

# Dual Language Education

## **BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM**

**Series Editors: Professor Nancy H. Hornberger**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA and **Professor Colin Baker**, University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, Great Britain

### **Other Books in the Series**

At War With Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety

*James Crawford*

Bilingual Education and Social Change

*Rebecca Freeman*

Building Bridges: Multilingual Resources for Children

*Multilingual Resources for Children Project*

Child-Rearing in Ethnic Minorities

*J.S. Dosanjh and Paul A.S. Ghuman*

Curriculum Related Assessment, Cummins and Bilingual Children

*Tony Cline and Norah Frederickson (eds)*

English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language

*Jasone Cenoz and Ulrike Jessner (eds)*

Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

*Colin Baker*

Language Minority Students in the Mainstream Classroom

*Angela L. Carrasquillo and Vivian Rodriguez*

Languages in America: A Pluralist View

*Susan J. Dicker*

Learning English at School: Identity, Social Relations and Classroom Practice

*Kelleen Toohey*

Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire

*Jim Cummins*

Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects

*Kendall A. King*

Multicultural Children in the Early Years

*P. Woods, M. Boyle and N. Hubbard*

Multicultural Child Care

*P. Vedder, E. Bouwer and T. Pels*

Reflections on Multiliterate Lives

*Diane Belcher and Ulla Connor (eds)*

The Sociopolitics of English Language Teaching

*Joan Kelly Hall and William G. Eggington (eds)*

Studies in Japanese Bilingualism

*Mary Goebel Noguchi and Sandra Fotos (eds)*

Teaching and Learning in Multicultural Schools

*Elizabeth Coelho*

Working with Bilingual Children

*M.K. Verma, K.P. Corrigan and S. Firth (eds)*

Young Bilingual Children in Nursery School

*Linda Thompson*

**Please contact us for the latest book information:**

**Multilingual Matters, Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall,  
Victoria Road, Clevedon, BS21 7HH, England  
<http://www.multilingual-matters.com>**

**BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM 28**

Series Editors: Nancy Hornberger and Colin Baker

# **Dual Language Education**

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary

**MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD**

Clevedon • Buffalo • Toronto • Sydney

### **Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data**

Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn J.  
Dual Language Education/Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary  
Bilingual Education and Bilingualism: 28  
Includes bibliographical references and index.  
1. Education, bilingual. I. Title. II. Series.  
LC3731.L568 2001  
370.117'5-dc21 00-068234

### **British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue entry for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 1-85359-532-2 (hbk)  
ISBN 1-85359-531-4 (pbk)

### **Multilingual Matters Ltd**

*UK:* Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon BS21 7HH.  
*USA:* UTP, 2250 Military Road, Tonawanda, NY 14150, USA.  
*Canada:* UTP, 5201 Dufferin Street, North York, Ontario M3H 5T8, Canada.  
*Australia:* Footprint Books, Unit 4/92a Mona Vale Road, Mona Vale, NSW2103, Australia.

Copyright © 2001 Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary. Reprinted 2002, 2003.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

Typeset by WordWorks Ltd.  
Printed and bound in Great Britain by the Cromwell Press Ltd.

# Contents

Acknowledgements . . . . .	vii
----------------------------	-----

Introduction . . . . .	1
------------------------	---

## **Part 1: Social and Theoretical Contexts of Dual Language Education**

1 Language Education Programs and Politics. . . . .	9
2 Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations for Dual Language Education Programs . . . . .	39
3 Critical Features of Successful Language Education Programs: Design and Implementation Issues . . . . .	59

## **Part 2: Classroom, Administrative and Familial Contexts in Dual Language Education**

4 The Dual Language Education School Characteristics and Data Collection . . . . .	79
5 Teacher Background and Perceptions of Support, Program Planning, Instructional Practices and Efficacy. . . . .	96
6 Teacher Talk in Dual Language Education Classrooms. . . . .	123
7 Parent Involvement, Attitudes and Satisfaction in Dual Language Education Programs . . . . .	143

## **Part 3: Student Outcomes in Dual Language Education Programs**

8 Student Outcomes: Introduction and Data Collection. . . . .	171
9 Student Outcomes: Oral Language Proficiency . . . . .	179
10 Student Outcomes: Academic Language Proficiency: Reading and Language Achievement . . . . .	207
11 Student Outcomes in Reading and Literacy: Standardized Achievement Tests vs. Alternative Assessment . . . . .	234
12 Student Outcomes: Content Area Achievement in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies . . . . .	247
13 Student Outcomes: Attitudes. . . . .	271

**Part 4: Conclusions and Implications for Language Education Programs**

14 Summary and Conclusions . . . . .	291
15 Implications . . . . .	310
Appendix. . . . .	331
References . . . . .	343
Index . . . . .	366

# **Acknowledgments**

This project has been a labor of love – and much labor! I owe a debt of gratitude to a number of individuals who helped to make this book possible. First, many thanks to all the schools and the tireless administrators and teachers who provided the data and helped me to understand the dual language education model up close. In particular, I thank my colleague Rosa Molina with whom I had many hours of discussion that made me think in different ways about implementation and about parent education issues. Considerable gratitude is extended to my other colleagues who provided input into this manuscript or my understanding of issues discussed here – Donna Christian, Judy Lambert, David Dolson, Jim Cummins, Fred Genesee, Jim Crawford, Linda Luporini-Hakmi, and many more.

I also want to sincerely thank Colin Baker who spent numerous hours reading the manuscript and offering suggestions for improvement. His input has clearly made this a higher quality book.

This project was supported in part by a Sabbatical Leave from San Jose State University and by the National Center for Research in Education, Diversity and Excellence at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Finally, I am very grateful to my family. To my son, Diego Padilla who inspired me to complete this project, my stepdaughter, Jessie Leary, and Terry Rowley, who provided cheers along the way. To all my other family as well, who listened to me talk about my book – many thanks. And to Dave, my husband, who lent support and expertise in his role as JOAT (Jack-Of-All-Trades), from repairing printer and computer hardware problems to introducing me to software that wouldn't freeze my computer, from making photocopies to making coffee, and much more. Thanks to you all.





# ***Introduction***

Across the globe, three major forces have created a surge of interest in various language education models. One concern is that, as the world communities develop business and political relationships, there is a greater need for individuals to develop multilingual competence. Immersion programs have thrived internationally as educators and politicians recognize the need to implement programs that promote higher levels of communicative proficiency than those offered by traditional foreign language models do. A second factor is that worldwide waves of immigration have forced many countries to address the educational needs of language minority students. In some instances, these students are children of guest workers who will return to their country of origin, while in other cases the immigrant students will stay in their host country. While these different outcomes may provoke the development of different educational models, there is still the need to meet the needs of these linguistically, if not culturally, diverse students. Still another force has led to increased interest in language education programs, which is the revitalization of languages in countries where the minority language has been suppressed or is in process of language loss (e.g. indigenous languages in many countries, Basque in Spain, Maori in New Zealand, Quechua in Peru). These factors have provided the impetus to challenge traditional language education models to assure that our models meet the increasingly diverse needs of the various student populations.

