

# Sources and Suggested Reading

*This book relies in part on journalistic sources – that is, interviews, press briefings, public records, legislative hearings, oral statements at conferences, school visits, and reporting of events during and after the author's tenure at Education Week (1985–87). Bibliographic sources, along with recommendations for further reading, are provided below. Many of the “public domain” documents listed are included on the CD-ROM companion to this book, along with numerous Internet links to copyrighted materials. For a full listing, see the Online Resource Guide.*

## Introduction

Sabine R. Ulibarrí describes the experience of Latino students before the bilingual education era in “The Word Made Flesh: Spanish in the Classroom,” in Luís Valdez and Stan Steiner, eds., *Aztlán: An Anthology of Mexican American Literature* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972).

Einar Haugen analyzes American attitudes toward bilingualism in *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969), and “The Curse of Babel,” in Haugen and Morton Bloomfield, eds., *Language as a Human Problem* (New York: Norton, 1973).

Joel Perlmann provides immigrant school attendance figures (extrapolated from the 1911 report by the federal Dillingham Commission) in “Bilingualism and Ethnicity in American Schooling before 1960: An Historical Perspective,” paper presented at the Institute on Bilingual Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Dec. 11, 1987. See also Perlmann's “Historical Legacies: 1840–1920,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 508 (Mar. 1990). Further discussion of the human costs of Americanization may be found in Stanley Feldstein and Lawrence Costello, *The Ordeal of Assimilation: A Documentary of the White Working Class* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1974).

The *Washington Post* editorial that blamed bilingual education for the growing number of LEP youth (“Teach English”) appeared on Aug. 9, 2001.

Kenneth G. Wilson’s misinformed tirade against bilingual education appears in his otherwise urbane and entertaining book, *Van Winkle’s Return: Change in American English, 1966–1986* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1987).

## Chapter 1. Bilingualism, American Style

Studies by the Urban Institute are unparalleled sources of statistical information about immigrants and demographic change. Especially useful are two presentations by Michael E. Fix and Jeffrey S. Passel:

- “U.S. Immigration at the Turn of the 21st Century,” testimony before the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, Aug. 2, 2001; and
- “U.S. Immigration – Trends & Implications for Schools,” presentation at the National Association for Bilingual Education NCLB Implementation Institute, New Orleans, Jan. 28–29, 2003.

See also Jorge Ruiz-de-Velasco and Michael Fix, *Overlooked & Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 2000).

For a broad sociological overview, see Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut, *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

Naturally, the U.S. Census Bureau offers enormous amounts of raw data through its Web site. Gateway to Census 2000 is a good starting point: <http://www.census.gov/main/-www/cen2000.html>. It also publishes numerous useful publications (many included on the companion CD to this volume). See in particular:

- *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000*; and
- *Language Use and English Ability: 2000*.

See also the annual *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics* published by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The premier source for English learner statistics is the National Clearinghouse for English Language Education (NCELA). See in particular Anneka L. Kindler, *Summary of the States’ Limited English Proficient Students and Available Educational Programs and Services: 2000–2001 Summary Report* (2002).

For more perspective on the limitations of census language data, see James Crawford, “Making Sense of Census 2000,” an article published by the Education Policy Studies Laboratory at Arizona State University: <http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/LPRU/features/article5.htm>.

François Grosjean explains some of the forces driving language shift in *Life With Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982). Another helpful book is Nancy Faires Conklin and Margaret A. Lourie, *A Host of Tongues: Language Communities in the United States* (New York: Free Press, 1983).

Calvin J. Veltman presents another view in “The American Linguistic Mosaic: Understanding Language Shift in the United States,” in Sandra Lee McKay and Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, eds., *New Immigrants in the United States: Readings for Second Language Educators*

(New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000). See also Veltman's *The Future of the Spanish Language in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1988) and *Language Shift in the United States* (Berlin: Mouton Publishers, 1983).

Dorothy Waggoner's critique of Veltman appeared in a review of *The Future of the Spanish Language* in *NABE Journal* 13, no. 3 (Spring 1989): 253–61. During the 1990s Waggoner published *Numbers and Needs*, an analytical newsletter on census data relevant to English language learners. Some back issues may be found at [http://www.asu.edu/educ/-sceed/n\\_n/index.html](http://www.asu.edu/educ/-sceed/n_n/index.html).

The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey is described in two articles by Alejandro Portes and Lingxin Hao:

- “*E Pluribus Unum: Bilingualism and Loss of Language in the Second Generation*,” *Sociology of Education* 71 (1998): 269–94; and
- “The Price of Uniformity: Language, Family, and Personality Adjustment in the Immigrant Second Generation,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25 (Nov. 2002): 889–912.

Stephen Krashen's comments about today's levels of diversity are from *Under Attack: The Case against Bilingual Education* (Culver City, Calif.: Language Education Associates, 1996).

Lucy Tse's study of successful biliterates is reported in “*Why Don't They Learn English?*” *Separating Fact from Fallacy in the U.S. Language Debate* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001).

The New York City exit rates for English learners come from Shelley Rappaport's study for the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, *Beyond Bilingual Education: Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners in the New York City Public Schools* (Nov. 2002). The San Francisco study on long-term outcomes is *Performance of Redesignated Fluent-English-Proficient Students* (Feb. 1998), by J. David Ramírez.

Patrick Welsh comments on the work ethic of immigrant students in “*Motivation, Focus Send Foreign-Born Students Soaring*,” *USA Today*, Aug. 25, 2003.

New York State dropout rates for English learners are reported by Catherine Man in “*Should New Immigrants Take Regent Exams?*”: [http://www.insideschools.org/view/-ed\\_elled](http://www.insideschools.org/view/-ed_elled). Russell Rumberger's conclusions on school completion appear in “*Dropping Out of Middle School: A Multilevel Analysis of Students and Schools*,” *American Educational Research Journal* 32 (1995): 583–625.

## Chapter 2. Options for English Learners

The National Research Council provides a broad overview of programs and practices for English learners in Diane August and Kenji Hakuta, eds., *Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children: A Research Agenda* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1997).

A rich resource, not only on bilingual program types but on a multitude of related issues, is Colin Baker and Sylvia Prys Jones, *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 1998).

The study on native-language usage in bilingual programs is Paul Hopstock et al.,

*Descriptive Study of Services to Limited English Proficient Students*, vol. 2, *Survey Results* (Arlington, Va.: Development Associates, 1993).

Lt. Richard Henry Pratt offered his thoughts on immersion in an 1883 address to the World Convention of Baptists; quoted in Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865–1900* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976).

Results of California's annual Language Census since 1980–81 are available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/>.

Daniel Domenech described his sink-or-swim experience to Welsh in "Motivation, Focus." Comments on speak-English-only rules by Edgar Lozano and state senator Joe Bernal appeared in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Excluded Student: Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest*, Mexican American Education Study, Report III, 1972.

A useful overview of program models is Fred Genesee, ed., *Program Alternatives for Linguistically Diverse Students* (Santa Cruz, Calif.: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, 1999). See also Carlos Ovando, Virginia P. Collier, and Mary Carol Combs, *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms: Teaching in Multicultural Contexts*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003); Colin Baker, *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3rd ed. (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2001); and Judith Lessow-Hurley, *Foundations of Dual Language Education* (New York: Longman, 2000).

*ESL/EFL Teaching: Principles for Success* (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heineman, 1998), by Yvonne S. Freeman and David E. Freeman, offers an especially helpful overview of all-English approaches.

The views of José Cárdenas on transitional and maintenance bilingual education are detailed in James Crawford, *Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of "English Only"* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1992).

Stephen Krashen describes the gradual-exit model in *Condemned without a Trial: Bogus Arguments against Bilingual Education* (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann, 1999).

