

Historical Overview of Bilingualism in the United States

ANA PATRICIA BARQUERO VARGAS

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to discuss whether immigrants should maintain or eliminate their native language and to analyze dual language programs whose bilingual methodology has proved to be successful. In addition, the analysis of bilingualism for the teaching of English aims to shed light on a series of erroneous beliefs surrounding bilingualism in the United States.

Key Words: Subtractive/additive bilingualism, immersion language programs, dual language programs or bilingual immersion, developmental bilingual education, two-way language development programs, transitional/maintenance approaches, biliteracy, cognitive academic language (CALP)

Resumen

El propósito de este ensayo es presentar ambos lados del controversial tema si los inmigrantes deben mantener o eliminar su idioma materno cuando entran al sistema educativo en los Estados Unidos. Parte también de este artículo es examinar los programas del desarrollo de la educación bilingüe o programas de inmersión bilingüe, los cuales han probado ser muy exitosos en cuanto a métodos bilingües de enseñanza se refiere. Al mismo tiempo, el escrutinio de estos métodos del aprendizaje de lenguas pretende esclarecer una serie de ideas erróneas que rodean el bilingüismo en este país.

Palabras claves: bilingüismo aditivo/sustractivo, programas de inmersión, programas del desarrollo de la educación bilingüe o programas de inmersión bilingüe, enfoques de transición o de mantenimiento, competencia académica ambos idiomas, lenguaje académico cognitivo (CALP)

The United States is a nation composed of immigrants. Individuals from different cultures and languages have converged on this country. But the process of attempting to melt into the mainstream has brought with it an array of political, social, economic, and linguistic problems. Since

language constitutes a large part of the culture of any individual, it is not surprising that scholars have debated whether immigrants should eliminate their native language in order to assimilate more rapidly into North American culture. Highly controversial, bilingualism has triggered the reformation of laws, encouraged extensive research in education at all academic levels, and has provoked a great deal of political antagonism as well as political advocacy by its opponents and supporters respectively. The purpose of this paper is to present both sides of this complex issue and to analyze dual language programs—briefly defined as 50% native language and 50% acquired language—which have proved to be successful as a bilingual method of teaching and learning. In addition, the scrutiny of bilingualism aims to clarify a series of misconceptions surrounding this language method in the US. In this paper, bilingualism is going to be defined “as a person’s ability to process two languages” (Williams & Snipper, 1990, 33). And it is going to be classified as subtractive or additive bilingualism. Subtractive bilingualism is when the target language is emphasized to the detriment of a student’s native language and culture. Additive bilingualism, on the other hand, is defined as when “both languages [L1 and L2] are seen as complementary and positive elements in the child’s development” (“Bilingualism,” n.d.). An overview of bilingualism will offer a better understanding of how this teaching method has been viewed historically in the US.

The history of bilingualism has suffered from constant shifts between governmental and public support or rejection. The history of the US from the colonial period to 1840 was characterized by the proliferation of bilingual schools. Bilingual education was common in states like “Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas during the 1700s.” Fishman & Keller (1982) claimed that “in some of these early schools the native tongue was used exclusively as the medium of instruction and English was taught as an academic subject” (3). The most common languages taught were those of Western Europe—German, Dutch, Polish, Norwegian, and French (Fishman & Keller, 1982, 3). With the establishment of California as a state, parochial schools proliferated in the southwest. At this time, bilingualism was accepted, and this acceptance was reflected governmentally by the establishment of one of the Acts of Congress in 1774-1779. As Fishman and Keller (1982) note, “The Congress provided for the publication in German of a number of documents in order to make them accessible to the German-speaking minority . . . In addition, federal laws were printed in French for the first time in 1806, and the federal government later mandated that all laws applying to the Louisiana territory be printed in both English and French” (4).