Dual language education (DLE) is a program that has the potential to eradicate the negative status of bilingualism in the US. The appeal of dual language education is that it combines maintenance bilingual education and immersion education models in an integrated classroom composed of both language majority and language minority students with the goal of full bilingualism and biliteracy.

While there has been a number of publications on the pedagogy and outcomes associated with bilingual education, immersion education, or other foreign language programs, there is little such information, especially empirically-based, available regarding dual language education (Lindholm, 1997, 1999b; Lindholm & Molina, 1998, 2000). Most publications on immersion and foreign language programs address the language

majority student, and those on bilingual education focus on the language minority student. This book merges these two populations and programs to describe the implementation and outcomes of the dual language education model in the US and to discuss the implications for other student populations as well.

The research described here is based on my own data collection efforts, which in 1986 began to document the dual language education program. My research includes data from more than 20 schools at different stages of implementation, and comprises the major types of dual language education programs. Data collection efforts encompass considerable longitudinal and cross-sectional data, with students from diverse cultural, socioeconomic, and language backgrounds. Student outcomes, such as oral language proficiency, literacy, academic achievement, and attitudes, are available in addition to teacher and parent attitudes as well as classroom interactions. Where possible, data from dual language education programs are compared to outcomes in other forms of bilingual education or English-only programs. While considerable data are presented here, they do not begin to match the scope of data available for immersion education in Canada. However, data are offered here in the hopes that others will gather and publish further information about dual language education, and that the findings will have implications beyond the dual language education model in the US.

## **Overview of the Book**

This book is organized into four parts. The first part sets the theoretical and conceptual stage for language education programs, and defines and describes dual language education. Part 2 provides contextual information, with data on school sites, teacher perceptions and attitudes, teacher talk in the classroom, and parental attitudes. Student outcomes are the focus of Part 3, which describes the language minority and language majority students' progress in oral language proficiency, academic achievement, and attitudes development. Finally, Part 4 summarizes and integrates the data to understand dual language education sites and students, as well as the implications of the findings for other language education designs and implementation in a variety of global contexts.

After working with dual language education programs for the past 15 years, I have an increasingly strong conviction that language education programs need a clear theoretical and conceptual framework in order to be successful. This is particularly true for bilingual education in the US, and is becoming true of dual language education programs as well. While recog-

nizing the need to develop a program that meets particular needs at a school site, I have seen so much experimentation with the dual language education model without any consideration of the consequences on the students of such 'playing around.' Some of these programs that call themselves dual language are really not dual language programs at all.

Without a clearly defined pedagogy, bilingual education in the US has become a catch-all phrase for any form of instruction in which some first language (L1) activity is used in the classroom. The variety of programs that call themselves bilingual seems limitless, including programs in which the primary language is used for 1% of the day as well as those in which it is used for the entire instructional day. Bilingual education is also used to refer both to classrooms in which teaching is carried out by a certified bilingual teacher in that language and also to classrooms in which a volunteer with no professional training provides the student(s) with instruction or translation. Other times, bilingual education refers to classrooms that comprise students who speak a language other than English, whether there is any native language instruction or not. This problem of using the term bilingual education so loosely does not result from any of lack of understanding of bilingual education among bilingual educators, but rather is because definitions have not been carefully used in implementation. Thus, there is no operational definition that is stringently used to clarify whether or not a classroom is following a bilingual education model. Also, bilingual education has become caught in a web of political confusion regarding immigration reform, educational reform, and which populations deserve dwindling financial resources. Because of the political context in which language education functions, both in the US and other countries, it is important to discuss the context of and framework for language education programs.

## **Part 1**

This section provides a conceptual grounding for effective language education models in general, and dual language education programs in particular. In Chapter 1 there is a description of demographic characteristics that affect language education in the US. Focus is on the changing demographics in the US, which reflect considerable cultural diversity and a significant language minority population, particularly among the school-aged population. To understand language education in the US also requires an understanding of the political context, which gives lip service to multilingualism and multiculturalism while promoting monoculturalism and monolingualism through ethnic and linguistic prejudice and discrimination. Chapter 1 then goes on to provide information regarding

the language education programs for language minority and language majority students in the US. The dual language education model is defined and described, with a brief history of its development and a discussion of the variability in model implementation across the US.

Chapter 2 examines the major theoretical and conceptual framework underlying language education models. The bodies of literature that are discussed for their relevance to language education include: effective schools, social context of language education, language development, and the relationship between language and thought. From these concepts, Chapter 3 discusses the specific design and implementation features that are critical to the success of language education programs in general, and dual language education in particular.

## **Part 2**

The dual language education school communities are described in Part 2 to provide a context for understanding the school, classroom, teacher, and parent issues in the dual language education model. Chapter 4 describes the school sites that were involved in my data collection efforts, including the ethnic density and socioeconomic features of the school, and the ethnicity, language background and socioeconomic characteristics of the program participants. In this chapter, we see the variability in dual language education program types and populations. Also included is a description of bilingual education sites that are used for comparison purposes in subsequent chapters.

To examine teacher background factors and attitudes in dual language education programs, Chapter 5 presents a variety of data on teacher attitudes, efficacy and satisfaction. These data include background information on the teachers' education, training, proficiency in the two languages of the program, and ethnicity, along with these teachers' perceptions of their teaching efficacy, their satisfaction with the model, their perceptions of support, program planning, and whether the program is meeting the needs of its population. Findings demonstrate the complexity of teacher background; program type; administrative, peer and parent support; as well as program planning issues that are associated with teachers who report feeling efficacious as teachers and satisfied with the model implementation at their site.

Two studies in Chapter 6 examine teacher talk and patterns of teacher initiation–student response–teacher response in the classrooms. The results are consistent with previous classroom discourse, bilingual education and immersion research in demonstrating the lack of opportunity for students to engage in meaningful and extended discourse with the teacher.

Chapter 7 deals with a topic that is typically absent from education and language education studies. Parent attitudes and reasons for enrolling their child in a dual language education program are examined, comparing attitudes and reasons for enrolling children according to program type, parent ethnicity, and parents' language background. This chapter provides a rich description of the types of parents who participate in DLE programs.

### **Part 3**

This section presents the evaluation outcomes of 4,900 students in dual language education programs, including longitudinal data collected over a period of 4–8 years. These outcomes are examined according to program type, school demographic characteristics, and student background characteristics. In addition, comparisons are made, wherever possible, with traditional bilingual education programs and English monolingual classrooms, wherever possible. Chapter 8 provides a description of the student participants from which data in subsequent chapters are drawn. In Chapter 9, the oral language proficiency and level of bilingual attainment are discussed. Oral language proficiency in the two languages is explored through teacher ratings of students' language proficiency and oral proficiency tests. From there, we move into Chapter 10 with an examination of reading and language achievement and Chapter 11, which includes and compares data from traditional standardized tests of reading achievement and reading rubrics developed as part of a language arts portfolio. A further look at content mastery is the topic of Chapter 12, which includes the level of achievement in mathematics, science, and social studies as indicated by traditional standardized tests of achievement. Students' attitudes and motivation are the topics of discussion in Chapter 13, which examines student attitudes toward the program, as well as student perceptions of their language and academic competence, motivation for challenge, integrative and instrumental motivation, cross-cultural attitudes, self esteem, and their beliefs about the benefits of bilingualism.

