Chapter 15
Bilingual Education as a Professional Responsibility for Public Schools and Universities

Anne Jones

Introduction

The use of languages other than English in the instructional programs of America's public schools has proven to be a troublesome issue of both public policy and professional practice since the establishment of mass compulsory public education more than a century ago. As a nation populated primarily by immigrants from more than a hundred other nations, the United States has had to wrestle with two fundamental linguistic questions: (a) How can we balance the national need for integrating language and culture with the democratic political rights of citizens to opt for preserving their own diverse linguistic heritages, and (b) Does multilingual schooling enhance or inhibit the acquisition of the academic and social skills needed for social and economic success? The first question is primarily political and tends to be worked on through interest group organization, political action, legislation, regulation, and formal adjudication. Political systems at the local, state, and national levels have been vexed with this conflict, with each side claiming some victories and suffering some losses. The second question is primarily professional, and its answer rests on a combination of scientific evidence and professional judgment regarding when and how to help children meet the linguistic and academic goals set by the political resolution of the first question. Of course, resolving the primarily professional questions of appropriate language use in the classroom quickly turns professional judgment into a political force. Professionals accepting the responsibility for facilitating linguistic and academic competence for the nation's school children cannot help but formulate an answer to the question of what public policies most effectively support the learning processes that their professional judgment dictates as most effective for children whose first languages are not English.

A. Jones (✉)
Associate Dean, University Extension, University of California Riverside, Riverside, CA, USA
e-mail: ajones@ucx.ucr.edu

D.E. Mitchell, R.K. Ream (eds.), *Professional Responsibility*,
Advances in Medical Education 4, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02603-9_15

Hence, to meet their professional responsibility for instruction, education professionals must first develop a coherent perspective on the central political question. The primary objective in this chapter is to address the professional question of appropriate language usage in academic instruction, but we must first describe the evolution of political context and how that context circumscribes and facilitates or inhibits linguistic, academic, and social education.

A Brief History of the Social and Political Context for Bilingual Education

In the nineteenth century, social, political, and economic changes within many countries resulted in a large number of people leaving their birth countries and emigrating to the United States to pursue economic success and individual freedom. As they immigrate, families typically seek to live in settlements, sharing language and cultural traditions. Social structures, such as local schools, churches, stores, etc. are established using native languages in daily discourse. A sense of belonging grows as immigrants establish social identity groups in their new nation (Lessow-Hurley 2013).

Over time, xenophobia (fear of foreign things) emerges throughout the nation, leading to legislative restrictions on native language use. Restrictive policies curtailed the flow of immigration, mandated English language use, and undermined immigrants' new-found freedom. During World War I, legislation forced closure of native language settlement schools. By contrast, during World War II, when communication with foreign allies was necessary, there was a positive shift in attitude toward bilingualism, with the military leading the way (Lessow-Hurley 2013).

In 1965, the Immigration and Nationality Act legislatively changed immigration policy, removing the national origin quota system, encouraging immigration from diverse groups. By the 1980s, legislative focus shifted toward undocumented immigrants seeking alternatively to create paths to citizenship or prevention of border crossing. As a result, many recent immigrants became legal citizens (Lessow-Hurley 2013).

As part of the "War on Poverty," Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 assisted local education agencies to serve children from families with annual incomes under $3,000 (Lessow-Hurley 2013) and who are disadvantaged by an "inability to speak English" (Faltis and Arias 1993, pp. 6–29). Title VII offered monetary grants to education agencies to: a) develop and run bilingual programs for low-income, non–English speaking students; (b) make efforts to attract and retain bilingual teachers; and (c) establish communication between home and school (Faltis and Arias 1993). Schools were not required to use students' primary languages or to apply specific instructional approaches. Money was provided for research to develop theory and methodology. In 1974, the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized and expanded to reach an increased number of English learners by removing the annual income cap (Lessow-Hurley 2013).

