"It's Difficult Because of the Language"

A Case Study of the Families Promoting Success Program in the Los Angeles Unified School District

Shartriya Collier & Susan Auerbach

The social nature of language learning and development has been widely acknowledged, as has the importance of family relationships in language learning processes (Gumperz, 1982; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2001). Unintended consequences result when public policies reshape any single component of the continuum of social experiences that are causatively related to language development. The 1998 passage of California's Proposition 227, which effectively eliminated bilingual education, affected not only students but their English language learning family members as well. Post-Proposition 227 schools must decide how they may use language in parent outreach and education efforts.

The role that the first language plays in the literacy development of English language learners (ELLs) and their families is irrefutable (August & Shannahan, 2006; Cummins, 1986; Durgunoğlu, 2002; Echevarria & Short, 2005; Gandara, 2005; Garcia & Beltran, 2005; Krashen, 1981). Advocates of family literacy programs have recognized the importance of integrating the first language and culture of both parents and students who speak English as a second language (Moll et al, 1992; Perez & Torres-Guzman, 1992; Valdes, 2001).

This is a particular challenge today, given not only Proposition 227 in California but the high-stakes accountability demands of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) and subsequent federal legislation and the low performance of English language learners on the California Standards Test (CST) in reading and writing (CA Legislative Analyst's Office, 2004).

Shartriya Collier is an assistant professor and Susan Auerbach is an associate professor, both with the Michael D. Eisner College of Education at California State University, Northridge, Northridge, California.

In response to the high proportion of Program Improvement schools failing to meet test score targets under NCLB, the Parent Unit of Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) Local District X started the Families Promoting Success (FPS) program in 2007.[1] This unique family literacy program consisted of a series of highly focused workshops targeted exclusively for parents of students who scored Basic, Below Basic, or Far Below Basic on the CST (mainly English Learners). Planned by staff teams to raise test scores, the workshops taught parents about the Open Court Reading Program and additional home literacy activities.

This multiple case study highlights the role of language in the development of the program at four sites. Specifically, this study examines the role of families' first language (L1) in the program, modifications made to promote the parents' understanding, and the incorporation of bilingual approaches in program design and implementation.

Parent Involvement, Family Literacy, and English Language Learning

English learners and their families face the challenges of learning a new language and adjusting to new, oftentimes conflicting cultural norms while learning academic content (Biggam, 2003; Cassidy, Garcia & Tejeda-Delgado, 2004; Cummins, 2002). School-family partnerships are essential to improving student achievement, especially for English learners (Auerbach, 1995; Moll et al, 1992; Snider, 2000; Torres-Guzman, 1992; Valdes, 2001).

Bilingual advocates have made a distinction between traditional forms of parental involvement and non-traditional intergenerational/partnership approaches to parental involvement. According to Arias and Campbell (2008), non-traditional approaches build upon family strengths, motivate parents to advocate for themselves and their children, and incorporate cultural and linguistic scaffolds throughout the curriculum.

A needs assessment protocol is critical so that a program can be designed that reflects parental resources and their children's needs. For example, Quintero and Velarde (1990) found that an essential element of intergenerational literacy programs' success was the initial identification of parent needs. Moreover, families need extended opportunities to discuss the contents of what they are learning and how to best apply it to their lives. Larrota and Ramirez (2009) stress acknowledging parents as adult learners who bring years of background experiences that can enhance and personalize the curriculum:

> Language is part of the identity of these families, and it is imperative that these type of school-related projects highlight the use and value of the native language. (p. 14)

Though only one site in this study adopted the intergenerational approach and only one site made connections to parents' experiences, all sites encouraged parent involvement in reading and taught family literacy strategies to use at home. Curriculum, however, was constrained due to its focus on decontextualized skills from Open Court.

Open Court Reading and English Language Learners

Open Court Reading (OCR) was adopted by LAUSD in 2001 as a research-based program that had all the components of effective literacy instruction. Open Court is known for its heavy emphasis on comprehension, phonics,

phonemic awareness, and vocabulary development, with a focus on decontextualized skills. LAUSD students have 90 minutes of daily OCR instruction with periodic assessments every six weeks.

While the program has many benefits, there are several challenges related to ELLs. Alvarez and Corn (2008) argue that Open Court replaces "authentic and differentiated assessment measures" with a more standardized approach to instruction and assessment. When comparing students' scores using an authentic Qualitative Reading Inventory QRI-II and Open Court assessments, they found that the literacy development of ELLs stagnated while their English dominant peers excelled. They also found that OCR measures are diagnostic and do not serve to help modify instruction.