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary's encyclopedic treatment of two-way programs is *Dual Language Education* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2001). Former education secretary Richard W. Riley gave the Clinton administration's blessings to this approach in "Excelencia para Todos – Excellence for All: The Progress of Hispanic Education and the Challenges of a New Century," a speech delivered at Bell Multicultural High School in Washington, D.C., Mar. 15, 2000.

Useful sources on newcomer programs include Monica Friedlander, *The Newcomer Program: Helping Immigrant Students Succeed in U.S. Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1991), and Lorraine M. McDonnell and Paul T. Hill, *Newcomers in American Schools: Meeting the Educational Needs of Immigrant Youth* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1993). Leona Marsh details the newcomer program at Liberty High School in "A Spanish Dual Literacy Program: Teaching to the Whole Student," *Bilingual Research Journal* 19 (1995), nos. 3–4: 409–28.

### Chapter 3. Language Policies in the USA

For a broad overview of this subject, see James Crawford's Language Policy Web Site: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/>. A wealth of information about language issues in Europe can be found at a web site funded by the European Commission, which is known as Mercator: Linguistic Rights and Legislation: <http://www.ciemen.org/mercator/index-gb.htm>. For background about language policies in Australia, see Joseph LoBianco, *National Policy on Languages* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1987). Further information is available through <http://languageaustralia.com.au/>.

For the latest information about Executive Order 13166, see the U.S. Justice Department web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm>.

Various historical documents in the Online Resource Guide are useful in understanding national myths that influenced American attitudes toward language:

- James Madison, *The Federalist*, No. 51 (1788);
- Alexis de Tocqueville, "Unlimited Power of the Majority in the United States, and Its Consequences" (from *Democracy in America*, 1835); and
- Theodore Roosevelt, "Children of the Crucible" (1917).

Geoffrey Nunberg analyzes many of these themes in "The Official English Movement: Reimagining America," in James Crawford, ed., *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). See also Richard B. Morris, *Witnesses at the Creation: Hamilton, Madison, Jay, and the Constitution* (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1985).

Herbert Kelman is quoted in Richard Ruíz's influential article, "Orientations in Language Planning," *NABE Journal* 8, no. 2 (1984): 15–34; rpt. in Sandra Lee McKay and Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, eds., *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?* (Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House, 1988), pp. 3–25.

Nathan Glazer's observation about the paradox of linguistic laissez-faire appears in "The Process and Problems of Language Maintenance: An Integrative Review," in Joshua A. Fishman, ed., *Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups* (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1966; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1978), pp. 358–68.

Milton M. Gordon traces the drive for Anglo-conformity in his seminal work, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). See also John Higham, "Ethnic Pluralism in Modern American Thought," in *Send These to Me: Jews and Other Immigrants in Urban America* (New York: Atheneum, 1975), pp. 196–230.

Rolf Kjolseth analyzes Americans' "schizophrenic" attitudes about language in "Cultural Politics of Bilingualism," *Society*, May–Jun. 1983, pp. 40–48. Noam Chomsky discusses language as a "question of power" in *Language and Responsibility* (New York: Pantheon, 1979).

The *Washington Post* article on U.S.-born English learners was Brigid Schulte, "Trapped Between Two Languages," Jun. 9, 2002.

Fascinating background about English learner programs in Georgia can be found in Stanton Wortham, Enrique G. Murillo Jr., and Edmund T. Hamann, *Education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Westport, Conn.: Ablex Publishing, 2002).

John Hawgood describes German parents' efforts at language maintenance in *The Tragedy of German-America* (New York: Putnam, 1940). The two works by Horace Kallen are "Democracy versus the Melting Pot," *Nation*, Feb. 25, 1915; and *Culture and Democracy in the United States* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1924).

The critical importance of language resources in a time of terrorism is highlighted by the National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland – <http://www-nflc.org/security/background.htm>.

A useful introduction to questions of policy and politics is David L. Weimer and Aidan R. Vining, *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*, 3rd ed. (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1999).

Maxwell F. Yalden describes Francophones' situation in "The Bilingual Experience in Canada," in Martin Ridge, ed., *The New Bilingualism: An American Dilemma* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1981), pp. 71–87. Another useful work on language rights is Reynaldo F. Macías, "Choice of Language as a Human Right: Public Policy Implications in the United States," in Raymond V. Padilla, ed., *Bilingual Education and Public Policy* (Ypsilanti, Mich.: Department of Foreign Languages and Bilingual Studies, Eastern Michigan University, 1979), pp. 39–57.

#### **Chapter 4. A Forgotten Legacy**

A more detailed history of language policy in the United States can be found in Crawford, *Hold Your Tongue*. Various supporting documents are reprinted in Crawford, *Language Loyalties*. See also Crawford, *At War with Diversity: U.S. Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2000).

A comprehensive and readable history of bilingual education is Diego Castellanos, *The Best of Two Worlds: Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the U.S.* (Trenton, N.J.: New Jersey State Department of Education, 1983). Useful anecdotal material may be found in Colman B. Stein, Jr., *Sink or Swim: The Politics of Bilingual Education* (New York: Praeger, 1986).

For researchers of U.S. language policy, the starting point is Heinz Kloss, *The American Bilingual Tradition* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1977; rpt. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems, 1998), which is unmatched for encyclopedic detail about language-minority schooling, particularly before 1968. See also Kloss, "German-American Language Maintenance Efforts," in Fishman, ed., *Language Loyalty in the United States*, pp. 206–52.

Franklin's English-only inclinations are described in Glenn Weaver, "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Germans," in Leonard Dinnerstein and Frederick Jaher, eds., *The Aliens: A History of Ethnic Minorities in America* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), pp. 47–64. See also Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., "Benjamin Franklin and the German Charity Schools," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 99, no. 6 (Dec. 1955): 381–87.

Shirley Brice Heath has traced the history of language attitudes in the colonial era in “A National Language Academy? Debate in the New Nation,” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 11 (1976): 9–43; and “English in Our Language Heritage,” in Charles A. Ferguson and Heath, eds., *Language in the USA* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 6–20. See also Allen Walker Read, “American Projects for an Academy to Regulate Speech,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 51, no. 4 (1936): 1141–79. Noah Webster’s efforts to standardize American English are described in *Dissertations on the English Language* (1789) and Dennis Baron, “Federal English” (1987); both are reprinted in Crawford, *Language Loyalties*, pp. 33–40. See also Baron’s *Grammar and Good Taste: Reforming the American Language* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

Lewis William Newton paints a fascinating picture of conflicts over language policy following the Louisiana Purchase in *The Americanization of French Louisiana: A Study of the Process of Adjustment between the French and the Anglo-American Populations of Louisiana, 1803–1860* (New York: Arno Press, 1980).

For details on language usage by minority groups before and after the American Revolution, see Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Atlantic Migration, 1607–1860: A History of the Continuing Settlement of the United States* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961). Another useful source is Louis B. Wright, *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607–1763* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957).

An excellent study of schooling for German–Americans in the mid-19th century is Stephen L. Schlossman, “Is There an American Tradition of Bilingual Education? German in the Public Elementary Schools, 1840–1919.” *American Journal of Education* 91, no. 2 (1983): 139–86. Joel Perlman’s work (cited above) is also noteworthy.

The Wisconsin and Illinois conflicts over English-only instruction are detailed in Louise Phelps Kellogg, “The Bennett Law in Wisconsin,” *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 2 (1918): 3–25; William F. Whyte, “The Bennett Law Campaign in Wisconsin,” *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 10 (1927): 363–90; and Daniel W. Kucera, *Church-State Relationships in Education in Illinois* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1955).

The nativist poem for the *Atlantic* was by Thomas Bailey Aldrich; quoted in Daniel Boorstin, *Hidden History: Exploring Our Secret Past* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989).

