

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM 61
Series Editors: Nancy H. Hornberger and Colin Baker

Bilingual Education

An Introductory Reader

Edited by
Ofelia García and Colin Baker

2007

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
Clevedon • Buffalo • Toronto

Reviewing the Research on Language Education Programs

Rebecca Freeman

This chapter presents an overview of the research on language education programs that we find in the United States and it is intended to serve a range of purposes. First, educators can use this review to guide their analysis of their own language education programs and practices so that they can determine whether and how their program is realizing its goals for its target populations. Second, language planners can use this review to determine the type of program that is appropriate for a particular school context, given an assessment of student needs and school requirements. [Third, readers can use this review as a foundation for understanding my discussion of language education programs and practices throughout this book.] This review is thus intended to provide a basis for working in the field of language education, broadly defined.

Language education in the United States is not generally discussed as one coherent field. Instead, we have seen language education professionals segregated in the fields of bilingual education, English as a second language (ESL), and world language education, and researchers and practitioners in each of these areas have focused on specific parts of the larger language education field. However, the United States is experiencing tremendous changes in demographics and language learning needs, and these changes are challenging traditional disciplinary distinctions. Language educators today in the subfields of bilingual education, ESL, and world languages are beginning to look to each other to develop programs and practices that can meet the language education needs of all language learners in the United States. We also see increasing interest in the needs of heritage language speakers and we see growing numbers of heritage language programs in secondary schools and universities.

My discussion of language education in this chapter is intended to bring together important developments in bilingual education, ESL, and world language education so that school districts and schools can make informed decisions about how to address the varied and changing language learning needs of all of their students. I use the following questions to structure my discussion of prototypical bilingual, ESL, and world language education programs:

1. Who is the target population?
2. What are the goals of the program for the target population?
3. How is the program structured?
4. How long do students spend in the program?
5. Is the program effective? That is, does the program enable its target populations to reach the stated goals in the allocated time?

Throughout this discussion, I consider research on second language acquisition, biliteracy development, standards-driven instruction, performance-based assessments, and program effectiveness. This review is intended to help educators make decisions about which types of language education programs are appropriate for their schools based on a solid research base, and to determine whether a program is well-implemented on the local school level.

Bilingual Education

Bilingual education is a controversial and frequently misunderstood field in the United States. There is considerable confusion and conflict about what bilingual education means, who is served by bilingual programs, what the goals of a bilingual program are for its target populations, and whether bilingual education

is or can be effective. General bilingual education policies are often made, amended, and/or abandoned without an understanding of how actual programs function on the local level. California's Proposition 227 and the ensuing local and national debates about bilingual education and English language development highlight some of this confusion and controversy.

Rather than legislate against bilingual education based on anecdotal evidence about particular programs, we need to consider what research tells us about bilingual education. We need to begin by clearly defining what we mean by bilingual education, and we need to look closely at what the research says about how English language learners (ELLs) develop expertise in academic English and/or in their primary language over time in different kinds of bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) programs. Perhaps most importantly, we need to be clear about our goals. Some argue that one of the reasons that Proposition 227 passed in California was that people simply did not understand that a primary goal of bilingual education is English language development.

This point should not be underemphasized. All well-implemented bilingual education programs should be aligned with the TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) standards, which are discussed later in this chapter. Moreover, all bilingual programs must now address all federal and state accountability requirements for ELLs' English language development and academic achievement in English, which means that all bilingual programs must be aligned with all state content-area and English language proficiency standards. Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 grants states flexibility to develop programs that research demonstrates are effective for ELLs. To comply with federal accountability requirements, states are now required to do the following:

- Articulate concrete, standards-based, observable, and measurable, targets for ELLs' English language development and academic achievement over time.
- Identify and use state-approved standardized assessment tools to measure students' performance relative to those targets.
- Articulate annual yearly progress (AYP)

objectives for English language development and academic achievement. These objectives must reflect the annual rate of growth of cohorts of ELLs from one year to the next in learning the English language, attaining English language proficiency, and achieving academically in the content areas according to the state's AYP measures.

- Demonstrate that all students have reached their performance targets in reading, language arts, and mathematics by the 2013–2014 school year (TESOL, 2003).

With this understanding of the current accountability criteria that are mandated for all bilingual and ESL programs in mind, I turn to a discussion of the kinds of bilingual education programs that we find in research and practice, and I review the research on program effectiveness.

Part of the confusion about bilingual education is that the same term is actually used to refer to a wide range of programs that may have different ideological orientations toward linguistic and cultural diversity, different target populations, and different goals for those target populations (Hornberger, 1991). My review of bilingual education models and program types in this section is organized around a major ideological distinction between the transitional bilingual model on the one hand and the dual language model on the other. As I discuss in more detail below, although transitional bilingual programs use ELLs' first language in the early years of their education, the goal of transitional bilingual education is English language development and academic achievement in English for ELLs. Dual language programs, in contrast, aim for bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic achievement in two languages for their target populations. Transitional bilingual programs tend to lead to subtractive bilingualism, and dual language programs generally lead to additive bilingualism. As I stress throughout, the choice between these program orientations has serious implications for individual students, for schools, and for society overall.

Transitional bilingual education

The majority of bilingual programs that have been funded in the United States are transitional, and they encourage students who have traditionally been defined as 'limited English proficient' (LEP) to transition to the all-English academic mainstream as quickly as possible.

The prototypical transitional bilingual education (TBE) program provides one to three years of content-area instruction through the students' primary language while the ELLs are enrolled in ESL classes. According to Thomas and Collier's (2002) national review of programs for ELLs, some TBE programs may provide as many as five years of bilingual instruction, and some may emphasize first language literacy development as a foundation for literacy development in English.