Similarly, Lee, Ajayi, and Richards (2007) found that teachers viewed Open Court as more effective for English dominant students than for ELLs. The scripted nature of the curriculum made it difficult to address the linguistic and cultural needs of the ELL population. Peck and Serrano (2002) also reported that the rapid pace of the program and the ELLs' lack of background knowledge made success difficult for this population. Will a parent program that uses Open Court as its basis experience the same limitations, given the critical role of the family as an agent of language learning?

The Continua of Biliteracy

In order to examine the role of the first language and the degree of biliteracy in the FPS program, we applied Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester's (2003) Continua of Biliteracy Model. This model identifies how language policies, power, and access impact literacy development and language learning and use. The continuum identifies one end as "traditionally more powerful" and the other end as "traditionally less powerful." It is comprised of four components—context, development, content, and media of biliteracy—and several subcategories (see Appendix).

A subcategory within development, for example, distinguishes oral versus written languages. In traditional school environments, written language is more valued than oral language. Similarly, macro "dominant" culture is more valued than micro "minority" culture. Literary discourses are more valued than vernacular ones. Effective literacy instruction for English learners integrates or balances both ends of the continuum.

Central to the continua is the discussion of power. In many cases, the linguistic and cultural contributions of immigrant families are not acknowledged and are considered less powerful. Schools and districts in the United States most often recognize the traditionally more powerful end of the continuum. According to the continua, effective family literacy programs should provide opportunities for participants to be active agents instead of passive recipients of knowledge (Bourdieu 1991; Freire, 1970, 1993; Norton, 2000). This is particularly important when considering a program designed to reinforce the mandated curriculum and increase test scores. However, this was not the case in FPS, which was based on a transmission approach to instruction with parents who were seen as deficient.

The Continua of Biliteracy model was useful for considering the multiple layers of linguistic interaction in FPS. For example, the translation of school documents represented the media of biliteracy, and the varying school sites of each of the sessions represented the multiple contexts of biliteracy. In the following sections, we first discuss the FPS methodology and setting, and then the key findings regarding the contexts, content, and media of biliteracy utilized in the program.

Methodology and Setting

This inquiry into the FPS program sought to answer three questions:

1. What modifications were made to help parents who are second language learners of English understand the content of OCR and learn strategies for assisting their children?

2. How did staff incorporate bilingual teaching strategies in the design and implementation of the programs?

3. What is the role of the first language (L1) in this process in the post-Proposition 227, high-stakes climate?

We examined four schools, Turner, Gabriel, Eliot, and Wilson. All of the schools, located in LAUSD's local District X, had similar demographics, achievement, and Program Improvement designations. Their students were predominantly low-income Latino/a English Learners, with less than one-third proficient in English Language Arts. Study participants included a convenience sample of 80 mostly Latino parents (65% spoke mostly Spanish at home) and a purposeful sample of 13 female school and district staff involved with the program (eight Latinas, four Whites, and one African American).

Data for this qualitative multiple case study was drawn from 80 hours of fieldwork, including observations of planning meetings and parent workshops, parent focus groups, semi-structured interviews with staff, a parent survey, and document review. Interviews and focus groups were tape recorded and transcribed. Using the constant comparative method for within-case and cross-case analysis, we coded data for patterns, insider (emic) perspectives, and discrepancies, which were further analyzed in case reports and matrices. Validity was enhanced by multiple methods and data sources.

Schools differed in how they implemented the district's FPS framework and materials (see Table 1). Although a telephone needs assessment was included as part of the framework, the schools needed to dispense with this due to time constraints. Eliot and Turner offered FPS outside school hours and provided child care, resulting in larger attendance than the other schools. Turner was the only school to include children in an intergenerational approach.

The Context of Biliteracy: The Use of L1 Across Sites

The goal of the FPS program, as stated by one principal, was to "help raise test scores and give parents strategies to use with their children" for reading English. Though language development and bilingualism were not the priority, FPS was largely implemented in two languages. The emphasis was upon the macro, literate, monolingual end of the biliteracy continua.

While the program was strong in terms of skills taught, it was not strategic in its approach to the use and scaffolding of language. Indeed, none of the sites offered a philosophy or methodology regarding when and how the L1 should be used. Organized planning meetings covered outreach and curriculum objectives, but there was no systematic plan to accommodate the needs of Spanish-dominant parents, many of whom had low literacy skills. Program planners assumed that translating and interpreting Open Court content would provide enough support.