### **Part 4**

Part 4 provides the opportunity to bring together data on teacher attitudes and student outcomes, and to examine implications of the data for language education pedagogy and student participants. Chapter 14 summarizes the findings and highlights key research results. This chapter clearly shows that the DLE model can produce its intended results – high levels of bilingualism, biliteracy, and achievement at or above grade level. Chapter 15 presents implications for language educational programs, including several issues that have been consistently important to dual

language education and which may influence language education programs in general. These include: design and implementation issues, teacher training, parent recruitment and education, student population characteristics, evaluation and assessment issues, and transition to secondary school concerns.

*Part 1*

***Social and Theoretical Contexts of  
Dual Language Education***





## *Chapter 1*

# ***Language Education Programs and Politics***

Language education is an increasingly vibrant issue in the United States, as it is in many other countries that have complex demographically- and politically-motivated language education programs. To provide a broader background for understanding language education programs, it is helpful to present the demographic and sociopolitical contexts that influence the implementation of these programs. Following a discussion of the demographic and political issues, this chapter will briefly present the existing language education models for language minority students as well as for language majority students. The final section will define the dual language education model.

## **Demographic and Political Issues Affecting Language Education in the US**

### **Demographic issues affecting language education**

The United States, along with many other countries, has experienced considerable immigration over many decades and particularly in the past 20 years. According to the last two decadal census reports and the most recent update (US Census, 1980, 1990, 1996), there have been significant population shifts, as shown in Table 1.1<sup>1</sup>. While the general US population grew at a rate of 17% (from 227 million to 275 million) from 1980 to 2000, the rate of growth varied tremendously across the different ethnic/racial groups in the US. The Hispanic population increased by 83% and represented 11.7% of the US population in 2000. One other group that expanded substantially was the Asian American population (at 3.8% in 2000), with a growth rate of 153%. More modest increases were witnessed among African Americans, who in 2000 represented 12.2% of the population. Thus, in 2000, the minority population encompassed 28.4%, or more than one quarter, of the US population. The remaining 71.6% of the population included European Americans, who decreased 9% in 2000, from 79.8% of the population in 1980. As one can see from Table 1.1, the non-European-American population is growing at a much faster rate, in part due to

**Table 1.1** US population by race and Spanish origin: Percent distribution and rate of growth: 1980–2000

<i>Ethnic Group</i>	<i>Distribution</i>		<i>Rate of Growth</i>
	1980	2000	
<i>Total</i>	227 million	276 million	22%
<b>Hispanic</b>	6.4%	11.9%	86%
<b>Asian American</b>	1.5%	3.8%	153%
<b>African American</b>	11.7%	12.2%	4%
<b>Native American</b>	0.6%	0.7%	17%
<b>European American</b>	79.8%	71.3%	-10.7%

*Source:* US Census Bureau (2000).

continuing immigration. By 1999, 26.4 million foreign-born people resided in the US, representing 9.7% of the total US population (Brittingham, 1999; US Department of Justice, 1999).

This demographic shift has been widely discussed in the US, particularly in states where immigrants are most likely to settle (i.e. California, New York, Florida, Texas, and Illinois). The State of California is a prime example where the demographic shift has led to political changes that have and will continue to impact language education programs. California has six of the top 20 cities that receive the most legal immigrants, accounting for about 100,000 new immigrants annually (Allen & Turner, 1988; US Department of Justice, 1999). Added to the legal immigrant figure are the estimated two million immigrants who have arrived illegally from many different countries (Allen & Turner, 1988; US Department of Justice, 2000).

The educational significance of this demographic shift is that many of these immigrants are children, or are adults who gave birth to children, who enter the school system speaking little or no English. In the US, an estimated 9.9 million of 45 million school-aged children, live in households in which languages other than English are spoken (US Census Bureau, 1996), a statistic which represents a 35% increase since 1980 (Waggoner, 1995). While Spanish continues to be the language of two thirds, or six million children, who speak a language other than English at home, speakers of languages that are Asian in origin have doubled from 1980 to 1990

(Waggoner, 1995). Close to eight million language minority children attended public schools, and one million entered private schools.

While language minority students live in each of the 50 states, only a few states have a significant language minority population. California has the largest language minority population, with an estimated 2.2 million students in 1999 ([www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/)). Other states with a significant number of language minority students include: Texas (1.4 million), New York (972,000), and five states each with at least a quarter million language minority students (Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, Arizona and Pennsylvania). It is in California where almost half of children entering school come from homes where a language other than English is used. Because California has the largest language minority population, it will be used to exemplify sociopolitical issues affecting language education as well as types of language education programs.

### **Political concerns affecting language education**

At a national level is the appearance of a healthy respect for, and a desire to see in students, bilingual or multilingual language proficiencies and multicultural competencies. For example, in 1989, the National Governor's Conference and then-President Bush agreed on a national education agenda comprising six broad goals to be met by the year 2000. President Clinton largely adopted this Goals 2000 national education agenda. Though bilingual proficiency was not specified as one of the six goals, it was subsumed under Goal 3 (titled Student Achievement and Citizenship). Objectives (v) and (vi) under Goal 3 specified that:

- (v) The percentage of all students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase; and
- (vi) All students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this Nation and about the world community. (Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994).

These goals have since been replaced by a new set of goals, none of which includes competence in a second language.

More recently, then US Secretary of Education Richard Riley (2000) was addressing the growth of Hispanic Americans, which he labeled a 'transformation of historic proportions', and the underachievement of this group. He noted:

This is why I am delighted to see and highlight the growth and promise of so many dual-language bilingual programs across the country. They are challenging young people with high standards, high expectations,

and curriculum in two languages. They are the wave of the future ... Our nation needs to encourage more of these kinds of learning opportunities, in many different languages. That is why I am challenging our nation to increase the number of dual-language schools to at least 1,000 over the next five years, and with strong federal, state and local support we can have many more. (Riley, 2000)

At the state level, there was also some interest in increasing bilingual competence in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Nine states mandated elementary foreign language classes and a number of other states seemed likely to follow suit or, at least, to provide substantial incentives for schools that did so (Met, 1998). According to Rhodes (1992), 30 states have instituted new foreign language requirements at the elementary level. In addition, the National Association of Elementary School Principals passed a resolution supporting elementary foreign language education (Black, 1993). However, as Crawford (1999: 238) points out, neither states nor the US has ever really 'had a language policy, consciously planned and [for the US] national in scope.' This lack of a coherent language policy is further supported in August and Hakuta's (1997) report from the First National Research Council on Developing a Research Agenda on the Education of English Language Learners and Bilingual Students.