In 1974, the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 provided critical leverage for proponents of bilingual education. The reauthorization was heavily influenced by the Lau v. Nichols decision (1974), in which the US Supreme Court held that Chinese American students in San Francisco, California were being denied their right to an equal educational opportunity under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Specifically, the Supreme Court found that these students were being denied their rights based on their ethnicity, and more significantly for the proponents of bilingual education, that language is inextricably linked to an individual's nation of origin; ethnic discrimination and language discrimination are interconnected. As a result of this ruling and stronger reauthorization language, schools were now forced "to provide equal access to children who could not function in English," strengthening an aspect of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Lessow-Hurley 2013, p. 141). This reauthorization included specific guidelines for addressing language minority (LM) students' needs, and a timetable for doing so was established. These remedies rejected the sole use of English as a second language (ESL) for teaching limited English proficient (LEP) students, implying that bilingual education programs were preferable in many cases. With the Lau v. Nichols decision in place, the Office of Civil Rights "embarked on a campaign of aggressive enforcement" (Crawford 1989, p. 37). While educational agencies were not given specific directives within the written law regarding how to address the equality court order with the Lau v. Nichols decision, the Federal government's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Civil Rights took the lead and designed a document that gave guidance to districts in order for them to implement programs which would bring them into legal compliance. The guidelines included standards for: (1) identifying limited English speaking students, (2) assessing language fluency, and (3) ways to meet their needs. These standards were the impetus for a state mandate to begin compliance review process, making review a condition of continued federal funding. The guidelines did not mandate dual language instruction, but school districts realized that this approach would help meet the requirements imposed upon them, and several states, including California, began to prioritize the development of dual language programs.

Because elections determine who controls the policymaking process, maintaining policy coherence is difficult (Cuban 1990; Fuhrman 1993; Tyack and Cuban 1995). In California, new public school curriculum frameworks were developed between 1987 and 1994. These frameworks reflected policy shifts in two ways. First, they urged substantial changes in curricular content, and second, they emphasized challenging academic outcomes while simultaneously providing less prescriptive guidance regarding how to achieve them. Fuhrman (1993) argued that these frameworks provide an essential foundation for systemic reform. They presented a new philosophy and approach to teaching and learning that, if enacted, would change power and authority relationships in the schools and classrooms. The framework developers sought to encourage teachers to move from teacher-centered to student-centered classrooms and from academic subject segregation to interdisciplinary learning activities that engage students in constructing knowledge through hands-on, cooperative, and active learning processes (Lucas et al. 1990).

In 1980, the Carter administration sought to impose more prescriptive guidelines, mandating bilingual education in schools with a sufficient number of limited English proficient (LEP) students. On transition to the Reagan administration in 1981, however, these guidelines were dropped and policy returned to emphasizing approaches that used only English. With the 1984 reauthorization of ESEA, some federal funds were offered for an instructional program called Special Alternative Instructional Programs (SAIPs) (Crawford 1989, p. 36). SAIPs provided instruction in English, placed greater emphasis on preparing students in academic skills and content areas, and made Title VII less compensatory in nature. While most Title VII funding went to programs using students' native languages, the addition of SAIPs allowed districts to deemphasize bilingual instruction in favor of English-only instruction. The rationale for SAIPs was that (a) bilingual programs are not feasible in districts with students of many different language backgrounds and (b) qualified bilingual teachers were not available in large enough numbers to staff bilingual programs (Lucas and Katz 1994).

In 1995, the California Legislature commissioned a study of test data, reclassification rates and program exit rates, comparing the effectiveness of different language development programs (Lopez and McEneaney 2012). A California businessman, Ronald Unz, used this study to argue that bilingual programs allowed by the California Department of Education were weak. In 1998, he sponsored Proposition 227—a referendum aimed at severely restricting the use of primary language for instructional purposes (Gandara 2000). The proposition passed despite opposition from language education researchers. As enacted, Proposition 227 mandates that all instruction in California public schools be conducted in English, with teachers specifically trained to address English language development (ELD). The proposition does allow parents or guardians to waive this requirement if they can show that the child already knows English or would learn English faster through alternative instructional techniques. It also provides that children not fluent in English may be given initial, short-term placements of 1 year or less in intensive sheltered English immersion programs (Garner 2012, League of Women Voters, 1998).