The four schools implemented different approaches towards the use of first language. Eliot, with its bilingual program still in place for students, had the most

consistent policy. All parent sessions were conducted in Spanish by bilingual, bicultural presenters, with some examples presented in English. Not surprisingly, this program generated the most evidence of addressing issues of language transfer, as well as demonstrating the highest level of parent participation and understanding. Eliot parents often engaged in humorous word play in Spanish with presenters, using the L1 to reinforce their learning of reading concepts. The main presenter created a "safe space" for this to take place by personalizing instruction with jokes, anecdotes, and cultural references. "When parents see that you are not going to judge them, that your [own] family struggled with the same issues, with help and support, anything is possible. It's not something out of their reach."

By contrast, Turner used the concurrent approach to translation in workshops, with bilingual presenters immediately translating their words from English into Spanish or vice versa. For example, one explained reading comprehension strategies:

> Making connections means that they connect what they read with what they already know. *Haciendo conexiones quiere decir que ellos conectan lo que ellos leen con lo que ellos ya saben*. This week we are doing "asking questions." When we don't understand things we ask questions, like, I wonder why that happened? *Cuando nosotros no entendemos algo hacemos preguntas por ejemplo, me pregunto por qué ese ocurrió*.

While the concurrent approach to Spanish translation is common, research has demonstrated that this is the least effective approach to bilingual instruction (Cummins, 2000). In addition, the Turner presenters expressed that they found the experience stressful.

There were several reasons why Turner chose this approach. Compared to other schools, this program had more bilingual or non-Spanish speaking parents, including some who had specifically requested workshops in English at a FPS orientation. The principal of this school, who was a monolingual African American, arranged for concurrent translation after an initial all-Spanish workshop when she noticed a monolingual African American grandmother and her grandson in the audience. As another administrator said, there were not enough English-speaking parents for separate sessions:

> So we're constantly having to translate, and it's a detriment because you lose a lot of time because you could be allocating more time to the activity. This is maybe something we have to look at for the future.

Several bilingual parents in a focus group expressed frustration with concurrent translation as a "waste of time" for them and "confusing" for their children, but there were no objections from Spanish-dominant parents.

At Wilson and Gabriel a separate person translated for monolingual English presenters yet there were also challenges associated with limited training in Open Court on the part of a district Parent Facilitator (Wilson) and a new literacy coach (Gabriel). Therefore, translations were not always accurate. Most instruction at Gabriel was in Spanish, and the literacy coaches suggested that this was a way they tried to make parents "comfortable" with the program and its strategies. Yet one coach was often frustrated trying to teach strategies, telling the parents, "It's difficult because of the language."

Thus, the use of language varied greatly across sites, with the L1 used haphazardly with the exception of Eliot. Overall, L1 was not maximized as a resource nor scaffolded for language and content development at any of the sites.

Table 1
FPS Program Sites

	Turner Elementary	*Gabriel Elementary*	*Wilson Elementary*	*Eliot Elementary*
Duration	2 years	-	-	1 year
Workshops offered	Weekday eve, 7 sessions at 1.5 hours each (with child care)	Weekday a.m., 8 sessions at 1.5 hours each	Weekday a.m., 6 sessions at 75 min. each	Saturday a.m., 7 sessions at 3 hours each (with child care)
Target audience	Parents & students: 3rd graders scoring Basic (B), Below Basic (BB), Far Below Basic (FBB) on CST (80 families)	Parents of 3rd graders scoring BB, FBB (32 families)	Parents of 3rd graders scoring B, BB, FBB (70 families)	Parents of 1st & 2nd graders below grade level on Open Court assessments (60 families)
Attendance	15-30 parents + 15-30 students	8-12 parents	8-12 parents	20-25 parents
Language	Spanish and English (concurrent translation by 2 bilingual presenters)	Mostly Spanish (+ presentation in English and translation by 2nd presenter at a few sessions)	English & Spanish (presenter in English with a translator)	Spanish only (but many examples in English)

Content of Biliteracy: Teaching Parents on Autopilot from Open Court

The FPS program used Open Court as the core of instruction. General topics covered in all schools included California Standards Test data, review of state standards, English Language Arts test questions, Open Court assessments, high frequency words, prefix/suffixes, synonyms/antonyms, homophones/homographs, and compound words; some schools also taught reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing strategies. In this regard, the FPS program and curriculum were situated on the traditionally more powerful—majority, literary, decontextualized—end of the continuum.