According to Ruiz (1984), TBE programs are characterized by a 'language-as-problem' orientation because the primary language is viewed as a problem to be overcome. The primary language is only used until the student has acquired sufficient English to transition to the mainstream English-only classroom (but see below for research about how long it takes to develop expertise in academic English). Once the 'limited English proficient' (LEP) student is deemed 'fully English proficient', he/she is exited to the English-only academic mainstream and, in most cases, not eligible for continued ESL instruction. Because TBE programs provide no continued support for the native language at school, and because they pressure ELLs to acquire English as quickly as possible, ELLs who attend TBE programs tend to assimilate to monolingualism in English.

Although transitional bilingual programs are the most common bilingual programs in the United States, research demonstrates that they are less effective than dual language programs for ELLs (Thomas & Collier, 2002; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Cummins' (1987) distinction between 'basic interpersonal communication skills', or 'BICS', and 'cognitive academic language proficiency', or 'CALP' is generally forwarded to explain this difference, although Cummins (2001) now uses the terms 'conversational fluency' and 'academic language proficiency' to refer to these notions. He defines conversational fluency as the ability to carry on a conversation in familiar face-to-face situations, and he defines academic language proficiency as the ability to comprehend and produce the increasingly complex oral and written language used in the content areas (e.g. literature, social studies, science, mathematics). Cummins and others argue that while it only takes second language learners one to two years of exposure to the second language at school and/or in other contexts to develop conversational fluency, it takes ELLs at least five years

of exposure to academic English to catch up to native speaker norms. Since prototypical TBE programs only last one to three years, they do not allow sufficient time for ELLs to develop the academic English they need to participate and achieve as equals in the academic mainstream. As Thomas and Collier's (2002) longitudinal research on program effectiveness for ELLs demonstrates, most ELLs who go through early-exit transitional bilingual programs are not able to reach parity with their English-speaking counterparts by the time they complete the program, or throughout their academic career in US public schools (see also Ramirez *et al.*, 1991).

Dual language education

Dual-language education is another model of bilingual education, and it stands in stark ideological contrast to transitional bilingual education. According to Ruiz (1984), dual language programs are characterized by a 'language as resource' orientation that sees languages other than English as resources to be developed rather than as problems to be overcome. Three types of dual language education programs are found in the United States: second or foreign language immersion programs for English speakers; one-way developmental bilingual education programs for ELLs; and two-way immersion programs for English speakers and speakers of another language. Before I discuss these program types, I consider how my use of the term 'dual language education' in this book relates to other uses of this term in the field.

The term 'dual language education' is currently used in two different ways in the field. Consistent with the Center for Applied Linguistics and Cloud *et al.* (2000), I adopt a broad view of dual language education that includes the following three types of programs:

- Second or foreign language immersion programs for English speakers.
- One-way developmental bilingual education programs for ELL.
- Two-way immersion (TWI) programs for English speakers and speakers of another language.

Cloud *et al.* (2000) use the term 'enriched education' to refer collectively to these types of programs because they all use the minority language (e.g. Spanish in the US) for at least 50 percent of the students' content area instruc-

tion and they all lead to bilingualism, biliteracy development, and academic achievement in two languages for their target populations. Lindholm-Leary (2001), in contrast, uses the term 'dual language education' in a narrower sense to refer exclusively to two-way immersion programs that target English speakers and speakers of another language. With this broader notion of dual language education in mind, let's look more closely at each of the types of programs.

Second/Foreign Language Immersion Programs

Dual-language programs that exclusively target speakers of the dominant language in society (e.g. English speakers in the United States and Canada) are called second or foreign language immersion programs. Immersion programs use a second/foreign language (e.g. French, Chinese) to teach at least 50 percent of the curriculum, and they last at least five to seven years. Immersion programs can vary in terms of the grade level at which the immersion experience begins and the amount of curriculum taught through the second/foreign language. According to Cloud *et al.* (2000), *early immersion education* begins in kindergarten and continues through the elementary grades. *Delayed immersion* typically does not begin until the middle elementary grades (around 4th grade). *Early total immersion* teaches 100 percent of the curriculum through the second or foreign language in kindergarten and 1st grade and begins to add English around 2nd or 3rd grade. *Early partial immersion* teaches between 50 and 90 percent of the curriculum through the second or foreign language and the remainder of the curriculum through English.

Extensive research on French immersion programs in Canada clearly demonstrates that second or foreign language immersion programs enable English speakers to become bilingual and biliterate and to achieve academically through two languages with no negative impact on English language and literacy development. English speakers are also reported to develop more positive attitudes toward French and French speakers through their participation in the immersion programs (see Cloud *et al.* (2000) and Lindholm-Leary (2001) for further discussions and references). Although considerable research evidence demonstrates the effectiveness of second/foreign language immersion education for English speakers, there are only a

few such programs in the United States today (see www.cal.org for more information on immersion programs in the United States).

At first glance, many see a parallel between (a) French immersion programs for English speakers in Canada and (b) the all-English academic mainstream in the United States for Spanish-speaking ELLs. Consideration of the larger sociolinguistic contexts in Canada and in the United States, however, makes it clear why these two cases are in fact radically different. In the case of the province of Quebec, both French and English have official status and both have considerable symbolic capital in the linguistic marketplace (Bourdieu, 1991; Heller, 1994). Because English has such prestige in Canada and in the world, English-speaking children do not resist speaking English while they acquire French. Moreover, because English is the language of wider communication outside of school, English speakers have considerable support for their native language development. English speakers continue to develop expertise in English even as they are immersed in French, and this environment is conducive to additive bilingualism.

