

Bilingual Education: How Do Local Interests and Resource Shape Pedagogical Practices

By Kimberly Cardinale,
Martin Carnoy, and
Sandra Stein



A PACE - Report Series 98.1
June 1998

Policy Analysis for California Education **PACE**

University of California, Berkeley ■ Stanford University
3653 Tolman Hall ■ Berkeley, CA 94720-1670

Telephone: (510) 642-7223

Web Site: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/PACE/pace.html>

**BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY STUDENTS:
LOCAL INTERESTS AND RESOURCE AVAILABILITY AS DETERMINANTS OF
PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE**

by Kimberly Cardinale, Martin Carnoy, and Sandra Stein

School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-3096

ABSTRACT

We argue in this paper that much of what actually occurs in bilingual education depends on the discourse and resulting policies at the school district level, and that is one reason why the construction of “bilingual education” varies so greatly and can be seen so positively or so negatively by the very clientele it is supposed to serve . Not surprisingly, within each school district the very definition of second language education centers on *interpretations* of how to deliver it—specifically on whether and how to recruit bilingual teachers and whether to implement curricula that are at all oriented toward English-learning pupils’ language needs and culture.

We show that implementation at the district level depends on how four specific issues are resolved: 1) the recruitment of certified bilingual teachers, 2) the "ghettoization" and politicization of bilingual education, 3) race relations in the district, and 4) a community consensus on bilingual education as a pedagogical strategy across language needs. Based on interviews and analysis of second language policies in four California school districts, we suggest that these issues and the discourse around them directly affect the type and design of programs which are implemented in each district. Further, the way that the national debates are reflected in local administrative interpretations and action are crucial to defining the practice of bilingual education.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR LEP STUDENTS: LOCAL INTERESTS AND RESOURCE AVAILABILITY AS DETERMINANTS OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

by Kimberly Cardinale, Sandra Stein, and Martin Carnoy¹
Stanford University

INTRODUCTION

A standard view of American education is that it was instrumental in defining the immigrant experience, assimilating immigrants and especially their children into the great melting pot of American culture (Cremin, 1962). But from the very beginning, immigration also shaped America's schools (Bowles and Gintis, 1975; Tyack, 1974). Major school reforms in the 19th and early 20th century, for example, were in part responses to the influx of new immigrant groups and their increased control over schools. With dramatic numbers of new immigrants in recent years,² schools are again the object of intense conflict. As in the past, language of instruction is part of the discourse, and political power over immigrants' schooling is the essence of the language issue. Bilingual education is a metaphor for *who* gets to teach and *how* immigrant children get to learn. In the past, those who favored bilingual instruction won a series of ideological and legislative victories at the national and state levels. The groups pushing for this legislation were by and large educational leaders from minority language groups. Today, these groups are on the defensive, facing an "English Only" initiative in California that has already prompted the State Board of Education to take bilingual education out of the state's hands and

make it a local school district choice.

This move by the State Board reflects an already existing reality. We argue in this paper that much of what actually occurs in bilingual education depends on the discourse and resulting policies at the school district level, and that is one reason why the construction of “bilingual education” varies so greatly and can be seen so positively or so negatively by the very clientele it is supposed to serve. Not surprisingly, within each school district the very definition of second language education centers on *interpretations* of how to deliver it—specifically on whether and how to recruit bilingual teachers and whether to implement curricula that are at all oriented toward English-learning pupils’ language needs and culture.

We show that implementation at the district level depends on how four specific issues are resolved: 1) the recruitment of certified bilingual teachers, 2) the “ghettoization” and politicization of bilingual education, 3) race relations in the district, and 4) a community consensus on bilingual education as a pedagogical strategy across language needs. Based on interviews and analysis of second language policies in four California school districts, we suggest that these issues and the discourse around them directly affect the type and design of programs which are implemented in each district. Further, the way that the national debates are reflected in local administrative interpretations and action are crucial to defining the practice of bilingual education.

The composition of the student body in many American school districts has changed radically in the past twenty years. The 1990 census reports that 6.3 million school-age children in the United States, or 14 percent of the population under 18, do not speak English at home (Center

for the Study of Social Policy, 1993). In addition, language minority students at the middle and high school grade levels have become increasingly identified as being at risk of academic failure or of dropping out of school (CCSSO, 1993). Although this situation is hardly new to educators and policy makers at the federal, state, and local levels, schools in many states are currently facing considerable and increasing pressure to devise more effective means of educating a culturally and linguistically diverse student body.

The issue of language is fundamental in the debate over educating America's growing population of Limited English Proficient (LEP) children. Shaped by concerns which range from the personal stakes of parents and their children to the political interests of politicians and policy makers to the professional preferences of teachers and administrators, defining the role of native languages in the classroom has always been problematic. Disputes over theory, research, and practice have led to the polarization of predominant ideology concerning not only the most effective programs for educating language minority students in America's schools, but also the very goals of such programs. Bilingual education as a pedagogical approach to schooling LEP students is at the very heart of this debate, and a wide body of literature both supports and contests its merits (see Crawford, 1992 and 1993, and Hakuta, 1986 for reviews of this literature).

Much of the controversy surrounding this issue, however, has little to do with effective curriculum or pedagogy. Instead, the bilingual education discussion is shaped by the politics of race, class, ethnicity, and inter-group conflicts over access to resources. National political debates over social issues such as English-only legislation and the crackdown on illegal immigration feed into the controversy surrounding bilingual education, dividing Americans along language lines. Consequently, the issue of language of instruction in America's schools has become a tool for

advancing political (and economic) interests, negotiating diversity, labeling students and funding schools, rather than one of pedagogical soundness and educational priority.

Educators and linguists generally agree that bilingual education in its "transition" form³ is the most effective strategy for promoting higher academic performance and English acquisition among LEP students. By the establishment of federal funding for innovative bilingual programs through the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) of 1968, the federal government weighed in on the side of academicians and the political groups supporting bilingual education by designating funds to make bilingual programs more available to LEP students. But in practice, programs for LEP students do not necessarily reflect the research findings of the academic community, nor the intention of the legislation. The term "bilingual education" has been used to refer to many different types of pedagogical practices, ranging from virtually no instruction in the native language to programs in which fully-developed bilingual proficiency in English and the native language is attained through the structured use of both languages in the classroom. Although formally defined by national and state legislation, the practice of "bilingual education" in classrooms hinges, we argue, on how national language politics are crystallized in school districts' site-based administrative decisions. This crystallization, in turn, is shaped by district race/ethnic relations and "language ideology."