This made the program very much a transmission model featuring fast-paced content coverage, also referred to as "teaching as telling." This approach mirrors past research on OCR's limited effectiveness for ELLs. Content in FPS was skills-based and decontextualized, words were used out of context, and one of few actual stories that was used did not contain any cultural connection to families. Although many presenters were bilingual Latinas, few connections were made to culture, home, or community, except again at Eliot. There was no evidence of language learning as a social process. This was because little or no opportunity was provided for the parents' voices or interaction, with Eliot again being the exception. The fast pace of transmitting information and content coverage seemed more important than the parents' actual understanding.

At Gabriel, for example, there was an excessive amount of drill and review of vocabulary strategies that challenged Spanish-dominant parents. In one in-

stance, the presenter showed parents a list of sentences in English with vocabulary words underlined and asked in Spanish how they would use context clues, word structure or apposition to understand the words. Parents responded with silence and hesitancy. "The language is huge!" the presenter admitted in an interview. "We're doing vocabulary strategies with them in Spanish, but asking them to go home and do it in English with their child."

Session leaders found integrating language and content to be a consistent challenge in FPS. In some cases, this was linked to low expectations on the part of the presenters because the parents were, in fact, language learners. Another literacy coach expressed frustration when asked about parents' access to the curriculum:

> There is nothing we can do about that. Because if they [parents] don't have the language, I can't teach them English. Those were some of the issues I've had in the past with parents [at other workshops], because I provide the material in English and give them the strategies in Spanish; I suggested that they all go take English classes. That is something we don't have any control over.

Clearly, this young, bilingual Latina viewed FPS parents' English, or lack thereof, as a barrier. We attribute this challenge to the fact that the programs had not completed a needs assessment evaluation or protocol. As a result, much of the content was inappropriate to the targeted audience. Although the information was comprised mostly of grade-level content that the children needed to know, it was taught in the manner that is typical of how coaches teach teachers in professional development sessions or how teachers teach children in an English immersion classroom.

Best practices for teaching adult learners, much less adults with limited English, were not followed. There were hidden assumptions that both parents and their children had the vocabulary to play the games using OCR grade level vocabulary. Thus, most presenters were teaching on auto pilot from Open Court, with little consideration or understanding of the audience.

Media of Biliteracy: Integrating Language and Content Using Sheltered Strategies

According to the continua, the media of biliteracy development occurs when instruction merges divergent and convergent, or similar and dissimilar scripts. An essential part of this process is integrating a variety of language sheltering techniques such as pre-teaching vocabulary, the translation of support documents, the use of visuals, monitoring speech, and making explicit connections to the first language (Echevarria & Short, 2008). The media of biliteracy varied across sites depending on which was the most dominant language used.

One commonality was that all of the schools did an excellent job of providing a variety of translated materials. Additionally, there was always someone available to interpret. However, the schools that used L1 more encountered more difficulty when it came to making explicit connections between materials given in Spanish and the content of the curriculum in English. Those with less L1 use showed more evidence of sheltered instruction. One coach at Gabriel commented:

> We modified it [the curriculum] because of the language, since their English was very limited, we had to back up and do things that were language-specific.

Nonetheless, direct translation of OCR materials was problematic. Although two schools did use the translated version of OCR, a textbook entitled *Foro Abierto*, instruction still focused on the English sound/spelling cards. These were complicated for English learners because they require abstract sound letter associations. For example, a coach explained,

> Qu, the q *siempre lleva la u*. It's kinda hard—*un poco dificil*. This card is the quacking duck. The sound is que. This next one is difficult in Spanish "r". *Hay que cortarlo*. In Spanish we say rrr, in English r.

Here the coach attempted to help parents understand how the English sounds differed from the Spanish. However, many parents became confused. It is generally better to have a clear allocation of L1 and L2 instruction. Perhaps it would have been a good idea to have the first half of the session in Spanish and the second half in English to avoid potential confusion.

Parents also mentioned in focus groups that this was frequently an issue with their children at home. They felt that their children became confused with when trying to distinguish between the two languages:

> Yes, well, it's difficult for me with the word structure . . . to translate them or try to explain them to him. Because I explain them to him in Spanish; he does speak Spanish, but since he learns only English here, then he says, "You're confusing me, Mami." Because . . . they explain it differently to him here. . . . Between the two of us we try to put everything together, but it is a little difficult for me to try to teach him correctly.