From 1774 to the 1840, bilingual education had been the domain of private and parochial schools. But after 1840 up to World War I, public schools began to experiment with bilingual education (Fishman & Keller, 1982, 4). After World War I, bilingual education was practically abandoned, and some states passed laws requiring “that English be the sole language of instruction . . .” (Fishman & Keller, 1982, 7). Other states even attempted to eradicate the teaching of foreign languages. However, the panorama for bilingual education in this

country changed after World War II because US soldiers found it difficult to deal with the linguistic pluralism of Europe. Therefore, according to Douglas Brown (2000), “the time was ripe for a language-teaching revolution. The US military provided the impetus with funding for special, intensive language courses that focused on the aural/oral skills . . .” (74). In the post-World War II period, the renewed interest in foreign language teaching continued. In the 50s and 60s, European immigration decreased, but after Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba in 1959, the United States experienced a new wave of immigration. The arrival of thousands of Spanish-speaking immigrants to Southern Florida paved the way for the proliferation of bilingual programs in this region. In 1963 in Dade County, Miami, the Coral Way elementary school initiated a bilingual program in which academic subjects were taught in both Spanish and English. This program became a model “for programs soon to be established in other parts of the country” (Fishman & Keller, 1982, 10). This was the beginning of dual language programs, which are also called bilingual immersion, developmental bilingual education, two-way language development programs. These programs “are full-time programs that use two languages, one of which is English, for the purpose of instruction Subject matter is learned through the native language as well as through the second language, enabling students to become proficient in a second language, and to continue developing skills and proficiency in their native language” (“Two-Way Language,” 1990). Since these programs are presented as the most successful language programs in the US, they are going to be analyzed in detail later on.

As it was stated before, the favorable outcome of Dade County Public Schools in Miami helped spread this language approach to other states: “Successful experiences in bilingual education—“first in Miami and later in Texas, New Mexico, and California . . . served to increased federal interest and support of bilingual programs in Spanish” (Escamilla, n.d.). Policymakers began to associate bilingualism with equal opportunity for minority groups. Then in 1968, the first national legislation on this issue was established with the passage of the Title VII Bilingual Education Act, which was “a new provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 [that] authorized funds for local school districts.” Escamilla notes that the monies “were specifically intended for programs for students who spoke languages other than English” (n.d). This act catapulted bilingual programs across the US.

Another factor that helped spread bilingual education was the decision of the US Supreme Court in 1974 in *Lau v. Nichols*. According to the Supreme Court decision, the educational rights of non-English speaking children are violated when the school fails to provide instruction in the language that these students understand. “While the Court did not mandate bilingual education as the remedy for these students, supporters of the Title VII Program—both inside and outside government—seized upon the case as legitimation for its expansion” (Schmidt, 2000, 13). Even though these laws were passed, pedagogical guidelines concerning the methods to approach bilingual education were nonexistent: “And by the early 1970s, controversy had erupted among educators and political activists

over competing approaches. During the decade that followed the conflict came to center on a debate between transitional and maintenance approaches to bilingual education” (Schmidt, 2000, 13). As used above, a transitional approach is one that employs “the student’s native language in subjects other than English only until the student masters the dominant language well enough to be mainstreamed into a monolingual English classroom” (Schmidt, 2000, 13-14). This approach sees the native language of the child as “a crutch that should be dispensed with as quickly as possible” (Schmidt, 2000, 13-14). Like the transitional approach, the maintenance approach, also “seeks to enable students to master English and to move quickly into mainstream classroom . . .” (Schmidt, 2000, 13-14). However, its view of the native language differs radically from the transitional approach. In the maintenance approach, the native language of a child is not seen as a crutch but rather as something valuable to be kept and mastered. “The aim for [it] is mastery of both languages, not just English” (Schmidt, 2000, 13-14). From out of these two approaches, different subtypes came into existence. However, the evaluation of their effectiveness has been shadowed by the political and social overtones of bilingualism in the US.

These political and social overtones can be found in the thoughts of opponents to bilingual education. For instance, Lloyd Dunn (1987) asserts that bilingual education will result in “‘at least the partial disintegration of the United States’” (as cited in Cummins, n.d., 2). Moreover, Dunn (1987) believes that Latino students speak neither English nor Spanish due to the lack of “‘scholastic aptitude or linguistic ability to master two languages well, or to handle switching from one to the other, at school, as the language of instruction’” (as cited in Cummins, n.d., 71). His view reflects that of other adversaries who think, as Cummings points out, “that children who speak a non-standard variety of English (or their first language [L1] are frequently thought to be handicapped educationally and less capable of logical thinking” (Cummings, n.d., 2). These misconceptions of bilingual children are rooted in socio-political attitudes rather than in serious scientific analyses of the cause(s) of the low performance of Latinos in the US.