In the United States, in contrast, English is the language of power and Spanish does not have nearly as much symbolic capital. As a result, Spanish speakers, especially low-income Spanish speakers, tend to resist speaking Spanish in favor of English. This encourages subtractive bilingualism, and we see that Spanish speakers in the United States, like speakers of other languages in this country, tend to assimilate to English. Although we hear the term 'immersion' used (incorrectly) to refer to the educational experience of ELLs who are placed in the all-English academic mainstream, 'submersion' is a more appropriate term. English language learners who are submersed in the all-English academic mainstream with no support for their English language development are expected to 'sink or swim'. Immersion and submersion are very different experiences, and they have very different outcomes.

One-way Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE) Programs

Dual language programs that exclusively target speakers of another language (e.g. Spanish speakers in the United States) are called 'developmental' or 'maintenance' bilingual programs. These programs are often referred to as 'one-way developmental bilingual education (DBE)

programs' because they only target one population (see below for discussion of two-way bilingual programs). While DBE programs are more common than immersion programs in the United States, they are not nearly as common as TBE programs.

The majority of the DBE programs in the United States target Spanish speakers. They provide content-area instruction through the native language as well as ESL instruction, and they last for at least five to seven years. The primary distinctions between DBE programs and the TBE programs discussed previously are that DBE programs continue to support the development of the student's primary language once the student has begun to use English for academic purposes, and DBE programs expect students to achieve academically through two languages. Because these programs last for at least five to seven years, ELLs have the time necessary to acquire the academic language and literacies they need in English while they continue to develop expertise in their primary language. And according to Thomas and Collier's (1998, 2002) research, ELLs who graduate from well-implemented DBE programs achieve educational parity with their English-speaking counterparts over time. The key here is implementation. Unfortunately not all programs are well-implemented.

Two-way Immersion (TWI) Programs

Two-way immersion programs (TWI) are dual language programs that target balanced numbers of English speakers and speakers of a language other than English, and they provide content-area instruction through both languages to all students in integrated classes. These programs are sometimes referred to as *bilingual immersion*, *dual-language immersion*, *two-way immersion*, or *two-way bilingual programs*, and they combine the best features of immersion education for English speakers and of one-way developmental bilingual programs for ELLs (Lindholm, 1990; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The goals of TWI programs are for all students, English speakers and ELLs, to become bilingual and biliterate, achieve academically through both languages, and develop positive intergroup understanding and relations (Christian, 1994; Cloud *et al.*, 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

We find two major variants in TWI programs in the United States, which are referred to as the 90:10 and the 50:50 models. The 90:10 model provides 90 percent of the content-area instruc-

tion in the non-English language (e.g. Spanish) and 10 percent in English in the early elementary grades. As students progress through the grade levels the amount of instruction in English increases to 50 percent in Spanish and 50 percent in English in the upper grades. The 50:50 model provides 50 percent of students' content-area in instruction in Spanish and 50 percent in English across all grades. According to Thomas and Collier (2002) and Lindholm-Leary (2001), well-implemented TWI programs enable all students to develop oral and written expertise in two languages. But again, the key is implementation.

TWI programs have attracted considerable attention and funding in the United States since the mid-1990s. Prior to 1990, the Department of Education's Title VII Program primarily funded transitional bilingual programs. However, the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) was reauthorized in 1994, and the new guidelines specified that up to 25 percent of the grant money could be used for alternative forms of bilingual education. Furthermore, Rita Esquivel, the Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs in 1994, was a strong supporter of dual language education and federal funds began to be available for dual language programs at that time. Over the past three decades, we have seen the numbers of TWI programs grow from fewer than five to 261 programs in 24 states. While Spanish is by far the most common language used in TWI programs, we also see TWI programs that use other languages. At the time of this writing six programs use Cantonese, four use Korean, four use French, two use Navajo, two use Japanese, one uses Arabic, one uses Portuguese, and one uses Russian for instructional purposes (Lindholm-Leary, 2001: 35; see also the TWI Directory at www.cal.org for updated information).

In March 2000, Richard W. Riley, then Secretary of Education delivered an address entitled 'The Progress of Hispanic Education and the Challenges of the New Century' in which he lauded the two-way immersion model and challenged the United States to increase the number of these programs to at least 1,000 over the next five years. Riley said,

Right now we have about 260 dual-immersion schools and that is only a start. We need to invest in these kinds of programs and make sure they are in communities

that can most benefit from them. In an international economy, knowledge – and knowledge of language – is power.

Title VII continued to aggressively fund two-way immersion programs, and at the time of this writing, more and more schools were designing and implementing TWI programs that would ideally meet the language and education needs of their target populations.

In 2003, The Center for Applied Linguistics convened a national dual language standards panel that is developing national standards for dual language programs. According to Hamayan (2003), a member of the national panel, the national dual language standards are inspired by the dual language standards developed in New Mexico, and they are organized around seven strands; program structure, assessment and accountability, staff quality, family and community involvement, curriculum, instructional practices, and resources/support. Each strand includes a number of specific standards that are intended to guide dual language program and professional development efforts. The national standards are to be made public during the fall of 2003.

Valdés (1997) makes a strong cautionary note about TWI programs. She argues that educators need to consider power relations between the target populations at schools, especially between white middle-class standard-English speakers and low-income Spanish speakers. Since white middle-class students tend to outperform their low-income Spanish-speaking counterparts academically in most US schools today, Valdés urges educators to ensure that their TWI programs provide Spanish speakers with the opportunities they need to reach equally high standards in their content-area classes. Otherwise, Valdés argues, Spanish speakers may be exploited for the Spanish resource that they offer to English-speaking students. If teachers do not ensure that their low-income Latinos are getting equal access to educational opportunities in their TWI programs, middle-class English speakers may continue to outperform Spanish speakers AND they will have developed expertise in two languages. In this case, TWI programs would have the unintended outcome of taking jobs that require bilingual proficiencies from bilingual Latinos because bilingual whites would now be more prepared to fill those jobs. Valdés maintains that this does not have to be the case if TWI teachers attend to the power

relations between languages and speakers of those languages on the local level and provide a high quality content-based program in Spanish as well as English. Again, the key is implementation, and the national dual language standards are intended to support the development of pedagogically sound, well-implemented dual language programs nationally.