Probably the most prolific writer on language restrictionism in the United States has been Arnold H. Leibowitz. Three important works are “Language as a Means of Social Control: The United States Experience,” paper presented at the 8th World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, Aug. 1974; “English Literacy: Legal Sanction for Discrimination,” *Notre Dame Lawyer* 45, no. 7 (Fall 1969): 7–67; and *The Bilingual Education Act: A Legislative Analysis* (Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1980).

Repression of the German language during and after World War I is well documented in Carl Wittke, *German-Americans and the World War: With Special Emphasis on Ohio’s German-Language Press* (Columbus: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1936), pp. 163–79. See also Hawgood, *The Tragedy of German-America*.

The seminal political and sociological analysis of the Americanization era is John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925*, 2d ed. (New

Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1988). See also Edward George Hartmann, *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948). Ellwood P. Cubberly's views on schooling immigrants are detailed in *Changing Conceptions of Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909). Josué M. González provides insights into ethnic politics and assimilationist pressures in "Coming of Age in Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Historical Perspective," *Inequality in Education* 19 (Feb. 1975): 5–17.

The Language Policy Task Force examines education as an instrument of colonial rule in "Language Policy and the Puerto Rican Community," *Bilingual Review* 5, nos. 1–2 (1978): 1–39. See also Aída Negrón de Montilla, *Americanization in Puerto Rico and the Public-School System, 1900–1930* (Río Piedras, P.R.: Editorial Edil, 1971); and Pastora San Juan Cafferty and Carmen Rivera-Martínez, *The Politics of Language: The Dilemma of Bilingual Education for Puerto Ricans* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1981).

For analyses of linguistic repression directed at American Indians, see Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy – A National Challenge*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969); Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder, *A History of Indian Education* (Billings: Eastern Montana College, 1989); and James Park, "Historical Foundations of Language Policy: The Nez Percé, Case," in Robert St. Clair and William Leap, eds., *Language Renewal among American Indian Tribes: Issues, Problems, and Prospects* (Rosslyn, Va: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1982). An excellent account of Indian education reform in the John Collier era can be found in Margaret Connell Szasz, *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination Since 1928* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977).

Leonard Pitt documents ethnic conflicts in early California in *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846–1890* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966). The modern Chicano experience is described by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Excluded Student*. See also Mario T. García, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930–1960* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); and Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "Let All of Them Take Heed": *Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910–1981* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987). Lyndon B. Johnson's enforcement of English-only rules is chronicled by Robert Caro in *The Path to Power* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

Stephen Steinberg critiques cultural theories of school failure in *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

On the misclassification of language-minority children, see Alba A. Ortiz and James R. Yates, "Incidence of Exceptionality among Hispanics: Implications for Manpower Planning," *NABE Journal* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1983): 41–53.

Kenji Hakuta details the Coral Way experiment and analyzes its outcomes in *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism* (New York: Basic Books, 1986). For additional details, see William Francis Mackey and Von Nieda Beebe, *Bilingual Schools for a Bicultural Community: Miami's Adaptation to the Cuban Refugees* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1977).



## Chapter 5. The Evolution of Federal Policy

In their general histories, Castellanos, Kloss, and Stein describe the political circumstances surrounding the passage of Title VII. The educational context is sketched in *The Invisible Minority: Report of the NEA–Tucson Survey* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966). Leibowitz summarizes the law's subsequent development in *The Bilingual Education Act*. See also Carlos J. Ovando, "Bilingual Education in the United States: Historical Development and Current Issues," *Bilingual Research Journal* 27, no. 1 (Spring 2003).

For details of state legislation in the 1970s, see Tracy C. Gray, H. Suzanne Convery, and Katherine M. Fox, *The Current Status of Bilingual Education Legislation, Bilingual Education Series*, no. 9 (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981). See also Kloss, *American Bilingual Tradition*.

Key documents from this era, included in the Online Resource Guide, include:

- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Memorandum to School Districts with More Than Five Percent National Origin-Minority Group Children" (1970);
- *Lau v. Nichols* (Supreme Court, 1974);
- U.S. Office for Civil Rights, "Task-Force Findings Specifying Remedies Available for Eliminating Past Educational Practices Ruled Unlawful under *Lau v. Nichols*" (Lau Remedies, 1975);
- *Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools* (10th Circuit Court of Appeals, 1974); and
- *Castañeda v. Pickard* (5th Circuit Court of Appeals, 1981).

Fascinating details about the civil-rights context are provided in *Revisiting the Lau Decision: 20 Years After* (Oakland, Calif.: ARC Associates, 1996). Martin Gerry's recollections about drafting the Lau Remedies appear in Thomas Toch, "The Emerging Politics of Language," *Education Week*, Feb. 8, 1984, pp. 1, 12–16.

Noel Epstein's influential attack on bilingual education, *Language, Ethnicity, and the Schools: Policy Alternatives for Bilingual-Bicultural Education* (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977), includes thoughtful responses by José A. Cárdenas and Gary Orfield.

A helpful article in untangling the legal issues is Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, "Educational Rights of Language Minorities," in McKay and Wong, *Language Diversity*. Complete texts of several precedent-setting court decisions are reprinted in Arnold H. Leibowitz, ed., *Federal Recognition of the Rights of Minority Language Groups* (Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1982).

For a detailed analysis of Office for Civil Rights activity under the Reagan administration, see James Crawford, "U.S. Enforcement of Bilingual Plans Declines Sharply," *Education Week*, Jun. 4, 1986.

Congressional hearings on Title VII, its periodic reauthorizations, and related issues are a treasure trove of information about federal policy and about the condition of bilingual education over the past three decades. The more significant of these include:

- Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967), hearing on S 428; rpt. by Arno Press (New York: 1978).
- House Education and Labor Committee, General Subcommittee on Education, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967), hearings on HR 9840 and HR 10224; rpt. by Arno Press (New York: 1978).
- Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess. (1970), hearings on Mexican American Education.
- Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Subcommittees on Education and Human Resources, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess. (1973), joint hearing on bilingual education, health, and manpower programs; rpt. by Arno Press (New York: 1978).
- Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities, 97th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1982), hearing on S 2002.

## Chapter 6. English Only or English Plus?

The debate over the English Language Amendment and, more generally, over bilingualism in the United States has produced a voluminous literature since 1983. Analyses, editorials, legislation, court decisions, and organizational positions on both sides of the issue are reprinted in Crawford, *Language Loyalties*, along with information about the English Plus alternative; *Hold Your Tongue* offers the author's own overview of language politics in the United States. See also Harvey A. Daniels, ed., *Not Only English: Affirming America's Multilingual Heritage* (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1990); Karen L. Adams and Daniel T. Brink, eds., *Perspectives on Official English: The Campaign for English as the Official Language of the U.S.A.* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990); Dennis Baron, *The English Only Question: An Official Language For Americans?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Roseann Dueñas González, ed., *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement* (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English and Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000); and Carol L. Schmid, *The Politics of Language: Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

The charge that Hispanics are resisting English is elaborated by Gerda Bikales and Gary Imhoff in *A Kind of Discordant Harmony: Issues in Assimilation*, Discussion Series, no. 2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. English, 1985). Bikales outlines her views immigration in remarks at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Mar. 12, 1987. Imhoff carries these arguments further in a book he coauthored with Colorado Governor Richard D. Lamm, *The Immigration Time Bomb: The Fragmenting of America* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1985).

The intimate ties between U.S. English and the immigration-restrictionist lobby are documented in William Trombley, "Prop. 63 Roots Traced to Small Michigan City," *Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 20, 1986, Pt. I, pp. 3, 20–21; and Laird Harrison, "U.S. English's Links to Anti-Immigration Groups," *Asian Week*, Aug. 15, 1986, pp. 1, 21. See also Trombley, "Norman Cousins Drops His Support of Prop. 63," *Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 16, 1986, Pt. I, p. 3.

Linda Chávez, as president of U.S. English, outlined her views in “English: Our Common Bond,” speech to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council, Dec. 4, 1987. The “cultural conservative” educational philosophy, which underlies attacks on bilingual education by Chávez and others, is elaborated in E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs To Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), pp. 92–93, 232–33.

