

Bilingual Annotated Bibliography

This bibliography was created specifically for a chapter in Wink, J., & Wink, D. (in production). *Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn: Passionate Pedagogy*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon. (4.12.03)

As this chapter is filled with stories, which demonstrate the data, we have chosen to list the research which support the narrative by the means of Chapter Notes. These specific citations were used in the development of the personal stories. Please note that we include a short annotated bibliography and three documents which follow.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

A comprehensive review of the basic and policy-centered research of schooling for language-minority students. It offers suggestions for how evaluation can be used to improve programmatic models.

Baker, C., & Hornberger, N. (Eds.). (2001). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

This text answers four specific questions which are embedded within the narratives of this chapters: (a) Does bilingual education work? The research clearly shows that successful programs exist throughout the world for linguistic minority and majority groups. In these programs students, students do not suffer academically or linguistically in the target language, even though much of their learning is in the minority language. (b) Does bilingual education work better than English-only programs? Until the term "bilingual education" has a clear definition which is accepted for research, it is difficult to be sure. However, to date the enriched models whose goals are bilingualism and biliteracy for both groups of learners show better outcomes. (c) Will students suffer academically if they are introduced to reading in their second language? No, the language of initial introduction of reading is not, in itself, a determinant in academic outcomes. (d) Will greater amounts of English instruction (time-on-task) result in greater English achievement? The data overwhelmingly fails to show any positive relationship between the amount of English instruction in a program and student outcomes.

Crawford, J. (1999, 4/e). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*.

An excellent critical perspective on the history of bilingual education; present-day bilingual education; in addition to an extensive look at the federal policies governing bilingual education. This text serves undergraduates and graduates well, whether they be new to bilingual education or veterans in the field who need a good resource book.

Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford tackles the paradox of bilingual education. Pedagogically speaking, the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that a well-designed bilingual program can produce high levels of academic achievement, at no cost to English. Politically speaking, the counter-intuitive research has not persuaded the public.

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD>

This web site has a wealth of current information relating to this chapter. Crawford reports how the English Only movement has advanced in all the fifty states of the United States. Email discussions with Ron Unz, a major supporter of the English Only movement are posted in this web site. Mr. Unz clearly reveals his intentions of eliminating bilingual education in this country. The academic research on bilingual education enables readers to gain a well balanced view of the language debate.

Cummins, J.(2000). Biliteracy, empowerment, and transformative pedagogy. In J. V. Tinajero and R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum*. (pp. 9 - 19). NY: McGraw-Hill School Division.

Applied linguists agree that research and evaluation results on bilingual education demonstrate its efficacy. The principles advanced by advocates have been found true in the data. In addition, instructional time spent on a student's first language does not adversely affect the acquisition of English as a second language.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Framed in a critical perspective which grounds teaching and learning in a broader sociocultural context, this is an overview of research and theory as it relates to the instruction and assessment of bilingual learners. In this text Cummins focuses on the patterns of human interactions within school and within the wider societal structures. He concludes the text with a critique of the most recent and significant studies on bilingualism.

<http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/researchbildebate.html>

Cummins, using the construct of doublethink, critiques three, who have publicly condemned bilingual education. Cummins demonstrates how Rosalie Pedalino Porter, Keith Baker, and Christine Rossell contradict themselves in their arguments against bilingual education. As Porter, Baker, and Rossell oppose bilingual education, they have also spoken in support of the effectiveness of bilingual programs. Cummins admonishes that they need to be more ethically responsible for the

information that they are presenting, especially since the public perceive them to be credible. Their arguments have helped with the passage of Proposition 227 in California and the denial of equal access to education for bilingual children.

Dolson, D. (1985) The effects of Spanish home language use on the scholastic performance of Hispanic pupils. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6 (2), 135-155.

Dolson, D. (1985) examined school performance among fifth and sixth graders in one Los Angeles school who came from families that spoke only Spanish at home when the child entered elementary school. Children from families that kept using Spanish at home significantly outperformed children from families that switched to English at home on tests of mathematics and had higher grade point averages. There was also a tendency for those who kept using Spanish at home to excel in English reading. A plausible explanation for this effect is that use of the first language at home encourages more and higher quality parent-child interaction, which has positive consequences for cognitive and affective development.

