the United States could be schooled in their native language for an average of 50 to 75 percent of the time from K-12 as an appropriate means to promote their normal academic achievement, high levels of English language proficiency, adequate psychosocial adjustment, and satisfactory native language development.

4. In formal schooling contexts, additive forms of bilingualism are best achieved through the separate use of two languages. That is, as students are instructed in both their first and second languages, steps are taken so that students are exposed to each language at different times and for distinct purposes.

5. To avoid cognitive confusion and greatly increase learning efficiency, program staff should provide initial literacy instruction in bilingual settings in a sequential manner. That is, basic literacy skills should be developed through one language before reading instruction is introduced in the other language.

6. Underachievers and students with learning disabilities seem to experience no detrimental effects from bilingual instruction. When such children receive bilingual schooling, their academic achievement and native language development are similar to those of their counterparts in monolingual programs.

7. Formal second language instruction, even when provided under optimal conditions, appears to be insufficient to develop all of the language skills needed by second language acquirers. Some amount of exposure through natural social interaction is also required.
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Empirical data support the use of structured immersion with Hispanic and Asian students in the U.S.; can Santiago claim the same for transitional bilingual education?

We disagree with Santiago on several points. First, there were four studies other than the St. Lambert study, all of which involved children from working-class families. The results of structured immersion with these students were comparable to those found with the middle-class children in the St. Lambert study. Second, our range of measures was not as narrow as Santiago suggests; our achievement battery included science and language as well as reading and math. Further, we provided data showing improved high school attendance, fewer retentions, and a reduced dropout rate. Our studies included a measure of student adjustment and achievement after transition into a regular English language classroom had been made, and one study (Becker and Gersten, 1982) followed the students for seven full years—the criteria suggested by Santiago as a sign of true effectiveness.
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