State guidelines were established, requiring schools to offer identified English learners. English Language Development (ELD) instructional services targeted their English proficiency level in one of three settings:

Structured English Immersion (SEI) – A classroom setting where nearly all classroom instructions are in English but with curricula and presentation formats designed for children who are learning the language.

English Language Mainstream (ELM) – A classroom setting for English learners who have acquired reasonable fluency in English and continue to receive additional educational services in order to recoup any academic deficits that may have been incurred as a result of language barriers.

Alternative Program (Alt) – With parental approval, a language acquisition process in which English learners receive ELD instruction targeted to their English proficiency level, while academic subjects are taught in the primary language. (http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp).

These guidelines also created legal sanctions threatening educators and school officials who failed to comply (Mora 2002). Districts were given the responsibility of establishing the number of students with waivers per grade level needed for establishing an Alternative Program. Teachers, administrators, and school board members are held personally liable for fees and damages by the child's parents and guardians for improper implementation. These provisions, taken together, are the most restrictive in the nation (García and Curry-Rodríguez, online: 22 Nov 2010).

There was an immediate impact on the then-current bilingual teachers, and many were compelled to leave the bilingual settings and embrace the English-only (EO) model. Administrators sent back bilingual materials; new textbooks adopted for the Spanish language instruction were returned unused to the publishing companies. Many school boards withheld teachers' bilingual stipends as a result of Proposition 227, causing a change in the teachers' annual salaries. Teachers' unions held emergency meetings to assist their colleagues with guidelines that were not clearly defined. Parent meetings were held to explain the new educational settings established by this legislation. Parental rights were addressed regarding the Alt option, with local bilingual advocates and teachers encouraging the choice of language waivers to re-establish bilingual instruction within the classrooms. As with the general electorate, opinion was divided on the issue; many in the educational community supported the changes brought by Proposition 227. However, the impact on the pro-bilingual education community was powerful. Teachers felt devalued as Spanish bilingual educators, even though they had the ability to continue teaching in bilingual education settings (Alamillo 2000). Confusion and feelings of abandonment were prevalent, especially in communities with a high number of English learners.

Bilingual education in California has faced persistent political resistance and recurring regulatory challenges. Even under the restrictive environment created by Proposition 227 and its regulatory enforcement, California schools have not been able to find a sufficient number of qualified bilingual teachers. Monolingual classroom teachers are challenged to find appropriate methods for teaching non–English speaking students.

The highly visible political controversy surrounding bilingual instruction has tended to obscure professional responsibility aspects of the issue. Professionally, educators are responsible for the well-being of the children assigned to their care and keeping. This requires more than just understanding the politically structured incentives and sanctions imposed on the schools and protecting children from the negative consequences of vitriolic political disagreements. Professional responsibility extends beyond simply managing political opportunities and constraints. Professional responsibility also encompasses understanding and managing the academic, technical, and social dimensions of language acquisition and usage. That is, educators are professionally responsible for understanding the interactions between language learning, academic subject mastery, and cognitive, social, and intellectual development by children as they navigate institutional life in schools and communities. Hence, we turn in the remainder of this chapter to an analysis of the complex dimensions of professional responsibility, giving special attention to the roles of university schools of education in nurturing and enabling the development of the educators who hold these professional responsibilities.

University Schools of Education and the Development of Professional Responsibility

Anti-bilingual political pressures following the passage of Proposition 227 significantly curtailed implementation of dual-language programs in the public schools. This led to sharply diminished interest in obtaining bilingual teaching certification by prospective teachers. This, in turn, reduced the ability of university schools of education to mount bilingual training programs.

Legislation and political pressure did not, however, stem the flow of non-English speakers into the nation's schools—particularly in California. And these pressures did not eliminate the substantial educational challenges facing English learner student populations. These political conditions, made even more damaging by budget cuts following the Great Recession of 2008, have produced a dramatic shortage of biliterate teachers and administrators. As a result, university education schools are now faced with the responsibility of expanding the size of the biliterate teaching force. As Santos et al. (2012, p. 3) note, this responsibility cannot be met by a few "boutique" programs serving a handful of schools. The public schools need scaled-up regular programs, preparing bilingual teachers for an increasing number of teaching jobs. Development of new programs is made even more urgent by the recent adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which require dramatic changes in professional practice with substantial implications for the EL student population (Quezada and Alfaro 2012). Quezada and Alfaro (2012) present a compelling argument that access to the CCSS for English learners is best accomplished through literacy and biliteracy development. They argue that the new standards require the development of "culturally proficient biliteracy teachers" who enable students to use their first language cultural funds of knowledge to enhance learning (Quezada and Alfaro 2012; Crawford and Krashen 2007; Verplaetse and Migliacci 2008).