Fishman, J. (1990). Empirical explorations of two popular assumptions: Inter-polity perspective on the relationships between linguistic heterogeneity, civil strife, and per capita gross national product. In G. Imhoff (Ed.) *Learning in Two Languages*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. pp. 209-225.

Fishman (1990) analyzed the impact of 230 possible predictors of civil strife and economic well-being in 170 countries. His results suggest that multilingualism is not to blame for political or economic problems.

Krashen, S. (1992). *Fundamentals of Language Acquisition*. Torrence, CA: Laredo Publishing Co.

Krashen provides an overview of his second language acquisition hypotheses, and their application to bilingual education. The “affective filter” prevents comprehensible input from reaching the “language acquisition device, as posited by Chomsky (1965).

Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City: Language Education Associates.

The published research on bilingual education is consistent: Children in properly organized bilingual education programs acquire English at least as well as, and usually better than children in all-English programs.

Krashen, S. (1998). Heritage language development: Some practical arguments. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, and J. McQuillan (Eds.) *Heritage Language Development*. Culver City: Language Education Associates. pp. 3-13.

The development of heritage language results in modest advantages in cognitive development (it makes you smarter; Krashen, 1999); it has

practical, job-related advantages (we need bilingual spies, sales personnel, interpreters) and it leads to smoother relationships between the 3 generations (Wong Fillmore, 1991).

Krashen, S. (2000). The two goals of bilingual education: Development of academic English and heritage language development. In J. V. Tinajero and R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum*. (pp. 20 – 27). NY: McGraw-Hill School Division.

The first goal of bilingual education is the development of academic English and academic success; the second goal is the development of the primary or heritage language. A bilingual citizenry is good for national security and diplomacy and carries additional economic and social advantages. Krashen posits that the way to increase good bilingual education is with a flood of book in the languages of children. It would cost less than the many tests, curriculum packages, and computers, and the rewards would be greater.

Krashen, S. (2002). Is all-English best? A response to Bengston. *TESOL Matters*, 12.2.2003. p. 5.

How the first language can help the second in school? Properly organized bilingual education programs use the first language in ways that accelerate and facilitate second language development. First, when teachers provide students with solid subject matter in the first language, it gives the students knowledge. This knowledge helps make the English children hear and read much more comprehensible. A child who speaks little English who is knowledgeable about history, thanks to education in the first language, will understand more in a history class taught in English than a limited English proficient child without this knowledge. The child with a background in history will learn more history, and will acquire more English, because the English heard in class will be more comprehensible. Second, developing literacy in the first language is a short-cut to literacy in the second language. It is easier to learn to read in a language you understand; once you can read in one language, this knowledge transfers rapidly to any other language you learn to read. Once you can read, you can read. This phenomenon has been confirmed in many studies and is well-known to many teachers

Greene, J. (1997). A meta-analysis of the Rossell and Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21 (2,3), 103-122.

A recent review of research on the effectiveness of bilingual education is Greene (1997), who concluded that the use of the native language in instructing English learners has beneficial effects and that "efforts to eliminate the use of the native language in instruction ... harm children by denying them access to beneficial approaches" (p. 115).

Kerper Mora, J. (2003)

<http://coe.sdsu.edu/people/jmora>

Mora provides the arguments supporting monolingual education and those arguments supporting bilingual education. The roadmap to the bilingual education debate presents the cultural, linguistic, and academic program issues from both points of view. The conclusion is clear. If bilingual students are not supported in their primary/heritage language, there will be great consequences for the rest of society. Since public education system has failed to meet their needs, bilingual children will not contribute to the society.

Oller, D.K. and R. E. Eilers, R.E. (2002). *Language and Literacy in Bilingual Children*. Clevedon, England.

The most recent study of the effectiveness of bilingual education was done by a research team headed by D. K.Oller and Eilers (2002). At grade five, students in a bilingual program (60% English, 40% Spanish) did as well as comparisons in an all-English program (with an optional 10% of the day in Spanish) on tests of English literacy, and did far better on tests of Spanish.

Ramírez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., & Ramey, D.R. (1991). *Executive summary: Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children*. Contract No. 300-87-0156. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. San Mateo: Aguirre International.