In direct opposition to this apparent interest in promoting the teaching and learning of other languages and cultures is the considerable attention and debate in recent years on the question of whether English should be designated the official language of the United States. Strongly organized movements, such as *US English* and *English First*, have made it their primary purpose to make English the *official* language of the United States, through an amendment to the US Constitution, through state legislation or through repeal of laws and regulations permitting public business to be conducted in a language other than English.

### English only movement in the US

As of 2000, 20 states had enacted laws designating English as the official state language (<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD>). One lone state, Hawaii, has not one but two official languages: English and Hawaiian. According to Crawford (1999: 70, emphasis added), Arizona's law 'imposed a blanket English Only policy: "This state and all political subdivisions of this state shall act in English *and no other language*.'" As various states (39 out of 50 to date) have considered constitutional amendments that would make English the official language, legal scholars have also examined the constitutional provisions that apply

to language-rights issues in the classroom, workplace, courtroom, and social service agencies (Crawford, 1999; Piatt, 1990).

The major difference, however, between the concern for language then and today is that in earlier times language issues were confined to local or state arenas. Today, in contrast, the initiatives dedicated to establishing English as the official language are orchestrated at the national level by a powerful and heavily funded political organization. Further, this English Only movement has close connections to restrictionist, anti-immigration organizations, which suggests that the English Only movement has a wider, more far-reaching and more negative agenda than simply advocating an official English language policy. For example, until mid-1988, US English was a project of US Inc., a tax-exempt corporation that also supports the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Americans for Border Control, Californians for Population Stabilization, and other immigration-restrictionist groups (Crawford, 1999).

Crawford (1999) suggests that *racist* attitudes appear to be behind English Only initiatives. The position that English Only may appeal to racist beliefs is also supported by Huddy and Sears (1990) who examined the attitudes of white Americans toward bilingual education. Similarly, in an analysis by MacKaye (1990) of letters to the editor of various California newspapers that appeared before and after the 1986 election which included Proposition 63 (the English Only Initiative), the signs of racism were clear in much of the public sentiment surrounding the initiative, as exemplified in Crawford's (1999) quotes from editorials in various newspapers around the US:

We here in Southern California are overrun with all sorts of aliens – Asian, Spanish, Cuban, Middle East – and it is an insurmountable task if these million are not required to learn English. Many are illerate [sic] in their native language [Rolling Hills, California] ...At the rate the Latinos (and non-whites) reproduce, [we] face a demographic imbalance if we do not change several of our dangerously outdated laws. Make English the official language everywhere in the USA. [Jersey City, New Jersey] ..No other ethnic group has made the demands for bilingual education as have the Cubans. The more you give them, the more they demand. WHOSE AMERICA IS THIS? ONE FLAG. ONE LANGUAGE. [North Miami, Florida]. (Crawford 1999: 66)

Over the past decade there has also been a sharp increase in the number of *hate crimes* and other forms of anti-minority group sentiment (e.g. Sniffen, 1999). We have seen an increase in Ku Klux Klan demonstrations, neo-Nazi activities, and skin-head youth attempts to intimidate individ-

uals because of differences in race, ethnicity, language, religion, or sexual orientation. In 1995 through 1998, almost 8000 hate crimes were reported annually (Summary of Hate Crime Statistics, 1998), and hate crimes against people far outnumbered crimes against property, accounting for 72% of the total hate crimes (*San Jose Mercury News*, 1996). So commonplace have these events become that in 1990 the US Congress passed, and then-President Bush signed into law, the Hate Crime Statistics Act, which requires local governments to keep track of bias crimes. Currently, the US legislature is considering the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999. We have long known that the more favorably one's own group is perceived, the less attractive other groups are viewed, making *ethnocentrism* the psychological mechanism that promotes ingroup-outgroup cleavage and prejudice of all forms (Adorno *et al.*, 1950). The English Only movement and the arguments used by its supporters to justify their actions are very similar to those used at other times and in other places to force the domination of one group over another. As Cummins (2000) points out, the debate on the merits of bilingual education can only be understood by considering these types of power relations that are operating in the society-at-large.

Yet, more and more North Americans are cognizant of the need to be more sensitive to other cultural groups and the different languages they may speak. There are small movements, including *English Plus*, that clearly support the acquisition and use of English for all US citizens and residents. However, these groups also advocate enhancing second language training and proficiency for English speakers. In addition, groups such as English Plus also promote expansion of bilingual education programs for the growing number of immigrant and other linguistic minority children in US schools, for broadening the range of health and other social services available to individuals who speak languages other than English, and for increasing the number of Adult English-as-Second-Language (ESL) and literacy programs for adult immigrants (Padilla *et al.*, 1991).

Consistent with this movement are the results of a survey by Lambert and Taylor (1990, cited in Lambert *et al.*, 1993). Their study was conducted with Americans of Albanian, Arabic, Mexican, and Polish descent, as well as with African American, and working and middle class Anglo Americans (who were not identified by ethnicity) to examine their attitudes toward multiculturalism (i.e. maintaining language and culture while also demonstrating English language proficiency and acculturation) versus assimilation (i.e. giving up native language and culture to become American and

speak English). Results showed that, overwhelmingly, all but the working class whites favored multiculturalism.

In several of the communities in which I work, the Dual Language Education (DLE) program is highly supported by both the language minority and language majority families who are participating. However, in one community, a lawsuit was filed charging the school with violating the new English Only law in California. While the lawsuit was dropped, it opened a chasm in the community around which the pro-US English Only and bilingual advocates vigorously fought. The outcome was actually a greater unity in the community for the DLE program. However, the community's attitudes toward multiculturalism cannot be underestimated with respect to the language education program's ultimate lifespan and success.

The realm most frequently targeted for opposition by English Only policies is the education of linguistic minority students. For example, in June, 1998, California voters passed an initiative (Proposition 227) that was labeled 'English for the Children' by its millionaire originator, Ron Unz, a software developer with absolutely no background in education. As Unz and his supporters could only have imagined, the name 'English for the Children' was the only support the bill needed for passage. Arguments about the effectiveness of bilingual education were moot in the face of such a title. As Krashen lamented in his description of the lay public's understanding of this measure:

It had been frustrating day. I had been scheduled to debate Ron Unz at Cal State LA, my first chance to debate him face to face. To my disappointment, Unz did not show up and he sent a substitute debater. Thanks to a very supportive, knowledgeable and sophisticated audience, the substitute was overwhelmed, but little was accomplished. Unz wasn't there and therefore the press wasn't there. On the way home ...was standing in line ...the woman behind me asked why I looked so depressed. I explained the situation briefly .. she asked what the debate was about, and I said that it was with Ron Unz and had to do with Proposition 227. Her response was immediate and animated: 'Oh yes, English for the children! I've heard of that. I'm voting for it. I'm for English.' I was stunned. I realized right then that my strategy of carefully presenting the research that contradicted the details of 227 had been all wrong. The woman had no idea what 227 was about: She was 'voting for English,' but she clearly had no idea that a major goal of bilingual education was English language development.' (Krashen, 2000: 20)



In reality, Proposition 227 was established to:

- Impose an English-only program for all limited-English-proficient (LEP) children – regardless of the wishes of parents, the recommendations of educators, or the decisions of local school boards.
- Mainstream 1.4 million LEP students after just one-year of English instruction – overtaxing teachers and holding back English-proficient students.
- Intimidate teachers and administrators, with threats of lawsuits and financial penalties, for using any language but English to assist a child.
- Restrict foreign-language instruction for all California students – including native English speakers.
- Restrict the California legislature by requiring a two-thirds vote to amend the English-only mandate – making it virtually impossible to modify or repeal.