Recruitment of a Biliterate Teaching Workforce

Enrollment in teacher preparation programs in California has declined steadily over the past 5 years (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing 2012). In some regions, however, as the English learner population has grown, so has the proportion of candidates entering the teaching profession whose first language is not English. This fact alone, however, has not facilitated recruitment of a bilingual teaching workforce. Recruitment efforts—particularly for elementary and middle school teacher candidates—have shifted from traditional liberal studies programs to ethnic studies and Spanish language majors, who have selected college careers that capitalize on their cultural and linguistic assets. Biliterate teachers' cultural funds of knowledge are necessary to effectively engage students and their students' families. They must develop sophisticated academic language skills and content pedagogy in both languages.

Curriculum Reform

Curriculum reform in teacher education requires both the emotional will needed to advance reform efforts and a clearly articulated direction. In response to the emerging demographic shifts in California, as well as the activism of professional groups such as the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE) and the California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education (CABTE), the California Commission on Teacher Education (CTC) recently adopted a comprehensive new set of standards for preparation of biliterate/bilingual teachers. The new standards are aimed at shaping the way university education school programs think about curriculum and design preservice teacher candidate experiences (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing 2009). One significant aspect of the new standards is an option allowing experienced teachers to earn their bilingual certification through added coursework while they continue to teach; previously, teachers could only earn their bilingual certification at the preservice level, or through the passage of a state-mandated examination. This professional coursework option increases the pool of certified bilingual teachers available to both teach students and mentor novice bilingual educators.

With the newly adopted preparation standards as a guide, university education school curricula for the bilingual authorization programs have generally been examined and revised. At the University of California, Riverside, the content for the student teaching seminars—the backbone of the preservice experience—was revised to include more opportunities for students to develop biliterate skills in parent communication and culturally relevant planning for instruction. Seminars throughout the program are conducted in two languages. Specific support for academic language acquisition in both native and target languages is infused across the curriculum and emphasized in a unique course for content literacy in a second language. At UC, Riverside, content methodologies for mathematics and science courses are now taught primarily in Spanish, the dominant non-English language in the region. Finally, candidates spend the entire year of practicum in dual immersion (DI) classrooms, under the supervision and mentorship of teachers that hold a bilingual authorization and have extensive teaching experience in bilingual settings.

Across the State, university schools of education have implemented similar programs and are giving renewed attention to the preparation of biliterate teachers. There is some evidence that an ideological shift toward relying on the public school system to help develop multilingual society is beginning to gain traction (Lara 2014). Local educational leaders report that enthusiasm for dual immersion programs is increasing in both the EL and English-only (EO) populations.[1] In response, some districts are expanding dual language programs; others are initiating programs for the first time. As a result, demand for credentialed bilingual teachers is rising. As the value of biliteracy is increasingly recognized in the education community,

[1] As reported in surveys and interviews with the superintendents and principals in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties during the period from 2009 to 2012.

the demand for teachers with bilingual certification has increased even in English-only schools and classes. School leaders report that in the current environment of workforce reduction for elementary school teachers, job security for teachers with bilingual certification is enhanced. All of this suggests that there is a perception of increased value for students when their teachers are biliterate.

Student Achievement and Biliteracy: Professional Responsibility for Outcomes

Once trained and certified, bilingual teachers have a professional responsibility to assure that students assigned to them are provided with instructional programs that, at a minimum, conform to the Hippocratic Oath to "do no harm," either academically or socially. Discharging this responsibility requires that teachers be able to clearly conceptualize program designs and consistently implement them as designed. Additionally, it is essential that alternative programs be competently and reliably evaluated for both adequacy of implementation and their intellectual and psychological impacts on students. For all their limitations, standardized academic achievement testing programs remain the basic tool of program evaluation in most public school settings. Hence, while it is important to keep pressing university schools of education, achievement test manufacturers, and education policymakers to produce more appropriate measures, for the foreseeable future, it is important for all teachers to develop a solid understanding of the programs they are expected to implement and be able to interpret the standardized achievement testing programs used to assess them.