POLITICS, COURTS AND STATE SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

A bilingual tradition has characterized public and private schooling, American religious life, and even the press throughout most of the nineteenth century. It was not until the turn of the century that "legal, social, and political forces opposed languages other than English" (Heath,

1977:24), associated mainly with the backlash against immigrant groups and the growing concern that linguistic diversity would threaten national unity (Heath, 1977). The result was national adherence to a monolingual English tradition, upheld in the national interest. The fact that bilingual education is often perceived as an effort to maintain ethnic cultures and traditions makes it a direct target for attack by Americans who believe in upholding the status of English through the cultural and linguistic assimilation of all immigrant groups (Hakuta, 1986).

A distinct shift in language politics occurred in the 1960s. The federal government took on a new, active role in the education of English learners in 1968, when Congress voted to allocate special funding to bilingual education programs through Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act, in order to promote "new and imaginative" educational programs that would teach students in their native languages while they developed proficiency in English (Crawford, 1991). The signing of Title VII into law provided federal funds for innovative programs serving English language learners, but schools and districts were under no obligation to apply for or use these federal funds. The Act and its amendments were designed to supplement state and local funding toward programs for educating linguistic minority students, yet did not require such programs nor specify which instructional approaches, curricular materials or pedagogical strategies to use. Title VII funds were commonly used for small pilot projects, employing a range of pedagogical approaches and demonstrating considerable variation in the amount of English and/or home language use. Vast differences emerged among program approaches, even among those considered as similar (August and Garcia, 1988). It was not until the *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court ruling of 1974 that school systems were legally obligated to meet the needs of English language learners. Through this ruling, local Boards of Education were ordered to

address the needs of English learners, although again, no specific remedies were mandated (Hakuta 1986).

Yet, even these judicial interpretations did not sufficiently clarify the Bilingual Education Act's poorly-defined goals (Hakuta, 1986 and Crawford, 1991). Such lack of clarity and the pedagogical flexibility it allows are reflected in the diversity of approaches used by school districts to address the needs of language minority children and the considerable controversy over which methods are more beneficial.

...the law's goals were unclear...for some, bilingual education was strictly a remedial effort, designed to overcome children's "language deficiency" and to assimilate them quickly into the mainstream. For others, it was an enrichment program, intended to develop students' linguistic resources and to preserve their linguistic heritage (Crawford, 1991:13).

In addition to the federal and judiciary influences on bilingual programs, state legislatures have also adopted policies and distributed funds earmarked for English learning students. For example, in California, funds for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are distributed from the state to the districts, who then provide those funds to the schools. Students identified by the districts as speaking a language other than English at home are tested by the districts and designated NEP (Non-English Proficient), LEP (Limited English Proficient) and FEP (Fluent English Proficient). Students designated LEP and NEP generate state funds for the schools' bilingual budgets.

Federal and state policies have hardly ended the ideological debate over language policy and the concept of an American Melting Pot, and the debate still influences how bilingual

education is implemented in schools. Bilingual education is the focus of two powerful political groups with heavily vested interest in their version of language policy in schools. Organized political support for bilingual education has been built primarily through the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), an organization of mainly bilingual education teachers and administrators, a group with considerable interest in its spread and financial support. Supporters of bilingual education have incorporated many of the characteristics of a social movement, and they are backed by scholarly opinion in favor of bilingual pedagogy supported by research on bilingualism, second-language acquisition, and social factors, much of which tends to support the use of native language instruction for English learners.⁴

The "English only" movement is also still powerful politically, and the appeal of its position increases with concerns about the large immigration of the 1970s and 1980s. The most vociferous proponent of this perspective is US English, the largest and oldest official lobby promoting Official English in the United States. Founded in 1983 by Senator S.I. Hayakawa, a scholar of semantics and also an immigrant to this country, US English was established in defense of English as the sole, official language of the United States. The group is opposed to bilingual education, which it considers to be an illustration of "misguided policies which threaten national unity" (US English, 1992: 146). US English supporters maintain an assimilationist perspective toward immigrant groups, insisting that all groups should be "Americanized" as rapidly as possible.⁵ US English advocates "sink or swim" immersion as the preferred instructional strategy.⁶ It points to evaluation studies of bilingual programs which have failed to demonstrate any substantial difference in effectiveness when compared to methods such as English as a Second Language (see Hakuta, 1986).

Since districts and schools have considerable leeway under federal and state legislation regarding bilingual education, the ideological debate has even more sway on implementation than it might under more stringent guidelines with clear objectives. Districts effectively can decide, within broad parameters, how to express their instructional "preferences" and how to respond to the debate raging around them. We shall show that administrative decisions at the district level essentially "define" bilingual education in California's school districts.

METHODOLOGY

Our study is conceived primarily as a district-level analysis and was designed to provide a closer look at the nature of the issues that school districts confront in the implementation of bilingual education programs. Its findings are based on a limited set of interviews conducted in four Northern California school districts during an eight week period in the Spring, 1995, with follow-up interviews in Fall/Winter, 1997-98. The districts were chosen for their variety of environments (large urban, suburban, small urban) and because they all faced growing minority populations. The Office of Bilingual Education in each district, when such an office exists, serves as the locus of information on matters concerning LEP programs. The director of bilingual education is at the center of the discourse on the nature and extent of bilingual education programs offered in the district. In three of the four districts studied, we interviewed the director of bilingual education programs. Interviews with were based upon a set of standard questions (Appendix A), which were adapted to responses and case-specific problems or concerns. In the Carlander district, there was no such office at the district-level in 1995. Only one school site in the district had an established bilingual education program. Our information

for Carlander is therefore based on an interview with the coordinator of bilingual programs and several teachers at the school. The coordinator was simultaneously involved in organizing district-wide support for bilingual education, and is now (1998) half-time coordinator of bilingual programs in the district.

Admittedly, the research does not represent a comprehensive study of all of the existing issues relevant to bilingual education. It is based on a limited set of interviews with a specific purpose: to understand from district-level administrators most involved with bilingual programs how the programs are implemented in these districts. But we chose districts that we knew well from other research conducted over a period of several years, so understood their ongoing controversies on this and other issues from previous time spend there.⁷

Our interviews identified the main issues in the second language debate as they appear at the local level. These turned out to be strikingly similar among districts. But the interviews also revealed differences among districts in the implementation of bilingual education legislation. Because of the limited number of districts in our sample these differences can only suggest that the "rules" set by bilingual education legislation are subject to broad "interpretation" by districts, and that administrators have considerable leeway in handling the larger conflicts surrounding language diversity.

Since the interviews were conducted in 1995, we were able to conduct a check on our results. We reinterviewed the bilingual coordinators in Fall/Winter, 1997-98. In three of the four districts, the coordinators were the same. In one of those, the bilingual coordinator we interviewed in 1995 had been replaced for two years but was now back in her old job. In the fourth district, the bilingual coordinator at the school where we interviewed had become the

half-time bilingual coordinator in the district office. The new interviews confirmed our previous results. They increased our confidence that the factors we identify as key to district construction of bilingual education are “robust”—that despite the continued rapid growth of LEP populations in these districts and even state intervention (in two of them), underlying power relations tend to persist, continuing to define the provision of bilingual instruction.

