schwartz, Sommerfeld, & Leikin (2010) used an ethnographic approach that included observation, semi-structured interviews, and life histories in order to explore how mainstream classroom teachers feel about having culturally and linguistically diverse students in their classroom, how they perceive issues of culture and language in young bilingual children, and how they understand the term ‘bilingual education' in a monolingual context. Canado (2014) administered four sets of questionnaires to 706 informants across Europe in order to get a more descriptive account of teachers’ training needs and ongoing professional development. These are just two examples of studies that were reviewed.

Ultimately, it was decided that, in order to best address the research questions and gain insight into the necessary perspective of the desired participants, a quantitative approach was decided to be adopted for this research by doing a
scoping questionnaire to see what issues and common themes there are in bilingual education in Ireland. More specifically, a descriptive design quantitative approach was adopted.

A descriptive design approach, according to The Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching (2019), “seeks to describe the current status of a variable or phenomenon. The researcher does not begin with a hypothesis, but typically develops one after the data is collected” (p. 1). A descriptive design quantitative approach was adopted for the research because the goal of the research was to seek the current status of bilingual education in a monolingual context and to reveal the underlying patterns and trends of bilingual students and parents of bilingual students’ thoughts towards the education that they received in a monolingual context. The purpose of the instrument is to elicit the data for your study (Henrichsen, 2019, p. 1). The instruments used in this study are outlined below.

3.4.1. Chosen Instrument and Description of my own Approach

For the purpose of this research, the quantitative method of surveys was chosen. According to Bhat (2018), “Quantitative data is usually collected for statistical analysis using surveys, polls, or questionnaires sent to a specific section of a population. In the case of this dissertation, surveys were used and sent to a population of participants who will be described further on” (p. 1). The website SurveyMonkey was used to create and distribute the survey to participants. There were two different surveys: one for the parents of bilingual learners, and one for former bilingual students. The method of multiple-choice
questions was chosen for this research because it is elemental to survey writing (SurveyMonkey, 2018, p. 1). According to the Survey Monkey website (2018), multiple-choice questions are “versatile, intuitive, and they yield clean data that is easy for you to analyze. Since they provide a fixed list of answer options, they give you structured survey responses and make it easier for your respondents to complete the survey” (p. 1). The multiple-choice questions were designed based on the literature reviewed. The questions and possible responses can be found in Appendix E (Student Survey), as well as Appendix F (Parent Survey).

3.4.2. Participants

The sample in this study consisted of 34 people. This is a rather low number as the desired participants were revealed to be a very niche group. This is explained in more detail in later chapters. That being said, 30 of the 34 participants who took part in this study are former students who were English Language Learners at the primary and/or secondary age, and four of the participants who took part in this study are caregivers, as well as current parents or caregivers of primary and/or secondary ELL students. Students who had finished their formal schooling were desired for this study because we wanted the research to gain a wider perspective of the programs in place. The parents of former and/or current bilingual students were desired and chosen for this research because the research and literature that were reviewed argued for different ways in which culturally and linguistically diverse should be incorporated into the education and how their parents should be incorporated,
approached, and involved. Thus, this research wanted to see if that was actually the case and if the parents were happy with the education that their child received and/or is currently receiving.

Participants were recruited using a variety of methods. Initially, the snowball sampling method was used. This method (also known as the friend of a friend approach) is, according to Crossman (2019), “A non-probability sampling technique (which includes purposive sampling) in which a researcher begins with a small population of known individuals and expands the sample by asking those initial participants to identify others that should participate in the study” (p. 1). In other words, I began with the people I knew in Ireland who could put me in contact with those who fit the profile of the desired participant. Once in contact with those individuals, they took the time to complete the survey and then sent the survey on to people they knew who also fit the profile. Then those people did the same, and so on and so forth. After exhausting that avenue, social media sites such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram were used to recruit participants. This proved to be very helpful and successful, as people who fit the profile were able to simply click on a link, consent, and take the quick survey in a matter of minutes. Most participants joined through this method. Participants were not asked for any identifying information in the questionnaire, making the data anonymized at the point of collection.

All parties involved in the study were informed of the structure and purpose of the research and completed consent forms for participants were
required before the study was conducted. For those participants that I was able to email directly, an information sheet and consent form (Appendix A sees the emailed consent form for students, and Appendix B sees the emailed consent form for parents) were presented, and no data was collected until all forms were returned and signed by all relevant parties (I believe it is important to note that I do not have any personal relationship with the participants who were emailed directly; they were all referred to me by peers and colleagues). For those participants who were recruited through other participants, I included an introduction page on each survey (Appendix C sees the Survey Monkey introduction page and consent form for students, Appendix D sees the Survey Monkey introduction page and consent form for parents) that stated who I was and the nature of the ethically approved research. Participants were all made aware that participation is entirely voluntary and that they were entitled to withdraw from the study at any time before completing the survey without having to give a reason and without prejudice. Moreover, all parties involved in the study were informed of the structure and purpose of the research, and consent from participants was required before beginning the survey.

3.4.3. Data Collection

The data was collected in the same way for both surveys — via the website “SurveyMonkey.” According to Finances Online (2019), “SurveyMonkey is a tool that allows you to launch any kind of online survey project, be it for the purpose of market research, a quick poll, competitive
analysis, or customer or the employee feedback. This easy to use platform allows you to tailor your surveys according to your defined target audience” (p. 1). The surveys were distributed (in a variety of methods, as previously detailed) to 33 participants and completed by them. The inbuilt engine in “Survey Monkey” provided easy access to the quantitative data.

3.4.4. Analyzing the Data

The data were numerically analyzed by the Survey Monkey site, and then I took the percentages and compared them to what I had read in the literature. This helped me decipher the potential reasoning behind rather large or small percentage responses.