Conceptually, there are five distinct approaches to language development being implemented with varying degrees of success in California public schools. Available data indicate that the academic efficacy varies dramatically across these approaches. The following is a brief description of the five major models of bilingual education:

1. *Early-Exit Bilingual Education*
   This program was designed to assist students learn English while they continue to learn academics in their primary language. However, it is also designed to have students' transition into all English by the end of third or fourth grade. Thus, development of bilingualism is limited, and students are still expected to leave their primary language behind and continue in English only.
2. *Late-Exit Bilingual Program*
   This program was designed to teach English as well as to continue teaching in the students' primary language up through the sixth grade. According to Thomas and Collier (2000), this program has been shown to be very effective in the education of English Learners.

3. *Immersion*
   In an immersion program, students are instructed in one language for the entire school day. For English learners, this program works on models similar to those originally designed to teach native English speakers a foreign language.
4. *Three-Language System*
   In this program, students are first taught in the official language of the state, a second language officially recognized by the state is introduced after approximately 2 years, and a third language is added several years later (Queen, Robin, "Spanish Speakers in the US").
5. *Dual Immersion*
   The program that has consistently been demonstrated to be a successful program for all language learners is the dual immersion (DI) program (Thomas and Collier 2003). Linguistically, this is a program based on an additive, rather than an interference perspective. Students are not asked to leave behind his/her culture or language; all languages and cultures are accepted and valued. Students study and learn the same academic content as other students at their grade level, but they also become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. The other great advantage of this type of bilingual program is that it is designed for both English learners and native speakers of English. It gives the opportunity of bilingualism to all.

In 1997, Thomas and Collier published a seminal study (Thomas and Collier 1997), which compared several models for bilingual education—including the early-exit, late-exit, and dual immersion models described above—assessing student achievement in English reading. They concluded that two-way bilingual immersion programs (dual immersion) and late-exit bilingual programs with content presented in English as a second language were the only programs where English learners reached the 50th percentile in English reading and maintained this level through 12th grade; the dual immersion programs produced the highest test score results. Their subsequent work (Thomas and Collier 2003; Collier and Thomas 2004) continued to demonstrate the efficacy of dual immersion bilingual education programs.

This evidence, along with the work of others (e.g., Cummins 2005; Crawford and Krashen 2007), has been compelling to some school districts serving high populations of English learners. There are currently 201 schools in 30 California counties offering dual immersion programs.[2] Administrators in one of the districts sponsoring several dual immersion programs believe that this model is the optimal program to ensure the academic success for English learners. The program was also chosen because it offers an opportunity for English monolingual students to become bilingual. The administrators believe this inclusive program has proven to be beneficial to all; education professionals in this district acknowledge the responsibility to offer the best education possible to students and to the community.

[2] Most recently available data (2012) from the California Department of Education (CDE) at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/ip/ap/directory.aspx

Benefits of Bilingual Authorization for Professional Educators

Bilingualism also benefits education professionals. Prior to the passage of Proposition 227, bilingual teachers received a stipend. Though these funds are now gone, teachers are still receiving benefits for their bilingual skills as they have been omitted from the reduction in force groups (i.e., laid off teachers) in some districts (Zehr 2008). As an example, in the Jurupa Unified School District, there has been an agreement with the district and the union each year that teachers with bilingual authorization have received specialized training and have special certification to teach in this program, and therefore are exempt from the reduction in force process.