This initiative has resulted in the replacement of many bilingual programs with English-only programs and the modification of other bilingual (including DLE) programs, if enough parents had requested a waiver to allow their child to be educated bilingually. Currently, thousands of teachers who have no training in working with language minority children or in English language development methodologies, have limited-English-proficient students in their classrooms (<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD>).

To understand the significant impact of the English Only movement on the education of language minority students requires a slight demographic reminder. As indicated in the previous section, growth trends over the past twenty years have demonstrated that the number of language minority students has increased substantially. The great majority of these language minority students, about 75%, are Hispanic. In addition, it is probably true that, instead of providing bilingual education for these students, a disproportionate number of language minority students are tracked inappropriately into special education programs (Baca & Cervantes, 1998; Olneck, 1995).

Nationally, the academic performance of minority students is considerably below majority norms (e.g. August & Hakuta, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1995; National Center for Education Statistics, 2000; Padilla & Lindholm, 1995; Portes & Rumbaut, 1990; Riley, 2000). Reading is critical to student achievement in all subjects, yet National Assessment of Educational Progress Reports (1990, 1998) for the period show that the achievement gap is greatest in reading. In addition, the highest drop-out rates are



obtained in schools with large concentrations of Southeast Asian (48%) and Spanish speaking (46%) students, and large concentrations of language minority students in general (Sue & Padilla, 1986). While there are a number of risk factors implicated in school drop out for ethnic and language minority students, one of these risk factors includes limited English language proficiency at school entry. Fluency in English is also one critical factor in achievement. Although many students can acquire the basic communication skills in English necessary to carry on a normal everyday conversation with others, they often have difficulty mastering the academic language required of schooling tasks (see Chapter 3 for further information regarding communication skills and cognitive academic language skills).

English Only advocates and other opponents of bilingual education have vociferously disparaged the ineffectiveness of bilingual education for language minority children. This viewpoint received considerable support in 1985 when then-Secretary of Education, William Bennett, stated in a speech to the Association for a Better New York: 'After seventeen years of federal involvement, and after \$1.7 billion of federal funding, we have no evidence that the children whom we sought to help have benefited.'

The central issue of the debate on bilingual education has been whether research supports the educational benefit of the program or whether federal monies could be better spent on other educational programs. As Crawford (1999) has pointed out, critics of bilingual education have had a decided edge in the controversy over its effectiveness. Where evidence is contradictory, the easiest position to defend and the hardest to disprove is that results are inconclusive. The US Education Department's request for proof that bilingual education is universally effective with every limited English proficient child from every background in every school is a standard that has been set for no other content area or program.

The strongest arguments against bilingual education came from two employees of the US Department of Education, Baker and de Kanter (1981, 1983) who reviewed the bilingual education evaluation literature and concluded that bilingual education was not effective in meeting the educational needs of language minority children. They went so far as to report that transitional bilingual programs were ineffective and harmful in some settings, instead endorsing a structured English immersion demonstration program, despite the lack of any evidence of its effectiveness in meeting the needs of language minority children. According to Crawford (1999: 112), 'During the 1980s it [the Baker and de Kanter report] was easily the most quoted federal pronouncement on the education of LEP children, and probably the most criticized as well.'

One critical reply to the Baker and de Kanter reports came from Willig (1985, 1987) who used meta-analysis procedures to re-analyze the Baker and de Kanter studies. In her analysis, Willig controlled for 183 variables that Baker and de Kanter had not taken into account and, most importantly, controlled for the design weaknesses in the studies. The results from the meta-analysis consistently yielded small-to-moderate differences supporting bilingual education. This pattern of findings was substantiated not only in English tests of reading, language skills, mathematics, and total academic achievement, but also in Spanish tests of listening comprehension, reading, writing, language, mathematics, social studies, and attitudes toward school and self. Methodological rigor also influenced the findings, such that higher quality study designs produced more positive effects favoring bilingually educated children over children in comparison groups.

Willig (1987), in a rebuttal to Baker (1987), elaborated upon her earlier study and argued even more convincingly for the soundness of her original conclusion. She also identified the numerous methodological flaws inherent in the Baker and de Kanter (1981, 1983) reviews of literature that contributed to their erroneous conclusions. While the policy questions that drove the Baker and de Kanter study are now quite moot, as Secada (1987) has so eloquently stated, the English Only movement has seriously eroded public and educator confidence in bilingual education as a promising educational program for language minority students.

In evaluation studies that compare bilingual education to structured English immersion and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs, these alternatives certainly fare far worse than bilingual education. One multi-million dollar study compared transitional bilingual education or early-exit (the most common bilingual education model, designed to transition students as quickly as possible to English mainstream), with late-exit (maintaining native language while developing English for several years), and structured English immersion approaches. This large-scale methodologically rigorous study showed that the immersion students scored lowest in almost every academic subject, while late-exit bilingual students scored highest, even when all groups were tested in English (Ramirez *et al.*, 1991). For a long time, the US Department of Education refused to officially release the results of this very expensive and well-designed study because it provided strong support for the effectiveness of *late-exit* bilingual education (Crawford, 1999).

Research has clearly shown that high quality bilingual education programs can promote higher levels of academic achievement and language proficiency in both languages, as well as more positive psychosocial outcomes (Holm & Holm, 1990). Similarly, the sink-or-swim

structured English immersion approach, advocated by English Only, results in lower levels of academic achievement and English language proficiency, as well as a decrement in psychosocial competence (Hakuta & Gould, 1987). These views are consistent with the US General Accounting Office's (1987a, 1987b) own independent review of the findings of bilingual education research in light of the US Department of Education policy statements and many other studies (see August & Hakuta, 1997; Cummins, 2000).

At the core of the controversy regarding the effectiveness of bilingual education are some theoretical issues regarding the relationship between bilingualism and cognition (see Chapter 2 for a fuller description of this point). One controversial issue is whether there are positive or negative influences of bilingualism on cognitive ability. Considerable research on this point has demonstrated that balanced bilinguals (i.e. those who develop full competency in both languages) enjoy some cognitive advantages over monolinguals in areas such as cognitive flexibility, metalinguistic knowledge, concept formation, and creativity (August & Hakuta, 1997; Bialystok, 1999; Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994). As Hakuta and Garcia (1989: 375) point out, 'Causal relationships have been difficult to establish, but in general, positive outcomes have been noted, particularly in situations where bilingualism is not a socially stigmatized trait but rather a symbol of membership in a social elite.' From this perspective, it is simple to understand why parents of a language majority child as well as language minority parents would want the *option* of enrolling their child in an enrichment bilingual program that promotes both languages. However, based on English Only goals, this type of language enrichment would not be possible in the public schools, because it would serve to strengthen proficiency in non-English languages. Interestingly, this contrasts sharply with recent concern for foreign language education and the need to prepare a language-competent society that is able to compete effectively with other nations in English and in the languages of our competitors.