The Four Districts

The four school districts in the study are given the fictitious names of Junipero, Ocean, Carlander, and Reddington. Each district, while different in linguistic composition, has at least one large group of students whose primary language is other than English. The following table represents the various districts and their linguistic composition:⁸

<i>District</i>	<i>Number of Schools</i>	<i>Number of Students (largest ethnic groups)</i>	<i>% LEP</i>	<i>Major Language Groups</i>	<i>Number of LEP students outside major language groups</i>
Junipero	59	31,097 (Latino, Anglo, Asian-origin)	24.5	Spanish (6,059) Vietnamese (843)	719
Ocean	110	51,076 (Black, Latino, Chinese, Vietnamese)	28.9	Spanish (7,496) Vietnamese (1,472)	5,991
Carlander	23	13,689 (Anglo, Asian-origin)	16.9	Spanish (918) Vietnamese (562)	828
Reddington	10	4,542 (Latino, Black, Pacific Islander)	63.0	Spanish (2,494)	368

Source: The California Department of Education, Consolidated Programs Description Database (September, 1995). Note: All data are for the 1994-95 academic year.

Differences in size and ethnic, socio-economic and linguistic composition should be important in how bilingual education is handled by the district, but this seems to be true for only one of our cases, Carlander, where Latino-origin English learners are concentrated in one of the district's schools, geographically separated from the rest of the district, and there is considerable dispersion of other English-learning groups, both in the number of groups and their concentration by school. Reddington's small size should give its administration an advantage in implementing bilingual education programs, but its bilingual policies, like those in the much larger Junipero and Ocean districts, are dominated by the combination of racial/ethnic politics and certified teacher shortages that set the broader context for district implementation. Although Junipero provides most LEP students with some form of bilingual or ESL instruction, in Ocean, barely one-third of all English learners receive primary language support, and twenty-seven percent receive no instructional program support whatsoever. Similarly, in Reddington, only a quarter of all English learners in Reddington receive some form of primary language support, and more than 32 percent receive no instructional program support whatsoever. As a result of recent reports of noncompliance with state regulations concerning education for LEP students and the consequent state freezing of district LEP funds in Ocean and Reddington, district policy toward bilingual education in both places strong emphasis on compliance with state laws, and programs for LEP designated students reflect the necessity of meeting the minimum requirements to ensure the continuation of state funding. But even so, compliance is slow, largely because statewide shortages of certified bilingual teachers and local resistance from the politically-dominant English-speaking black community combine to limit primary language provision to English learners and leave a high fraction of LEP students without any bilingual

education attention at all.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICTS

We now turn to the four districts to analyze which factors are most influential in shaping bilingual education at the district level. Our interviews with bilingual program directors and teachers reveal surprisingly similar issues in the district discourse around the design and implementation of bilingual education programs. Four major themes emerged from these interviews. They reveal the underlying political/educational context in which bilingual programs operate. These are: the politics of defining which teachers are “qualified” to teach English learners; the ghettoization of bilingual education programs; the politics of race relations; and the elusive consensus on bilingual education as a pedagogical strategy across language needs.

The Politics of Defining “Qualified” Teachers. In all four districts, the issue of district-wide capacity for the implementation of bilingual education programs was clearly part of the bilingual education discussion. Bilingual coordinators in each district felt the need to staff their schools with teachers who were both bilingual in the appropriate language and credentialed by the California requirements. In all four districts, various attempts were made to staff the schools with “qualified” teachers (those with a BCLAD, or bilingual certificate of language development), and all attempts confronted two principal problems: first, there is a real (not merely perceived) shortage of certified bilingual teachers in California, and the shortage allowed district administrations that were not committed to bilingual education to avoid developing full-fledged (primary language provision) bilingual programs; and second, attempts to staff schools with bilingual teachers were resisted on some level by district administrators, principals.

current teachers, and the school board. In two of the districts, this has led to state intervention with mandates to comply. Yet, even this has had only limited impact on the recruitment of “qualified” teachers.

California schools are caught in a bind. On the one hand, the California requirements for teacher credentialing are quite strict, and often require additional training and course work in addition to credentials earned in other countries or other states. Additionally, the credentialing programs entail taking standardized competence tests and extensive course work in teacher education. Relative to the need for bilingual teachers, few bilingual, bicultural university graduates decide to choose teaching as a profession. A number of district administrators in our study lamented that low starting teacher salaries acted as a deterrent for bilingual and bicultural college graduates to go into teaching. They suggested that corporations are able and willing to pay high salaries to these potential employees, and that educational institutions, with their limited budgets cannot compete. As the bilingual coordinator at Reddington told us:

....If you go to a career fair and you're bilingual, and you go to 10 different places and wow, they're interested in having you. And they start making you these offers that you can't refuse... being able to have well-trained, certified teachers is a challenge.

Ocean's coordinator saw it this way:

....Maybe our district is not one where teachers want to teach anyway. We are mostly urban, and don't have the greatest reputation. But whatever the reason, personnel has a hard time getting certified bilingual teachers.

Schools and districts therefore try to recruit teachers with the appropriate language background and then encourage them to get credentials, or, alternatively, they follow the much

easier route of staffing their LEP classes with monolingual English teachers who have gotten cross-cultural language development certificates (CLAD) and add instructional aides (certificated staff) with primary language capability. This latter approach satisfies state requirements but falls far short of adequate "transition" bilingual education, where students are provided instruction in their primary language and transitioned to English by a certified bilingual teacher. Certified teacher recruitment therefore has an enormous impact on defining the nature of bilingual education in the district. The more BCLAD teachers and BCLAD teachers-in-training, the more bilingual education is based on primary language provision with transition to English. The fewer the certified bilingual teachers, the more bilingual education is defined as English as second language instruction with *possible* assistance from primary language-speaking aides.

In the districts that seem to have the greatest trouble recruiting bilingual teachers, the general shortage is only part of the problem. Recruitment is hamstrung by a general lack of commitment from district administration. In the Reddington district, for example, central administrators went as far as Spain in the late 1980s to recruit trained teachers for their Spanish bilingual programs, but then did nothing to expand recruitment locally. With the help of national exchange programs, Reddington was able to bring 14 teachers from Spain in the first recruitment effort in 1989, and 10 more in a second wave in 1994. Yet only 8 of these were left teaching in the district in 1997-98. Although the LEP population in the late 1980s was already well over 30 percent of the district's 4,000 pupils, and over 60 percent of the district's 5,300 pupils today, the teachers from Spain were the majority of bilingual teachers in the district's schools then, and still almost one-half of all bilingual teachers today. Parents filed a class action lawsuit against the district in 1995 for failure to meet bilingual education requirements, putting the district under a

state mandate of compliance. But there is still little effort to develop a systematic bilingual education program. In our most recent interview with the bilingual coordinator in Reddington, she told us that the district had been able to recruit 17 teachers with CLAD but “was struggling” to get teachers with the bilingual certificate (BCLAD).

