

Dual Language Education in New York City and Philadelphia: A Comparative Analysis Looking Within and Beyond Language Policies

Peizhu Liu

University of Pennsylvania

There has been a steady growth in the number of dual language (DL) programs in the U.S. However, there is an uneven development of DL programs across cities/states. This paper focuses on New York City (NYC) and Philadelphia, where the number of DL programs differs drastically. Specifically, this paper examines the DL policies at the federal, state, and local level, respectively, with the goal of discovering how the difference in policy influences the development of DL education in NYC and Philadelphia. I conclude that policies at the federal level do not favor DL education explicitly, but allow ideological and implementational spaces (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007) for the development of DL programs. It is primarily the differences in policies at the state and local levels that seem to contribute to uneven implementational spaces for DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia. This paper makes a call for continuing ethnographic research on DL education policies and programs across the country.

Dual Language (DL) programs in the United States vary in structure and implementation but share three common goals for students: to develop bilingualism and biliteracy; to achieve academically at grade level or better in both languages; and to develop an understanding and appreciation of multiple cultures, with positive cross-cultural attitudes toward fellow students, their families, and the community (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). To promote bilingualism and biliteracy, DL programs integrate language and academic content instruction in English and a partner language. DL programs vary in how they divide instructional time between English and the partner language, but a general principle is that at least 50 percent of instruction takes place in the partner language through the elementary school grades. There are two types of DL programs: Two-way DL programs, which serve both English Language Learners (ELLs) and non-ELLs by integrating ELLs from a common language background (e.g., Spanish and Mandarin Chinese) and English-speaking students in the same classroom for academic instruction in both languages; and one-way DL programs, which typically include one language group (from a common language background) learning through two languages, rather than students from two different language backgrounds learning together. Since all DL programs within the school districts of New York City (NYC) and Philadelphia are two-way DL programs, I use the term DL programs to refer to two-way DL programs only in this article.

There has been a steady growth in the number of DL programs in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). For example, the number of Chinese DL programs across the United States has increased from eight in 1998 to 265 in 2018 (Weise, 2019). The rapid expansion of DL programs is likely the result of a convergence of factors (U.S. Department of Education, 2015): First, there is increased attention to foreign language learning for English speakers and the availability of federal and state funding for programs using this approach; Second, research suggests that DL education provides more opportunities for ELLs to reach higher levels of academic achievement than other types of programs (Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Marian, Shook, & Schroeder, 2013; Valentino & Reardon, 2015).

However, there is an uneven growth of DL programs across cities and states in the U.S. For example, the distance between NYC and Philadelphia is less than 100 miles, but the difference in the number of DL programs in the two cities is significant. In NYC, there are 216 DL programs in 13 languages: Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, Haitian Creole, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Polish, Russian, Spanish, and Urdu (2017–2018 Anticipated Bilingual Education Programs, 2019). By contrast, there are only six DL programs in Philadelphia, and all of them are in Spanish (Dual Language Handbook, 2017). In this article, I am going to examine language policies relevant to DL education in NYC and Philadelphia, in an effort to account for the significant difference in the number of DL programs.

Methods

In this paper, I use the corpus linguistics approach (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2015) to conduct a policy discourse analysis of laws, legal codes, handbooks, and news relevant to DL education from government databases, Department of Education of NYC and Philadelphia, and related news media. The corpus linguistics approach is chosen because it provides reliable ways to study the identification of ideologies encoded in political texts.

The corpus based Language Planning and Policy (LPP) analysis is a three-step process based on Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2015). First, I developed the research question: Is the difference in the number of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia attributable to the difference in language policies? Second, I create my own corpus of laws, legal documents, handbooks, and news articles from the United States that are related to the topic of DL education. Finally, I make use of all four common corpus analysis techniques: wordlists, keyword analysis, collocation analysis, and concordance searches. Specifically, I looked for instances where the words bilingual education, bilingual programs, dual language education, dual language programs, or English Language Learners are mentioned in the documents.

NYC versus Philadelphia: Factors Other Than Language Policies

The difference in the number of DL programs in the two cities is shocking, and initially, I tried to find explanations in factors beyond the scope of education policy. First, I examined the population of NYC and Philadelphia. NYC, as the most populous city in the United States, has about 8.6 million people, while in comparison, the population of Philadelphia is about 1.5 million (US City Populations, 2019). Under the assumption that the need for bilingual education per

individual is similar for the two cities, this almost 6-to-1 difference in population does not account proportionately for the vast 36-to-1 difference in the number of DL programs.