This comment perfectly demonstrates the contradictions that have emerged as a result of Proposition 227. Proposition 227 allows students to receive English only instruction with minimal L1 support. In many cases, the youth lack the academic language skills in both the L1 and the L2, making parent support in the L1 more difficult and preventing students from seeing the link between languages. Although staff spoke in interviews about how parents reading to children in Spanish would be helpful to students' literacy development, this was not addressed in the workshops.

Some programs did make several attempts to draw attention to language transfer by focusing on the similarities between English and Spanish. For example, staff at the all-Spanish program at Eliot were adept in pointing out national and regional differences in Spanish related to workshop concepts, and parents were able to expand their literacy in Spanish by discussing word analysis skills and parts of speech in Spanish.

Presenters also solicited L1 examples from parents. During a lesson on synonyms and antonyms the Wilson coach provided the following example in English with the translation done by a district staff member:

> COACH: This is great discussion. Now let's look a similar concept with small differences. For example, acidic vs. sour. Coffee is sour but not acidic. (She writes on the white board: Big, Huge, Enormous.) I am big compared to the children. An elephant is enormous compared to me. . . . Give me an example of this concept in Spanish.
>
> PARENT: *Amargo, acidico, agrio El café es agrio y amargo pero no acidico*.
>
> COACH: What is *agrio*?
>
> PARENT: Sour.
>
> COACH: Yes, good example.

Here the presenter attempts to explain the degree to which synonym meanings can vary. She attempts to scaffold the concept by providing examples and asking parents to make connections in the L1. However, a monolingual English speaker might believe that the definition of coffee as sour instead of acidic is inappropriate, particularly for second language learners of English. This concept is further lost in translation because as a monolingual English speaker,

the coach needs an interpretation of parents' examples in the L1. Nonetheless, as we see above, the parent is able to provide a direct translation of the presenters' example of synonyms. Thus, there was some degree of comprehensibility.

Again, one of the main challenges was that language was often an after-thought, not the nucleus of the program design and implementation. Thus, instead of effective sheltered instruction, we saw session instructors struggling with language instead of maximizing it.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In this study we examined the context, content, and media of biliteracy development in the design and implementation of the FPS program. We found that the FPS program fell largely on the traditionally more powerful end of the continua of biliteracy. An effective curriculum for English learners and their families will draw upon both the traditionally less powerful and the traditionally more powerful ends of the continua. While there were several attempts to draw upon the various ends of the continua in the FPS program, there were several factors that inhibited this process.

The strict emphasis on content coverage left little space for integrating the complex social worlds of the parents and their children. This was very reflective of the broader social context and of teaching to the tests as well as the pressure and anxiety that these schools felt as a result of being Program Improvement schools. The program's approach to teaching parents how to assist their children with reading was identical to the approach to teaching pupils Open Court. However, if Open Court is not that effective with English learner children, who are still behind, it may be ineffective to use the same approach with parents without major sheltering or accommodation to their language and literacy needs.

To better meet the needs of Spanish-dominant parents who want to help their children with reading, parent programs should consider the following:

- Begin with a needs assessment evaluation that includes information about the parents' language preferences/ability, literacy levels, questions, and concerns.
- Inform both the planning and instruction with best practices for teaching adult learners of English as a second language.
- Incorporate more scaffolding and sheltered instructional practices, such as visuals and explicit connections between the two languages.
- Give parents suggestions about home literacy practices that use the home language to support literacy in English.
- Encourage presenters to make more personal and cultural connections with parents and encourage parent voice to enhance language and literacy development.

Parents and children are not empty vessels, but overflowing with knowledge. In order for any curriculum to be effective, both parents and their children must have authentic contextualized learning experiences (Schwinge, 2003). Should these programs continue to utilize the mandated curriculum, they must breathe life into the strategies and approaches used. They must work with the intention of bilingual/biculturalism in order to maximize the full potential and develop families who are empowered agents of their own language learning and literacy development.

Table 2
Recommendations for Parent Programs

- Begin with a needs assessment evaluation that includes information about the parents' language preferences/ability, literacy levels, questions, and concerns.
- Inform both the planning and instruction with best practices for teaching adult learners of English as a second language.
- Incorporate more scaffolding and sheltered instructional practices, such as visuals and explicit connections between the two languages.
- Give parents suggestions about home literacy practices that use the home language to support literacy in English.
- Encourage presenters to make more personal and cultural connections with parents and encourage parent voice to enhance language and literacy development.

Note

[1] All names of local districts, schools, and programs within LAUSD are pseudonyms.

References

Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher. 33*(1) 4-14.

Alvarez, L., & Corn, J. (2008). Exchanging assessment for accountability: The implications of high-stakes reading assessments for *English Learners. Language Arts*, *85*(5), 354-65.