English-only advocates and opponents of bilingualism found great support in 1985 when William Bennett, then Secretary of Education, noted in a speech to the Association for a Better New York: “After seventeen years of federal involvement, and after \$1.7 billion of federal funding, we have no evidence that the children whom we sought to help have benefited” (as cited in Lindholm, 2001, 17). Schmidt (2000) asserts that “Bennett became a leading national spokesperson for the campaign to ‘rescue’ English as the sole national language from the forces of bilingualism and multiculturalism, and remained active in this campaign long after he left public office” (p. 16). Bennett’s ideas produced a great deal of mistrust toward the effectiveness of bilingual education. Furthermore, he presented bilingualism as an evil force that threatened the stability of the US and would lead to the establishment of English as the sole language of the country. Another political event that affected the reputation of bilingual programs was the report of “two employees of the US Department of Education, Baker and de Kanter (1981, 1983) who reviewed the bilingual education evaluation

literature and concluded that bilingual education was not effective in meeting the educational needs of language minority children” (Lindholm, 2001, 17).

Revisions of evaluative studies on bilingual education continued. In his essay *The Evaluation of Bilingual Education: From Necessity and Probability to Possibility*, Gary A. Cziko reviews seven major bilingual education evaluations: Zappert & Cruz (1977), Troike (1978), American Institutes for Research, Baker & de Kanter (1981, 1983), Willig (1985), General Accounting Office (1987), and Aguirre International (1990). In this essay, Cziko (1992) analyzes these seven major evaluative studies of bilingual education and their diverse results. Zapper & Cruz tried to examine 184 studies in the US and abroad comparing bilingual and monolingual programs, but they selected only 12 studies due to the methodological flaws of the rest. Of these 12 studies, 9 were conducted in the US. Cziko (1992) noted that “of the 66 findings reported in these studies, 38 (58%) showed the bilingual programs to be superior, and 24 (14%) indicated no difference” (10). Cziko further acknowledges how the values ascribed to other languages and cultures affect the interpretation of any study. He notes Zapper & Cruz accepted the findings of “no difference” between bilingual and monolingual programs as evidence in favor of bilingualism because children were learning two languages without falling behind in the rest of the subjects (Cziko, 1992, 10). Troike’s study, on the other hand, differed from Zapper & Cruz in that Troike’s purpose in analyzing 12 bilingual programs in eight different states (involving native speakers of Spanish, Chinese, French, and Navajo) was to find evidence of the effectiveness of good bilingual programs. Troike concluded that “a quality bilingual education program can be effective in meeting the goals of equal educational opportunity for minority language children” (as cited in Cziko, 1992, 11). Recent studies (Cazabon et al., 93; Lindholm 2001) confirm the results of Troike’s investigation. These studies are going to be analyzed in detail later in this paper. Cziko examined another study by American Institutes for Research. The aim of this study was to assess the impact of Title VII (federal funded bilingual education) programs across the US. Their findings indicated that Title VII programs “did not appear to be having a consistent significant impact on student achievement” (Cziko 1992, 11). However, this study was criticized by others like Cardenas 77 and O’Malley 78 for its methodology. They did not distinguish between high- and low-quality bilingual programs (Cziko, 1992, 11). Of Baker and de Kanter’s study, Cziko mentions that they “concluded in their narrative report that the evidence they examined does not support the belief that bilingual education is more effective than other approaches to educating LEP [Limited English Proficient] children while Willig’s meta-analysis of their [Baker and de Kante’s] data provided evidence for consistent advantages in achievement for bilingually educated students” (Cziko, 1992, 12). The inadequacy of the research methodology used by Baker and de Kante discredits this evaluation of bilingual education. Lindholm (2001) asserts that “in her analysis, Willig controlled for 183 variables that [they] had not taken into account and, most importantly, controlled for the design weaknesses in the studies” (18). This evidence completely shattered

the findings and credibility of Baker and de Kante's evaluation of bilingual education.