3.5. Validity and Reliability

The use of validity and reliability are very important in assessing the quality of a research instrument (Bryman, 2005). They are the tests of the robustness of your instruments. In general, validity is an indication of how sound your research is. More specifically, validity applies to both the design and methods of your research. Validity in data collection means that your findings truly represent the phenomenon you are claiming to measure – valid claims are solid claims (Henrichsen, 2019, p. 1). Validity is one of the main concerns with research. According to Seliger and Shohamy (1989), “Any research can be affected by different kinds of factors of which, while extraneous to the concerns of the research, can invalidate the findings” (p. 95). In other words, controlling all possible factors that threaten the research’s validity is the primary responsibility
of every good researcher (Henrichsen, 2019, p. 1). In this context, the term reliability basically means the research is consistent. A measure is considered reliable if it would give the same result over and over again (Trochim, 2006, p. 1).

Brown (2001) emphasizes the significance of validity and reliability in research using questionnaires and surveys. The assessments must measure what they are meant to measure, and they must be consistent in their measurements. One way of ensuring the validity and reliability of survey data is to use an instrument that has been previously used and validated by other researchers. While reviewing literature and other studies done in the field of bilingual education and the monolingual context, I found that many researchers used multiple-choice surveys. For example, Beaver (2017) used the same website as this research did, SurveyMonkey, to conduct a multiple-choice-question survey to a population of English and Irish bilinguals. According to SurveyMonkey (2018), multiple-choice questions are “versatile, intuitive, and they yield clean data that is easy for you to analyze Since they provide a fixed list of answer options, they give you structured survey responses and make it easier for your respondents to complete the survey” (p. 1), making them very valid and reliable. For this particular data, SurveyMonkey provided me with the overall results of my surveys in the form of a visual analysis through dynamic charts displaying the percentages of each response to the closed-ended questions.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was sought from and approved by the Trinity College Dublin’s School of Education’s Research Ethics Committee. The project received approval
from the School of Education Research Ethics Committee, as registered in module ET7208-A-Y-201819: M.ED. DISSERTATION on the course website Blackboard. The Ethics Committee Code of Practice set out by the School of Education’s Research Ethics Committee was strongly adhered to throughout this study. The research also adhered to Trinity’s Policy on Good Research Practice, which is based on the following:

1. Respect for the Participants
2. Beneficence and the Absence of Maleficence
3. Justice

Informed consent, which is required in order to take part in this research study, was initially obtained from individuals whom I was put in contact with by mutual friends. The consents were obtained via email, in which the participants were sent a consent form and information sheet (Appendix A and B). Issues relating to confidentiality and anonymity were explained. These participants then sent the surveys to other individuals who they knew that also fit the profile. Because of this, there was an introduction page/information sheet and consent form (Appendix C and D) included in the survey as well, as I did not have these additional contacts’ information to send them the initial information sheet and consent form. However, contact details of the researcher and the supervisor were also included, in case of any questions, queries, or concerns.

All parties involved in the study were informed of the structure and purpose of the research, and data was anonymized throughout. All parties were made aware of the fact that participation was entirely voluntary and that they were entitled to
withdraw from the study at any time, without having to give a reason and without prejudice. There were no known security concerns beyond those encountered by participants and the researcher in everyday life. All data was anonymized by SurveyMonkey to ensure confidentiality throughout the research project, and not even the researchers knew who was taking the surveys, apart from the people with whom I had initial contact.

3.7. Conclusion

Overall, I believe that the best methodology was chosen given the amount of time, and the resources and participants available. However, while there were advantages to the chosen methodology, there were limitations as well. It is important to note that this next section will only discuss the limitations of the chosen methodology, as the limitations of the study overall will be discussed in the next chapter.

3.7.1. Advantages of the Chosen Methodology

A quantitative research method in the form of surveys was used for this research, as, after reviewing the variety of methods, this seemed to be the most beneficial for this particular study. Through the use of surveys, the research revealed numerical data which was suitable for this research, as there was a time constraint, and this made it easier to gather data in the allotted amount of time. The study was also anonymous, which leads to little to no bias in the participants’ responses as well as the ability for the participants to complete the survey at their own pace, on their own time.

3.7.2. Disadvantages of the Chosen Methodology
Though I do believe that this was the best method for this particular research, there were still a variety of disadvantages and challenges. For example, the responses generated (as you will see in the next chapter) were very interesting, and I was not able to follow up on any of them. They were also very limited. Had I actually met with the participants in person, there is the possibility that I could have garnered and recruited more participants through them. The small and limited number of participants unfortunately makes the results less generalizable and not as in-depth as I would have liked. This challenge, however, will be discussed in more detail and specifics in the next chapter.
4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Introduction

As the previous chapter discussed the methodology chosen for the research, this chapter will elaborate on the results of the research. The chapter will first analyze all of the results from the two surveys. After, the chapter is then structured according to the research questions, with a section on each of them that details all the data that responded to the research question in focus and discusses what the results tell us in relation to that research question. The main purpose of this chapter is to illustrate the extent to which the participants' reported experiences are in line with the different models described in the literature.

4.2. Student Survey Discussion and Data Analysis

In total, 34 people have participated in this research study and completed the surveys (30 former students and 4 parents). This is a very low number which led to limited results. However, the results still proved helpful and gave valuable insight into the research.

To restate, the two surveys are listed in Appendix E and F. What follows now are the results and analysis of the student survey:

4.2.1. Question One – How did you Learn English at School?
Figure 1: First Question of Student Survey

Of the 30 participants, 7 responded by saying that they were pulled out of their mainstream classrooms for English class. As previously discussed, this program is called the pull-out method, and it is recognized as one of the more routine and common methods of bilingual education because it has proven to be very successful. According to the New York Times (1985), “In this method, students usually attend one or two English classes a day… Because a potpourri of languages is represented in these classes, the teachers usually do not know all of the languages that are spoken. However, they are trained to be sensitive to students’ native languages and cultures, which can have an influence on how quickly they learn English.
These teachers stress fundamental speaking and comprehension skills in English first, then develop proficiency in reading and writing” (p. 1). Next, 5 of the 29 participants responded by saying that they had to “sink or swim” when it came to speaking and learning English. As previously discussed, this program is known as submersion. Literature revealed to us previously that this “sink or swim” idea is usually a reflection of the school’s inability to respond to the needs of a small number of non-English speaking children who have a less common mother tongue (Roberts, 1995, p. 5), causing the researcher to believe this result could be because the school(s) that these five participants attended was/were either unwilling or unable to respond to the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Next, 6 of the 29 participants responded by saying that they learned alongside their monolingual peers but that the mainstream classroom teacher supported and accommodated them. This is the immersion model. Further, 4 of the 29 participants responded by saying that they learned alongside their monolingual peers, but they had an assistant teacher assigned to them who supported their learning. This is also a form of the immersion model. Lastly, 7 of the 29 participants responded by choosing “other.” There was no overwhelming majority in these responses.