This is a longitudinal evaluation which compared three distinct programs: English-only immersion; early-exit or transitional bilingual education; and late-exit or enrichment/maintenance bilingual education. This study followed over 2,000 elementary children for four years. The comprehensive data collection documented an array of child, family, classroom, teacher, school, district, and community information. The study concluded that providing language minority students with substantial instruction in their primary language does not interfere with or delay their acquisition of English language skills, but helps them to "catch-up" to their English-speaking peers in English language arts, English reading, and math. In contrast, providing language minority students with almost exclusive instruction in English does not accelerate their acquisition of English language arts, reading or math, i.e., they do not appear to be "catching-up." The data suggest that by grade six, students provided with English-only instruction may actually fall further behind their English-speaking peers. Data also document that learning a second language will take six or more years. Retrieved from:

http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/nabe/brj/v16/16_12_ramirez.htm

Rand Reading Study Group (2002). Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension. Report prepared for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Stanley, N (August 2002).

Teaching non-native speakers to read. *Language Magazine*, p. 36.

According to a Rand Corporation report (McCarthy and Valdez, 1985), over 90% of Mexican-Americans born in the United States say they are proficient in English, and among those born in Mexico who are permanent residents of the United States, over 75% said they spoke some English and nearly half said they spoke English well. The Rand researchers concluded that "the transition to English begins almost immediately and proceeds very rapidly." (See Tse, 2001, for additional evidence showing that immigrants and their families are acquiring English.)

<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1465/MR1465.pdf>

<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/language/table5.txt> and

<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/language/table2.txt>).

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Resource power and autonomy through discourse in conflict—a Finnish migrant school strike in Sweden. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins. (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 251-277). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

This book contains a collection of articles, which reveals the impact of the societal power structure on minority language students throughout the world. Collectively, the articles demonstrate that the use of minority language for instruction lessens the ambivalence and hostility of the language minority students towards the dominant culture and languages, and the use of the minority language increases academic performance and feelings of self-worth. The history of struggle of the Finnish students in the context of Sweden is highlighted in several of the articles. In one example, a school strike by Finnish parents who withdrew their children from a Swedish school when they learned that instruction time in Finnish was to be cut. It is hypothesized that the resulting renewed sense of efficacy among the Finnish children lead to higher levels of academic achievement.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—Of worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahawa, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Thirty years of passion and dedication to linguistic human rights and scholarly contributions are shared in this 785-page synthesis of her life's work. Language rights is the glue which holds together her vast global perspectives regarding marginalized communities.

Declaration of Children's Linguistic Human Rights

Every child should have the right to identify with her original mother tongue and have her identification accepted and respect by others.

Every child should have the right to learn the mother tongue fully.

Every child should have the right to choose when she wants to use the mother tongue in all official situations.

Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. George Mason University, Fairfax, VA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence

English-language learners do better academically over the long term if they participate in special programs to learn English at the start of their school careers, rather than attend only mainstream classes. Students who take bilingual education classes do much better on standardized tests after entering mainstream classes than students who take English-only classes. The study reports on student records from 1982 to 2000 provided by five school districts, including the 208,000-student Houston district, and is part of an ongoing, federally financed study of programs for English-language learners in 16 school districts.

http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (Winter/Spring, 2003). Reforming education policies for English learners: Research evidence from U.S. Schools. *The Multilingual Educator*, 4 (1), pp. 16-19.

A summary of their longitudinal research findings. It is particularly accessible information, as the data are all summarized and listed in bulleted items; for example:

- English Learners submersed in the English mainstream because their parents refused all bilingual and ESL services show large decreases in reading and math achievement by Grade 5, when compared to students who received bilingual/ESL services.
- The strongest predictor of L2 student achievement is amount of formal L1 schooling. The more L1 grade-level schooling, the higher L2 achievement.

Tse, L. (1997, December 17). A bilingual helping hand education: Many children get no help learning English outside school. Los Angeles Times.

One can also argue that encouraging the use and development of heritage languages is in the national interest: Tse (2001) points out that, "learning English while maintaining the heritage language is perhaps the easiest and most efficient way to achieve bilingualism, and being bilingual carries advantages in many domains" (p. 48). For the individual, bilingualism improves school performance, provides access to wider sources of information, and has career advantages. Bilingual citizens contribute to society economically, through improved trade and improved national security (Krashen, 1998; Tse, 2001).