The last study reviewed was Aguirre International for the US Department of Education, a *Longitudinal Study of Immersion Strategy, Early-Exit and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language-Minority Children* (Ramirez, Yen, Ramey, & Pasta, 1991). The goal of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of English Immersion and late-exit transitional bilingual programs. From this study, research has focused on high-quality bilingual programs. Indeed, two major findings in this report were the turning point of bilingual programs in the US. The first finding was that

achievement in Mathematics, English language skill, and English reading skills were comparable in the English immersion and early-exit bilingual programs. In other words, language-minority students in atypical bilingual education program that provides less than an hour per day of native-language instruction over a period of two or three years did not demonstrate better achievement than comparable students in programs with bilingual teachers who permitted their students to use their native language but who themselves essentially used English as the sole language of instruction. (Cziko, 1992, 12)

Even though students in early-exit programs did not manifest better achievement than students in English immersion, they did not fall behind in their studies because they were instructed in their native language less than an hour per day. Therefore, bilingualism, in this case, did not retard the learning process. On the other hand, the second finding revealed "that students in late-exit programs who were provided with substantial instruction in their native language and who were gradually introduced to English as the language of instruction showed the greatest growth in Mathematics" (Cziko, 1992, 12). In other words, children who received much less English than those in English immersion outperformed them. And, not only did they outperform English immersion children, but they also benefited from instruction in two languages.

The Ramirez report clearly demonstrated the effectiveness and success of certain bilingual programs in the US. Program evaluations like the Ramirez report (1991) showed the benefits of bilingual programs with a maintenance approach (learning L2 while maintaining their L1). Ramirez compared the academic performance of Latino elementary children in three different bilingual programs: English immersion, early-exit programs, and late-exit programs. In the first one, the instruction is almost exclusively in English throughout the grades. In early-exit bilingual programs, "instruction in the first language is phased out rapidly, with most students mainstreamed by the end of first or second grade" ("ESL Bilingual Program," 1993). And the third one, late-exit bilingual programs vary from early-exit programs " 'primarily in the amount and duration that English is used for instruction as well as the length of time students are to participate in each program' " ("ESL Bilingual Program," 1993).

In these programs, Ramirez notes that “students remain in late-exit programs throughout elementary school and continue to receive 40% or more of their instruction in their first language, even when they have been reclassified as fluent-English-proficient” (“ESL Bilingual Program,” 1993). In sum, in late-exit programs, the native language is an asset rather than a crutch that has to be taken away. The benefits of these programs are shown in Ramirez’s conclusion to his report:

Students who were provided with a substantial and consistent primary language development program learned mathematics, English language, and English reading skills as fast or faster than the norming population used in this study. As their growth in these academic skills is atypical of disadvantaged youth, it provides support for the efficacy of primary language development in facilitating the acquisition of English language skills. (as cited in Cummings, n.d., 16)

His findings are significant since they provide evidence of the transfer of literacy skills from the students’ native language to their target language. Hence, academic knowledge in both languages proves beneficial for children. In addition, these findings contradict an important belief held by opponents of it: the time-on-task issue (the more time a student spends on English, the better his/her overall academic performance). Cummings asserts that these findings show “that there is no direct relationship between the instructional time spent through the medium of a majority language and academic achievement in that language” (Cummings, n.d., 16). In fact, these findings demonstrate that, in the case of Latino(a) students, the opposite occurs.

Other studies confirm this phenomenon and indicate that dual language programs prove to be more effective in achieving a better academic performance of Latino students in the US. For instance, In 1993 Mary Cazabon, Wallace E. Lambert, and Geoff Hall carried out a study titled *Two-Way Bilingual Education: A Progress Report on the Amigos Program*. Cazabon worked for six years with a program called the Amigos Program. “*Amigos* is a two-way immersion program instituted in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1986. The students typically begin the program in kindergarten and continue through Grade 8. Half of each class is composed of native-English speaking students and half of native-Spanish-speaking students” (Cazabon, Nicoladis, & Lambert, 1998). The students are taught in both languages, 50% Spanish, 50% English. The purpose of the study carried out by Cazabon is to examine the development of students in a two-way bilingual program by analyzing both their attitudes toward becoming bilingual and their personal academic achievement in both languages. The study lacks data to claim that better attitudes toward the target language will result in better academic achievement; however, as they say “this study [is] . . . a first step toward showing the relationship between the two” (Cazabon et al., 1998, 2).