International Research on Bilingual Education

There is a solid international research base that supports findings from the research on the effectiveness of different types of bilingual education in the United States. For example, Dutcher (1995) carried out a comprehensive review of research for the World Bank on the use of first and second languages in education. This review examined three different types of countries: (1) those with no (or few) mother-tongue speakers of the language of wider communication (e.g. Haiti, Nigeria, the Philippines); (2) those with some mother-tongue speakers of the language of wider communication (e.g. Guatemala); and (3) those with many mother-tongue speakers of the language of wider communication (e.g. Canada, New Zealand, the United States). Tucker (1999) draws the following conclusions from this review of the research:

1. Success in school depends upon the child's mastery of cognitive/academic language, which is very different from the social language used at home.
2. The development of cognitive/academic language requires time (4 to 7 years of formal instruction).
3. Individuals most easily develop literacy skills in a familiar language.
4. Individuals most easily develop cognitive skills and master content material when they are taught in a familiar language.
5. Cognitive/academic language skills, once developed, and content-subject material, once acquired, transfer readily from one language to another.
6. The best predictor of cognitive/academic language development in a second language is the level of development of cognitive/academic language proficiency in the first language.
7. Children learn a second language in different ways depending upon their culture and their individual personality.

8. If the goal is to help the student ultimately develop the highest possible degree of content mastery and second language proficiency, time spent instructing the child in a familiar language is a wise investment.

The cumulative evidence from research conducted over the last three decades at sites around the world demonstrates conclusively that cognitive, social, personal, and economic benefits accrue to the individual who has an opportunity to develop their bilingual repertoire when compared with a monolingual counterpart. Dual language programs that promote bilingualism, biliteracy development, and academic achievement through two languages for their target population(s), when well-implemented, show real promise in our efforts to address our national language needs.

This section has discussed the types of bilingual education program that we find in US schools today. All well-implemented bilingual programs hold students to the same high academic standards as the all-English academic mainstream. Furthermore, all well-implemented bilingual programs provide ESL services to their students that are aligned with the TESOL standards. The next section looks more closely at the kinds of ESL programs and practices that we can find in the US today.

English as a Second Language

We can find a wide range of English as a second language (ESL) programs and practices in US schools today. For example, we may see pull-out ESL programs that take ELLs out of the all-English academic mainstream for ESL instruction. We may see push-in ESL programs in which the ESL teacher enters the all-English classroom and works to support the ESL students' needs within the context of that classroom. In schools that have large numbers of ELLs, we may see sheltered ESL programs that segregate ELLs for content-area instruction (see below for further discussion). The organization of the actual ESL program depends on the local context, including the number of ELLs that the school serves, and on the relationship between the ESL teachers and content-area teachers at the school.

Regardless of the program structure, all ESL programs are to use a communicative approach to language teaching and learning (Canale & Swain, 1980), and all ESL programs are to address the

goals and standards that the professional organization for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages has defined for pre-K–12 students (TESOL, 1997). The No Child Left Behind Act now requires each state to develop English language proficiency (ELP) standards that are aligned with state content-area standards, and we see variation across states in the ways that they develop ELP standards that are aligned with the national TESOL standards, their state (English/Spanish) language arts standards, and standards in other content areas. This section begins with a brief discussion of the theoretical notion of communicative competence used in the language teaching and learning field. Then I introduce the TESOL goals and standards and review the range of ESL program types we find in US schools. Future research is necessary to document the range of ELP standards that are developed and how they are translated into programs and practices for ELLs across contexts.

Hymes' (1966) notion of communicative competence is fundamental to most contemporary approaches to language teaching and learning, and it informed the development of the TESOL standards discussed in this section and the ACTFL (American Council for Teachers of Foreign Languages) world language standards discussed later in this chapter. Communicative competence can be broadly defined as what a speaker needs to know to be able to communicate correctly and appropriately within a particular speech community (Saville-Troike, 1996). Canale and Swain (1980) extend this notion to the field of language teaching and learning and identify and define the following four aspects of communicative competence:

1. Linguistic competence means that the forms, inflections, and sequences used to express the message are grammatically correct.
2. Sociolinguistic competence means that the expression of the message is appropriate in terms of the person being addressed and the overall circumstances and purpose of communication.
3. Discourse competence means that the selection, sequence and arrangement of words and structures are clear and effective means of expressing the intended message.
4. Strategic competence means that the strategies used to compensate for any weaknesses in the above areas are effective and unobtrusive.

A language learner is considered 'communicatively competent' relative to the target speech community when he/she demonstrates competence in each of these areas. Communicative language teaching in US schools is intended to facilitate the learners' acquisition of the spoken and written language they need in order to use language correctly and appropriately in social settings and in all academic content areas.

The three goals that TESOL established for ELLs in pre-K-12 schools reflect this fundamental notion of communicative competence. Each goal is associated with three distinct standards, and ELLs are to meet the standards as a result of the instruction they receive. As they meet the specific standards, ELLs realize the more general social, academic, and personal goals. The ESL goals and standards are as follows (TESOL, 1997: 9-10):

Goal 1: To use English to communicate in social settings.

Standards for Goal 1

Students will:

1. Use English to participate in social interaction.
2. Interact in, through, and with spoken and written English for personal expression and enjoyment.
3. Use learning strategies to extend their communicative competence.

Goal 2: To use English to achieve academically in all content areas.