Arias, B., & Morillo-Campbell, M. (2008). *Promoting ELL parent involvement: Challenges in contested times*. Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://epsl.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPSL-0801-250-EPRU.pdf

Auerbach, E. R. (1995b). Which way for family literacy: Intervention or empowerment? In L. M. Morrow (Ed.), *Family literacy: Connections in schools and communities* (pp. 11–27). New Brunswick, NJ: International Reading Association.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Belfoire, M., & Burnaby, B. (1995). *Teaching English in the workplace*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Institute for the Study Education Press and Hooder & Stoughton.

Biggam, S. (2003). Making the most of parent partnerships to strengthen literacy development: Lessons from John and Janet Poeton and recent research. *The New England Reading Association Journal*, *39*(3), 24-27.

Cassidy, J., Garcia, R., & Tejeda-Delgado, C. (2004). A learner-centered family literacy project for Latino parents and caregivers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *47*(6), 478-488.

Cummins, J. (1986) Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56*(1), 18-36.

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (2000). BICS and CALP. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp.76-79). London, UK: Routledge.

Durgunoğlu, A.Y. (2002). Cross-linguistic transfer in literacy development and implications for language learners. *Annals of Dyslexia* 52(1), 189-204.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D.J. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English Language Learners: The SIOP model.* (3rd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Freire, P. (1970, 1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Forrest, S. (2004). Implications of No Child Left Behind on family literacy in a multicultural community. *The Clearing House*, *78*(1), 41-5.

Gándara, P. (2005). *Latino achievement: Identifying models that foster success*. Storrs, CT: National Center for the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.

Garcia, G. G., & Beltran, D. (2005). Revisioning the blueprint: Building for the academic success of English learners. In G. G. Garcia (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy (*pp.197-226). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Garcia, G. G. (2005) *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hornberger, N., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework of educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education*, *14*(2), 96-122.

Johnson, L. (2009). Challenging "best practices" in family literacy and parent education programs: The development and enactment of mothering knowledge among Puerto Rican and Latina mothers in Chicago. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *40*(3), 257-76.

Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Lee, S., Ajayi, L. & Richards, R. (2007). Teacher's perceptions of efficacy of the Open Court Program for English proficient and English learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 34*(3), 19-33.

Larrotta, C., & Ramirez, Y. (2009). Literacy benefits for Latina/o parents engaged in a Spanish literacy project. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *52*(7), 621-30.

Los Angeles Unified School District. (2003). *Language census report* (Publication #158). Los Angeles: Planning, Assessment, and Research, School Information Branch.

McCullom, H., & Russo, A. (1993). *Model strategies in bilingual education: Family literacy and parent involvement*. Washington, DC: Department of Education. Retrieved January 1, 2010 from http://eric.ed.gov:80/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/15/23/bb.pdf

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and schools. *Theory Into Practice 31*(2), 132-141.

Mohr, K. (2004) English as an accelerated language: A call to action to reading teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(1), 8-26.

Norton, P. B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change.* Singapore: Pearson Education.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in second language learning and use. In V.Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Peck, S., & Serrano, A. (2002). Open Court and English language learners: Questions and strategies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, April 6-9, Salt Lake City, UT.

Perez, B., & Torres-Guzman, M. (1992). *Learning in two worlds*. New York: Longman.

Quintero, E., & Velarde, M.C. (1990). Intergenerational literacy: A developmental bilingual approach. *Young Children, 45*, 10-15.

Snider, M. (2000). The social process of a family literacy project with bilingual families In Z. Beykont (Ed.), *Lifting every voice: Pedagogy and politics of bilingualism* (pp.71-81). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Publishing Group.

Schwinge, D. (2003). Enabling biliteracy: Using the continua of biliteracy to analyze curricular adaptations. In N.H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy and ecological framework of educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 248-265). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Valdes, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix

Continua of Biliteracy

Traditionally less powerful <———————> traditionally more powerful

Contexts of biliteracy

micro <———————> macro
oral <———————> literate
bi(multi)lingual <———————> monolingual

Development of biliteracy

reception <———————> production
oral <———————> written
L1 <———————> L2

Content of biliteracy

minority <———————> majority
vernacular <———————> literary
contextualized <———————> decontextualized

Media of biliteracy

simultaneous exposure <———————> successive exposure
dissimilar structures <———————> similar structures
divergent scripts <———————> convergent scripts

Source: Hornberger & Skilton Sylvester, 2003.