Cazabon et al. (1998) aimed to examine students’ progress in a two-way bilingual program by observing whether the Amigos’ attitudes about

bilingualism and their academic achievement improved as they spent more time in this curriculum. To ratify this claim, they utilized the following procedure. First, since they wanted to analyze and get insights into students' attitudes toward bilingualism, they interviewed two Hispanic Amigos students in depth. Second, they gave the Amigos students a questionnaire with items related to the importance of becoming bilingual. Some of the questions were about how much they enjoyed studying Spanish and English within a bilingual setting. They also tried to elicit information about whether too much time was spent on Spanish, and on how well they translated from English to Spanish. Third, in order to see if the students were in fact becoming bilingual and achieving academically, they examined the Amigos students' scores on standardized achievement tests of reading and math in English and Spanish over a 5- to 6-year period.

They produced several interesting results from this study. From the interviews of the two Hispanic Amigos students, they observed that both students highly valued bilingualism. One of them saw bilingualism "as a plus to her life and future prospects . . . being bilingual . . . will make [her] business more successful" (Cazabon et al., 1998, 4). The other one stated that bilingualism helped her with skills "she might need in the future" (Cazabon et al., 1998, 4). Both wanted to continue with their higher education no matter the obstacles.

From the questionnaire on attitudes, the answers to the questions—i.e., if they enjoyed learning Spanish and English in the Amigos program, and if they thought that the right amount of time was spent on Spanish—were mostly answered positively. However, Cazabon observed a slight decrease in satisfaction with Spanish and English as they are taught in the Amigos Program across the grade levels (English Amigos group 8th grade). Then as to the question of how good they were at translating from Spanish to English, or from English to Spanish, there was not much difference between English- and Spanish-Amigos and not much difference by grade level. Cazabon states that "both groups at all grades seem[ed] to think that they [could] translate more than 'some things' but less than 'most things'" (Cazabon et al., 1998, 7). Finally, as to the question if they thought that they were behind in English compared to children at other schools, there was also not much difference between grade levels, but there was a slight difference between the two groups. The English Amigos reported "that they [were] generally 'not behind in English at all.' The fourth-grade Spanish-Amigos [thought] they [were] closer to 'a bit behind but not very much,' but by fifth grade, they [thought] they [were] not behind at all" (Cazabon et al., 1998, 7).

After the analysis of the questionnaire, they decided to compare scores on standardized tests in English and Spanish. For this comparison, they used control groups. The English control group was made up of native- English-speaking students enrolled in the regular all-English stream that was offered in the same school as the Amigos Program. The Spanish control group was made up of native- Spanish-speaking students enrolled in the transitional bilingual stream in the Cambridge public schools. In other words, the latter were in the early-exit program. From this comparison they expected to find that if the Amigos had achieved bilingualism, both groups of Amigos would have scored

the same or higher on the English achievement tests as the English-speaking control group and the same or higher on the Spanish achievement tests as the Spanish-speaking control group. On the English Reading (CAT), the English Amigos scored as well as, or better than, the English control groups. The Spanish Amigos scored “no differently from the English control group in reading on the CAT and scored significantly higher than the English control group in English-language math in grades 4 through 6” (Cazabon et al., 1998, 10). On the other hand, the SABE test of Spanish achievement reveals that the Spanish Amigos scored as well as, or better than, the Spanish control group in reading and math at all grades. As Cazabon (1998) notes, the English-Amigos scored “significantly lower in reading than the Spanish control group in grades 4 to 6 and as well as or better than the Spanish control group in math at all grades” (11).