Events leading to the resignations of Chávez, Walter Cronkite, and John Tanton as officers of U.S. English are detailed in Crawford, *Hold Your Tongue*.

Joshua A. Fishman looks at the movement’s social psychology in “‘English Only’: Its Ghosts, Myths, and Dangers,” paper presented at the 12th annual conference of the California Association for Bilingual Education, Anaheim, Jan. 30, 1987, excerpted in Crawford, *Language Loyalties*, pp. 165–70. See also Ana Celia Zentella, “Language Politics in the U.S.A.: The English-Only Movement,” in Betty Jean Craige, ed., *Literature, Language, and Politics* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), pp. 39–53.

Linguists from several countries attack the notion of an official language for the United States in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 60 (1986), a special issue devoted to “The Question of an Official Language: Language Rights and the English Language Amendment.” The lead article is by David F. Marshall, with responses by Tom McArthur, Eric Maldoff, Michael Clyne, Shirley Brice Heath and Lawrence Krasner, Heinz Kloss, Kathryn A. Woolard, and James E. Alatis.

Other noteworthy criticisms include: Mary Carol Combs and John Trasviña, “Legal Implications of the English Language Amendment,” in *The English Only Movement: An Agenda for Discrimination* (Washington, D.C.: League of United Latin American Citizens, 1986); Geoffrey Nunberg, “An ‘Official Language’ for California?” *New York Times*, Oct. 2, 1986; Roseann Dueñas González, Alice A. Schott, and Victoria F. Vásquez, “The English Language Amendment: Examining Myths,” *English Journal*, Mar. 1988, pp. 24–30; Elliot L. Judd, “The English Language Amendment: A Case Study on Language and Politics,” *TESOL Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (Mar. 1987): 113–35; and Amado M. Padilla et al., “The English Only Movement: Myths, Reality, and Implications for Psychology,” *Journal of the American Psychological Association* 46, no. 2 (Feb. 1991): 20–30.

Rosalie Porter’s *Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education* was published by Basic Books (New York: 1990). Keith Baker reviews the book in “*Forked Tongue’s* Forked Tongue,” unpublished article, 1990. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., confounds bilingual with multicultural and Afro-centric education in *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York: Norton, 1992).

Several Congressional hearings have been held on the Official English question, including:

- Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on the Constitution, 98th Cong., 2nd Sess., hearing on SJ Res 167, Jun. 12, 1984.
- House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, 100th Cong., 2nd Sess., hearing on HJ Res 13, 33, 60, and 83, May 11, 1988.
- Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, 104th Cong., 1st & 2nd Sess., hearings on S 356, Dec. 6, 1995, and Mar. 7, 1996.

For an excellent history and analysis of English Plus, see Mary Carol Combs, "English Plus: Responding to English Only," in Crawford, *Language Loyalties*, pp. 216–24. Further information on English Plus and a wide range of policy issues is provided by Rosa Castro Feinberg, *Bilingual Education: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2002.

Editorials favorable to Secretary Bennett's "bilingual education initiative" include the *New York Times*, "Language Is the Melting Pot," Sept. 27, 1985, and the *Washington Post*, "Secretary Bennett Makes Sense," Sept. 27, 1985.

Criticisms of Bennett's position may be found in James J. Lyons, "Education Secretary Bennett on Bilingual Education: Mixed Up or Malicious?" *NABE News* 9, no. 1 (Fall 1985): 1, 14; José, A. Cárdenas, "Education Secretary Bennett and the Big Lie," *Intercultural Development Research Association Newsletter*, Oct. 1985, pp. 7–8; and "A Forked Tongue," *Miami Herald*, Sept. 29, 1985, p. 2E.

Two 1987 reports by the U.S. General Accounting Office that played a role in the legislative battles that year are *Bilingual Education: A New Look at the Research Evidence*, GAO/PEMD-87-12BR, and *Bilingual Education: Information on Limited English Proficient Students*, GAO/HRD-87-85BR. See also U.S. House Education and Labor Committee, *A Compendium of Papers on the Topic of Bilingual Education*, serial no. 99-R (Jun. 1986).

Policy controversies during Bennett's tenure are recounted in *Education Week* articles by James Crawford: "Bilingual-Education Proposals Spark Politically Charged Debate," Feb. 12, 1986; "Bennett Proposes Bilingual Legislation," Mar. 12, 1986; "Immersion Method Is Faring Poorly in Bilingual Study," Apr. 23, 1986; "Lawmakers, Lobbyists Challenge E.D.'s Bilingual-Education Data," Apr. 30, 1986; "Bennett Pushes Bilingual Bill in Congress," Jun. 11, 1986; "Bilingual-Ed. Measure Is Vetoed in California," Oct. 8, 1986; "G.A.O. Refutes Bennett's Criticism of Bilingual Education," Nov. 19, 1986; "Finn Criticizes G.A.O.'s Handling of Bilingual Study," Jan. 14, 1987; "E.D.'s Bilingual-Education Plan Faces Second Test in Congress," Jan. 21, 1987; "Battle Lines Redrawn over Bilingual Education," Apr. 1, 1987; "Bilingual Educators Challenge E.D.'s 'English Only' Proposal," Apr. 15, 1987; "Accord Is Reached on Bill to Extend Bilingual-Ed. Act," Apr. 29, 1987; "Senate Panel Would Expand Bilingual-Ed. Funding Options," May 13, 1987.

Lyons's letter on the 1988 House-Senate conference deliberations on reauthorizing Title VII is reprinted in *NABE News* 11, no. 6 (Apr. 1988). Relevant Congressional hearings include:

- Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities, 99th Cong., 2nd Sess., hearing on S 2256, Jun. 4, 1986.
- House Education and Labor Committee, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, 100th Cong., 1st Sess., hearing on HR 1755, Mar. 24, 1987.

The Stanford Working Group's report, released in June 1993, is Kenji Hakuta, ed., *Federal Education Programs for Limited-English-Proficient Students: A Blueprint for the Second Generation* – <http://www.nclae.gwu.edu/miscpubs/blueprint.htm>.

## Chapter 7. The Effectiveness Debate

The politicization of bilingual education research is critiqued in August and Hakuta, *Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children*, chap. 6, “Program Evaluation.” Barry McLaughlin summarizes and rebuts many of the popular misconceptions surrounding bilingualism in *Second-Language Acquisition in Childhood*, 2d ed. (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1984).

The American Institutes for Research study – Malcolm N. Danoff et al., *Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs* – had two significant installments: vol. 1, *Study Design and Interim Findings* (1977) and vol. 3, *Year Two Impact Data, Educational Process, and In-Depth Analysis* (1978). For criticisms of this first major evaluation of Title VII, see Tracy C. Gray and M. Beatriz Arias, “Challenge to the AIR Report,” Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978; Rudolph C. Troike, “Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education,” *NABE Journal* 3, no. 1 (1978): 13–24; Merrill Swain, “Bilingual Education: Research and Implications,” Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979; and Heidi Dulay and Marina Burt, *Bilingual Education: A Close Look at its Effects*, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education Focus Series, no. 1 (1979).

Jim Cummins describes alternative research models in *Language, Power, and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2000). Rudolph Troike stresses the importance of longitudinal studies of bilingual education in “Synthesis of Research on Bilingual Education,” *Educational Leadership* 14 (Mar. 1981): 498–504.

Keith A. Baker and Adriana A. de Kanter question the effectiveness of Title VII programs in “Federal Policy and the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education,” which appears in a volume they edited, *Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1983). The literature review by Laraine T. Zappert and Roberto B. Cruz is *Bilingual Education: An Appraisal of Empirical Research* (Berkeley, Calif.: Bay Area Bilingual Education League, 1977).