After having discussed the results in the previous paragraph, the results will now be analyzed. As is evident from Figure 1, there was no overwhelming majority in the responses; they were somewhat mixed. The
majority of the participants, though, were split between being pulled out of their classroom for English class and the choice of “other,” with 7 participants responding for each. The pull-out method in bilingual education was the most common and successful one according to the literature, making the fact that most participants responded by saying that this was their experience not surprising. The other 7 participants, however, who responded by saying “other,” is curious to me as in my opinion, based on the literature reviewed, the most commonly used practices and the practices deemed “best” were listed as choices. This would be where I would have liked to have used followup interviews so I could ask the participants probing questions and gain a more in-depth response about their experience.

4.2.2. Question Two – Did you Continue to Speak Your Native Language at Home?

Did you continue to speak your native language at home?

Answered: 30    Skipped: 0

![Graph showing response to Question Two](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Second Question of the Student Survey*
Of the 30 participants, 27 responded by saying that yes, they continued to speak their native language at home. Next, three of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, they did not continue to speak their native language at home.

The majority of the participants still speak their native language at home, despite the fact that it was not the language of instruction at school and that they were learning English. This could be for a variety of reasons. Research shows us that oftentimes people continue to speak their native language despite learning another one as a way to maintain their culture and ability to communicate. For example, in a study done by Park and Sarkar (2008) where Korean parents of bilingual students’ attitudes towards their first language (Korean) and their efforts to maintain it was explored, the results showed that these parents were keen to have their children maintain their first language. They wanted their children to maintain their first language and speak it at home because they felt that having the ability to speak Korean would allow their children to maintain their cultural identity, as well as ensure them better future economic opportunities (Park and Sarkar, 2008).

However, there is still a small percentage of participants who did not continue to speak their native language at home. Literature and research in this field give a variety of reasons for why that might be the case. Some research shows that this could be a result of a generational process. According to Portes & Hao (1998), “First the immigrant
generation learns as much English as it can, but speaks the mother tongue at home; the second generation may speak the language with parents but shifts to unaccented English at school and in the workplace; by the third generation, English becomes the home language and effective knowledge of the parental tongue disappears” (p. 2). In other words, the generation in which the bilinguals are will affect whether or not the mother tongue is spoken at home. Based on this, potentially, those three participants could be second-generation immigrants. However, it is unknown what generation the participants are. What is more important is what it means when children no longer speak the home language. It is a result of the hegemony and power of the dominant language. This often results in linguistic insecurity and placing a low value on the home language. Monolingualism can be the result here, and therein lies the problem of insufficient support for the home language in school and in broader society.

4.2.3. Question Three – Did Your Main Classroom Teacher Give You Extra Time to Complete Work?
Did your main classroom teacher give you extra time to complete work?

Answered: 30   Skipped: 0

![Bar graph showing 9 responses (30.00%) for Yes and 21 responses (70.00%) for No]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Question 3 of the Student Survey

Of the 30 participants, nine responded by saying that yes, their main classroom teacher gave them extra time to complete work. Next, 20 of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, their main classroom teacher did not give them extra time to complete work.

As is evident from Figure 3, the majority of the participants responded by saying that the main classroom teacher did not give extra time to complete their work. As research has shown us that this is a helpful support and method in bilingual education (the Lakewood City School District, 2019, p. 1), it was expected that the participants would have had extra time to complete work. However, that being said, the potential reason behind the 20 participants’ saying that their classroom teacher did not give them extra time to complete work could be related to the fact that in question one, seven of the participants responded by saying that they were pulled out of the classroom for English
class, meaning that their instruction was not solely led by the main classroom teacher. In addition, six participants responded to question one by saying that they had to “sink or swim” in terms of learning English, meaning that the submersion method was used in their education which, as previously detailed literature has revealed to us, means that the students are thrown to the mercies of the classroom with no support (Temple et al., 2014).

4.2.4. Question Four – Were There Books in Your Main Classroom About Your Culture, and did Your Main Classroom Teacher Ever Read them Aloud to the Class?

Were there books in your main classroom about your culture, and did your main classroom teacher ever read them aloud to the class?

**Figure 4: Question 4 of the Student Survey**

Of the 30 participants, five responded by saying that yes, there were books in their main classroom about their culture, and their main classroom teacher would read them out loud to the class. Next, 20 out of the 30 participants
responded by saying that no, there were no books in their main classroom about their culture (and, as a result, their main classroom teacher never read them out loud to the class). Next, five out of the 30 participants responded by saying that there were books in their main classroom about their culture, but their teacher never read them out loud to the class.

The majority of the participants (20 out of 30) responded by saying that no, there were no books in their main classroom about their culture (and, as a result, their main classroom teacher never read them out loud to the class).

These results could stem from the fact that, again, many participants responded to the first question by saying that the submersion method was used in their bilingual education, meaning that there were no supports for them in terms of fostering multilingualism, supporting home languages and allowing students from diverse linguistic backgrounds to access the curriculum. However, this could also be due to the fact that, again, in question one, seven were pulled out for English class—meaning that they could have had supporting literature in their other classroom—and five had a teacher or assistant assigned to them—meaning that they could have had that support from their designated instructor. Lastly, though, these results could stem from the approach of the teacher. According to Yoon (2007), “Teachers can act as supports or constraints on ELL’s active participation in the mainstream classroom, depending on their teaching approaches,” (p. 216). This stance compliments Gay and Kirkland (2010) who did a study that revealed that most
teachers do not feel comfortable discussing the culture of their students, which will be discussed later on.

4.2.5. **Question Five – Were there books in your main classroom written in your native language, and did your main classroom teacher allow you to showcase these books to the class?**

Were there books in your main classroom written in your native language, and did your main classroom teacher allow you to showcase these books to the class?