Second, a look at the demographics of the two cities reveals that (Table 1, U.S. Census Bureau, 2018), though their ethnic diversity is similar to a degree, NYC has a higher proportion of some groups than Philadelphia. For example, the Hispanic population accounts for 29.1% of the city's population in NYC compared to 14.1% in Philadelphia; the Asian population accounts for 14% in NYC compared to 7.1% in Philadelphia. That being said, even if I assume that the demographic diversity of a city is proportional to the number of DL programs, the difference in demographics is still insufficient to be responsible for almost 36 times as many DL programs in NYC compared to Philadelphia.

Table 1
Population estimates by race

Race and Hispanic Origin	Philadelphia	New York City
White	41.60%	42.80%
Black or African American	42.60%	24.30%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.40%	0.40%
Asian	7.10%	14.00%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.10%	0.10%
Two or More Races	2.80%	3.30%
Hispanic or Latino	14.10%	29.10%
White, not Hispanic or Latino	34.9%	32.10%

Source: Adapted from U.S. Census Bureau (2018)

Third, I compared language diversity in NYC and Philadelphia. As table 2 shows, 51.1% of NYC residents speak only English, while 48.95% speak other languages. In comparison, 77.3% of Philadelphia residents speak only English, with 10.4% speak Spanish, 5.4% speak Asian languages, and 6.9% speak other languages. Even though Philadelphia is less linguistically diverse than NYC, there is still a large group of residents who speak a language other than English. Again, under the assumption that the number of speakers of minority languages is proportional to the number of DL programs, the slight difference in language diversity does not fully explain the substantial difference in the number of DL programs in the two cities. Finally, this paper zooms in and compares the number of ELLs in the School District of NYC and Philadelphia (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). There are 160,624 ELLs in the School District of NYC (English Language Learner Demographics Report, 2017), whereas there are about 14,000

ELLs in the School District of Philadelphia (English Learners Program Handbook, 2017). Therefore, NYC has 11 times more ELLs than Philadelphia does; however, NYC has 36 times more DL programs than Philadelphia does.

According to the evidence above, it seems that the factors of population, demographics, language diversity, and the number of ELLs may contribute to the difference in the number of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia, but these factors are insufficient to fully explain the difference. Therefore, it is worth examining other factors, such as language policies relevant to DL education, to see if and how these policies have led to the uneven number of DL education programs in NYC and Philadelphia.

Table 2

Language diversity in New York City and Philadelphia (2018)

	NYC	Philadelphia
Only English	51.5%	77.3%
Spanish	24.4%	10.4%
Other Indo-European	12.9%	5.3%
Asian	8.9%	5.4%
Other	2.3%	1.6%

Source: Adapted from U.S. Census Bureau (2018)

Theoretical Frameworks

This study draws on Ruiz's (1984) three orientations in language planning, Cooper's (1996) framework of acquisition planning and Hornberger and Johnson's (2007) ideological and implementing spaces in LPP in order to examine the factors that may influence the growth of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia.

Ruiz (1984) proposed three orientations in language planning. According to Ruiz, "orientation refers to a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society" (p. 16). The three orientations are: *language-as-problem*, *language-as-right*, and *language-as-resource*. Transitional bilingual education programs and ESL programs reflect the language-as-problem orientation for the reason that, in those programs, minority students' mother tongues are viewed as a problem, so the resolution is to teach minority students English at the expense of their first language. Examples of language rights include "the right to receive mother tongue instruction, the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language and the right to use one's language(s) in the communal life" (p. 22). Therefore, DL programs where non-English speakers' first languages are affirmed reflect the *language-as-right* orientation for minority students. According to Ruiz, language is treated as a resource mainly because of the positive effects foreign languages have on military preparedness and national security, global economy, students' academic scores, and development of bicultural or multicultural awareness. DL programs—with the goal of having English and minority-language speakers learn each other's first language, of achieving academically at grade level or better in both languages, and of developing an understanding and appreciation of multiple cultures—also reflect the *language-as-resource* orientation.