Standards for Goal 2

Students will:

1. Use English to interact in the classroom.
2. Use English to obtain, process, construct, and provide subject matter information in spoken and written form.
3. Use appropriate learning strategies to construct and apply academic knowledge.

Goal 3: To use English in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

Standards for Goal 3

Students will:

1. Use the appropriate language variety, register, and genre according to audience, purpose, and setting.
2. Use nonverbal communication appropriate to audience, purpose, and setting.
3. Use appropriate learning strategies to extend their sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence.

A framework for ESL language planning and for making use of the standards is also outlined (TESOL, 1997). The TESOL standards describe the kinds of English that ELLs need to acquire so that they can attain the same high-level standards within and across content areas, including English language arts, as fully proficient English-speaking students.

Research on effective ESL programs demonstrates that the most effective way to enable students to develop the academic language and literacies that they need in English to reach the standards across all content areas is through a content-based second language instruction approach (Brinton *et al.*, 1989). Brinton *et al.* define content-based second language instruction as

the integration of particular content with language teaching aims. More specifically . . . it refers to the concurrent teaching of academic subject matter and second language skills. The language curriculum is based directly on the academic needs of the students and generally follows the sequence determined by particular subject matter in dealing with the language problems which students encounter. The focus for students is on acquiring information via the second language and, in the process, developing their academic language skills (1989: 2).

Brinton *et al.* identify three models of content-based second/foreign language programs that are appropriate for use in different instructional contexts. These are (1) the sheltered model, (2) the adjunct model, and (3) the theme-based model.

Sheltered courses are content-area courses (e.g. math, science, social studies) that are taught by a content-area specialist to a segregated group of language learners, and the primary goal of these courses is content-area mastery. Sheltered ESL courses follow the tradition of second or

foreign language immersion education for elementary and secondary school students. Because the content-area teacher employs strategies that make complex content comprehensible to second language learners, language tends to be learned incidentally. Adjunct courses are paired content and language courses that language learners enroll in concurrently. Two teachers are necessary for adjunct courses. The content-area teacher teaches the content area (e.g. math, science, social studies), and the language teacher teaches the content-obligatory and content-compatible language that students need to participate and achieve in the content-area class (Snow *et al.*, 1992). Theme-based classes are taught by language teachers who structure the language course around particular topics or themes. The common feature of all of these types of courses and/or programs is that content material is used as the basis for language learning (see Brinton *et al.*, 1989, for further discussion).

Research on second language teaching and learning highlights several important reasons for integrating language and content for instructional purposes. First, content provides a motivational basis for language learning. When students are interested in the content they are learning about, they tend to learn the language forms and functions they need because those language forms and functions provide access to that content. Content also provides a meaningful context within which learners can connect language forms and functions. Furthermore, students learn language most effectively when they need to use that language in meaningful, purposeful social and academic contexts (see Brinton *et al.*, 1989; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Cloud *et al.*, 2000; Snow *et al.*, 1992).

The key to an effective ESL program is implementation. The educators who work with ELLs (i.e. ESL teachers, bilingual teachers, mainstream classroom teachers who have ELLs in their classes) must clearly understand their students' content and language strengths and needs, and their programs need to be aligned with the TESOL standards and with state content-area standards. The No Child Left Behind Act holds mainstream teachers accountable for ELLs' academic achievement, and holds ELS teachers accountable for ELLs' English language development. Mainstream classroom teachers and ESL teachers should work together to provide a coherent program that enables all ELLs to acquire the academic language and literacies that they need for access

to equal educational opportunities in the all-English academic mainstream. These programs should have clearly articulated objectives for their ELLs' English language development and academic performance, and educators should use multiple forms of assessment to determine how well ELLs are performing relative to those objectives. Educators at these schools must understand that it takes at least five to seven years for ELLs to develop expertise in academic English and to close the gap between their performance and the performance of their English-speaking counterparts across content areas, and exit criteria and promotion and graduation requirements should reflect this understanding (see also Echevarria *et al.*, 2001; NSSE, 2002).

World Language Education in the United States

As national recognition of the need for languages other than English grows in the United States, we see exciting new developments in a field that was traditionally called 'foreign' language education. In this book, I use the term 'world language' to refer to the teaching of a language as a subject area to a student who does not speak that language (e.g. Spanish to English speakers in the United States). This section considers how the changes in language learning goals and changes in students' language learning strengths and needs have influenced the ways that we are beginning to think about world language education in the United States today. First, I review the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) *Standards for Foreign Language* (1999) and the *ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners* (1999) to determine realistic and attainable goals and expectations for world language learning at school. Then I describe the prototypical FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary School) program structure that is recommended for elementary school world language programs, and discuss the increase in elementary and secondary school world language programs that we see nationally. I conclude this section by considering the impact that heritage language speakers have had on a field that traditionally targeted only monolingual English speakers.

In 1995, the ACTFL standards were released to the world language profession at their annual meeting, and they were endorsed by 46 state, regional, and national language organizations. Like the standards-based projects in other disciplines, the world language standards attempt

to outline the focus of instruction with specific reference to 4th, 8th, and 12th grades. The goal of the standards is to clearly articulate what students need to know and what they need to be able to do as a result of their study of world languages.

The standards are arranged into five major goal areas: communication, cultures, connection, comparisons, and communities. Like the TESOL standards, each goal area includes specific standards. These standards do not describe specific course content, they do not provide a recommended scope and sequence, and they do not prescribe an instructional approach or teaching methodology. Instead, the goal areas are intended to be seen as interconnected, and they emphasize using language for communication with other peoples, gaining understanding of other cultures, and accessing information in a wide range of disciplines (Omaggio Hadley, 2000). Educators who are familiar with their students' language learning needs and preferences are encouraged to select the content, sequence, and method that are appropriate for their context.