Thus, psychological and educational research suggests that policies aimed at promoting English at the expense of other languages are misguided on at least three counts. First, there is considerable basic, applied, and evaluation research that shows that bilingual education can promote academic achievement, dual language proficiency, and psychosocial competence, whereas structured English immersion approaches may lead to lower levels of achievement, English proficiency, and psychosocial development. Second, there is no evidence that bilingualism causes any type of cognitive overload, causing children to become confused between the two languages. Third, bilingualism may lead to higher levels of intellectual development, a finding that should lend

support for enrichment bilingual models rather than immersion English Only approaches, for both language minority and language majority students (August & Hakuta, 1997; Bialystok, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Tinajero & DeVillar, 2000).

In summary, the arguments against bilingual education by advocates of English Only (e.g. Imhoff, 1990) are inaccurate. Bilingual education, when properly implemented, can be a very effective pedagogical technique for assisting both in the smooth transition to English and in an orderly educational preparation of students from non-English-speaking homes. In fact, this may be the best way to achieve participatory democracy since the beneficiaries of bilingual education are both proficient in English and equipped educationally to contribute to society.

A final comment regarding the sociopolitical context is that support for bilingual education has always been paltry but, with the rise in the US English movement and escalating economic problems in educational settings, support for bilingual education is waning even further. Evaluation and research studies, even methodologically sound ones, are not awarded their due credibility (Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Krashen, 2000). Added to this enigma are the methodological challenges in conclusively demonstrating the superior effect of bilingual education over other educational approaches for language minority students. The net impact is that policy on language education for language minority and majority students is typically *not* guided by research and evaluation studies on the effectiveness of bilingual or immersion education programs, but rather by emotional appeals and myths based on misguided opinions.

## Education of Language Minority Students

Almost without exception, language minority education in the US has been restricted to compensatory educational models based on a linguistic, academic, and socio-cultural deficit model. In Baker's (1996) and Skutnabb-Kangas' (1988) terminology, language education programs are largely submersion (devalue and attempt to eradicate the native language, as in immersion programs in English) or transitional (provide some L1 support, but move as quickly as possible into English). Both of these serve the societal and educational aim of assimilation, and result in English monolingualism.

This assimilationist aim is clearly seen in the manner in which educational services are decided for specific students. First, there is a determination of who requires language education services. All students from homes where a language other than English is spoken are potential language

minority students. On the basis of their performance on English-language-proficiency tests, students are categorized as Limited English Proficient (LEP) or Fluent English Proficient (FEP). This terminology, which implies a deficit rather than the strength of a potential bilingual, sets the stage for further derogatory treatment, as seen in the reference to LEPs by educators, lawmakers or others as 'nonspeakers,' because the focus is on what the students lack rather than what they are able to do.

Only LEP students are offered placement in specialized language programs. Further, special services are typically offered only for the period of time that the so-called LEP students are considered deficient in English communication skills. Thus, all programs required by federal law for language minority students are transitional in nature. To reclassify as FEP and exit a student from specialized instruction, schools typically give the student some sort of oral language proficiency test that assesses the student's ability to communicate and understand English. Some schools go a step further and require that the student performs to a certain standard on an achievement test. However, when such achievement testing is carried out, the standard of attainment is typically quite low and certainly well below grade level.

Once students are reclassified as FEP, they are no longer protected by the educational laws that require bilingual or other specialized instructional services (Dolson, 1985). FEP students are rarely offered primary language, or L1 instruction by school districts. Certainly, they have no legal support in terms of linguistic human rights to petition the local school for mother tongue classes, although there are some school districts that provide ESL instruction for FEP students or that offer Spanish for Native Speaker classes at the high school level.

In 2000, 1.4 million language minority students enrolled in California's schools were categorized as LEP students ([www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov))<sup>2</sup>. While these students represented a wide variety of languages, the most common languages were:

- Spanish (81.9%)
- Vietnamese (2.9%)
- Hmong (2.0%)
- Cantonese (1.8%)
- Tagalog (1.3%)
- Kmer (Cambodian, 1.2%).

Table 1.2 depicts the manner in which these students were distributed among the various types of language education programs designed for language minority students. For further information about typologies of

**Table 1.2** LEP Student enrollment in instructional programs: California summary

<b>Number and Percent of LEP</b>	Grades K–6	913,063 (69%)
	Grades 7–12 or ungraded	410,862 (31%)
	<i>Total</i>	1,323,787
	(1) English Language Development (ELD)	13.5%
	(2) ELD and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)	16.0%
	(3) ELD, SDAIE and Primary Language Support	19.7%
	(4) ELD and Academic Subjects Through the Primary Language	30.2%
	(5) Not in Program	20.6%

Source: California Department of Education (1996a).

language education programs, see Baker and his colleagues (Baker, 1996; Baker & Jones, 1998; Garcia & Baker, 1995) and Skuttnab-Kangas (1988).

Data in Table 1.2 were collected as part of the annual language census conducted by the California Department of Education (1996a). The survey used the following operational definitions for each of the program categories listed in rows 1 through 4 (Dolson & Lindholm, 1995):

- (1) *English Language Development (ELD)*: A specialized program of *English* language instruction appropriate for the student's identified level of language proficiency which is consistently implemented and is designed to promote second language acquisition of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Instruction must be provided by a qualified bilingual teacher or by a teacher who is a language development specialist.
- (2) *ELD and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)*: Each LEP student must receive a program of ELD and, at a minimum, two academic subjects required for grade promotion or graduation taught through specially designed academic instruction in *English*. SDAIE is an approach utilized to teach academic courses to LEP students in *English*. The instructional methodology must be designed for non-native speakers of English and must focus on increasing the

comprehensibility of the academic courses provided. Instruction must be provided by a qualified bilingual teacher or a teacher who is a language development specialist, or by any other teacher who has sufficient training to implement the SDAIE methodology.

- (3) *ELD, SDAIE, and Primary Language Support*: Each LEP student must receive a program of ELD, SDAIE, and instructional support through the primary language in at least two academic subject areas. Primary language support may be provided by any teacher, or by any paraprofessional who has sufficient proficiency in the target language.
- (4) *ELD and Academic Subjects Through the Primary Language*: In kindergarten through grade 6, *primary language* instruction is provided, at a minimum, in language arts (including reading and writing) and mathematics, science, or social science. In grades 7–12, primary language instruction is provided, at a minimum, in two academic subjects required for grade promotion or graduation. Lesson content and curriculum must be aligned with that provided to FEP and English-only students in the school district. Primary language instruction must be provided by qualified bilingual teachers.

It is interesting to note that 20.6% of the students are listed in Table 1.2 as 'Not in Program.' This refers to students who:

- Are not offered (contrary to law at that time) any specialized instruction.
- Have been withdrawn from a program by their parents.
- Are enrolled in a program that does not meet the operational definition of any of the programs indicated in rows 1 through 4.