...The [black] parents are not happy with the Latinos getting special teachers and Spanish-speaking aides. So the principals drag their feet. We are lucky to get the CLAD teachers. The state has told us we have done a good job with getting our people CLAD certificates, but are not too happy with the BCLAD recruitment (Reddington bilingual coordinator).

Ocean has been under a state mandate for compliance since 1995, but has made relatively little progress in hiring certified teachers. The district still only covers only 18 percent of its 17,500 LEP students (the percentage has grown from 29 percent in 1994-95 to 33 percent in 1997-98) with primary language instruction.

We waived the teacher credential requirement in a number of cases in efforts to hire linguistically qualified teachers. But monolingual English teachers believe that uncredentialed teachers with minimal teacher training are not suited to teach at the primary grade level. They are resisting the plan (interview with Ocean bilingual coordinator in 1995).

We are still being heavily criticized for our recruitment of teachers. We still only have about 200 BCLAD teachers to staff our large Spanish, Cantonese, and Vietnamese populations... They are hard to find... (interview with Ocean bilingual coordinator, 1998)

The situations in Reddington and Ocean contrast with a more orderly recruitment in Junipero and Carlander, where there has been white resistance to bilingual education, but also somewhat more of a willingness by the white-dominated administration to “compromise” with state mandates. This is made easier in Carlander because of the relative segregation of the Latino population in one school, and little pressure from Asian-origin groups for primary language instruction. In Junipero, the district's bilingual coordinator was able to recruit enough committed bilingual teachers to “create” and staff two Spanish bilingual primary schools and one Vietnamese bilingual school. The district's bilingual coordinator told us:

We have a shortage, yes, like a lot of districts, but when we find [bilingual teachers], we put them in the lower grades...I know that [currently] half of the teachers in the bilingual classes are bilingual certified and half are on waiver.

In our most recent interview, the bilingual coordinator told us that out of 265 K-5 classrooms in the district, 101 had credentialed bilingual teachers, 24 had teachers with a BCLAD emergency, “which means that they are bilingual biliterate but they haven’t completed their course work for the credential,” and 140 with teachers who are on waiver, “which indicates that they are still in the process of training and we really don’t know their language proficiency.” So over the past two years, despite some willingness to recruit BCLAD teachers, the district was unable to increase the proportion of bilingual classrooms providing primary language instruction. Somewhat more than half the classrooms are still covered by teachers uncertified in bilingual education. This is still far better coverage than Ocean or Reddington.

And in Carlander’s one bilingual school, its aggressive principal was able to recruit a number of bilingual teachers in order to staff a well-organized bilingual education program.

This is a very unique school...this is the first staff that I have seen that is strong and committed bilingually. And that has to do with when [the principal] believes in something, she went out and actively pursued competent bilingual teachers, not just someone who was bilingual, but really someone who is committed (Interview with Carlander teacher).

Even when administrators are able to staff their schools adequately, they are aware of their unique situation. In the Ocean district, one principal explained how her aggressive recruitment efforts to staff her Chinese bilingual program left the other schools in the district "high and dry" for qualified staff. She explained that her ability to "woo" teachers to her school was a result of maintaining a good reputation in the district and pitching her students as high-achieving and easy to teach.

Because of new immigration, schools in all these districts have undergone dramatic demographic changes over the past decade, making the adequate staffing of schools a constant challenge. Bilingual positions may be required for the tenure of a particular cohort of students over the course of a few years, but as neighborhoods change in their linguistic compositions, and bussing patterns change in schools with desegregation mandates, the needs of the school for bilingual staff also change.

In all districts, both school and central office administrators specifically mentioned the problem of adequately staffing the schools in order to serve students through bilingual education programs. Such "shortages" cut deeply into any attempts at implementing a cohesive district-wide policy on bilingual education since they required policies of recruiting teachers from outside the district and often using recruitment criteria that raised resistance from the

teacher corps and parents in the district.

At the same time, the recruitment problems are usually tied into other problems concerning the district's commitment to bilingual education and, in general, to serving English-learning pupils. In districts such as Junipero, Ocean, and Reddington, ethnic groups compete with each other for educational services, and both English-learning and English-only groups perceive that bilingual programs are an important element in this competition (Carnoy and Hannaway, 1996). Shortages of anything, including bilingual teachers, are viewed by the shortchanged group as the district's favoring someone else over them. In Reddington, for example, it was not until the 1994-95 school year that the majority African-American school board formally adopted a bilingual education policy that reflected the demands of the Spanish-speaking *majority* community in the district. Even with that new policy in place, the transformation of one of the larger schools in the district into a "bilingual academy," and an increase in the number of bilingual classes, the effort is far short of anything resembling a coherent bilingual education policy.

The Ghettoization of Bilingual Education Programs. From the central office bilingual department to the school bilingual administrator to the bilingual teachers to the students themselves, the creation of a separate bilingual program can lead to its isolation and the isolation of its participants from the rest of school, or bilingual schools, from the rest of the district.. We refer to this as the "ghettoization" of bilingual programs, in that the programs are separated, bounded entities with their own internal structures, and these are understood as the responsibility of only those associated with bilingual education.

I think that people tend to unfortunately see LEP students as an issue that should be dealt

with by bilingual teachers, when in reality its' an issue that needs to be dealt with by everybody, on the school site and in the district. It's not a bilingual teacher issue, it's a school-wide and district-wide concern; it should be a concern... it's not going to go away (interview with Carlander bilingual teacher heading up bilingual efforts).

Although we have LEP students scattered pretty much throughout the "flats," the primary language bilingual programs are concentrated in five or six schools. This has to do with the neighborhood concentrations. Most of our Cantonese bilingual teachers are in a couple of schools, and the same with the Vietnamese. Those groups are concentrated in certain neighborhoods. It's less true of the Latinos, but there are some high concentrations of LEP students in certain schools. (interview with Ocean bilingual coordinator).