Kenji Hakuta and Catherine E. Snow elaborate the lessons of basic research in “The Role of Research in Policy Decisions about Bilingual Education,” *NABE News* 9, no. 3 (Spring 1986): 1, 18–21 (rpt. in House Education and Labor Committee, *Compendium of Papers*). See also Carrol E. Moran and Kenji Hakuta, “Bilingual Education: Broadening Research Perspectives,” in James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks, eds., *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1995), pp. 445–62.

Chester E. Finn’s argument about the burden of proof in bilingual education research appears in an appendix to the 1987 GAO report, *Bilingual Education: A New Look at the Research Evidence*, pp. 63–70.

For a different view on the role of theory in educational research, see Cummins, *Language, Power, and Pedagogy*, and Stephen Krashen, *Inquiries and Insights: Second Language Learning, Immersion & Bilingual Education, Literacy* (Hayward, Calif.: Alemany Press, 1985). Karl Popper’s major articles on the philosophy of science can be found in David Miller, ed., *Popper Selections* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985).

There are two versions of the Baker–de Kanter report. The earlier one – Keith A.

Baker and Adriana A. de Kanter, *Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature* (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, 1981) – received wide publicity in unpublished form but was never officially released. “Federal Policy and the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education,” as published in *Bilingual Education*, is more concise and accessible; this 1983 version is relied upon here.

Ann C. Willig has produced the most influential critique of Baker and de Kanter, “A Meta-Analysis of Selected Studies on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education,” *Review of Educational Research* 55, no. 3 (Fall 1985): 269–317. See also Willig, “The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: Review of a Report,” *NABE Journal* 6, nos. 2–3 (Winter/Spring 1981–82): 1–19. An exchange between Baker and Willig on their points of disagreement appears in the *Review of Educational Research* 57, no. 3 (Fall 1987): 351–76.

The literature review by Christine Rossell and Keith Baker is “The Educational Effectiveness of Bilingual Education,” *Research in the Teaching of English* 30, no. 1 (1996): 7–74. Jay P. Greene’s reanalysis of their conclusions is described in “A Meta-Analysis of the Rossell and Baker Review of Bilingual Education Research,” *Bilingual Research Journal* 21, nos. 2–3 (1997). Krashen’s critique can be found in *Under Attack*.

## Chapter 8. Basic Research on Language Acquisition

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages reports statistics on Americans’ limited linguistic abilities in *ACTFL Public Awareness Network Newsletter* 6, no. 3 (May 1987).

Historical overviews and theories of language education may be found in Barry McLaughlin, *Second-Language Acquisition*, and Stephen D. Krashen and Tracy D. Terrell, *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom* (Hayward, Calif.: Alemany Press, 1983). See also Charles A. Ferguson, “Linguistic Theory,” in *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives*, vol. 2, *Linguistics* (Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977). Wilga M. Rivers makes a case for the audiolingual method in *Teaching Foreign Language Skills* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

An accessible introduction to Noam Chomsky’s work, presented in the form of an extended interview, is *Language and Responsibility*. For a discussion of the “language faculty,” see his *Language and Problems of Knowledge: The Managua Lectures* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988). See also John Lyons, *Noam Chomsky*, rev. ed. (New York: Viking Press, 1970). Jeff MacSwan and Kellie Rolstad offer a Chomskyan view of the language faculty in “Linguistic Diversity, Schooling, and Social Class: Rethinking Our Conception of Language Proficiency in Language Minority Education,” in Christina Bratt Paulston and G. Richard Tucker, eds., *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003). Kenji Hakuta discusses Chomsky’s relationship to psycholinguistic research in *Mirror of Language*, pp. 109–11.

Ellen Bialystok and Hakuta evaluate the critical period hypothesis in *In Other Words: The Science and Psychology of Second-Language Acquisition* (New York: Basic Books, 1994). See also Hakuta, Bialystok, and Edward Wiley, “Critical Evidence: A Test of the Critical Period Hypothesis for Second Language Acquisition,” *Psychological Science*, Jan. 2003.

Lily Wong Fillmore and Barry McLaughlin's study of variability in second-language acquisition is *Learning English through Bilingual Instruction: Final Report to the National Institute of Education* (NIE-80-0030), 1985. The findings are summarized by Wong Fillmore in "Teachability and Second Language Acquisition," in R. Schiefelbusch and M. Rice, eds., *The Teachability of Language* (Baltimore: Paul Brookes, 1989), pp. 311–32. See also Wong Fillmore, "Second-Language Learning in Children: A Model of Language Learning in Social Context," in Ellen Bialystok, ed., *Language Processing in Bilingual Children* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 49–69.

An early summary of basic research on second-language acquisition, along with its implications for the bilingual classroom, can be found in a book compiled by California's state Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education: *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework* (Los Angeles: California State University, 1981). This collection includes Jim Cummins, "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students"; Stephen D. Krashen, "Bilingual Education and Second Language Acquisition Theory"; Dorothy Legaretta-Marcaida, "Effective Use of the Primary Language in the Classroom"; Tracy D. Terrell, "The Natural Approach in Bilingual Education"; and Eleanor W. Thonis, "Reading Instruction for Language Minority Students."

Krashen discusses the input hypothesis and related issues in a series of absorbing essays, *Inquiries and Insights*. He outlines and documents his theory more formally in *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications* (London: Longman, 1985) and *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982). See also his *Bilingual Education: A Focus on Current Research*, Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, no. 3 (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1991).

Cummins further elaborates his theories – and responds to critics – in "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention," *Harvard Educational Review* 56, no. 1 (Feb. 1986): 18–36; *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society* (Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education, 1996); and *Language, Power, and Pedagogy*.

For more on the distinctions between "immigrant minorities" and "caste minorities," see John U. Ogbu and María Eugenia Matute-Bianchi, "Understanding Sociocultural Factors: Knowledge, Identity, and School Adjustment," in *Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1986), pp. 73–142.

Rossell and Baker attack the so-called "facilitation hypothesis" in "The Educational Effectiveness of Bilingual Education."

MacSwan's critique of Cummins's theory is "The Threshold Hypothesis, Semilingualism, and Other Contributions to a Deficit View of Linguistic Minorities," *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 22, no. 1 (2000): 3–45. William Labov's refutation of verbal deprivation theory, "The Logic of Nonstandard English," originally appeared in *Georgetown Monographs on Language and Linguistics* 22 (1969); rpt. in Pier Paolo Giglioli, ed., *Language and Social Context* (Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin Books, 1972). See also

MacSwan and Rolstad, “Linguistic Diversity, Schooling, and Social Class,” and Kellie Rolstad, “Second language Instructional Competence,” in Kara McAlister et al., eds., *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press, in press).

Barry McLaughlin elaborates his critique of Krashen’s work in *Theories of Second-Language Learning* (London: Edward Arnold, 1987). Krashen responds to these and other objections in “The Input Hypothesis and Its Rivals,” in Nick C. Ellis, ed., *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages* (London: Academic Press, 1994). See also Krashen, *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use: The Taipei Lectures* (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann, 2003).

Hakuta reviews the research on bilingualism and cognition in *Mirror of Language*. See also Bialystok and Hakuta, *In Other Words*.

## Chapter 9. Considering Program Alternatives

A helpful introduction to immersion – its theoretical underpinnings, the development of program models in Canada and the United States, and arguments about its appropriateness for language-minority students – is provided in *Studies on Immersion Education: A Collection for United States Educators* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, 1984). This anthology includes Wallace E. Lambert, “An Overview of Issues in Immersion Education”; Fred Genesee, “Historical and Theoretical Foundations of Immersion Education”; and Eduardo Hernández-Chávez, “The Inadequacy of English Immersion Education as an Educational Approach for Language Minority Students in the United States.”

The genesis and development of French immersion is described in detail by Lambert and G. Richard Tucker, *Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972). Tucker argues that the Canadian immersion model is inappropriate for language-minority children in “Implications of Canadian Research for Promoting a Language Competent American Society,” in Joshua A. Fishman, ed., *The Fergusonian Impact*, vol. 2, *Sociolinguistics and the Sociology of Language* (Berlin: Mouton, 1986).