Most of the students reported in row 5 receive some form of instructional assistance. However, such assistance rarely includes instruction in and through the *L1*, and almost never implies that the instruction is provided by a bilingual or other qualified teacher. None of the program options seeks to maintain the student's proficiency in his/her primary language. These potential bilinguals are forced into a monolingual mold because bilingualism is viewed as a liability rather than as a resource. Thus, close to 70% (rows 1–3 and 5) of these LEP students receive little, if any, *L1* instruction and what *L1* 'support' they do receive may be provided by an untrained paraprofessional if the teacher is not proficient in the target language.

Language education for language minority students is further complicated by the lack of state and local support and by the lack of trained teachers. Public schools in California were required to abide by a mandatory bilingual education act from 1976 to 1987. In 1987, the governor and



the state legislature were unable to reach an agreement on renewing the policy for language minority education in the state. Subsequently, programs for language minority students have been governed by a complex combination of state and federal laws, court cases, and local guidelines. All of this well-publicized legal uncertainty seems to have undermined efforts to obtain the human and material resources necessary to support bilingual programs. For instance, between 1987 and 1990, the number of bilingual teachers available for classroom assignments actually decreased slightly while the number of language minority students in the same period increased on average more than 10% annually (California State Department of Education, 1992). The demand for bilingual classroom teachers was estimated to be 22,365 for the 1.1 million LEP students in 1991 (California State Department of Education, 1991). The current supply of bilingual teachers is calculated at 13,543 for over 1.3 million LEP students. This results in a significant statewide shortage of teachers (Dolson & Lindholm, 1995). Currently, California State incentives to lower the teacher:student ratio to 1:20 in kindergarten through third grade have severely exacerbated this already-acute shortage of trained bilingual teachers.

Reviews of research on the scholastic underperformance of language minority students in the 1980s were reported by Dolson (1985), Cummins (1989), and Fishman (1989) among many others. More recent reports demonstrate that these negative trends continue in California and the US in general (August & Hakuta, 1997; National Center for Education Statistics, 2000; Riley, 2000; US Department of Education, 2001). Studies such as these, coupled with the California Department of Education language census reports on the quantity and quality of specialized language programs, provide an overall picture of the persistence of unfavorable educational conditions for language minority students in California and elsewhere.

Initially, many bilingual educators in the US mistakenly believed that transitional forms of bilingual education would be sufficient to provide language minority students with equal educational opportunities. What they did not realize at the time is that sociopolitical pressures would reduce the intervention to almost exclusive reliance on the *early-exit* version of this model, with its concomitant promotion of subtractive bilingualism (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984). These educators further underestimated the negative effects of minority status on bilingual program teachers and student participants (Cummins, 1989; Spener, 1988). The results of earlier investigations have been confirmed by the longitudinal study conducted by Ramirez and others (1991), which clearly indicates that the quick-fix versions of bilingual education are severely limited in their ability to address the scholastic needs of language minority



students. This implication has stimulated interest among many educational practitioners and researchers who are concerned about the failure of current programs to adequately address the needs of language minority students.

These advocates of language minority students have worked to transform the compensatory nature of transitional programs into enrichment models of bilingual schooling (Cloud, Genesee & Hamayan, 2000; Dolson & Mayer, 1992; Genesee & Gándara, in press). Because enrichment models, or maintenance bilingual models, for language minority students have received such unfavorable media and popular attention as ineffective in promoting quick acquisition of English, they are rarely found in the US. Thus, educators have begun to see the need for combining enrichment models that include language majority along with the language minority students as a way to allow enrichment language education for language minority students.

## **Education of Language Majority Students**

As in most countries, the US provides two major types of foreign language instruction at the elementary school level. These major approaches include: FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary School), and immersion. According to a national survey of public and private schools conducted by Rhodes and Oxford (1988), 59% of elementary-school foreign-language programs in the US can be categorized as either FLES or immersion.

The term FLES has a dual meaning. It is often utilized as an umbrella term to refer to elementary-school foreign-language education. However, the acronym also describes specific programs that usually last for two or more years and encompass a range of 5–15% of the weekly school curriculum (Lipton, 1985). In general, the objectives of FLES programs are:

- To develop a certain amount of listening and speaking skills (the amount varies from program to program).
- To acquire an understanding of and appreciation for other cultures.
- To reach a limited level of proficiency in reading and writing (in some programs).

When a FLES program emphasizes appreciation of culture rather than development of listening and speaking skills, the program is considered a FLEX (Foreign Language Experience) program.

The national Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) program, with its accompanying federal funds, generated a modest amount of

**Table 1.3** Foreign language enrollments in California schools in Grades K–12

<i>Language of Instruction</i>	<i>Total Course Enrollment</i>			<i>Totals</i>
	<i>Grades K–6</i>	<i>Grades 7–12</i>	<i>Advanced Placement (College Credit)</i>	
<b>Spanish</b>	7,706	506,091	24,732	538,529
<b>French</b>	1,084	96,816	3,745	101,645
<b>German</b>	53	19,511	948	20,512
<b>Japanese</b>	23	6,451	n/a	6,474
<b>Latin</b>	56	4,626	315	4,997
Mandarin/Cantonese	73	3,859	0	3,932
<b>Russian</b>	0	1,328	0	1,328
<b>Korean</b>	0	874	0	874
<b>Italian</b>	29	623	0	652
<b>Vietnamese</b>	0	452	0	452
<b>Portuguese</b>	0	386	0	386
<b>Other</b>	2,756	15,580	0	18,336
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11,780</b>	<b>656,597</b>	<b>29,740</b>	<b>698,117</b>

Source: California Department of Education (1996a).

interest in kindergarten through grade 6 schools in the late 1960s. Most of these programs faded by the early 1970s, and activity in second language programs at these grade levels has remained paltry. Table 1.3 contains data that show that, in the 1995–96 school year, fewer than 11,780 elementary-level (grades K–6)<sup>3</sup> students were enrolled in such programs in California. The languages offered at the elementary level tend to parallel the traditional foreign language choices in the US (Spanish or French), but include a few other languages as well.

Including secondary students, fewer than 700,000 of California's 5.2 million public school students participated in some form of second language instruction. This represents only 11.5% of the state's total student enrollment. Only 29,740 students were enrolled in Advanced Placement

courses, mostly in Spanish, which require higher levels of language proficiency. According to Dolson and Lindholm (1995), most English-speaking students in California tend to graduate from secondary schools with the following characteristics:

They are able to speak only one language, English, and even if they know something of another language, it is at a minimal, non-functional proficiency level. Further, since little or no attention is given to the development of their cross-cultural competencies, they are not well suited to participate in cooperative efforts to address global concerns of commerce, ecology, poverty or peace. (Dolson & Lindholm, 1995: 78)

Dissatisfaction with the dismal outcomes of traditional foreign language programs and the emergence of reports from Canada on the spectacular results of French immersion programs led some educators to speculate on the application of immersion education in the United States (California Department of Education, 1984).