WestEd Study (in progress). (2003). Effects of the Implementation of Proposition 227 on the Education of English Learners, K-12: Year 2 Report

This is a legislatively mandated study to monitor and record the effects of California's 1998 move away from traditional bilingual education to immersion. Robert Linqunti is the lead investigator. The study compares the achievement of children in schools that maintained bilingual education through special waivers with the achievement of children in schools that dropped bilingual education; the increases in the reading scores of the two groups of students in grades 2 top 5 were identical. Some areas of concern for researchers remains; for example, in 2001 more children were tested than in 1998. In addition, this study demonstrates that even some "English-only" programs use considerable amounts of the child's first language. The data so far demonstrate that there is no substantial increase in English competence in California since 1998. The gap between English speakers and English learners has widened since the passage of Prop 227 in 1998. Currently, 4% of English learners in high school made it to the 50% on the state-wide test—a score that is down from other years. Scores from other grades are either stagnant or down, and continue to get worse, as the students get older.

<http://www.wested.org/cs/wew/view/rs/661>

Crawford, J. (November, 1998). *Ten common fallacies about bilingual education*. (Retrieved February 26, 2003 from <http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/crawford01.html>)

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Sacramento, CA: California Association of Bilingual Educator.

Mora, J., Wink, J., & Wink, D. (Fall, 2001). Dueling models of dual language instruction: A critical review of the literature and program implementation guide. *Bilingual research journal*, 25(4), 435-460.

Crawford, J. (1997). Ten Common Fallacies About Bilingual Education. Retrieved February 26, 2003, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cal.org/ericc11/digest/crawford01.html>

Researchers have made considerable advances in the fields of psycholinguistics, second language acquisition, bilingual pedagogy, and multicultural education. Today, we know a great deal more about the challenges faced by English language learners and about promising strategies for overcoming them. One such strategy, bilingual education, has been the subject of increasing controversy. Although a growing body of research points to the potential benefits, there are a number of commonly held beliefs about bilingual education that run counter to research findings. Based on current research, this

digest clarifies some of the myths and misconceptions surrounding language use and bilingual education in the United States.

Fallacy 1: English is losing ground to other languages in the United States.

More world languages are spoken in the United States today than ever before. However, this is a quantitative, not a qualitative change from earlier periods. Concentrations of non-English language speakers were common in the 19th century, as reflected by laws authorizing native language instruction in a dozen states and territories. In big cities as well as rural areas, children attended bilingual and non-English schools, learning in languages as diverse as French, Norwegian, Czech, and Cherokee. In 1900, there were at least 600,000 elementary school children receiving part or all of their instruction in German (Kloss 1998). Yet English survived without any help from government, such as official-language legislation.

Fallacy 2: Newcomers to the United States are learning English more slowly now than in previous generations.

To the contrary, today's immigrants appear to be acquiring English more rapidly than ever before. While the number of minority-language speakers is projected to grow well into the next century, the number of bilinguals fluent in both English and another language is growing even faster. Between 1980 and 1990, the number of immigrants who spoke non-English languages at home increased by 59%, while the portion of this population that spoke English very well rose by 93% (Waggoner, 1995). In 1990, only 3% of U.S. residents reported speaking English less than *well* or *very well*. Only eight tenths of one percent spoke no English at all. About three in four Hispanic immigrants, after 15 years in this country, speak English on a daily basis, while 70% of their children become dominant or monolingual in English (Veltman, 1988).

Fallacy 3: The best way to learn a language is through "total immersion."

There is no credible evidence to support the "time on task" theory of language learning, the claim that the more children are exposed to English, the more English they will learn. Research shows that what counts is not just the quantity, but the quality of exposure. Second-language input must be *comprehensible* to promote second-language acquisition (Krashen, 1996). If students are left to sink or swim in mainstream classrooms, with little or no help in understanding their lessons, they won't learn much English. If native language instruction is used to make lessons meaningful, they will learn more English, and more subject matter, too.

Fallacy 4: Children learning English are retained too long in bilingual classrooms, at the expense of English acquisition.

Time spent learning in well designed bilingual programs is learning time well spent. Knowledge and skills acquired in the native language, literacy in particular, are "transferable" to the second language. They do not need to be

relearned in English (Krashen, 1996; Cummins, 1992). Thus, there is no reason to rush limited-English-proficient (LEP) students into the mainstream before they are ready.