Recent survey results from San Diego, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties regarding workforce benefits for bilingual educators provide further evidence for the advantage of biliteracy in the teaching workforce. Of 25 responding districts, 15 indicated that teachers received some type of benefit for biliteracy skills or certification. Benefits included a stipend, job security over others who do not have a bilingual certification, or both. Responses indicated that some districts recognize these skills as indispensible. These districts exempted the authorized bilingual teachers from layoffs, irrespective of whether they were in a dual language class or not. This reflects a commitment to ensure that bilingual teachers are working with EL students, regardless of the availability of dual immersion programs. In addition, at a time when very few teachers are being hired because of the current climate of economic distress, bilingual teachers with the special certification (BCLAD, which certifies their bilingualism) have a better chance of being hired over their monolingual counterparts.[3] Many positions open at elementary schools in this region specify, "Must be BCLAD certified."

Student Achievement and Biliteracy: Lasting Benefits

Dual immersion programs provide multiple benefits to both native English speakers and English learners. Most dual immersion programs reflect the language of their communities; in California, this is predominantly English and Spanish. Long-term exposure is especially helpful in meeting three Dual Immersion program goals:

1. Developing high ability levels in both first and second languages,
2. Grade-level academic performance, and
3. Positive cross-cultural attitudes (Howard 2002).

Linguistic proficiency, the most obvious linguistic benefit, is that students participating in dual immersion programs over time become bilingual. Students acquire

[3] As reported in surveys and interviews with superintendents and principals in Riverside and San Bernardino counties during the period from 2009 to 2012.

their second language at no risk of losing their primary language (English or Spanish), and they are able to maintain their first language while adding a second language. Thonis (2005) supports the proposition that mastery of the first language supports the acquisition of the second language and allows for the transferability of skills from one language to another. Native speakers of English who learn the content in Spanish (the target language) and English learners who learn the content in English (the official language of the nation) become bilingual and contribute to the linguistic resources of this nation.

It is important to distinguish between bilingualism and biliteracy. Students in DI programs learn to speak two languages (become bilingual), and within their classroom contexts, they also learn how to read and write in both languages (become biliterate). The instructional day is planned to introduce literacy skills in the target language for both groups, native speakers of English and English learners. A common Spanish–English DI model begins with a 90/10 instructional time allocation in kindergarten, that is, 90 % of the instruction is in Spanish and 10 % is in English. Importantly, literacy skills are introduced in Spanish. Native speakers of English learn to speak Spanish while concurrently developing their literacy skills in this language. As the grade levels progress, the proportion of time shifts by 10 % each year (i.e., in first grade, the instructional time is 80 % Spanish and 20 % English), until the instructional time is evenly split, at which point the students are considered fluently bilingual.

The important differences between learning to read English as a first and as a second language are described by August and Shanahan (2010). They note that strong literacy skills in the first language facilitate the acquisition of literacy skills in the second language. Receiving literacy instruction in the first language sets the stage for "cross-language" influences (Lindholm-Leary and Genesee 2010). These cross-language influences are observable as students rely on their first language literacy skills and gradually transfer them to attain biliteracy. Lindholm-Leary reports that "successful English learner readers/writers view reading and writing in English and the home language as similar activities with language specific differences" (Lindholm-Leary and Genesee 2010, p. 343).

Some scholars have argued that continued use of students' native languages helps develop English proficiency (Collier and Thomas 2004; Cummins 2005; Crawford and Krashen 2007). Moreover, it is asserted, developing and maintaining one's native language does not interfere with second language development. Clearly, many people become fully bilingual and multilingual without suffering interference of a first language in learning another (see, e.g., Baker 2011). Research suggests that proficiency in one's native language is a strong predictor of second language proficiency. Cummins' linguistic interdependence principle (2005) argues that this phenomenon results from a common underlying linguistic proficiency, allowing cognitive/academic and literacy-related skills to transfer across languages (Phillips and Crowell 1994).

Dual language programs also support academic success. In the last decade, Kathryn Lindholm-Leary (2001), Thomas and Collier (2002), and Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010) looked at the academic achievement of students placed in DI programs.

Lindholm-Leary (2001) collected data from 16 two-way programs, divided equally between 90/10 and 50/50 models for Spanish- and English-speaking children. She documented that both English- and Spanish-speaking students scored high in oral and academic skills in their respective native languages. Lindholm-Leary found that students in the 90/10 model performed better in Spanish skills, but all Spanish speakers (regardless of the model) became equally proficient in English. In general terms, she found that "across the grade levels, as students became more proficient in both languages, the correlation between reading achievement in English and Spanish increased" (Crawford 2004a, b, p. 304).