Bilingual policies contribute to this ghettoization in their identification of program participants and targeting of funding based on student linguistic capabilities. Teachers are informed which of their students qualify for LEP funding from the state on class lists distributed early in the year. Funding strategies encourage school staff members to think categorically about their students. Students generating certain funds are seen as entitled to services purchased with these funds. The staff members hired with these funds are seen as accountable for providing services to these students. This all tends to create a separate structure based on targeted funds and linguistic capabilities.⁹ An unfortunate consequence of this structure, as highlighted in our four districts, is the notion that the education of the English language learners is seen as the sole responsibility of the bilingual teachers rather than the school or district as a whole. Non-bilingual teachers may also feel inadequate in their abilities to communicate with bilingual students and

their families, and have the tendency to feel threatened by bilingual teachers in the labor market. Non-bilingual teachers can therefore come to see bilingual students as "someone else's" responsibility. The notion that there are certain students who are the responsibility of certain teachers in a clearly bounded program can create school-based cultural cleavages between teachers and students along the lines of linguistically-oriented programmatic participation.

[The categorical nature of bilingual programs] can create even staff divisiveness that really shouldn't be there. But it happens when you have materials that can't be used by all the kids, even when there's a reason why it would be used that way (interview with Carlander school teacher).

Whereas such cleavages depend largely on the school's linguistic composition, district policies, site-based leadership and professional community, they clearly influence and are influenced by the structure of bilingual programs in the schools. In previous interviews we conducted in Junipero district schools, bilingual resource teachers had suggested that there were clear boundaries around the bilingual program and a troubling sense of bilingual education as isolated from the rest of the educational experiences in the schools. These resource teachers explained that bilingual teachers are often perceived as those who "know what is best" on all matters for English learning students, and find themselves identified as a sub-group within the schools. They mention site-based and systemic reform and restructuring efforts as somehow "missing" the bilingual programs, or as overlooking the needs of bilingual teachers and students. At the same time, as bilingual teachers, they are inherently identified with a particular program and are pitted against other teachers in the struggle for resources in the district.

Districts have been asked to provide their own instructional materials for primary

language instruction. This stuff is hard to get. Imagine that you have to find math and reading materials in Vietnamese. So the bilingual teachers are out there hustling all the time for resources to get these materials, they have to compete with the other teachers, and they are seen as a group with very special interests (Ocean bilingual coordinator).

In Reddington, even when the school board finally agreed in 1994 to a district-wide bilingual education policy developed and proposed by the board's single Latino representative, the bilingual education program was largely isolated in one designated bilingual magnet school, and even in that school was limited to a few classrooms. Other schools continue to have large numbers of LEP designated pupils without coherent programs. For the principals of those schools, bilingual education is still something that is supposed to take place in the "designated school." Yet, within the designated school, there was also little cohesion in the implementation of bilingual education.

In our most recent interview with the bilingual coordinator in Reddington, she indicated that several other schools besides the bilingual academy now had bilingual classrooms. Thus, in a district that is under a state compliance order to implement bilingual education and where almost 40 percent of pupils are Latino and LEP, even when the district drags its feet, ghettoization begins to break down, but it breaks down largely on the basis of English as a Second Language instruction (using teachers with CLAD certificates), not transition bilingual instruction. BCLAD teachers are still concentrated in one or two schools. In Ocean, too, primary language instruction provided by BCLAD teachers continues to be highly concentrated whereas other forms of bilingual education based largely on ESL are spread throughout the district.

In all the districts, even though bilingual education was relatively isolated in designated schools, the linguistic composition of the school or a unified professional community dedicated to the quality education of all students at least allowed for coherent, whole-school approaches to bilingual education. In Carlander, the district with the lowest proportion of LEP designated students, one school created its bilingual program goals and planning strategies with the entire school staff. This approach encouraged all teachers to take responsibility for all students, and blurred the boundaries of responsibility and expectations, at least within that school. That cohesion, however, did not obviate the school's general isolation from the rest of the district. Similarly, in Ocean, Junipero, and even Reddington, groups of bilingual teachers did form coherent communities dedicated to improving the quality of bilingual instruction, yet they were viewed as a special group in their respective districts.

The other side of the ghettoization coin is that it also defines bilingual education for parents, and shapes their choices regarding bilingual education for their children.

The Latino community, the majority is very responsive to a bilingual program. Many of our Latino students' parents who do not want a bilingual program is because they really do want an English only, and they feel it is the responsibility of the home that takes the primary language. And that we have families like that, that choose not to have a bilingual program choice, and they have that choice, but I don't think the numbers are very high. The Vietnamese community, I am not sure why, but they do not want their children in a Vietnamese program because they do not want their children segregated. What happens with the Vietnamese families is many times they, there are only two bilingual program

schools in the district for the Vietnamese families, and what the schools do, they put all the Vietnamese children into one classroom for each grade, and the Vietnamese families do not want that. If it is not an integrated classroom, they would rather have an English only classroom (interview with Junipero bilingual coordinator).

How districts and schools handle the ghettoization of bilingual education plays a major role in defining how English learners learn. The need to target funds for bilingual education is based on state policy and court mandates; but without a strong sense of responsibility for bilingual students on the part of all teachers, bilingual education becomes a separate entity that can have minimal contact with the rest of the school, or of a school designated bilingual with the rest of the district. This separation may ultimately be directly at odds with improving the educational experiences and opportunities of English learning students.

The Politics of Linguistic Diversity and Race Relations. In three of the districts, the lack of support for bilingual education was attributed to race and ethnic relations within the district. All districts struggled with easing tensions between ethnic/racial groups at both the administrative and community levels, but the way race relations entered into issues of bilingual education differed considerably. This difference was largely influenced by district demography, and the ethnic make-up of school boards and educational administrations.

In each district in our study, the increase in language minority students is the result of recent and on-going demographic changes. The presence of increasing numbers of immigrant groups has significantly altered the ethnic and linguistic composition of neighborhoods and schools. However, even as neighborhood composition changes, the local power structure and political players tend to stay in place, leading to a disjuncture between the needs of the growing

linguistic minority community and the priorities of those in decision-making positions. How this disjuncture is discussed and addressed varies according to a variety of local factors. One important aspect of this local variation seems to be the racial/ethnic composition of the group with historical political power or numerical majority in the area. Put more concretely, whether the "majority" English-speaking population considers itself to be an "oppressed minority" or "dominant majority" community overall, influences the ways in which race relations are discussed as impacting bilingual education.¹⁰

In both the Junipero and Carlander districts, immigrant families have moved into communities that, previous to their arrival, were predominantly Anglo-American. While the ethnic composition of Junipero now has Latino students as the largest ethnic concentration (46.5 percent of the kindergarten through eighth grade students), the school board and administrators remain predominantly white. In this district, the lack of consistency in programs between schools throughout the district was seen by district bilingual personnel as the result of racism in the district. These bilingual administrators claimed that white parents and elected officials did not want to provide Latino students with the resources to which they were entitled out of a feeling of "racism," or an overall distaste for Latinos. They accused the district's power holders of differential treatment toward the Latino community and students, and argued that many of the inconsistencies in the district's bilingual programs were due to overt and covert racism on the part of board and community members.