Keith Baker and Adriana de Kanter’s arguments for the time-on-task hypothesis can be found in *Bilingual Education*. See also Christine H. Rossell and J. Michael Ross, “The Social Science Evidence on Bilingual Education,” *Journal of Law and Education* 15 (1986) 385–418; and Rosalie Porter, *Forked Tongue*.

Philadelphia’s ESOL Plus Immersion program and the controversy surrounding it are described in Martha Woodall, “As Refugees’ Grades Sink, English Immersion Faulted,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Mar. 30, 1986, pp. 1B, 8B.

Baker and Willig’s differences over program definitions may be found in their exchange in the *Review of Educational Research*, Fall 1987.

The El Paso pilot program is described in El Paso Independent School District, Office for Research and Evaluation, “Bilingual Education Program Evaluation: 1986–87 School Year,” Jul. 1987. Robert Rosier’s erroneous characterization appears in the “Twelfth Annual Report of the National Advisory and Coordinating Council on Bilingual Educa-



tion,” Mar. 31, 1988. The READ study by Russell Gersten et al. is “Bilingual Immersion: A Longitudinal Evaluation of the El Paso Program” (1993).

Gersten and John Woodward discuss the limited research evidence that exists on English-only immersion approaches in “A Case for Structured Immersion,” *Educational Leadership*, Sept. 1985, pp. 75–79, 83–84. See also Ramón L. Santiago’s response in the same issue, “Understanding Bilingual Education – or The Sheep in Wolf’s Clothing,” pp. 79–83.

As released in 1991, the Ramírez study’s full reference is: J. David Ramírez, Sandra D. Yuen, and Dena R. Ramey, *Final Report: Longitudinal Study of Structured Immersion Strategy, Early-Exit, and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language-Minority Children* (San Mateo, Calif.: Aguirre International, 1991). For analyses of, and debate over, its findings, see the *Bilingual Research Journal* 16, nos. 1 & 2 (Winter/Spring 1992).

The review of the Ramírez study by the National Research Council is summarized in Michael M. Meyer and Stephen E. Fienberg, eds., *Assessing Evaluation Studies: The Case of Bilingual Education Strategies* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1992).

The research on Fairfax County’s ESL-only program was conducted by Virginia P. Collier and Wayne P. Thomas, who describe their findings in “Acquisition of Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency: A Six-Year Study,” paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Apr. 7, 1988. See also Collier, “Age and Rate of Acquisition of Second Language for Academic Purposes,” *TESOL Quarterly* 21, no. 4 (Dec. 1987): 617–41. Reactions by the school district and others are reported in James Crawford, “Study Challenges ‘Model’ E.S.L. Program’s Effectiveness,” *Education Week*, Apr. 27, 1988.

Stephen Krashen outlines his theory of de facto bilingual education in *Under Attack*.

The Arizona study on the time required for second-language acquisition is Lisa C. Pray and Jeff MacSwan, “Different Question, Same Answer: How Long Does It Take for English Learners to Acquire Proficiency?” a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Apr. 4, 2002. The Stanford University study on this topic is Kenji Hakuta, Yuko Goto Butler, and Daria Witt, *How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: Linguistic Minority Research Institute, 2000).

Rudolph Troike’s comments about late-exit programs appear in “Synthesis of Research on Bilingual Education.”

The Thomas-Collier reports are *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students* (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1997) and *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students’ Long-Term Academic Achievement: Final Report* (Santa Cruz, Calif.: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, 2002). Christine Rossell criticizes the 1997 study in “Mystery on the Bilingual Express,” *READ Perspectives* 6 (1999).

The controlled study in Dade County, Florida, is D. Kimbrough Oller and Rebecca E. Eilers, eds., *Language and Literacy in Bilingual Children* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2002).

## Chapter 10. The Case Studies Project

The most comprehensive description of this program is California State Department of Education, *Case Studies in Bilingual Education: Second Year Report* (1984–85), evaluation report to the U.S. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (Federal Grant #G008303723), May 1986.

Implications of basic research for curriculum design are developed in California Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, *Basic Principles for the Education of Language-Minority Students: An Overview* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1983).

A detailed analysis of student scores in Case Studies schools and other exemplary programs is provided in Stephen Krashen and Douglas Biber, *On Course: Bilingual Education's Success in California* (Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education, 1988). See also F. Samaniego and L. Eubank, *A Statistical Analysis of California's Case Study Project in Bilingual Education* (Davis: University of California, Intercollegiate Division of Statistics, 1991).

For a summary of early experience in replicating the Eastman/Case Studies model, see Jesús Salazar, *Eastman Curriculum Design Project, 1986–87, First Year Implementation Report*, Publication no. 512, Los Angeles Unified School District, Research and Evaluation Branch, Feb. 1988.

## Chapter 11. Indian Language Education

Michael Krauss quantifies the threat to endangered languages, including those spoken by Native Americans, in “The World’s Languages in Crisis,” *Language* 68, no. 1 (Mar. 1992): 6–10. In the same issue, see also Lucille J. Watahomigie and Akira Y. Yamamoto, “Local Reactions to Perceived Language Decline,” pp. 10–17; and Ken Hale, “Language Endangerment and the Human Value of Linguistic Diversity,” pp. 35–42. An excellent overview of the problem is Ofelia Zepeda and Jane H. Hill, “The Condition of Native American Languages in the United States,” in Robert H. Robins and Eugenius M. Uhlenbeck, eds., *Endangered Languages* (Oxford: Berg, 1991).

Leanne Hinton provides a unique and readable account of language preservation efforts now under way in *Flutes of Fire: Essays on California Indian Languages* (Berkeley, Calif.: Heyday Books, 1994). See also Gina Cantoni, ed., *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages* (Flagstaff, Ariz.: Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University, 1996).

For more perspective on these issues from the author, see James Crawford, “Endangered Native American Languages: What Is To Be Done, and Why?” and “Seven Hypotheses on Language Loss,” in *At War with Diversity*.

William L. Leap describes the unique language situation of American Indian children in “Title VII and the Role It Plays in Indian Education: A Background Statement,” paper for the National Conference of American Indians, 1982. See also his *American Indian English* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993), and Bea Medicine, “Speaking Indian”: *Parameters of Language Use Among American Indians*, Focus series, no. 6, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Mar. 1981.

Steve Chesarek’s research on the influence of native language development on later

school achievement is summarized in “Cognitive Consequences of Home or School Education in a Limited Second Language: A Case Study in the Crow Indian Bilingual Community,” paper presented at the Language Proficiency Assessment Symposium, Airlie, Va., Mar. 1981.

For a detailed description of the Crow Agency bilingual program (although the district is not identified by name), see “A Well-Organized Indian Project,” in *ESEA Title VII Case Studies* (Arlington, Va.: Development Associates, 1983), pp. 111–29.

A wealth of information about Navajo bilingual programs may be found in a special issue of the *Bilingual Research Journal* 19, no. 1 (Winter 1995), including Sally Begay et al., “Change from the Inside Out: A Story of the Transformation in a Navajo Community School,” pp. 121–39; Agnes and Wayne Holm, “Navajo Education: Retrospect and Prospects,” pp. 141–67; and Daniel McLaughlin, “Strategies for Enabling Bilingual Program Development in American Indian Schools,” pp. 169–78.

For detailed, first-person accounts of bilingual education at Rock Point, see the Holms’ “Rock Point, A Navajo Way to Go to School,” *Annals of the American Association of Political & Social Science* 508 (1990): 170–84; and McLaughlin’s *When Literacy Empowers: Navajo Language in Print* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992).