Research over the past two decades has determined that, despite appearances, it takes children a long time to attain full proficiency in a second language. Often, they are quick to learn the conversational English used on the playground, but normally they need several years to acquire the cognitively demanding, decontextualized language used for academic pursuits (Collier & Thomas, 1989).

Bilingual education programs that emphasize a gradual transition to English and offer native-language instruction in declining amounts over time, provide continuity in children's cognitive growth and lay a foundation for academic success in the second language. By contrast, English-only approaches and quick-exit bilingual programs can interrupt that growth at a crucial stage, with negative effects on achievement (Cummins, 1992).

Fallacy 5: School districts provide bilingual instruction in scores of native languages.

Where children speak a number of different languages, rarely are there sufficient numbers of each language group to make bilingual instruction practical for everyone. In any case, the shortage of qualified teachers usually makes it impossible. For example, in 1994 California enrolled recently arrived immigrants from 136 different countries, but bilingual teachers were certified in only 17 languages, 96% of them in Spanish (CDE, 1995).

Fallacy 6: Bilingual education means instruction mainly in students' native languages, with little instruction in English.

Before 1994, the vast majority of U.S. bilingual education programs were designed to encourage an early exit to mainstream English language classrooms, while only a tiny fraction of programs were designed to maintain the native tongues of students.

Today, a majority of bilingual programs continue to deliver a substantial portion of the curriculum in English. According to one study, school districts reported that 28% of LEP elementary school students receive no native-language instruction. Among those who do, about a third receive more than 75% of their instruction in English; a third receive from 40 to 75% in English; and one third of these receive less than 40% in English. Secondary school students are less likely to be instructed in their native language than elementary school students (Hopstock et al. 1993).

Fallacy 7: Bilingual education is far more costly than English language instruction.

All programs serving LEP students, regardless of the language of instruction, require additional staff training, instructional materials, and administration. So they all cost a little more than regular programs for native English speakers. But in most cases the differential is modest. A study

commissioned by the California legislature examined a variety of well implemented program models and found no budgetary advantage for English-only approaches. The incremental cost was about the same each year (\$175-\$214) for bilingual and English immersion programs, as compared with \$1,198 for English as a second language (ESL) "pullout" programs. The reason was simple: the pullout approach requires supplemental teachers, whereas in-class approaches do not (Chambers & Parrish, 1992). Nevertheless, ESL pullout remains the method of choice for many school districts, especially where LEP students are diverse, bilingual teachers are in short supply, or expertise is lacking in bilingual methodologies.

Fallacy 8: Disproportionate dropout rates for Hispanic students demonstrate the failure of bilingual education.

Hispanic dropout rates remain unacceptably high. Research has identified multiple factors associated with this problem, including recent arrival in the United States, family poverty, limited English proficiency, low academic achievement, and being retained in grade (Lockwood, 1996). No credible studies, however, have identified bilingual education among the risk factors, because bilingual programs touch only a small minority of Hispanic children.

Fallacy 9: Research is inconclusive on the benefits of bilingual education.

Some critics argue that the great majority of bilingual program evaluations are so egregiously flawed that their findings are useless. After reviewing 300 such studies, Rossell and Baker (1996) judged only 72 to be methodologically acceptable. Of these, they determined that a mere 22% supported the superiority of transitional programs over English-only instruction in reading, 9% in math, and 7% in language. Moreover, they concluded that "TBE [transitional bilingual education] is never better than structured immersion" in English. In other words, they could find little evidence that bilingual education works.

Close analysis of Rossell and Baker's claims reveals some serious flaws of their own. Krashen (1996) questions the rigor of several studies the reviewers included as methodologically acceptable, all unfavorable to bilingual education and many unpublished in the professional literature. Moreover, Rossell and Baker relied heavily on program evaluations from the 1970s, when bilingual pedagogies were considerably less well developed. Compounding these weaknesses is their narrative review technique, which simply counts the votes for or against a program alternative, a method that leaves considerable room for subjectivity and reviewer bias (Dunkel, 1990). Meta-analysis, a more objective method that weighs numerous variables in each study under review, has yielded more positive findings about bilingual education (Greene, 1998; Willig, 1985).