Evoking the notion of privileged white parents and elected officials wanting to maintain their children's advantages at the expense of educational opportunities for linguistic minority students, district personnel did not hesitate to name attitudinal "racism" as a key cause in the

district's approach to bilingual education and the schools' inconsistent implementation of these programs. According to these district resource teachers, teachers, board members and parents do not prioritize, support or demand results from bilingual education because it is seen as threatening to their own children's welfare and success, as well as to the job security of monolingual English speaking teachers.

In Junipero in the past two years, since our first interviews, an important compromise was struck between the strong bilingual advocates in the district office and district's school board, dominated by the district's Anglo community. The bilingual effort in Junipero has shifted from a "maintenance" program, that attempted to make English learners bilingual and biliterate, to a "transitional" program, that uses the home language to transition pupils to English literacy only.

I would say that we have a supportive Board that understands the needs of our students...they have taken the time to read and understand, and meet with me, and have a better foundation of why we have bilingual programs...I think that there is a very strong message from the Board as well as from the Superintendent and the assistant that it is a transitional program, we don't have a maintenance program here anymore like we used to... I would say that it was an error that we tried to foster children to become bilingual biliterate...It is very difficult to have a policy where you cannot implement it... We don't have the staffing (Junipero bilingual coordinator).

"But isn't a transition program also more politically acceptable in a district where there was a lot of opposition to bilingual programs?" we asked.

It is more politically acceptable and I think that the first driving forces was that it was a buy in from the community and the Board and everyone else. But I think too looking

realistically at where we stand now it has become more of a realistic goal not so much because of the politics but just because of the numbers....The support [for a maintenance program] just isn't there (Junipero bilingual coordinator).

In contrast, in African-American majority districts, accusations of attitudinal racism were not prevalent; however, notions of ethnic competition were. Whereas in the Anglo-majority districts the sense of white parents and school board members protecting privilege was pervasive, in African-American majority districts, concern about the education of African-American students challenged any particular attention to other groups.¹¹ District personnel in both the Reddington and Ocean districts explain that African-American parents and advocacy groups express concern that immigrant students get limited school funds and services which take away from the already less than adequate education of their children. In both districts, administrators reported that African-American parents complained that their children were already not learning English well, and that the focus on bilingual education was seen as distracting from and competing with the need to improve their children's education. In these schools, the lack of consistency in provided services and discrepancies between programs within and between schools were largely attributed to the problems of ethnic competition in the context of scarce resources.

I've had a couple of times where some people have said, "Well, the Hispanic kids are getting all the attention." The need has been there and there has been some attention given to it. I'm not saying it hasn't, but attention should be given to all kids, so I find that sometimes I have to explain to the African-American parents what bilingual education is, why we are teaching primary language, because they say that it's un-American (Interview

with Reddington's bilingual coordinator).

Parents of English speakers are not the only ones who can react negatively to bilingual education. It can also elicit strong reaction from non-bilingual English-only *teachers* and *principals* who feel that bilingual programs are competitive with resources that otherwise would come to them.

...they [English only teachers] feel that the bilingual classrooms and teachers have all this material and more access to the science lab than the English only staff...they're not getting certain services, the benefit of certain services and monies that we're getting from the federal government. Because right now it's an us and them issue (interview with Carlander school's bilingual coordinator).

Well, they have to fight with other teachers to advocate for materials. They have to advocate for support services for the students from other people funded through other categorical programs. As an example, if you have a Title I teacher who says, 'I don't provide services for LEP students,' that person, even though LEP students make up a large percentage of Title I monies, they really do not see how they are in any way responsible for LEP students (interview with Junipero bilingual coordinator).

In Reddington and Ocean, we also found the issue of resistance to bilingual education from school principals.

I'm thinking in particular of principals who need to learn the background as to what bilingual education is and what needs to be done. A lot of principals completely resist the implementation of bilingual education in their schools (interview with Reddington bilingual coordinator).

Principals still resist bilingual education because they see competition for resources.

BCLAD and CLAD teachers receive extra stipends; instructional assistance is provided to CLAD teachers. The [black] principals think that this money is coming out of the general fund. 'How come bilingual kids get more support?' They refuse to understand that this is money that is specifically earmarked for LEP students, and that it is no skin off their backs (Ocean bilingual coordinator)..

Furthermore, bilingual programs, when operating in a multi-ethnic, multi-racial or multi-lingual school population can segregate schools by race, leading to classrooms that are all Chinese, all Latino, and sometimes, by default, all African-American. This issue is particularly problematic in districts in which integration mandates call for certain percentages of ethnic groups in schools. In such schools, integration plans bring students of various racial/ethnic backgrounds into the same school building, but once they are inside the building, language needs determine the classroom compositions.

There's more talk of clustering students, but then you get into political issues with that, you know, the expense of bussing, but also all the political issues of grouping all the same language kinds can be looked at as tracking or segregating, so you have that issue (Interview with Carlander school's bilingual coordinator).

We observed a difference in the nature of discussions of bilingual education and race relations in "majority-majority" and "minority-majority" districts. The issue is complicated further when we recognize that many students from Asian and Latino ethnic backgrounds are monolingual English speakers and that ethnic/racial lines are not consistent with linguistic capabilities. Bilingual education is but one issue of many that challenge school districts to

service a widely diverse student population.

The Elusive Consensus on Bilingual Education. Scholars of bilingual education are in relative agreement that primary language instruction with gradual transition to English, allowing for the transference of skills, is the best approach to bilingual education. Although this notion is based mainly on research on English language acquisition for Spanish speakers (August and Garcia), it has been the basic educational theory supported by academic research. It has thus become yet another influence on program design and delivery.

Practitioners, however, are not of such a similar mind. With the politics of recruiting qualified teachers, the ghettoization of insulated programs, conflictive race relations and logistical concerns, the actual implementation of the strategies and approaches that scholars support often do not occur in school practice. As district personnel suggest in all four districts, issues of capacity and logistical feasibility drive many programs, especially in districts that are struggling to meet the diverse needs of students and their families.

District personnel describe many issues that play into the difficulties of providing consistent and cohesive bilingual programs to diverse groups. From teachers' sense of sound pedagogy to their sense of job security; from parents' desires for their children's success in the United States to their concerns over the loss of home language; from the courts and legislatures' pressures to provide specialized services to English language learners to their focus on compliance and monitoring; from the shifts in the national political climate on issues of diversity and race relations to the local politics of power; and from the logistical challenges of multilingual districts and schools challenged to meet a variety of inconsistent demands, bilingual education has taken on meanings that are well beyond the most effective ways in which to teach

English language learners.