Teresa L. McCarty relates the complex and compelling story of Rough Rock in “School as Community: The Rough Rock Demonstration,” *Harvard Educational Review* 59, no. 4 (Nov. 1989): 484–503. See also McCarty, *A Place To Be Navajo: Rough Rock and the Struggle for Self-Determination* (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002); Galena Sells Dick and Teresa L. McCarty, “Reclaiming Navajo: Language Renewal in an American Indian Community School,” in Nancy H. Hornberger, ed., *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997); and John Collier, Jr., “Survival at Rough Rock: A Historical Overview of Rough Rock Demonstration School,” *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 19 (1988): 253–69.

For an overview of Indian bilingual education policy, see McCarty, “Federal Language Policy and American Indian Education,” *Bilingual Research Journal* 17, nos. 1 & 2 (Spring 1993): 13–34. See also Jon Reyhner, ed., *Teaching American Indian Students* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992).

Joshua Fishman provides a worldwide perspective on the problem of language loss and efforts to solve it in *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 1991). See also Fishman’s edited volume, *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2001).

Details of the Pūnana Leo immersion program may be found in Larry Lindsey Kimura, “The Hawaiian Language and Its Revitalization,” in Freda Ahenakew and Shirley Fredeen, eds., *Our Languages: Our Survival, Proceedings of the 7th Annual Native American Languages Issues Institute* (Saskatoon: Saskatchewan Indian Languages Institute, 1987). Robert Bunge, “Language: The Psyche of a People,” appeared in the same volume. See also William G. Demmert, Jr., “Language, Learning, and National Goals: A Native American View,” in Center for Applied Linguistics, *The National Education Goals: The Issues of Language and Culture* (Washington, D.C.: CAL, 1992), pp. 25–33.

## Chapter 12. Two-Way Bilingualism

The estimate for speakers of English worldwide comes from the English Speaking Union, cited in Chris Redman, "Wanna Speak English?" *Time Europe*, Jun. 24, 2002. See also Chinese Language Teachers Association, *CLTA Newsletter* 25, no. 2 (Sept. 2001), and Jamie B. Draper and June H. Hicks, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 2000: Summary Report* (Yonkers, N.Y.: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2002).

Then-Representative Paul Simon, a member of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (1979), documented the sad state of our linguistic resources in *The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis* (New York: Continuum, 1980). See also Catherine E. Snow and Kenji Hakuta, "The Costs of Mono-lingualism," in Crawford, *Language Loyalties*, pp. 394–94.

Russell N. Campbell and Kathryn J. Lindholm of the Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR) make a case for two-way bilingual education in *Conservation of Language Resources*, Educational Report Series, no. 6 (Los Angeles: University of California, CLEAR, 1987). See also two related publications by CLEAR: Marguerite Ann Snow, *Innovative Second Language Education: Bilingual Immersion Programs*, Educational Report Series, no. 1 (1986); and Lindholm's *Directory of Bilingual Immersion Programs: Two-Way Bilingual Education for Language Minority and Majority Students*, Educational Report Series, no. 8 (1987).

The Center for Applied Linguistics compiles an annual *Directory of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs in the U.S.*: <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory/>.

G. Richard Tucker explains how two-way programs serve both language-majority and language-minority students in "Encouraging the Development of Bilingual Proficiency for English-Speaking Americans," Center for Applied Linguistics, Jun. 1986.

Sidney Morison describes the rationale for launching a two-way program at New York City's P.S. 84 in "Two-Way Bilingual Education: The Time Has Come," paper presented at the 17th annual conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Houston, Apr. 30, 1988. See also Morison, "A Spanish-English Dual Language Program in New York City," *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science* 508 (1995): 160–69.

Campbell, who helped design the Culver City Spanish immersion program in the early 1970s, outlines its history and effects in "The Immersion Approach to Foreign Language Teaching," in California Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, *Studies on Immersion Education*, pp. 114–43. Also in that volume, Merrill Swain voices theoretical objections to teaching literacy simultaneously in two languages in "A Review of Immersion Education in Canada: Research and Evaluation Studies," pp. 87–112.

Rebecca Freeman's ethnographic study of the Oyster School is *Bilingual Education and Social Change* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 1998). Greg Toppo describes parents camping out in the snow to enroll their children in "Unique Public Schools Highlighted," *Los Angeles Times*, Feb. 24, 2002. Virginia Collier traces the outcomes of Oyster graduates in

“Two-Way Bilingual Programs: The Longitudinal Impact of Integrated Majority-Minority Bilingual Classes on Majority Students’ Attitudes and Career Goals,” paper presented at the annual meeting of Advocates for Language Learning, Washington, D.C., Oct. 17, 1987.

Guadalupe Valdes expresses reservations about the two-way model in “Dual-Language Immersion Programs: A Cautionary Note Concerning the Education of Language-Minority Students,” *Harvard Educational Review* 67, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 391–429.

Fred Genesee analyzes San Diego’s experiment in two-way total immersion in “Considering Two-Way Bilingual Programs,” *Equity and Choice* 3, no. 3 (Spring 1987): 3–7. The program’s effects on student achievement are reported in Krashen and Biber, *On Course*.

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary provides the most comprehensive overview of two-way programs to date in *Dual Language Education* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2001).

Deborah L. Gold compiles useful details about two-way programs and policymakers’ responses in “2 Languages, One Aim: ‘Two-Way’ Learning,” *Education Week*, Jan. 20, 1988, pp. 7, 24–25.

The evaluation of the Key School partial dual immersion program appears in Donna Christian, Christopher L. Montone, Kathryn J. Lindholm, and Isolda Carranza, *Profiles in Two-Way Immersion Education* (McHenry, Ill.: Delta Systems, 1997).

The Thomas-Collier data in Houston are reported in *A National Study of School Effectiveness*.

Stephen Krashen expresses cautious optimism about two-way bilingual education in “The Acquisition of Academic English by Children in Two-Way Programs: What Does the Research Say?” unpublished, Oct. 2003.

### Chapter 13. Disaster at the Polls

Initial coverage of the Ninth Street School boycott appeared in the *Los Angeles Times*, Feb. 13–26, 1996. Another side of the story was provided by James Crawford, “The Ninth Street Myth: Who Speaks for Latino Parents?” an article syndicated by the Hispanic Link News Service, May 25, 1998.

The National Research Council report is August and Hakuta, eds., *Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children*. Charles Glenn’s “political spin” on the report is posted at <http://www.ceousa.org/READ/nrc.html>. Hakuta responds at <http://ourworld.com-putserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/hakuta.htm>.

For more on the changing face of the English-only movement, see Crawford, “Boom to Bust: Official English in the 1990s” and “The Proposition 227 Campaign: A Post Mortem,” in *At War with Diversity*.

Ron Unz outlines his strategic ideas for Republicans in “Immigration or the Welfare State: Which Is Our Real Enemy?” published in the Heritage Foundation journal *Policy Review*, Fall 1994. Peter Salins’s *Assimilation, American Style* was published by Basic Books (New York: 1997).

Stephen Krashen’s campaign experience is detailed in “The Two Goals of Bilingual

Education: Development of Academic English and Heritage Language Development,” in Josefina V. Tinajero and Robert A. DeVillar, *The Power of Two Languages 2000: Effective Use Across the Curriculum* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2000).

Unz makes his case against bilingual education on a campaign Web site: <http://one-nation.org/>. Commentaries, analysis, debates, poetry, opinion polls, research briefs, study guides, resource links, and an archive news articles on Proposition 227 can be found at <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/unz.htm>.

## Chapter 14. No Child Left Untested

The *Sacramento Bee* article is Janine DeFao, “Choice Looms: Fix or End Bilingual Education System,” Oct. 5, 1997.

David Berliner and Bruce Biddle debunk the claims and conclusions of *A Nation at Risk* in *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America’s Public Schools* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1995). See also Gerald Bracey, “20 Years of School Bashing,” *Washington Post*, Apr. 25, 2003.