Cazabon concluded that in general both ethnic groups in the Amigos program “[were] approaching balanced skills in the two languages in reading and math” (Cazabon et al., 1998, 11). In addition, that through the day-by-day contact between both groups, students gained appreciation for each other’s culture. He also acknowledged that more data are needed to make thorough claims of these students’ bilingualism and biculturalism. In addition, they stated that the results of this study might answer the question if bilingualism was beneficial for all children. The fact that English Amigos and Spanish Amigos were not behind in English, even though they received 50% of their instruction in English; that their English seemed as good as or in many instances better than that of students who were in an all-English program; and that they generally scored higher in math than students in an all-English program, indicate the positive aspects of having a bilingual education. In short, the suggestion of this study is “that immigrant students can better learn and master English if they are simultaneously permitted to develop or maintain a high degree of literacy in their native language” (Cazabon et al., 1998, 12).

This study aroused interest because, no matter if the control group was Spanish or English, the overall performance of the English Amigos and Spanish Amigos excelled that of the control groups. Furthermore, the English-Amigos had a better performance in math than the Spanish-Amigos. Both the English-Amigos and the Spanish-Amigos obtained a higher score in English reading at all grades than the English control group. However, when these two groups are compared to the Spanish-control group in Spanish reading, only the Spanish Amigos obtained a higher score than the Spanish-control group.

It seems to me that the Spanish-Amigos performed as well as or slightly inferior to the English-Amigos but superior to the English control group in English because they were learning the L2 in the country of the target language. Notwithstanding, when the Spanish-Amigos were compared to the English Amigos in Spanish reading, the Spanish Amigos outperformed the English Amigos because, according to my view, the Spanish Amigos received academic Spanish at school and had a chance to practice it at home, while the English Amigos only had academic instruction in Spanish at school. In regard to math, English Amigos and the Spanish Amigos had higher scores than the English

control group and the Spanish control group except for grade 7. In addition, the English Amigos always had higher scores than the Spanish and English control group in math, despite the fact that math was taught in English or Spanish. Obviously, math goes beyond language proficiency.

By looking at both of the results of the attitude survey and the results of the standardized tests in Spanish and in English, the students of the Amigos two-way immersion program seem to have both a better attitude and appreciation for people of another culture and to perform better than students who are enrolled in all-English programs. This study does not show a direct link between a good attitude toward bilingualism and good language performance. But what this study does, in particular, is to defy the arguments of people who oppose bilingualism by claiming that it leads to academic failure. This study demonstrates the opposite. Furthermore, it reveals that students enrolled in this program perform better than students enrolled in early-exit programs. Students who are deprived of studying their native language are deprived of both their L1 and the opportunity to have a better academic performance in the rest of the subjects. There seems to be a link between proficiency of L1 and success in L2. Maybe Lambert is right and the “degree of language mastery influences an individual’s self-concept and sense of attainment of proficiency” (as cited in Cazabon et al., 1998, 1)

At the end of the report, Cazabon refers to the fact that many educational programs do not allow minority students to succeed, which is contrary to what seems to occur in the Amigos two-way immersion program. They even go further by hypothesizing that the Amigos two-way immersion program may “become a new form of non-elitist, talent-promoting gifted program open to all students, if further studies of two-way bilingual programs confirm what [they] have seen so far” (Cazabon et al., 1998, 12). But one thing is true: two-way bilingual programs are both a good option for dealing with non-English speaking immigrants and for broadening the horizons of the world of English-speaking children. The makers of education policy in the US should reconsider the success or failure of bilingualism in the light of these programs.

Another extensive study that analyzes two-way immersion programs is the one by Kathryn J. Lindholm (2001), who began to document and recollect data from these programs in the 80s. Lindholm’s research “includes data from more than 20 schools at different stages of implementation, and comprises the major types of dual language education programs. Data collection efforts encompass considerable longitudinal and cross-sectional data, with students from diverse cultural, socioeconomic, and language backgrounds” (2). This research is one of the most extensive in the field of bilingual programs. The great majority of schools involved in this study are found in California and have the two main variants of the TWI model: 90:10 and 50:50. Transitional bilingual Education (TBE) programs are included as comparative data. Schools are also described in terms of their ethnic density and socioeconomic status need (SES need). These factors are included because they are “important in influencing the quality of education, including teacher attitudes and the availability of educational resources and experienced teachers” (Lindholm, 2001, 79). Her data also

include background information of the teachers, parents, and students. Data collection approaches contain observational methods, assessment frameworks, standardized tests, portfolios, and questionnaires. In this study, she presents the evaluation outcomes of 4,900 students in these programs in oral and academic language proficiency, reading and literacy, and in the content area achievement of mathematics, science, and social studies. For the purpose of this paper, one of these studies (oral language proficiency) is going to be discussed in detail.