In both Ocean and Reddington, bilingual coordinators told us that there was considerable ambivalence on the part of language minority parents about bilingual education programs for their children. In Ocean, the district coordinators and the teachers in those schools that were designated bilingual schools (several Spanish, two Cantonese, and one Vietnamese) had to "sell" the parents on the advantages of bilingual education for learning. In Reddington, most parents supported bilingual education, but

... then there are some parents that don't understand. They say, "What do you mean, you're going to teach in Spanish? I want them to learn English." They don't understand that the child needs to have a foundation in one language to be able to transfer it to the other...sometimes we'll have parents who will say, "Oh, no, I speak Spanish. I can teach my child Spanish at home. You don't have to teach them Spanish" (interview with bilingual coordinator, Reddington).

Similarly, in Carlander's bilingual school, some of the parents are apprehensive because of the negative image of bilingual education. Those who are advocates of bilingual education identify two possible reasons for this negative image: the English only assimilationist campaign against bilingual education, that seeps into the popular culture; and the effect of second-rate ESL classes that are called bilingual education. By providing poor education for English learners and then branding that "bilingual," those who are opposed to bilingual education, it is argued, serve their own interests. At the same time, making everything "bilingual" solves the compliance issue for the district.

They [the parents] think "Oh, my child is going to be behind because they're in bilingual

classes. " So we try to educate parents because there are misunderstandings, and justly so, with just the connotations that are associated with bilingual education. I've been at school sites where the title of the class is a bilingual classroom and in the classroom there's nothing that's aligned with what bilingual education signifies (interview with Carlander school's bilingual coordinator).

We described above the problem that Vietnamese parents have with bilingual education in Junipero because they do not want their children isolated in Vietnamese-only classrooms. Although this is much less of a problem for the Latino parents, in part because of the much larger numbers of Spanish bilingual classrooms and their spread across more schools, it still plays a role in the resistance of at least some Latino parents to bilingual education. Segregation in this case is the opposite of elite selection. Bilingual education is associated with tracking, where primary language instruction classrooms are often considered the low track.

CONCLUSION

Over one million students with limited proficiency in English will be enrolled in California's public schools by the year 2000 (California Department of Education, 1995). At least until this June, when the Unz initiative, calling for the end of bilingual education is put before the voters, Federal and state of California legislation require that LEP students must have access to educational programs which enable them to develop an adequate foundation for pursuing secondary and post-secondary education and participating in the mainstream economy. The legislation also provides funds for implementing bilingual education programs intended to raise academic standards and promote more effective instructional programs for LEP students

nationwide.

However, the legislation is vague about the meaning of bilingual education and encourages individual communities to decide upon the best instructional practice for language minority students. We have argued that this has made school districts the principal definer of bilingual education. At the district level, the meaning of such education is shaped in a contested terrain by the politics of race and the struggle over resources by various ethnic groups. In this contested terrain, fully operational bilingual education staffed by certified bilingual teachers, and available to all English learners should they want to choose it, symbolizes *power* in the hands of new immigrant groups over educational services. California's Latino educational professionals have been acutely conscious of this symbolism, and have pushed for a "maintenance" type of bilingual education that strives to make English learners bilingual and biliterate. But other groups in each school district are also aware of the power struggle represented by the district's bilingual education policy. These groups include parents of English-speaking children, monolingual teachers, and administrators, all of whom have their own vision of district resource use and their own conception of bilingual education. They have worked actively to "contain" bilingual primary language instruction in certain schools located in neighborhoods with high concentration of Spanish or Cantonese and Vietnamese speakers and to provide the vast majority of LEP students with "bilingual" education much more broadly defined to include English as a Second Language programs. In these, teachers are monolingual English, and at best can only rely on primary language aides to assist in teaching children who know very little, if any, English..

In addition to impact that conflict over power and resources has on defining bilingual education in particular districts, it is also shaped by a real shortage of certified bilingual teachers.

Efforts by the state of California to increase its supply of certified bilingual teachers have actually been fairly successful in the last ten years, but the numbers are still fall short of rising demand. The increase of practicing bilingual teachers in the state was about 50 percent between 1985 and 1995, but the number of LEP students rose by 140 percent in the same period (California Department of Education, 1995). As long as it is difficult to recruit bilingual teachers capable of teaching children in two languages, not all LEP students *can* have access to primary language instruction that would properly transition them to English. Shortages obviously hinder the staffing of bilingual classes, but as important, the shortage of teachers enables groups contesting the expansion of bilingual education to drag their feet in hiring certified bilingual teachers, hence in extending the district's primary language instruction-type bilingual education programs. Administrators opposed to or unconvinced by the proponents of bilingual education "meet" federal and state requirements with uncertified bilingual teachers or classes taught by certified ESL teachers who know little about the languages or cultures of their English learning pupils. This has the effect of reducing the claims of bilingual education on other of the district's resources.

Thus, even with scholarly consensus on how to best meet the needs of LEP students, bilingual education as implemented in schools (if implemented at all) may have little or no relationship to the bilingual curriculum and pedagogy that academics claim will significantly raise the academic performance of English learners.

Our interviews in four Northern California districts suggest that if districts had much easier access to certified bilingual teachers for staffing bilingual education classes, it would change the conditions of the conflict over bilingual education at the local level. Yet, other district

issues would continue to influence whether each district hires those teachers or not, how bilingual education is implemented, and the role that primary language instruction bilingual education plays in the district. The degree to which district administrators are committed to bilingual education is key to understanding whether full-fledged bilingual education would be implemented in district schools. That commitment, in turn, is affected by the nature of national and local race and ethnic politics, and by the attitudes of the district's non-bilingual teachers and principals toward bilingual education. US English continues to have considerable influence, the current national anti-immigrant political climate works against bilingual education, and the ideologies of English only and total immersion continue to have sway even in English learner communities.

The fact that these communities themselves are ambivalent about being “isolated” in bilingual programs (such as the Vietnamese in Junipero district) is partly affected by the inherent tendency for student in all categorical programs to be “separated” from other students, just as advanced placement (AP) students are separated. Separation in the case of bilingual education does not always have a stigma attached to it, as might be supposed. It does in Junipero and Carlander because the dominant Anglo and Asian-origin groups are disassociated from bilingual classes. Parents who want their children to be with high-performing pupils have to stay away from bilingual classes. But in Ocean and Reddington, where black children perform even worse than those in bilingual classes, bilingual education has a much more positive image for the immigrant groups fighting for more of them. The problem is that in none of these districts is bilingual education free of the conflict associated with any program that has a constituency associated with it. The conflict is worse in Ocean and Reddington, where the dominant political

group is a black minority, acutely threatened by the rapid growth of immigrant populations vying for resources and power. But it is also a major issue in the other two districts.