![Bar chart showing the responses to Question Five of the Student Survey.](image)

Answered: 30  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.67% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70.00% 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were books in my native language in the class, but I never showcased them to my class.</td>
<td>13.33% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: Question 5 of the Student Survey**

Of the 30 participants, five responded by saying that yes, there were books in their main classroom written in their native language, and they were given the opportunity by the main classroom teacher to showcase said books to the class. Next, 20 of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, there were no books in their main classroom written in their native language, thus meaning that they did not have the opportunity to showcase said books to their
class. Next, four of the 30 participants responded by saying that there were books in their main classroom in their native language but that they never showcased said books to their class.

The majority of the participants (20 out of 30) responded by saying that there were no books in their main classroom written in their native language. These results are both surprising and disappointing, as research has shown us that having literature in the classroom in the native languages of the culturally and linguistically diverse students is a very helpful support in bilingual education. However, the fact that these results are strikingly similar to the results of the question just before is not surprising, as they are both rooted in whether or not the classroom library is diverse and supportive of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Again, these results could be related to the fact that many participants responded to the first question by saying that the submersion method was used in their bilingual education, meaning that there were no supports for them in terms of their second language learning.

4.2.6. **Question Six – Was Your Culture Ever a Topic of Class Discussion?**
Figure 6: Question 6 of the Student Survey

These results were split right down the middle; of the 30 participants, 15 responded by saying that yes, their culture was a topic of class discussion. Next, the other 15 of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, their culture was not a topic of class discussion.

These results are not surprising, as half of the participants said that yes, their culture was a topic of class discussion, and literature has now shown us that by letting the culturally and linguistically diverse students speak about their culture, or by the main classroom teacher speaking about their culture, they felt supported, encouraged, and included. However, the other 15 participants who responded no should be highlighted. These results could be a result of the previously discussed fact that teachers are not adequately trained. Research shows that oftentimes teachers are afraid
of discussing culture in the classroom, as they do not know how to incorporate it appropriately. Gay and Kirkland (2010), for example, did a study on developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education that revealed that most teachers do not feel comfortable discussing the culture of their students. Their research argued that “developing personal and professional critical consciousness, racial, cultural, and ethnic diversity should be a major component of preservice teacher preparation” (p. 182). They also discuss how oftentimes teachers will use different strategies to avoid certain situations pertaining to diversity and the culture of their students. According to Gay and Kirkland (2010), “The resistance strategies include silence, diversion, guilt, and benevolent liberalism” (p. 186).

4.2.7. Question Seven – Did Your Main Classroom Teacher Ever Inquire About Your Native Language and Culture? Did They Encourage the use of Your Native Language?
Did your main classroom teacher ever inquire about your native language and culture? Did they encourage the use of your native language?

**Figure 7: Question 7 of the Student Survey**

Of the 30 participants, six responded by saying yes and yes; their main classroom teacher did inquire about their native language and culture, and they also encouraged the use of their native language. Next, 16 of the 30 participants responded by saying that their teacher would ask them about their culture, but they did not encourage them to speak their native language. Next, two of the 30 participants responded by saying that their teacher would encourage them to speak in their native language, but their teacher would not ask them about their culture. Next, another six of the 30 participants responded by saying that they were not sure.
The majority of the participants (16 of the 30) responded by saying that their teacher would ask them about their culture, but they did not encourage them to speak their native language. These results are surprising, as it was to be expected that the main classroom teacher would ask about the culture and encourage the use of the native language. However, only six of the participants said that that was the case for them. This could again be due in part to the fact that teachers are not properly trained or to the fact that many of the participants were enrolled in a pull-out program. Though, the results could be largely in part of the fact that as we have now seen from the literature that often, teachers do not feel comfortable or they are unwilling to discuss the culture of their students.

4.2.8. Question Eight – Would Your Main Classroom Teacher Pre-Teach Content (Pre-teaching is the teaching of certain skills or content that would be needed later. For example, the whole class is going to hear a short discussion on environmental issues. Before listening, the teacher has the ELLs match key environment words to definitions)?
Would your main classroom teacher pre-teach content? (Pre-teaching is the teaching of certain skills or content that would be needed later. For example, the whole class is going to hear a short discussion on environmental issues. Before listening, the teacher has the ELLs match key environment words to definitions).

Of the 30 participants, 13 responded by saying that yes, their main classroom teacher would pre-teach them content. Next, 17 of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, their main classroom teacher would not pre-teach them content.

These results are unexpected because pre-teaching content is a key method and support in bilingual education, so one would assume that it would be more common in practice; however, referring back to the question one responses, most participants were enrolled in a pull-out program, meaning they were not in the classroom all of the time; were in a submersion program, meaning that they were completely on their own; or were in an immersion model, meaning that they had a teacher or assistant assigned to help them.

Figure 8: Question 8 of the Student Survey

Of the 30 participants, 13 responded by saying that yes, their main classroom teacher would pre-teach them content. Next, 17 of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, their main classroom teacher would not pre-teach them content.
4.2.9. Question Nine – Did Your Main Classroom Teacher Honor Your Silent Period

(The silent period is a time when ELL students are noticing their surroundings and observing the behaviors of others, but lack confidence in their oral language ability. They do not want to be embarrassed or make a mistake when speaking, so they simply remain silent)?

Did your main classroom teacher honor your silent period? (The silent period is a time when ELL students are noticing their surroundings and observing the behaviors of others but lack confidence in their oral language ability. They do not want to be embarrassed or make a mistake when speaking, so they simply remain silent)

![Figure 9: Question 9 of the Student Survey](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 30 participants, 13 responded by saying that yes, their main classroom teacher honored their silent period. Next, two of the 30 participants responded by saying that no, their main classroom teacher did not honor their silent period. Next, 15 of the 30 participants responded by
saying that they were not sure if whether or not their mainstream classroom teacher supported their silent period.

Though the majority of the participants (15 of the 30) said that they were not sure whether or not their main classroom teacher honored their silent period, the majority of the participants who were sure said that their main classroom teacher did, in fact, honor their silent period. For the half who responded yes, this could be their mainstream classroom teacher practicing Just Good Teaching. For the two who responded no, this could be a lack of proper and adequate teaching training on the part of their mainstream classroom teacher.