For oral language proficiency, some of the research questions examined were the following: what level of oral proficiency (L1, L2, and bilingual proficiency) students had after participating in a DLE program; what student background (ethnicity, SES, level of L1), school demographic (high versus low ethnic/SES density), and program type (90:10, 50:50, TBE, EO) influenced L2 proficiency; and what level of L1 proficiency at program entry influenced L1 and L2 proficiency after years of participation (Lindholm, 2001, 182).

Concerning the first question both English and Spanish students exhibited high levels of proficiency in their L1. But English speakers “did not vary in their English language development according to the type of program in which they were participating” (Lindholm, 2001, 203). Even though English speakers in 90:10 programs received 10% or 20% of English, they scored as well as, or better than, students who received 50% or 100% of instruction in English. On the contrary, the type of program affected significantly the Spanish speakers’ proficiency level in their L1. “Students in 90:10 programs received higher ratings than did students in 50:50 and TBE programs” (Lindholm, 2001, pp. 203-204). The other factors, school demography and SES need, were not significant in influencing students’ oral language proficiency in L1.

Interesting findings were obtained when analyzing the L2 proficiency. Spanish speakers in TBE programs outscored DLE students; “they began kindergarten with fairly high scores and made little growth across the years in English proficiency. In contrast, DLE students made significant gains across the grade levels, with sixth-grade DLE students outscoring TBE students in the percentage of students rated as proficient in English” (Lindholm, 2001, 204). This finding is valuable because DLE students obtained 100% of proficiency in English by grade sixth while TBE students obtained 73%. Another suggestive finding about Spanish speakers was the fact that the differences between students who participated in 90:10 and 50:50 programs were not noticeable. It did not matter if they received 10% or 50% of English. 90:10 students scored similarly to 50:50 students (Lindholm, 2001, 204). However, English speakers seemed to benefit more from 90:10 than from 50:50 programs; they outscored 50:50 students. In analyzing schools’ SES need, there were no significant differences in students in 90HI (high in ethnicity and in SES need) or 90LO (low in ethnicity and in SES need). But English students of upper-grade levels in 90HI “were graded more proficient in Spanish than 90LO English students” (Lindholm, 2001, 205).

The question if the level of L1 proficiency at program entry influences the L1 and L2 proficiency after years of participating in the program did not produce

important results. "There was little significant relationship between L1 and L2 proficiency for English or Spanish speakers at any grade level. Thus, as a group, their L1 scores were not related to L2 scores" (Lindholm, 2001, 206). Lindholm attributes this lack of relationship between L1 and L2 to the fact that the students were at very different levels of bilingual proficiency.

From the results of this first study, Lindholm concluded that both DLE models promoted high levels of proficiency in both L1 and L2 and that students in 90:10 programs developed higher levels of bilingual proficiency than did students in 50:50 (Lindholm, 2001, 206). She also concluded that "in developing proficiency in English language, both English and Spanish speakers benefited equally from 90:10 and 50:50 programs" (Lindholm, 2001, 206). However, in developing proficiency in Spanish, both groups benefited more from 90:10 than from 50:50 programs. These findings that she observes also show that participation in DLE programs does not retard "the native language development of Spanish or English speakers. In contrast, almost all students, regardless of their student characteristics, were proficient in English and Spanish" (Lindholm, 2001, 206).