The *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1999) outline *what* students need to know, and the *ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners* (1999) provide a framework for assessing *how well* novice, intermediate, and pre-advanced learners can use the world language for communicative purposes. The performance guidelines do not focus on the traditional skills areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking in isolation. Instead, they define how well students at different levels can use language in what the guidelines refer to as three different communicative modes: the interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational. The interpersonal mode is characterized by active negotiation of meaning among individuals (e.g. in face-to-face communication). The interpretive mode is focused on the appropriate cultural interpretation of meanings that occur in written and spoken form where there is no active negotiation of meaning with another interlocutor (e.g. reading a novel, listening to the radio, watching a film). The presentational mode refers to the creation of spoken and/or written messages in a manner that facilitates interpretation by members of the other culture where no direct opportunity for the active negotiation of meaning between members of the two cultures exists (e.g. writing a report, presenting a speech).

Both the standards and the performance guidelines are designed to reflect second language learning that begins in kindergarten and that continues in an uninterrupted sequence through

12th grade. These guidelines suggest that English speakers who have been enrolled in a well-articulated, long-sequence foreign language program can demonstrate intermediate to advanced levels of proficiency in the western languages that are most commonly taught in American schools. The authors of the performance guidelines explain why we can expect different kinds of performances by English speakers studying western languages on the one hand and by English speakers studying less commonly taught languages on the other. They write,

Students whose native language is English find many similarities between English and the languages of the western world, both in oral and written forms, which aid students in their acquisition of the new language. Conversely, when students encounter the less commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Russian, new hurdles await them: unfamiliar sounds, different writing systems and new grammars. These linguistic features, which oftentimes cannot be linked to anything the students know in their native language, present challenges and generally tend to extend the language acquisition process. It cannot be expected, therefore, that students learning the less commonly taught languages should reach the same levels of performance as those who study the western languages more frequently offered in American schools (p. 3).

Because it may take longer for English speakers to develop expertise in the less commonly taught languages, it is even more important to begin study of these languages earlier. However, since an uninterrupted 13-year sequence of world language study is not commonly found in the United States today, the ACTFL K-12 performance guidelines also account for various entry points that reflect most major language sequences (see American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages [1999] for further discussion and for performance indicators).

What does a 'well-articulated, long-sequence' world language program look like in practice? *Lessons Learned: Model Early Foreign Language Programs* (Gilzow & Branaman, 2000) describes seven foreign language programs in the United States that they identified through a selection process informed by the national standards for

foreign language education and by research on effective language instruction for elementary and middle school students (Curtain & Pesola, 1994; National Standards for Foreign Language Education Project, 1996). Each of the programs selected met the following criteria (Gilzow & Branaman 2000: 2):

- Curricula based on the 'five Cs' of the national foreign language standards – communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities
- Regular program evaluation
- Outcomes that meet program goals
- Accessibility for all students
- Communication and coordination across content areas
- A student population that reflects the ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the local population
- Articulation from elementary to middle school and from middle school to high school
- Professional development for teachers
- Support from the community

The seven programs included five content-enriched FLES programs, one partial immersion program, and one middle school immersion continuation program. Because we reviewed the characteristics of second/foreign language immersion programs in our discussion of dual language education earlier in the chapter, the focus here will be on the prototypical FLES program structure.

While secondary world language programs teach the language as a separate subject area, FLES programs integrate language instruction into the students' regular classroom schedule. According to Curtain and Pesola (1994) and Gilzow and Branaman (2000), elementary school students should have a 30- to 45-minute language class three to five times per week for a minimum of 90 minutes total per week. Of course, when schools allocate more time to target language instruction, students can be expected to develop a broader range of expertise in that language. What is important to emphasize is that the language program be treated as an integral part of the whole school program. Students need to have regular opportunities to participate in language class each week throughout the years of the program if they are to realize the annual and long-term objectives and goals of the program.

Prototypical FLES programs assume that the language teacher and the classroom teacher are two different people, and FLES teachers either travel to the mainstream classroom or the students travel to a separate language classroom for FLES class. Like any pedagogical choice, there are pros and cons to each teaching arrangement. For example, having the FLES teacher travel to the regular classroom can present a wide range of challenges for that teacher (e.g. physical wear and tear, difficulty transporting materials, time to get from one class to the next), but the traveling teacher can help make the target language an integral part of the regular classroom and school. Having a separate classroom for the FLES class can be much easier for the FLES teacher (e.g. to develop libraries full of authentic texts in the target language, display teacher-made materials and student work), but this arrangement could contribute to the marginalization of the world language class in the school.

What is the content of a FLES program? Each of the FLES programs described in Gilzow and Branaman (2000) focused on content, although the ways that they focused on content varied across programs and grade levels. Following Curtain and Pesola (1994), I differentiate between a content-based second language program (like those implemented in English as a second language and foreign/second language immersion programs discussed earlier in the chapter) and a content-related second language program. According to Curtain and Pesola (1994),

In the typical FLES classroom, in which twenty to thirty minutes per day is devoted to foreign language instruction, it is not realistic to base the curriculum on concepts taken from grade-level curriculum of other content areas, nor is it probable that the foreign language program can take full responsibility for teaching grade-appropriate concepts from the general curriculum in the target language. While many hands-on activities related to content may still be successful, language skills in a second language simply do not develop quickly enough in a FLES setting to permit the effective initial teaching of increasingly sophisticated and abstract ideas. Through theme-based, integrative teaching, however, the foreign language class can reenter and reinforce important concepts from mathematics, social studies,

and other areas, drawing from earlier grade levels as well as from grade-level-appropriate curriculum (p. 151).