Most important, Krashen (1996) shows that Rossell and Baker are content to compare programs by the labels they have been given, with little consideration of the actual pedagogies being used. They treat as equivalent all approaches called TBE, even though few program details are available in many of the studies under review. Researchers who take the time to visit real classrooms understand

how dangerous such assumptions can be. According to Hopstock et al. (1993), "When actual practices . . . are examined, a bilingual education program might provide more instruction in English than . . . an 'English as a second language' program." Moreover, from a qualitative perspective, programs vary considerably in how (one or both) languages are integrated into the curriculum and into the social context of the school. Finally, simplistic labels are misleading because bilingual and English immersion techniques are not mutually exclusive; several studies have shown that successful programs make extensive use of both (see, e.g., Ramírez et al., 1991).

Even when program descriptions are available, Rossell and Baker sometimes ignore them. For example, they cite a bilingual immersion program in El Paso as a superior English-only (submersion) approach, although it includes 90 minutes of Spanish instruction each day in addition to sheltered English. The researchers also include in their review several studies of French immersion in Canada, which they equate with all-English, structured immersion programs in the United States. As the Canadian program designers have repeatedly stressed, these models are bilingual in both methods and goals, and they serve students with needs that are quite distinct from those of English learners in this country.

Fallacy 10: Language-minority parents do not support bilingual education because they feel it is more important for their children to learn English than to maintain the native language.

Naturally, when pollsters place these goals in opposition, immigrant parents will opt for English by wide margins. Who knows better the need to learn English than those who struggle with language barriers on a daily basis? But the premise of such surveys is false. Truly bilingual programs seek to cultivate proficiency in both tongues, and research has shown that students' native language can be maintained and developed at no cost to English. When polled on the principles underlying bilingual education, for example, that developing literacy in the first language facilitates literacy development in English or that bilingualism offers cognitive and career-related advantages, a majority of parents are strongly in favor of such approaches (Krashen, 1996).

References

California Department of Education (CDE). (1995). *Educational demographics unit. Language census report for California public schools*. Sacramento: Author.

Chambers, J., & Parrish, T. (1992). *Meeting the challenge of diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English. Vol. IV, cost of programs and services for LEP students*. Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (1989). How quickly can immigrants become proficient in school English? *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 5, p. 26-39.

Cummins, J. (1992). Bilingual Education and English Immersion: The Ramírez Report in Theoretical Perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, p. 91-104.

- Dunkel, P. (1990). Implications of the CAI effectiveness research for limited-English-proficient learners. *Computers in the Schools*, 7, 31-52.
- Greene, J. P. (1998). *A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of bilingual education*. Claremont, CA: Tomas Rivera Policy Institute.
- Hopstock, P., Bucaro, B., Fleischman, H. L., Zehler, A. M., & Eu, H. (1993). *Descriptive Study of Services to Limited English Proficient Students*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates.
- Kloss, H. (1998). *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Washington, DC and McHenry, IL.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics and Delta Systems Inc.
- Krashen, S. D. (1996). *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Lockwood, A. T. (1996). Caring, Community, and Personalization: Strategies to Combat the Hispanic Dropout Problem. *Advances in Hispanic Education*, 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Ramírez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children. Executive summary*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Rossell, C., & Baker, K. (1996). The Educational Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30, p 7-74.
- Veltman, C. (1988). *The Future of the Spanish Language in the United States*. Washington, DC: Hispanic Policy Development Project.
- Waggoner, D. (1995, November). Are Current Home Speakers of Non-English Languages Learning English? *Numbers and Needs*, 5.
- Willig, Ann C. 1985. A Meta-Analysis of Selected Studies on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, p 269-317.

Book Review - May 15, 2002

To be submitted to Joan Wink by Carrie Diehl and all students of EDML
5400 Theory of Multilingual Education, CSU Stanislaus

Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society. 2nd edition. Jim Cummins. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), 2001. 368pp. ISBN 1-889094-01-3

Chapter one, *Identity and Empowerment*, defined the term negotiating identities: it is the critical process of affirming a student's sense of self. A student whose culture is respected and celebrated will have a positive outlook on his/her education, and he/she will be motivated to succeed. Teachers are at the heart of this process. Students and teachers need to establish trust and respect for real, powerful learning to take place. Positive teacher-student and student-student interactions that take place in school are linked to the successes of all students, not just minority students.