4.2.10. Question Ten – Did Your Main Classroom Teacher Encourage You to Participate in Class?

Did your main classroom teacher encourage you to participate in class?

![Bar chart showing responses to Question 10](figure10.jpg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10: Question 10 of the Student Survey*
Of the 30 participants, 29 responded by saying that yes, their main classroom teacher did encourage them to participate in class. Next, one of the 29 participants responded by saying that no, their main classroom teacher did not encourage them to participate in class. The overwhelming majority (29 out of the 30) shows that these students were encouraged to participate in class by their main classroom teacher.

The fact that 29 of the 30 participants responded by saying yes shows that either their teacher was adequately trained in how to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students, or that they understand the method of Just Good Teaching. More realistically, they most likely understand Just Good Teaching practices, as all teachers (mainstream, ESL, special education, etc.) should encourage participation from all of their students.

4.3. Parent Survey Discussion and Data Analysis

To restate, in total, 34 people have participated in this research study and completed the surveys (30 former students and four parents). What follows now are the results and analysis of the parent survey, which consisted of six questions:

4.3.1. Question One – Is English Your First Language?
Figure 11: Question 1 of the Parent Survey

100% of the participants responded by saying that no, English is not their first language. These results were expected.

4.3.2. Question Two – Did You Continue to Speak Your Native Language at Home With Your Child, Even Though They Were Learning to Speak English at School?
Did you continue to speak your native language at home with your child, even though they were learning to speak English at school?

**Figure 12: Question 2 of the Parent Survey**

100% of the participants responded by saying that no, they did not continue to speak their native language at home with their child, despite the fact that they were learning to speak English at school. These results could be related to the fact that the pool of parent participants was very small, thus creating less generalizable results. However, King & Fogle (2006) state that, “Raising children to be bilingual remains the exception in the United States, as most children eventually become English dominant or even monolingual in English. This is due at least in part to the high status of English and the limited number of opportunities for children to learn languages other than English,” (p. 1). In other words, the results of this survey saying that the parents did not continue to speak their native language at home could have something to do with the fact that the English language is so dominant in today’s society, and is often held in a
high regard and associated with intelligence. Further, King & Fogle go on to say that, “Research also indicates that parents’ beliefs, attitudes, and interactions with their children are important in helping children become bilingual,” (p. 1). This statement gives another potential reasoning behind these results that the parents thought that they needed to be involved and have a positive attitude towards the English language, thus diminishing the use of their own.

4.3.3. Question Three – If it was Made Available to You, Would You Have Sent Your Child to a School That Followed the Curriculum of Your Country of Origin?

If it was made available to you, would you have sent your child to a school that followed the curriculum of your country of origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Question 3 of the Parent Survey

Of the four participants, one responded by saying that yes, if it were made available to them, they would have sent their child to a school that followed the curriculum of their country of origin. Next, three of the four
participants responded by saying that no, even if it were made available to them, they would not have sent their child to a school that followed the curriculum of their country of origin.

The majority of the participants (three out of the four) responded by saying that they would not have sent their child to a school that followed the curriculum of their country of origin, even if it were made available to them. These results are not surprising, as the literature has now shown us that the parents of culturally and linguistically diverse students mostly wish to integrate their children as fully as possible. According to Nesteruk & Marks (2011), “Immigrant parents report pacing greater value on developing their children’s self-esteem and assertiveness as important qualities for successful adaptation to the new context… Typically, immigrant children acculturate more rapidly than their parents,” (p. 811).

Parents want what is best for their child, and in order to maintain high levels of self-esteem and confidence in the new context in which they live, so sending them to a separate school would separate them more from society than they already are.

4.3.4. Question Four – Did the Fact That Your Child was Learning English Motivate You to do the Same?
Did the fact that your child was learning English motivate you to do the same?

**Answered:** 4  **Skipped:** 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14: Question 4 of the Parent Survey**

Of the four participants, two responded by saying that yes, the fact that their child was learning English motivated them to do the same. The other two of the four participants responded by saying that, no, the fact that their child was learning English did not motivate them to do the same.

These results could be related to the fact that, again, the parent participant pool was very small, thus creating very limited results. However, the results do show that there is not a general consensus among parents in terms of learning English. This could be the result of a variety of factors. Some researchers believe that parents do not have the desire to learn English alongside their children for fear of the new language affecting their relationship with their children. Some parents may feel uncomfortable speaking another language and may feel as though they cannot express the same feelings in the second language (Gonsales-
Ishikawa, 2017, p. 1). Other researchers, such as Nesteruk & Marks (2011) state that, “While immigrant parents support their children in acquiring education and cultural competency too succeed in the host society, they often… Oppose changes to their core values and traditions,” (p. 812). In other words, while parents are encouraging of their children learning English and assimilating to a new culture and context, they do not always feel inclined to assimilate themselves.

4.3.5. Question Five – Please Rank, in Order of Importance, Reasons for Having Your Child Learn English:

Please rank, in order of importance, reasons for having your child learn English:

Answered: 4  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have an academic/career advantage</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English was the language of instruction at their school.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To integrate into the Irish culture</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To communicate better in our community</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 15: Question 5 of the Parent Survey

Four out of the four participants listed “To integrate into the Irish culture” as their number one most important reason for having their child learn English. Next, four out of the four the participants listed “Other” as their fifth and last choice for having their child learn English. Next, two out of the four participants listed “To have an academic/career advantage” as their second most important reason for having their child learn English, while the other two participants listed “To better communicate in our community” as their second most important reason for having their child learn English. Next, two of the four participants listed “English was the language of instruction at school” as their third most important reason for having their children learn English while the other two participants listed “To better communicate in our community” as their third most important reason for having their children learn English. Next, two of the four participants listed “To have an academic/career advantage” as their fourth most important reason for having their children learn English while the other two participants listed “English was the language of instruction at school” as their fourth most important reason for having their children learn English. These results are not surprising, as no individual has the same motivations, generally speaking.
4.3.6. Question Six – Were You Happy With the Bilingual Education That Your Child Received in School?