According to Gilzow and Branaman (2000), some FLES programs align language curricula with curricula in the subject areas at the district level, and the world language curricula are revised as the district curricula are revised. In other programs, the language class content is closely tied to the content of regular classes, but curriculum development and revision are handled informally by the teachers involved.

What is the state of world language education in the United States today? In 1999, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) published *Foreign Language Instruction in the United States: A National Survey of Elementary and Secondary Schools*. This survey was intended to explore current patterns and shifts in enrollment, languages and programs offered, curriculum, teaching methodologies, teacher qualifications and training, and reactions to national reform issues, and it was designed to replicate CAL's 1987 survey in an effort to show trends during the 1987-1997 decade. According to CAL's executive summary, 'foreign language education in the United States is at a unique moment historically'. World languages were recognized as part of the core curriculum in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and there was evidence of considerable increases in K-12 world language instruction throughout the country (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1997).

The CAL survey found that in the past decade, world language instruction in the elementary schools increased significantly. In 1997 one in three elementary schools reported offering world language instruction, and this represented a 10 percent increase since 1987. While most programs offer Spanish, there was some increase in Japanese, Russian, and Italian on the elementary level and in Japanese and Russian on the secondary level. However, CAL's executive summary concludes by saying that there is still reason for concern about the limited number of K-12 long-sequence world language programs that enable students to develop communicative competence in languages other than English. The National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) echoes this concern and highlights the need for well-articulated long-sequence language programs in the less commonly taught languages like Chinese and Russian (Brecht & Rivers, 2000).

Both CAL and NFLC emphasize that well-articulated elementary and secondary foreign language programs are still the exception rather than the norm. Unfortunately, the increasing interest in world language programs in the United States today is not accompanied by sufficient numbers of well-implemented programs that could dramatically alter the US ability to meet the kinds of language needs outlined [in Chapter 1].

Heritage Language Programs

Traditionally, world language classes have targeted monolingual English speakers who generally begin their language study with no expertise in the target language and minimal knowledge about the people who speak it. Until recently, little attention has been paid to developing and coordinating well-designed and carefully articulated language programs for heritage language speakers. However, student populations enrolled in world language programs on the elementary, secondary, and university levels are rapidly changing, and world language teachers see increasing numbers of heritage language speakers in classes with monolingual English-speaking students. These students have a wide range of proficiencies in spoken and/or written languages, and they pose a serious challenge to teachers who are not trained to work with such diversity.

Since the 1990s, we have seen considerable interest in the teaching of heritage Spanish speakers in particular and speakers of other heritage languages more generally. The CAL survey of foreign language programs found a significant increase in Spanish for native speakers (SNS) classes on the elementary and secondary levels. Two major volumes of articles were published that reflected new energy within the Spanish-teaching profession, and we see SNS teachers and researchers looking critically at how they can assess and build on their students' linguistic and cultural strengths (Merino *et al.*, 1993 and Colombi & Alarcón, 1997).

Valdés (2000) encourages SNS teachers to draw on the framework of communicative modes (interpersonal, interpretive, presentational) discussed previously in their efforts to understand and expand the bilingual range of students who have grown up in homes where non-English languages are spoken. She offers a wealth of ideas that can help SNS teachers determine what strengths a particular heritage Spanish speaker brings to class (e.g. strong interpersonal abilities) and what needs that student

has relative to the framework (e.g. the need to develop interpretive and presentational modes of communication, including reading and writing authentic texts, understanding films, making formal presentations).

Teachers of Spanish to native speakers, Valdés argues, have much to teach, but they must take a different approach from that traditionally taken by world language educators. They need to see heritage Spanish speakers' linguistic and cultural expertise as resources that they can build on. They must not see their students' expertise in nonstandard varieties of Spanish (e.g. vernacular Puerto Rican Spanish) as deficits that they must overcome. Instead SNS teachers need to organize their programs and practices so that heritage Spanish speakers can add standard Spanish and literacies in Spanish to their linguistic repertoires. In the process, teachers can encourage heritage Spanish speakers to think critically about the sociolinguistic variation in Spanish that is a very real part of their everyday lives.

World language programs in the United States face enormous challenges today. National, state, and local education policies are beginning to emphasize the need for US citizens to develop proficiency in more than one language in order to participate in the global economy and to ensure national security. High schools are increasingly requiring expertise in world languages to meet graduation criteria, which has encouraged many school districts to offer world language education in the elementary grades. At the same time, student populations enrolled in world language programs on the elementary, secondary, and university levels are rapidly changing, and we see heritage language speakers attending the same language classes as monolingual English speakers. Not only is there a serious shortage of world language teachers available to fill an increasing number of positions in the field, but many world language educators have not been trained to meet the diverse and rapidly changing needs of students today. Some university world language programs, in-service professional development programs, and individual world language teachers are working in creative ways to address these challenges, but much work remains (for further discussion see Peyton, 2001).

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed prototypical bilingual education, English as a second language, and world language programs that we

find in the United States today, and it has related these kinds of program to research on second language acquisition, biliteracy development, content-based second language instruction, and program effectiveness. As we have seen, there are a number of different kinds of language education programs that educators can draw on to promote additive bilingualism on the local school level.

However, language educators face several important challenges as they work to design and implement context-responsive programs and practices. First, program planners need to have a clear understanding of who their students are and they must be able to clearly articulate their language education goals for their target populations. Program planners also need to have a clear understanding about how language education programs are structured to realize those goals so that they can develop and implement programs that are pedagogically sound. Perhaps most importantly, program planners need to understand the ways that languages are taught, learned, used, and evaluated on the local school and community level in order to build on the linguistic and cultural resources that are available.