Chapter two, *The Evolution of Xenophobia: Cultural Diversity as the Enemy Within*, chronicled the evolution of the bilingual education debate. Bilingual education has many proponents and opponents. In addition, bilingual education does not mean the same thing to all people. Assumptions about bilingual education programs and their overall effectiveness vary. The bottom line is that no one who is informed will argue that bilingual education is harmful or takes away from the learner.

Chapter three, *The Three Faces of Language Proficiency*, highlighted common confusions and misconceptions among educators. First, educators need to be aware that there are multiple levels of language proficiency (conversational proficiency, discrete language skills, and academic language proficiency), and the varied time it takes to achieve each level, so that they won't unwittingly impose curriculum that impedes language development. Second, students should not be dropped from bilingual programs when they can speak English somewhat fluently, and people should not blame a lack of success in schools on a language problem because it is often due to a lack of support, understanding, high expectations, and involvement on the part of the school staff.

Chapter four, *Reading and the Bilingual Student: Fact and Friction*, presented the ubiquitous phonics vs. whole language debate over how to teach reading. According to Cummins, second language learners, like others, need early exposure to phonics, but they also need a print-rich environment and lots of time to read, think, and discuss. Phonics-only reading programs omit the other important aspects of reading including comprehension, context clues, and other strategies for word solving when the code doesn't work; these programs, by their form and structure, cannot be culturally responsive. In short, Cummins believes teachers and policymakers should stop wasting their time over philosophical debates and do something to help children succeed academically.

Chapter five, *Understanding Academic Language Learning: Making it Happen in the Classroom*, gives teachers practical advice on second language acquisition. Teachers must know that a student's prior knowledge in L1 is important for a student to successfully acquire L2. Also, teachers must know that students should be able to express themselves (who they are and what they already know). If the above fails to occur, then a child's L2 will remain abstract.

Chapter six, *Bilingual Education: What Does the Research Say?*, looked at the important data: reports, studies, and theories. First, literacy in two languages increases overall intellectual and academic achievement, and it greatly improves chances for success in advance academic settings and future employment in the world. Second, research on bilingual education has shown that equal language development in two languages leads to the strongest cognitive base. Third, although it might seem that two different languages are clearly separate, there is common ground that can be transferred between them.

Chapter seven, *The Deep Structure of Educational Reform*, outlined how schools can be successful. Six key factors must be in place for this: teachers and schools must value their students' language, teachers and schools must

have high expectations for their students, teachers and schools must receive more training, teachers and schools must provide counseling and support, teachers and schools must enlist parent support, and teachers and schools must share a strong tie with the community.

Chapter eight, *Collaborative Empowerment at the Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary Levels*, provided a how-to guide to making school-wide changes at various grade levels, by looking at examples of programs that work. There are many examples of successful bilingual education schools that demonstrate empowerment at the deep structural level enabling student success. Students are empowered when they have positive interactions that recognize their culture and identity.

Chapter nine, *From Doublethink to Disinformation: The Academic Critics of Bilingual Education*, named several well-known educational authorities and their research. Unfortunately, there are many “spin doctors” on both sides of the bilingual education debate, and this makes it hard to view what the research really says. Bilingual education has essentially been given a bad rap.

Chapter ten, *Babel Babble: Reframing the Discourse of Diversity*, is the culminating chapter of the book. In it, Cummins outlines why teachers should care about society’s issues: we have a stake in the future citizens of our society. He also argues teachers have the power to make important changes in society. Teachers should make their classrooms into a model of how things should be. The more we can help our children acquire literacy, the better they will be able to learn to think and challenge the assumptions and contradictions of the dominant culture.

This review was primarily written by Carrie Diehl (a graduate student in the Multilingual Education Master’s program at California State University, Stanislaus). Other graduate students who contributed were: Susan Ange-Hatch, Richard Beatty, Anna Blunt, Pati Davila-d’Escoto, Corri Figueiredo, Rachelle Ford, Israel and Monica Gonzalez, Kara Cadungug-Lo, Dee Hawksworth-Lutzow, Ted King, Pao Lee, Ana Marroquín, Michele Marta, Lorena Ortega, Angelica Ozuna, Chyllis Saueressig, Fred Stange, and Rene Velasco.