Perhaps the most illuminating case is Junipero, where the strong movement among bilingual educators for biliteracy was forced to retreat by an Anglo-dominated school board to a more “acceptable” transition version of bilingual education. The bilingual coordinator’s assessment that the board is “supportive,” “understands the needs of our students,” and has “a better foundation of why we have bilingual programs,” reflects that compromise around a program more to the board’s and superintendent’s liking. Yet, the fact that the transition version now has broader-based political support is good for bilingual students, too. This more “mainstream” version of bilingual education will not make them biliterate but can provide them with a functional program that has a lower conflict profile.

Our study is only suggestive, but the interviews and our analysis of them imply that bilingual education is inherently a *political* movement, and that unless those who support it as an educational/pedagogical construct can continue to mobilize political support for it, it will either not be implemented at the district level, or will be pushed into corners with relatively little access to resources or the educational attention of district administrators. In other words, research showing that bilingual education improves English-learner student performance is, not, in and of itself, influential enough to carry the day for this approach in school districts influenced by a host of their own local political complexities and larger, “external” politics.

REFERENCES

August, D. and Garcia, E. E. (1988). *Language minority students in the United States: Research. policy and practice*. Springfield, Ill.: C.C. Thomas.

Baker, C. (1988). *Key issues in bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1975). *Schooling in capitalist america*. New York: Basic Books.

California Department of Education.(1995). *BiCalReport, 1995* and District specific data from the Consolidated Programs Description Database (September). Sacramento, CA: CDOE.

California Department of Education (1995). "Languages from around the world are found in California" (Charts and tables based on the language census, Spring). Sacramento, CA: CDOE.

California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office (1994). *BiCal Reports* #1 and #8B. Sacramento, CA: CDOE.

Carnoy, M. (1994). *Faded dreams: The economics and politics of race in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carnoy, M. and Hannaway, J. (forthcoming, 1998). *Urban and suburban school districts: Different worlds, different issues*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

Center for the Study of Social Policy (1993). *Kids count data book*. Washington, DC..

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Resource Center on Educational Equity (1993). *Concerns*. Issue 40, July.

Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education*. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

Crawford, J. (ed.) (1992). *Language loyalties*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cremin, L. (1962). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1976-1957*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Cummins, J. (1976). "The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses". *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 9: 1-43.

Cummins, J. (1977). "Cognitive factors associated with the attainment of intermediate levels of bilingual skills". *Modern Language Journal*, 61: 3-12.

Hakuta, K. (1984). *The mirror of language*. New York: Basic Books.

Heath, S. B. (1977). "Our language heritage: A historical perspective.,, in Phillips, J. K. (ed.). *The language connection: from the classroom to the world*. ACT FL foreign language education series, vol 9. Skokie, Ill: National Textbook Company: 23-47.

Lambert, W. (1984). "An overview of issues in immersion education," in *Studies on immersion education: A collection for United States educators*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual-Bicultural Education.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1990). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. White Plains, NY: Longmans.

Minow, M. (1990). *Making all the difference: Inclusion, exclusion and American law*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Peal, E. and Lambert, W. (1962). "The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence."

Psychological Monographs. 76 (27): 1-23.

Stewner-Manzan, G. (1988). "The Bilingual Education Act: Twenty years later". *NCBE Focus* 6 (Fall). Washington, DC: The National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. English (1992). "In defense of our common language," in Crawford, J. (ed.). *Language loyalties*. Chicago, ILL: University of Chicago Press: 143-49.

USA Today (1995). "'English-only' movement picks up steam" (March 14).

ENDNOTES

1. The authors are educational consultant, Professor of Education and Economics, Stanford University, and Assistant Professor, Baruch College, City University of New York. Correspondence should be directed to Professor Carnoy at Stanford School of Education. The research for this paper was conducted under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, OERI, to the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The opinions in the paper, however, are the authors' own and should not be attributed to the Department of Education.
2. During the decade of the 1980s for example, it is estimated that nine million new immigrants came to the United States. When combined with the seven million reported to have come during the decade prior, more new immigrants arrived during the twenty year period from 1970-1990, than any other in the history of the nation (Carnoy, 1994).
3. "Transition" means that the English learner begins in a classroom learning primarily in his/her home language but consistently exposed to English. This exposure increases steadily so that by the fourth grade, the student is learning in English only.
4. Again, we are using the terms minority and majority to describe political power, rather than numerical prevalence. In fact, in one of the districts, bilingual students make up the numerical majority population.
5. This line of reasoning is frequently used by politicians who support the English-only movement in defense of their opposition toward bilingual education. For example, Congressman Toby Roth (R-Wis.), a sponsor of one recent bill, claims that, "people realize that America is changing very quickly; we're breaking up into groups. To have that common glue we must have official English" (USA Today, March 14, 1995).
6. Immersion as an instructional pedagogy is best exemplified by the Canadian French immersion model, in which monolingual English students have successfully mastered French while maintaining high levels of academic achievement when placed in French-only classrooms. Critics of bilingual education cite the success of this model to advocate its adaptation for language-minority students in the United States. Despite the success of immersion programs in Canada, Canadian-immersion researchers unanimously agree that these models are inappropriate for children belonging to a language-minority group. For language majority students, bilingualism poses no threat to the native language, the dominant language used outside of the school setting. The instructional design promotes additive bilingualism in which the goal is to attain balanced proficiency in two languages. According to Wallace Lambert, a McGill University researcher on bilingualism, immersion for language minority students would conversely, "make the first language vulnerable to neglect and replacement," due to the social and cultural dominance imposed by a majority language. English immersion for language

minority students in the United States, according to Lambert, would therefore, slowly subtract proficiency in the native language, replacing it with English (Lambert, 1984). Keeping up with English proficient classmates in content matter has proven problematic during this process, and subtractive approaches are consequently credited with producing, "a disproportionate number of children who fall behind in class, question their ethnic identity, and drop out of school" (Crawford, 1991: 117).

7. One or more of the authors had, in previous research, followed around the superintendent for two days in two of the districts; spent one year observing school board meetings in one district; interviewed school principals and staff in several of a third district's schools; and done a case study of one bilingual school in the fourth district.

8. The information provided in these brief profiles come from the California Department of Education and interviews with the district bilingual coordinators, teachers, and principals.

9. For a powerful legal analysis of bilingual education as it is impacted by categorization and court mandates, see Minow, 1990.

10. Here we put the term "dominant majority" in quotes since we use this term to refer to both numerical majorities as well as majorities in terms of political representation. This is an important notion since in the Reddington district, the African-American community makes up less than 30 percent of the actual district student population, yet maintains majorities on the city council and school board.

11. Again, we are using the terms minority and majority to describe political power, rather than numerical prevalence. In fact, in one of the districts, bilingual students make up the numerical majority population.