Were you happy with the bilingual education that your child received in school?

![Graph showing survey results]

- **Yes**: 25.00% (1 response)
- **No**: 25.00% (1 response)
- **Somewhat; there was more that could have been done**: 50.00% (2 responses)

**Total**: 100.00% (4 responses)

*Figure 16: Question 6 of the Parent Survey*

Of the four participants, one said that yes, he/she was happy with the bilingual education that his/her child received in school. Next, one of the four participants said that no, he/she was not happy with the bilingual education that his/her child received in school. Next, two of the four participants said that they were somewhat happy with the bilingual education that their children received in school but felt that there was more that could have been done for them.

Considering the results of the student survey, these results are not surprising. The best practices for bilingual education were, based on the results of the student survey, not always observed, and oftentimes if they were
observed, they were not observed to their full potential, making it no surprise that 2 of the 4 participants in the parent survey felt that there was more that could have been done for their children.

4.4. Research Questions

4.4.1. Research Question One – What are the experiences of bilingual and/or multilingual students of educational support for the development of their linguistic repertoire across named languages?

The results of the student survey showed the experiences of the culturally and linguistically diverse students to be varied. Best practice was observed, but not consistently across participants, and oftentimes not to its full potential. For example, Question 7 asked, “Did your main classroom teacher ever inquire about your home language and culture? Did they encourage the use of your native language?” Only six of the 30 participants said yes to both, while 16 of the 30 participants responded by saying that their main classroom teacher would ask them about their culture, but would not encourage the use of their native language. If schools were modeling best practice for bilingual education, the results would have been flipped, with the majority of participants saying yes to both – that their main classroom teacher would ask them about their culture and would encourage the use of their native language. This avoidance or ignorance could be due to a variety of factors; though, to restate, literature points to a lack of proper teacher training as being a cause.

4.4.2. Research Question Two – What is the Extent to Which the Participants Felt That Their Own Experiences Were in Line With What is Found in
the Literature as Common Practice? In Other Words, was Common Practice Observed?

Research question one was best addressed by the results of nearly all of the questions of the student survey, but more specifically by questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 of the student survey. According to the literature, the pull-out method, giving culturally and linguistically diverse students extra time to complete tasks, having literature in the classroom library about the culturally and linguistically diverse student’s/students’ culture, having literature in the classroom library written in the culturally and linguistically diverse student’s/students’ native language, pre-teaching content, and honoring the silent period of the culturally and linguistically diverse student(s) are key practices and methods in bilingual education, each with their own strengths and limitations, but each having aspects that support the linguistic development of bilingual and/or multilingual students. The results of this survey showed that for the most part, these practices were observed, meaning that the experiences of the participants were in fact in line with the literature.

4.4.3. Research Question Three – What are the Experiences of Parents of Support for the Bilingual Development of Their Children? Did They Feel The Bilingual Education Their Child/Children Received was Adequate?

The results of the parent surveys showed the experiences of parents in terms of supports for their children. Overall, the parents experienced what literature suggested but these results, though rather limited, indicated that the parents surveyed felt that there was more that could have been done in terms of their
child’s bilingual education. The number of parent participants was, again, unfortunately very limited, thus leading to a less generalizable result. However, the information received from the four participants is still insightful and helpful.

4.5. Conclusion

The number of participants in this research was rather limited, making the results difficult to generalize. However, the results are still able to be theorized by the knowledge that was gained from the literature review. The idea and aim of the two surveys (student and parent) was to see the alignment of participants’ experiences with different models of bilingual education; an insight into the alignment was certainly gained, however a generalizable statement of whether or not best practice was observed in the experience of the bilinguals. This drawback will be discussed in more detail in the next and final chapter.
5. Conclusion

5.1. Introduction

This study set out to investigate the practices and methods used in bilingual education as well as whether or not they were experienced by the bilinguals surveyed. Having reported on the main findings of the study with reference to the literature in the previous chapter, this concluding chapter will begin by summarizing the main arguments put forward in the dissertation. The remainder of the chapter will outline some recommendations for bilingual education in Ireland, limitations of the current study, and considerations for further research.

5.1.1. Chapter Summaries

Each chapter was unique in what they discussed or set out to explore. Before diving in to the first chapter, key vocabulary terms in the researched field were identified and defined. Chapter one introduced the focus of the dissertation and described the coming chapters. Chapter two saw the literature review which provided a comprehensive review on the relevant literature on bilingual education. Chapter three focused on the research and the chosen methodology. Chapter four discussed and analyzed the results and data.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the literature review and the results of the student and parent surveys, there are a few recommendations that have come to mind in terms of bilingual education in Ireland, though I recognize that I cannot make a recommendation based on such a small sample, which is why these recommendations are mostly driven by the literature reviewed. Firstly, I would recommend more specific and
focused teacher training programs. General education teachers should have more requirements in terms of whether or not they are allowed and/or capable of having bilingual students in their classroom. Second, more approaches need to be adopted by the schools themselves. As it stands today, there are no set bilingual education programs in Ireland besides the Irish medium schools. That being said, the Irish medium schools are consistently outperforming their peer schools. According to the Irish Times (2018), “While Irish-medium schools where all students are taught exclusively in the Irish language number just 48 of the 715 schools registered with the Department of Education for the school year 2017-2018, they continue to be overrepresented in the Feeder School listings across almost all rankings. This year, for example, two of the three non-fee paying schools listed in the top 20 list of schools with the greatest progression to high points courses are Irish-medium schools” (p. 1). The fact that these schools and students perform well is a testament to the benefits of bilingual education, and I believe that Ireland should adopt a set and focused program.

5.2.1. Teacher Training

As seen in the literature review, teacher candidates learn very little about how to support culturally and linguistically diverse students and are basically told that just being a good teacher and being aware is enough; however, we now know that that is not enough. Culturally and linguistically diverse learners cannot be understood in the same way that mainstream students can be (Bustos-Flores, 2011, p. 3). More specific programs and lessons need to be in place for teacher candidates who are studying mainstream general education,
especially since Ireland is becoming more and more linguistically diverse each year.