Collier and Thomas (2004) compared the English-reading achievement in three types of bilingual programs in the Houston Independent School District during the period of 1996–2000. The data, reported in percentile ranks, indicate that students in two-way bilingual programs outranked their peers in transitional bilingual education and those in developmental bilingual education. Lindholm-Leary and Block also examined the achievement level of 659 Hispanic students in a DI program (90/10 model). They reported that though these students came from low SES homes, they still scored comparably or better than their peers who received their instruction only in English. Native speakers of English in DI programs also scored higher than their peers in regular mainstream programs in both reading and math (Lindholm-Leary and Block 2010).

These researchers concur that students who participate in two-way immersion programs in both models perform very well in comparison to the students in other programs. The students in DI programs, both English learners and native speakers of English, obtain scores at the same level or higher than their peers in transitional bilingual and English mainstream classrooms (Thomas and Collier 2003). Lindholm-Leary asserts that time spent in Spanish instruction positively impacts achievement in Spanish and has no negative effect on achievement measured in English. Confirming the results posted by Thomas and Collier, Lindholm-Leary states that English learners in dual language programs "appear more likely to close the achievement gap by late elementary or middle school than their English learner peers in English mainstream programs" (Lindholm-Leary 2010, p. 352). These outcomes identify higher achievement as a benefit for students in two-way immersion programs. These benefits are also received by native speakers of English in DI programs. These students have consistently posted higher academic gains as compared with their peers in mainstream classrooms. The benefits of adding a second language to English are a welcome addition that will prove advantageous in the years to come (Thomas and Collier 2003).

Cross-cultural attitudes improve along with academic achievement and biliterate language skills in DI programs. This culture competence is the third goal of DI programs. The bilingual classroom environment and the integration of multicultural curriculum content help students to effectively function in two cultures. A modified and culturally differentiated curriculum gives students skills needed to participate in a global society. In these classrooms, student-to-student interactions help to develop

cross-cultural understanding. Teachers and students come to value the cultures represented in their classroom in very direct and concrete ways. Positive attitudes toward school and college are fostered.

Lindholm-Leary and Borsato (2001) researched these questions and concluded that former students in two-way immersion programs developed positive attitudes toward school and high levels of satisfaction with participation in these programs. The research, which included 142 high school students who were enrolled in two-way immersion programs, grouped students into three categories. The comparison group consisted of Hispanic students who had not participated in two-way bilingual programs.

All students completed a questionnaire that consisted of 147 questions. These questions probed issues of identity and motivation, attitudes toward schooling, current schooling path and college ambition, attitudes toward bilingualism and the two-way bilingual program, parental involvement, and school environment. The results showed that most of the students attained high academic competencies and developed motivation to do well in school. The researchers analyzed the data and indicated that in the areas of college preparation, students had a positive attitude, and they participated in activities that ensure academic success at the college level. In high school, they were enrolled in higher level math courses, were receiving good grades, and reported that they intended to stay in school and attend college. This encouraging report has implications for educators in the elementary level and sends the message that the DI program's success has ripple effects on high school students and may motivate students to attend college. The reported benefits of two-way programs for Hispanic Spanish speakers were, in the words of Lindholm-Leary, impressive: "almost half of these students believed that the program kept them from dropping out of school." She felt confident that these students would want to go to college right after high school graduation. Lindholm-Leary implies that the amount of information these students receive in elementary and middle school may give them more detailed and accurate information about what courses to take in high school and help them meet college admission requirements. So, in addition to developing high levels of academic competence and motivation, these high school students also developed pride on being bilingual, had positive self-concept, and saw themselves as successful students in high school and college (Lindholm-Leary and Borsato 2001, pp. 19–21).

Participation in DI programs offers multiple, long-term benefits to both native speakers of English and English language learners. Research shows that students who are schooled in DI programs reap collateral benefits in the area of bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic achievement. In addition, research shows that these students develop cross-cultural skills and a persistently positive attitude toward school. These attitudes may help to ameliorate the academic achievement gap and reduce the high school dropout rate. The evidence supports our assertion that expanding access to DI programs for students and preparing a highly qualified biliterate teaching force are essential responsibilities for the education profession.