Jonathan Kozol’s *Savage Inequalities* was published by Crown Publishers (New York: 1991).

Thomas Toch provides a useful account of 1980s school reform efforts in *In the Name of Excellence: The Struggle to Reform the Nation’s Schools, Why It’s Failing, and What Should Be Done* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). A discussion of the movement’s limitations can be found in Marshall S. Smith and Jennifer O’Day, “Systemic School Reform,” *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*, 1990, pp. 233–67.

For a history of the standards-and-goals movement, see Cynthia D. Prince and Pascal D. Forgione, Jr., “Raising Standards and Measuring Performance Equitably: Challenges for the National Education Goals Panel and State Assessment Systems,” in Center for Applied Linguistics, *National Education Goals*, pp. 11–22.

IBM’s Louis Gerstner is quoted in Susan Ohanian, *One Size Fits Few: The Folly of Educational Standards* (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann, 1999), a passionate critique of top-down “reform.” Alfie Kohn further analyzes the role of business ideology in *The Schools Our Children Deserve: Moving Beyond Traditional Classrooms and “Tougher Standards”* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999).

The *ESL Standards for Pre-K–12 Students* were developed by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Alexandria, Va.: TESOL, 1997). The *English-Language Development Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* were adopted by the California State Board of Education in 1999.

Jill Kerper Mora’s comments on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) can be found at: <http://coe.sdsu.edu/people/jmora/Prop227/celdt.htm>. On LEP assessment, see also Edward De Avila, *Setting Expected Gains for Non and Limited English Proficient Students* (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1997).

The Florida grade retention figures are from Michael Winerip, “A Pupil Held Back, a Heavier Burden,” *New York Times*, May 21, 2003. For media coverage of the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act, see Malcolm Gladwell, “Making the Grade,” *New Yorker*, Sept.

15, 2003; Erik W. Robelin, "State Reports on Progress Vary Widely," *Education Week*, Sept. 3, 2003; Rosalind S. Helderman and Ylan Q. Mui, "Comparing Schools' Progress Difficult," *Washington Post*, Sept. 25, 2003; and Perry Bacon, Jr., "Struggle of the Classes," *Time*, Sept. 22, 2003. See especially Susan Ohanian, "Bush Flunks Schools," *Nation*, Dec. 1, 2003.

Wayne E. Wright describes the classroom impact the Stanford 9 testing program in California in "The Effects of High Stakes Testing in an Inner-City Elementary School: The Curriculum, the Teachers, and the English Language Learners," *Current Issues in Education* 5, no. 5 (2002): <http://cie.asu.edu/volume5/number5/>.

James Crawford considers the implications of NCLB for English learners in "The Bilingual Education Act, 1968–2002: An Obituary," Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University (2002): <http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/LPRU/features/brief2.-htm>.

Gerald Coles debunks extravagant claims about "scientifically based" literacy programs in *Misreading Reading: The Bad Science That Hurts Children* (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann, 2000). See also Elaine Garan, "Beyond the Smoke and Mirrors: A Critique of the National Reading Panel Report on Phonics," *Phi Delta Kappan* 82, no. 7 (2001): 500–6.

## Chapter 15. Advocating for English Learners

Statements on NCLB by Raul Yzaguirre and Delia Pompa were made in press releases dated Dec. 14, 2001, and Nov. 30, 2001, respectively.

The Gallup executive is quoted in Norman Solomon, "Polls Give Numbers, But the Truth Is More Elusive," Creators Syndicate, May 20, 1996. The Gallup Poll results on bilingual education are reported in Eric Hubler, "Bilingual Ed Backed by 58% in U.S., Poll Says," *Denver Post*, Jul. 9, 2003"; and "Bilingual Education, June 6," in *Public Opinion*, 1998 (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1999).

Stephen Krashen analyzes changing opinions on bilingual education in "Evidence Suggesting That Public Opinion Is Becoming More Negative: A Discussion of the Reasons, and What We Can Do About It" (2002): <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/Krash11.htm>. He summarizes the findings of several studies by Fay Shin in *Under Attack*; see also *Condemned without a Trial*.

The Public Agenda and Kaiser surveys are detailed in Steve Farkas, Ann Duffett, and Jean Johnson, *Now That I'm Here: What America's Immigrants Have To Say about Life in the U.S. Today: A Report from Public Agenda* (New York: Public Agenda, 2003).

Opinion patterns on Proposition 227 were reported in two Los Angeles Times Polls conducted in 1998: *Study #410: California Politics* (Apr. 13) – <http://www.latimes.com/extras/timespoll/stats/pdfs/410ss.pdf> – and *Study #413: Exit poll, California Primary Election* (Jun. 2) – <http://www.latimes.com/extras/timespoll/stats/pdfs/413ss.pdf>.

The *New York Times* editorial, "New York's Bilingual 'Prison,'" appeared on Sept. 21, 1995, p. A22.

For advocates of progressive causes, the best all-round guide to understanding and working with news media is Charlotte Ryan, *Prime Time Activism: Media Strategies for Grassroots Organizing* (Boston: South End Press, 1991).

McQuillan and Lucy Tse report their findings on media bias in “Does Research Matter? An Analysis of Media Opinion on Bilingual Education, 1984–1994,” *Bilingual Research Journal* 20, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 1–27.

The federal court case against Proposition 227 was *Valeria G. v. Wilson*, 12 F.Supp.2d 1007 (N.D. Cal. 1998). The state case that expanded parental waiver rights was *McLaughlin v. State Board of Education*, 75 Cal.App.4th 196 (1999). The opinion by California Attorney General Bill Lockyer was Opinion No. 99-802. See also Multicultural Training, Education, and Advocacy, “Prop. 227 Vests Program Choice with Parents, Not Administrators,” *Education Equity* 10, no. 1 (Spring 2000).

The *New York Times* report is Jacques Steinberg, “Increase in Test Scores Counters Dire Forecasts for Bilingual Ban,” Aug. 20, 2000. The Stanford analysis of California achievement test results is Evelyn Orr, Yuko Goto Butler, Michele Bousquet, and Kenji Hakuta, *What Can We Learn about the Impact of Proposition 227 from SAT-9 Scores?* (Aug. 15, 2000): [http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/SAT9/SAT9\\_2000/analysis2000.htm](http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/SAT9/SAT9_2000/analysis2000.htm).

Ken Noonan describes his “conversion” experience in “I Believed That Bilingual Education Was Best . . . Until the Kids Proved Me Wrong,” *Washington Post*, Sept. 3, 2000.

The study of Proposition 227 commissioned by the California legislature is Thomas B. Parrish et al., *Effects of Proposition 227 on the Education of English Learners, K–12: Year 1 Report* (Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research and WestEd, 2001).

Results of the Linguistic Minority Research Institute studies of Proposition 227 are reported in a special issue of the *Bilingual Research Journal* 24, nos. 1–2 (Winter 2000). See especially Patricia Gándara, “In the Aftermath of the Storm: English Learners in the Post-227 Era,” and Tom Stritikus and Eugene E. García, “Education of Limited English Proficient Students in California Schools: An Assessment of the Influence of Proposition 227 on Selected Teachers and Classrooms.”

Wayne Wright’s case study is reported in “The Effects of High Stakes Testing.”

The California law allowing Reading First grants for bilingual programs is A.B. 1485 (signed into law on Oct. 10, 2003). The court decision is summarized by Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy at: <http://www.latinosonline.com/cabe/show-article.cfm?titleID=1006>. For information on New York City’s expansion of English learner programs, see David M. Herzsenhorn, “Mayor Steps back from English Immersion,” *New York Times*, Jun. 25, 2003; and Clara Hemphill, “Mike Likes ‘Dual Language’”: [http://www.insideschools.org/nv/NV\\_bilingual\\_plan\\_june03.php](http://www.insideschools.org/nv/NV_bilingual_plan_june03.php).