5.3. Limitations

This research study unfortunately had striking limitations, which was challenging. Firstly, it would have been preferred to collect data from a wider sample of participants, particularly more parents of culturally and linguistically diverse students, in order to be able to generalize beyond the sample in question. I believe that since the number of participants was somewhat limited, the data collected, though valuable and definitely pointed toward a certain perspective, cannot be generalized and does not show the true experience of a bilingual student in a monolingual context. Secondly, another limitation of the study is the use of quantitative research as the sole research methodology. Though the quantitative research method of a survey was helpful and provided the research with valuable information, the study should not have stopped there. It would have been preferred to use the qualitative approach of interviews after using the quantitative approach of surveys. For example, if there had been a wider sample of participants, then it would have been preferred to have them all take the survey and not make it completely anonymized, in that I, the researcher, would know who responded and how, so that I could contact a few participants afterward for interviews to explain their responses, and ask more in-depth, probing questions in order to gain a wider, more accurate perspective on what the realities and experiences of a bilingual learner in a monolingual context really are. That is what I had initially set out to do, but this proved to be a very niche population of
people, which were hard to identify and find. I would have also liked to have surveyed and interviewed main classroom teachers and bilingual teachers and gained their perspective as well. There was a lot of literature and studies on the teachers and their perspectives, and I believe that would have proved invaluable to this research.

5.4. Considerations for further Research

As the current study stands, it is hard to say that this is the exact, accurate, and general experience of a bilingual person in a monolingual context, meaning that there is significant scope for further research. Firstly, a follow-up qualitative study with the participants, where I could collect more descriptive data in terms of their responses to the questions, could be carried out. The follow-up qualitative study would be in the form of an interview, as I believe that actually hearing what the participants experienced in their own words would prove invaluable. The surveys (parent and student) would be sent out to a large group of people who fit the profile, and then the responses generated would be used to decide who would be called for an interview. Secondly, further studies involving a much larger sample size of more diverse age ranges, including students who are currently enrolled in bilingual education in Ireland, from a variety of schools (urban, suburban, rural, etc.), would also be recommended so that the conclusions could be generalized to the wider population of bilingual education in Ireland.

I would also include the participation of teachers in Ireland, both mainstream teachers and bilingual teachers. Much of the research and literature reviewed showed their perspectives and thoughts, and I believe that would have
proved invaluable to this research. Much of the research also pointed to a lack in preparing them for culturally and linguistically diverse students. As a result, it would be interesting and helpful to the research to hear their experience on their training and preparation. Further, if given the opportunity, I would also like to extend this research into the United States. Being as most of the literature and research I found were about practices in the United States, I believe it would be really interesting to see if those suggested practices are actually in place in terms of bilingual education and the mainstream. In addition, the initial inspiration for this dissertation topic, the bilingual experience in a monolingual context, came from an American classroom, and I believe it would be beneficial to see how that classroom compares to others in that city and state and in the United States.
References:


medium-schools-continue-to-outperform-on-feeder-lists-1.3719834


Devitt, S. (n.d.). *Language Teacher Training and Bilingual Education in Ireland.*


Published online on 23 April 2010.


Kappa Delta Pi Record, 165 – 169.


http://linguistics.byu.edu/faculty/henrichsenl/ResearchMethods/RM_2_18.html


Retrieved from

http://archive.learnhigher.ac.uk/analysethis/main/qualitative1.html


Productive Vocabularies of Polish Toddlers Living in the UK and Ireland.  


doi:10.2167/lcc337.0


doi:10.1080/15235882.1995.10162679


I would like to invite you to take part in a research study. Before you decide, you need to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Ask questions if anything you read is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not to take part.

**WHO I AM AND WHAT THIS STUDY IS ABOUT**

My name is Siobhán Monaghan and I am studying towards a Master’s Degree in Education at Trinity College Dublin. This study is part of my dissertation. My overall aim for this study is to research and find out what the best practices for teaching ELL students are, and then to see if that is the reality and if those practices are actually being utilized in the classroom.

**WHAT WILL TAKING PART INVOLVE?**

Taking part in this research study will involve filling out a questionnaire. The questionnaire will ask about your experience as an English Language Learner in a new school, and will take no longer than 20 minutes of your time.
**WHY HAVE YOU BEEN INVITED TO TAKE PART?**

You have been invited to take part because you were an ELL student in Ireland and are now a college student.

**DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART?**

Participation is completely voluntary and you have the right to refuse participation, refuse any question and withdraw at any time without any consequence whatsoever.

**WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS OF TAKING PART?**

There are no known risks or concerns beyond those encountered by participants and the researcher in everyday life. Any data collected will be securely stored and password protected. All electronic data will be stored securely on an encrypted USB in compliance with GDPR. Taking part will be confidential.

**HOW WILL INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE BE RECORDED, STORED AND PROTECTED, AND WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY?**

Data will be stored and destroyed in line with Trinity College’s Policy on Good Research Practice and Policy for Retention, and with Irish Data Protection Legislation, and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). All electronic data will be stored securely on an encrypted USB in compliance with GDPR. Signed consent forms and original audio recordings will be retained in a locked box in a locked room on the campus of Trinity College Dublin, with access being given solely to myself (the researcher), and my supervisor (Noel Ó Murchadha) until after
my degree has been conferred. Under freedom of information, legislation you are entitled to access the information you have provided at any time. Access to raw data will be limited to the researcher, supervisor, and potentially, examiners. Data will be retained for 13 months after completion of the thesis examination process. Following this period, all electronic copies of the data will be deleted from all storage sites and all paper copies will be shredded.

WHO SHOULD YOU CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION?

Siobhán Monaghan, Trinity College Dublin, M.Ed Student (School of Education)
Email: monaghsi@tcd.ie

Dr. Noel Ó Murchadha, Trinity College Dublin, Professor and Supervisor (School of Education)
Email: murchadn@tcd.ie

THANK YOU,

Siobhán Monaghan

Trinity College Dublin

I have read and understood the information sheet and agree to complete the survey:

Signed: ____________
B. Emailed Consent Forms (Parents)

The Reality of Bi/Multilingual Education in Monolingual Schools

I would like to invite you to take part in a research study. Before you decide, you need to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Ask questions if anything you read is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not to take part.