References

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2010). Effective English literacy instruction for English learners. In *Improving education for English learners; Research-based approaches* (pp. 209–250). Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed., pp. 248–249). New York: Multilingual Matters.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009). *Standards of quality and effectiveness for programs leading to bilingual authorization* (reports available at ctc.ca.gov).

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2012). *Teacher supply in California: A report to the legislation* (reports available at ctc.ca.gov).

California Senate. (2014). *SB 1174, Lara. English language education*. Retrieved from http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/ at http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB1174

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE, Journal of Research and Practice, 2*, 1.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Trenton: Crane.

Crawford, J. (2004a). Basic research on language acquisition. In *Educating English learners; Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed., pp. 182–209). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J. (2004b). *Educating English learners; Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed., pp. 46–48). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J., & Krashen, S. (2007). *English learners in American classrooms: 101 questions, 101 answers*. New York: Scholastic.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(1), 3–13. Washington, DC: Published American Educational Research Association.

Cummins, J. (2005). *Teaching the language of academic success: A framework for school-based language policies. Schooling and language minority students: A theoretico-practical framework* (3rd ed., pp. 3–28). Los Angeles: LBD Publishers.

Faltis, C. J., & Beatriz Arias, M. B. (1993). Trends in bilingual education at the secondary school level. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *69*(1), 6–29.

Fuhrman, S. (1993). *Designing coherent education policy: Improving the system*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gandara, P. (2000). In the aftermath of the storm: English learners in the post-227 era. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 24*(1–2), 1–13.

Garner. (2012). *League of women voters of California, Smart Valley, Inc. 1998*. Retrieved from http://smartvoter.org

Howard, E. R. (2002). Two-way immersion: A key to global awareness. *Educational Leadership, 60*(2), 62–64.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Lessow-Hurley, J. (2013). The foundations of dual language instruction. *Historical and International Perspectives on Language Education*, *19*(2), 18–24.

Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn, J. (2001). Dual Language Education. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. *Multilingual Matters 28*, 1–377.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*(1), 43–60.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Borsato, G. (2001, May). *Impact of two-immersion on students' attitudes toward school and college* (Research Rep. No. 10). Santa Cruz: University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for english learners. In *Improving education for english learners; Research-based approaches* (pp. 323–367). Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Lopez, F., & McEneaney, E. (2012). State implementation of language acquisition policies and reading achievement among hispanic students. *Educational Policy, 12*, 418.

Lucas, T, and A. Katz. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(3), 537–561.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(3), 315–340. Texas A & M University.

Mora, J. K. (2002). Caught in a policy web: The impact of education reform on latino education. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 1*(1), 29–44.

Quezada, L. R. & Alfaro, C. (2012). Moving pedagogic mountains: Cutting to the common core. *The Journal of Communication & Education*. (8), 19–22, http://languagemagazine.com/?page_id=4699.

Santos, M., Darling-Hammond, L., & Cheuk, T. (2012). *Teacher development to support English language learners in the context of common core state standards*. Stanford University Understanding Language, http://ell.stanford.edu/papers.

Phillips, D., & Crowell, N. A. (1994). Cultural Diversity and Early Education: Report of a Workshop.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (2000). Accelerated schooling for all students: Research findings on education in multilingual communities. In S. Shaw (Ed;), *Intercultural education in European classrooms* (pp. 15–35). Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement (CREDE Research Brief* #10). Santa Cruz: University of California, Santa Cruz, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational Leadership, 61*(2), 61–64.

Thonis, E. (2005). Reading instruction for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretico-practical framework* (3rd ed., pp. 186–192). Los Angeles: LBD Publishers.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Verplaetse, L. S., & Migliacci, N. (2008). Making mainstream content comprehensible through sheltered instruction. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zehr, M. A. (2008). *Bilingual teachers largely unaffected in Dallas layoffs*. [Web log]. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/2008/10/bilingual_teachers_largely_una.html