Immersion is a method of foreign-language instruction in which the regular school curriculum is taught through the medium of a second language. Immersion education originated as a community experiment in the 1960s in Quebec, Canada (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). At the time, a group of parents was becoming increasingly concerned about deficiencies in the foreign-language pedagogy at local schools. In anticipation of a future in which a knowledge of French would be instrumental in their society, and with the help of Lambert and Tucker, two McGill University researchers, the parents founded an experimental French immersion program.

There are a number of alternative forms of the immersion approach. Two factors serve to differentiate among the existing variations of immersion:

- The amount of instruction provided in the second language (total or partial immersion).
- The grade level at which immersion commences (early, delayed or late immersion).

Not all of the different approaches will be described here as they are aptly described in a number of different sources (e.g. Baker, 1996; Baker & Jones, 1998; Cloud *et al.*, 2000; Genesee, 1987); rather, I will briefly define the major early immersion approaches.

In the *early total immersion* program, 90–100% of the students' instructional day is taught through the medium of the foreign language during grades K and 1. In grades 2 and 3, about 80% of the instructional day is devoted to teaching content through the foreign language. By the upper

grades (typically grades 4–6), at least 50% of instruction continues to be offered in the second language (Snow, 1990).

*Early partial immersion* is a program in which less than 100% of curriculum instruction during the primary grades is provided in the second language. The amount of second-language instruction varies from program to program, but 50% first-language instruction and 50% second-language instruction is the most common formula from kindergarten through grade six (Snow, 1990).

The basic goals of immersion programs are usually the same (Lipton, 1985: v):

- Functional proficiency in the second language.
- The ability to communicate in the second language on topics appropriate to age level.
- Mastery of subject content material of the local school district curriculum (which is taught through the second language).
- Achievement in English language arts comparable to or surpassing the achievement of students in English Only programs.
- Cross cultural understanding.

Several *longitudinal* studies reflect the high degree of success that has characterized Canadian immersion programs (see Genesee, 1983; Johnson & Swain, 1997; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Swain & Lapkin, 1981). For US educators, the first Canadian immersion model adapted to an 'American' context represented an encouraging solution to the lack of foreign language proficiency among US students. In 1971, Culver City, California became home to the first US immersion program. Culver City has since experienced positive results similar to those produced by the Canadian programs (see Cohen, 1974; Campbell, 1984; Genesee, 1985; Snow, Padilla & Campbell, 1988).

According to a survey of public schools by Fortune and Jorstad (1996), second-language immersion programs are on the increase in the United States, as parents and educators recognize the career advantages of having bilingual students. In this survey of schools offering immersion education, they located 79 schools, of which 43% provided instruction through Spanish and 35% in French. German, Japanese, and Hawaiian represented the remaining languages taught through immersion. About one third of these schools used a full early immersion model (at four hours of content instruction in the target language), and the remaining two thirds offered a partial immersion model. Most (87%) of these immersion schools were in predominantly English-speaking urban or suburban neighborhoods, with only a few programs situated in small towns or rural communities. These

programs also are typically elite choice offerings that function much like private schools.

In general, immersion programs have been associated with solid advances in language skills as well as academic achievement in a variety of countries (e.g. Artigal, 1997; DeCourcy, 1997; Duff, 1997; Genesee, 1997). Genesee (1985: 559) confirms that 'the immersion approach is a feasible and effective way for English-speaking American students to attain high levels of second language proficiency without risk to their native language development or their academic achievement.' Snow (1986), reporting on twenty years of US and Canadian immersion research, concludes that the English language development and overall academic achievement of immersion students tends to equal or surpass that of their peers in mainstream class environments.

Genesee (1987) reviewed the evaluation results from three total immersion programs: the Culver City program in California; the Four Corners project in Maryland; and the Cincinnati immersion project. In terms of *first-language development*, Genesee reported that the immersion students did not experience any deficits in their English language development as a result of their participation in the immersion approach. During the first few years of immersion programs, there is usually a lag in English language arts performance due to the fact that English has not yet been introduced into the curriculum. However, upon the introduction of English language arts into the curriculum, the lag disappears (Snow, 1990).

In terms of the immersion students' *second-language development*, Genesee (1987: 130) reported that 'the American IM [immersion] students under evaluation attained functional proficiency in the target language.' Similarly, Snow (1990: 115) concluded that, in general, 'immersion students achieve a level of fluency rarely, if ever, attained in any other type of foreign language program; however, their speech and writing lack the grammatical accuracy and lexical variety of native speakers.' Yet research has demonstrated that the linguistic deficiencies of immersion students 'do not appear to impede their functional use of the language' (Genesee, 1985: 544, citing research from Genesee, 1983; Swain & Lapkin, 1981). Genesee (1987) reported that, with the occasional exception, early total immersion students achieve higher levels of second language proficiency than early partial immersion students do.

The positive results of immersion programs in Canada and other countries, and the handful of US experiments, although convincing, have not lead to large-scale implementation of this program model in California or other parts of the US (Fortune & Jorstad, 1996; Rhodes & Schreibeinstein, 1983). Apparently, both lack of interest in, and the scarcity of funds for elementary school foreign language education have, until recently, combined to limit the

establishment of immersion programs to a few scattered attempts. In the past ten years, educators and especially English-speaking parents have expressed interest in preparing children for a more global future with necessary bilingual and multicultural proficiencies. This interest has led to the resurgence of the practice of examining the advantages of immersion education in meeting these future needs. Further, because an immersion classroom does not provide students with the opportunity to talk and interact with children who are from the target culture and speak the target language, some parents have become interested in models that would integrate their English-speaking children with real target-language speakers to provide more opportunities for their children to acquire higher levels of proficiency in the target language. Dual language education provides this opportunity for English speakers to learn a second language through immersion, with the added advantage of using the language with, and learning about the culture from, target-language speakers.

## **Dual Language Education (DLE)**

### **Program description and goals**

Dual language education (DLE) programs have a variety of names in addition to dual language. These include: bilingual immersion, two-way bilingual immersion, two-way immersion, two-way bilingual, Spanish immersion (or whatever the target language is, combined with the word immersion), and developmental bilingual education (DBE – because of the name of the funding provided by the US Department of Education for this type of program). One reason some programs focus on the immersion aspect of the name is to affiliate it with enrichment or elitist programs. Another reason for focusing on the immersion aspect is to de-emphasize the ‘bilingual’ nature of the program because of the political connotations of bilingual education as a compensatory or lower quality education program.

Regardless of the name, DLE programs are similar in structure to immersion programs, but differ from the previously mentioned variations of immersion in terms of one very important factor: student composition. Unlike other forms of immersion, DLE includes native as well as non-native speakers of the target (non-English) language. In dual language programs, English-dominant and target-language-dominant students are purposefully integrated with the goals of developing bilingual skills, academic excellence, and positive cross-cultural and personal competency attitudes for both groups of students. While many immersion programs are elite and do not include language minority students, DLE programs serve a more diverse population.