After looking at the results of this study, I believe that they confirm what other researchers in the field of bilingual education have concluded: "there is no direct relationship between the instructional time spent through the medium of a majority language and academic achievement in that language" (Cummins, n.d.). In other words, these findings contradict an important issue in bilingual education held by its opponents: the time-on-task issue. The fact that less English in the classroom does not affect the performance of this language for both English and Spanish speakers but that more Spanish in the classroom makes a difference for both groups, may be explained by the fact that, being English the majority language of the US, students have longer exposure to it outside the classroom. On the other hand, in the case of Spanish speakers, they may transfer content in their L1 to English, which demonstrates that good bilingual programs reinforce the additive bilingualism enrichment principle. As Cummins notes "Bilingualism can positively affect both intellectual and linguistic process" (Cummins, n.d.).

The results of this study and of others in this field have great implications for the future of bilingual education in the United States. Since the history of bilingualism in the US has constantly shifted between governmental and public support or outright rejection of bilingualism, language programs in the US should, therefore, be depoliticized, and authorities should plan governmental policies based on the analyses of academic research. Studies have accessed different variables such as family background and teachers, peers, and parents' attitudes toward bilingual programs. However, when examining the success of bilingual programs, researchers still do not acknowledge the different variations and types of bilingual programs in the US, and they often give a simplified and unfair judgment of them. Recent research has shed light on the different characteristics of bilingual problems and on the effectiveness of some of them. But, the success of two-way immersion or dual language programs should further be examined, and authorities should implement and train teachers, parents, and

local authorities in these programs because, as Lindholm (2001) asserts, there has been a lot of experimentation with these programs, and “some . . . programs that call themselves dual language are really not dual language programs at all” (3). There is a need for what Lindholm calls “a clearly defined pedagogy” (2001, 3) for bilingual programs in the US in order to assure a better future for bilingualism.

Once “a clearly defined pedagogy” is achieved, the next step would be to examine an important variable that has not been evaluated, and which I consider primordial when assessing the effectiveness of a bilingual program: teaching methodology. Those bilingual programs that have been considered successful—in the sense that children have achieved average or higher performance than those in English immersion—must be analyzed in the light of what happens in the classroom. What are the teaching techniques used by the teachers? What are the activities that promote learning? What are the relationships between teachers and students? What are the relationships among students? Do students learning the L2 benefit more from interacting with other students who are native speakers of the L2, or from their teachers? The spectrum of future research in determining not if dual language programs are effective but what makes them effective is more than ample. Dual language programs have started to pave the way for new insights and investigations in second language acquisition. As Charles L. Glen states:

The best setting for educating linguistic minority pupils—and one of the best for educating any pupil—is a school in which two languages are used without apology and where becoming proficient in both is considered a significant intellectual and cultural achievement. (as cited in Christian, 1994, 1)

Bibliography

- Bilingualism: What is it?* (n.d.). Retrieved September 2, 2003, from <http://busboy.sped.ukans.edu/~tl817/course/notes/note4.html>
- Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Longman.
- Cazabon, M. T., E. Nicoladis & W.E. Lambert (1998). *Becoming Bilingual in the Amigos Two-Way Immersion Program*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence. Retrieved September 25, 2003, from <http://www.cal.org/crede/pubs/research/rr3.htm>
- Christian, D. (1994). *Two-Way Bilingual Education: Students Learning Through Two Languages*. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved November 11, 2003, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/miscpubs/ncrecdsl/epr12index.htm>

Cummins, J. (n.d.). *Primary Language Instruction and the Education of Language Minority Students*. Retrieved September 2, 2003, from <http://www.busboy.sped.ukans.edu/~tl817/course/articles/cummins.html>

Cziko, G. (n.d.). *The Evaluation of Bilingual Education: From Necessity and Probability to Possibility*. *Educational Researcher*, 21(2), 10-15. Retrieved from JSTOR database. <http://www.busboy.sped.ukans.edu/~tl817/course/articles/cziko.html>

Escamilla, K. (n.d.). *A Brief History of Bilingual Education in Spanish*. Retrieved November 6, 2003, from <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed308055.html>

ESL and Bilingual Program Models (1993). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED362072)

Fishman, J. & G.D. Keller (1982). *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual Language Education*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Two-Way Language Development Programs (1990). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED321589)

Williams, J. & G.C. Snipper (1990). *Literacy and Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.