*WHO I AM AND WHAT THIS STUDY IS ABOUT*

My name is Siobhán Monaghan and I am studying towards a Master’s Degree in Education at Trinity College Dublin. This study is part of my dissertation. My overall aim for this study is to research and find out what the best practices for teaching ELL students are, and then to see if that is the reality and if those practices are actually being utilized in the classroom.

*WHAT WILL TAKING PART INVOLVE?*

Taking part in this research study will involve filling out a questionnaire. The questionnaire will ask about your experiences as the parent and/or caregiver of an English Language Learner in a new school, and will take no longer than 20 minutes of your time.
**WHY HAVE YOU BEEN INVITED TO TAKE PART?**

You have been invited to take part because you are the parent/caregiver of a child who was an ELL student who is now in college.

**DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART?**

Participation is completely voluntary and you have the right to refuse participation, refuse any question and withdraw at any time without any consequence whatsoever.

**WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS OF TAKING PART?**

There are no known risks or concerns beyond those encountered by participants and the researcher in everyday life. Any data collected will be securely stored and password protected. All electronic data will be stored securely on an encrypted USB in compliance with GDPR. Taking part will be confidential.

**HOW WILL INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE BE RECORDED, STORED AND PROTECTED, AND WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY?**

Data will be stored and destroyed in line with Trinity College’s Policy on Good Research Practice and Policy for Retention, and with Irish Data Protection Legislation, and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). All electronic data will be stored securely on an encrypted USB in compliance with GDPR. Signed consent forms and original audio recordings will be retained in a locked box in a locked room on the campus of Trinity College Dublin, with access being given solely to myself (the researcher), and my supervisor (Noel Ó Murchadha) until after my degree has been conferred. Under freedom of information, legislation you are entitled to
access the information you have provided at any time. Access to raw data will be limited to the researcher, supervisor, and potentially, examiners. Data will be retained for 13 months after completion of the thesis examination process. Following this period, all electronic copies of the data will be deleted from all storage sites and all paper copies will be shredded.

**WHO SHOULD YOU CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION?**

Siobhán Monaghan, Trinity College Dublin, M.Ed Student (School of Education)

Email: monaghsi@tcd.ie

Dr. Noel Ó Murchadha, Trinity College Dublin, Professor and Supervisor (School of Education)

Email: murchadn@tcd.ie

THANK YOU,

Siobhán Monaghan

Trinity College Dublin

I have read and understood the information sheet and agree to complete the survey:

Signed: _______________________________________________________________

(Name) (Date)
C. Survey Monkey Introduction and Consent Form (Students)

Bilingual Students in Ireland

Welcome to My Survey

My name is Siobhán Monaghan and I am studying towards a Master’s of Education Degree at Trinity College Dublin. This study is part of my dissertation. My overall aim for this study is to research and find out what the best practices for teaching ELL students are, and then to see if that is the reality and if those practices are actually being utilized in the classroom.

All information is anonymous, and participation is completely voluntary.

By continuing, you are consenting to this research.
D. Survey Monkey Introduction and Consent Form (Parents)

Parents of Bilingual Students in Ireland

Welcome to My Survey

My name is Siobhán Monaghan and I am studying towards a Master’s of Education Degree at Trinity College Dublin. This study is part of my dissertation. My overall aim for this study is to research and find out what the best practices for teaching ELL students are, and then to see if that is the reality and if those practices are actually being utilized in the classroom.

All information is anonymous, and participation is completely voluntary.

By continuing, you are consenting to this research.

OK
E. Student Survey Questions and Response Choices

1. How did you learn English at school?

- I was pulled out of my main classroom for English class.
- I was put into a mainstream classroom and had to "sink or swim" when it came to English.
- I learned alongside my monolingual peers, but the main classroom teacher would accommodate and support my learning.
- I learned alongside my monolingual peers, but I had an assistant teacher assigned to me to help support my learning.
- Other
2. Did you continue to speak your native language at home?

- Yes
- No

3. Did your main classroom teacher give you extra time to complete work?

- Yes
- No
4. Were there books in your main classroom about your culture, and did your main classroom teacher ever read them aloud to the class?

○ Yes

○ No

○ There were books about my culture in the classroom, but we never read them as a class.
5. Were there books in your main classroom written in your native language, and did your main classroom teacher allow you to showcase these books to the class?

- Yes
- No
- There were books in my native language in the class, but I never showcased them to my class.

6. Was your culture ever a topic of class discussion?

- Yes
- No
7. Did your main classroom teacher ever inquire about your native language and culture? Did they encourage the use of your native language?

- Yes and yes.
- My teacher would ask me about my culture, but they did not encourage me to speak my native language.
- My teacher would encourage me to speak in my native language, but they would not ask me about my culture.
- Not sure.
8. Would your main classroom teacher pre-teach content? (Pre-teaching is the teaching of certain skills or content that would be needed later. For example, the whole class is going to hear a short discussion on environmental issues. Before listening, the teacher has the ELLs match key environment words to definitions).

- Yes
- No
9. Did your main classroom teacher honor your silent period? (The silent period is a time when ELL students are noticing their surroundings and observing the behaviors of others but lack confidence in their oral language ability. They do not want to be embarrassed or make a mistake when speaking, so they simply remain silent)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not sure
10. Did your main classroom teacher encourage you to participate in class?

- Yes
- No
F. Parent Survey Questions and Response Choices

1. Is your first language English?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Did you continue to speak your native language at home with your child, even though they were learning to speak English at school?
   - Yes
   - No
3. If it was made available to you, would you have sent your child to a school that followed the curriculum of your country of origin?

- Yes
- No

4. Did the fact that your child was learning English motivate you to do the same?

- Yes
- No
5. Please rank, in order of importance, reasons for having your child learn English:

- To have an academic/career advantage.
- English was the language of instruction at their school.
- To integrate into the Irish culture.
- To communicate better in our community.
- Other
6. Were you happy with the bilingual education that your child received in school?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat; there was more that could have been done.