References

- American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages. (1999) *ACTFL K-12 Performance Guidelines*. Yonkers: ACTFL.
- Brecht, R.D. and Rivers, W.P. (2000) *Language and National Security in the 21st Century: The Role of Title VII/Fulbright-Hays in Supporting National Language Capacity*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
- Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A. and Bingham Wesche, M. (1989) *Content-based Second Language Instruction*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980) Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second-language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1-47.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (1997) *National Survey of Foreign Language Instruction in Elementary and Secondary Schools in the United States*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Chamot, A.U. and O'Malley, J.M. (1994) *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

- Christian, D. (1994) Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two languages. In *The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning: Educational Practice Report 12*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F. and Hamayan, E. (2000) *Dual Language Instruction: A Handbook for Enriched Education*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Colombi, M.C. and Alarcón, F.X. (eds) (1997) *La Enseñanza del Español a Hispanohablantes: Praxis y Teoría*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cummins, J. (1987) Bilingualism, language proficiency, and metalinguistic development. In P. Homel, M. Palij and D. Aaronson (eds) *Childhood Bilingualism: Aspects of Linguistic, Cognitive and Social Development* (pp. 57-73). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cummins, J. (2001) *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society*. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Curtain, H. and Pesola, C.A.B. (1994) *Languages and Children: Making the Match*. New York: Longman.
- Dutcher, N. (1995) *Overview of Foreign Language Students in the United States*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Resource Collection Series, 6. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Echeverría, J., Vogt, M. and Short, D.J. (2000) *Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gilzow, D.F. and Branaman, L.E. (2000) *Lessons Learned: Model Early Foreign Language Programs*. McHenry: Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Hamayan, E. (2003) National dual language standards. Draft presented at Desplaines, IL: Illinois Resource Center.
- Heller, M. (1994) *Crosswords: Language, Education and Ethnicity in French Ontario*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N.H. (1991) Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In O. García (ed.) *Bilingual education Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman* (Vol. 1) (pp. 215-234). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hymes, D. Paper presented at the Research Planning Conference on Language Development among Disadvantaged Children. New York: Yeshiva University.
- Lindholm, K. (1990) Bilingual immersion education: Criteria for program development. In A. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild and C.M. Valdez (eds) *Bilingual Education: Issues and Strategies* (pp. 91-105). Newbury Park: Corwin Press Inc.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001) *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Merino, B.J., Trueba, H.T. and Santiago, F.A. (eds) (1993) *Language and Culture in Learning: Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers of Spanish*. London: Falmer Press.
- National Study of School Evaluation. (2002) *Program Evaluation: English as a Second Language*. Indicators of Schools of Quality Program Evaluation Series. Schaumburg, IL: NSSE.
- Omaggio Hadley, A. (2000) *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Peyton, J., Reynard, D. and McGinnis, S. (2001) Charting a new course: Heritage language in the United States. In J. Peyton, D. Reynard and S. McGinnis (eds) (pp. 3-26) *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource*. McHenry: Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Ramirez, J.D., Yuen, S.D. and Ramey, D.R. (1991) *Executive Summary Final Report: Longitudinal Study of Structures English Immersion Strategy, Early-exit and Late-exit Transitional Bilingual Programs for Language Minority Children*. San Mateo: Aguirre International.
- Ruíz, R. (1984) Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8(2), 15-34.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1996) The ethnography of communication. In S. McKay and N. Hornberger (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 351-382). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Snow, C.E., Met, M. and Genesee, F. (1992) A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content instruction. In P.A. Richard-Amato and M.A. Snow (eds) *The Multicultural Classroom: Reading for Content-area Teachers*. New York: Longman.
- Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. Yonkers: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1997) *ESL Standards for Pre-K-12 Students*. Alexandria: TESOL.
- Thomas, W. and Collier, V. (2002) *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long Term Academic Achievement*. Santa Cruz: Center for Research, Education,

- Diversity and Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Tucker, G.R. (1999) A global perspective on bilingualism and bilingual education. *ERIC Digest*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Valdés, G. (1997) Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Education Review* 67, 391–429.
- Valdés, G. (2000) Introduction. *Spanish for Native Speakers. AATSP Professional Development Series Handbook for Teachers K–16* (pp. 1–20). Orlando: Harcourt College.

Questions

1. What are the main types of bilingual education? How do the following vary in different types of bilingual education: the language background of the students; the language goals and outcomes of programs; the language(s) used in the classroom; languages in assessment/testing; the age range (length) of the program; the desired societal outcomes (e.g. assimilation, integration, pluralism).
2. What is the difference between schools that are bilingual and those that are organized for second language teaching? What are the differences in the students, personnel, instruction, services and philosophy? Are there political differences?
3. Explain the difference between teaching a new language and using a language as a medium of education. Also, indicate what is the way languages are used in any *five* of the following:
 - a. transitional bilingual education
 - b. maintenance/heritage bilingual education
 - c. two-way dual language education
 - d. foreign language (FL) classes
 - e. second language (SL) classes
 - f. immersion classes
 - g. structured immersion or sheltered SL classes
 (You may want to refer to 'Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism' (4th edition, 2006), chapters 10 and 11 in order to expand on this question).
4. What are the main types of English as a second language program? How do they differ in content, aims and outcomes?
5. Using Tucker's (1999) eight conclusions from research on bilingual education listed in Freeman's chapter, explain the meaning of each using local schools and students as examples.

Activities

1. Using a local school with which you're familiar, interview parents, teachers and administrators. Find out the school's *current* policy with regard to language minority students and the use of minority languages in education. Profile the bilingualism of that school in terms of its students, staff, curriculum content (especially biliteracy or multilingual literacies, cultural awareness, anti-racism), use of language assessment/testing, mission and aims, performance and achievements, and its relationship with the local community. Also find out whether the school's policy responds to any societal policy or demands. Summarize answers on a chart or in a Powerpoint presentation. Different groups might select schools with different characteristics. For example, an urban school might