However, even though “the language-as-resource orientation has become an effective metaphor for advocates of DL education to counter dominant, deficit-oriented approaches to minority-language student education” (Jong, Yilmaz, & Marichal, 2019, p. 108), I argue that some DL programs are designed with the main goal of helping minority students succeed academically and maintaining their first language, whereas some others are developed with the main goal of meeting the needs of English-speaking students. In other words, some DL programs are *language-as-resource* oriented mainly for minority students, whereas some others have the *language-as-resource* orientation mainly for English-speaking students (Valdes, 1997). The question of which groups of students are favored might influence the number of DL programs, an issue to which I will return.

In addition to the theoretical framework proposed by Ruiz, Cooper’s (1996) framework of acquisition planning provides another perspective to examine policies relevant to DL programs. According to Cooper, “acquisition planning refers to organized efforts to promote the learning of a language” (p. 157). The overt goals of acquisition planning include: “acquisition of the language as a second or foreign language”; “reacquisition of the language by populations for whom it was once either a vernacular or a language of specialized function”; and “language maintenance” (p. 159). DL programs fit in with the first and the third goals, since within DL programs, minority students learn English as a second language, and English-speaking students learn the minority language as a foreign language. Also, DL programs enable minority students to maintain their first language. Moreover, Cooper pointed out the three types of means employed to attain acquisition goals: To “create or to improve the opportunity to learn the language,” to “create or to improve the incentive to learn,” and to “create or improve both opportunity and incentive simultaneously” (p. 159). DL programs fit in with the third type because classroom instruction and provision of materials for self-instruction in both English and the minority language create the opportunity to learn, and the inclusion of both languages as a compulsory medium of instruction creates the incentive to learn. To Cooper, acquisition planning is “far more than the planning of language instruction” (p. 160). He argued that the “process of formulating and implementing language policy as a spiral process, beginning at the highest level of authority, and descending in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners” (p. 160).

Indeed, Ruiz is not the only scholar who understands LPP as a spiral process. Ricento and Hornberger (1996) also suggested that “LPP is a multilayered construct, wherein essential LPP components—agents, levels, and processes of LPP—permeate and interact with each other in multiple and complex ways as they enact various types, approaches, and goals of LPP” (p. 419). This paper looks at LPP processes at national and institutional layers, describing how activities on one layer interact with processes on another. Furthermore, the issues of how federal policy is interpreted and taken up by the state or city, and whether guidelines proposed in one administration are enforced by those that follow are also examined.

While analyzing DL policies at different levels, I also pay attention to ideological and implementational spaces (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007) for developing DL programs at each level. Hornberger and Johnson drew on long-term ethnographic work in the School District of Philadelphia and the Andean regional graduate program in bilingual intercultural education in Bolivia “to shed

light on the opening up or closing down of ideological and implementational spaces for multilingual language education policy and practice" (p. 509). Specifically, in the case of the School District of Philadelphia, Hornberger and Johnson demonstrated how different interpretations of Title III of No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) at the School District level, opened up and then closed down the ideological and implementational spaces for implementing DL programs. Even though my analysis is not an ethnographic study, I focus on understanding how top-down policies open up or close down ideological and implementational spaces for DL education and if these spaces are taken up by intermediary agencies between national language policies and local educational initiatives. In particular, I examine the ideological and implementational spaces under Title III of NCLB and Every Student Success Act (ESSA), and I investigate how New York State (NYS) and Pennsylvania, as well as the School Districts of NYC and Philadelphia, respond to these spaces.

Policy Analysis

I use Ruiz's (1984) three orientations in language planning, Cooper's (1996) framework of acquisition planning, and Hornberger and Johnson's (2007) ideological and implementing spaces in LPP to examine policies relevant to DL education at the federal, state, and local levels respectively, with the goal of discovering how the differences in policy might have influenced the growth of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia.

Policies at the Federal Level

Hornberger and Ricento (1996) argued that LPP processes "interact across layers—national, institutional and interpersonal" (p. 411), and the state plays a very important role in deciding which language(s) will receive support, which will be repressed, and which will be ignored. Therefore, analyzing language policies at the federal level is of great importance for understanding the LPP processes regarding DL education.

At the federal level, I focus on Title III of NCLB and that of ESSA. In 2001, the Bilingual Education Act was replaced with Title III of NCLB, and in 2015, NCLB was replaced by ESSA, which became the main federal law for K–12 general education. With its rigorous attention to English language acquisition for ELLs, "Title III of NCLB has fomented concern that maintenance or additive bilingual education will be phased out and transitional or English-only pedagogical approaches phased in" (Johnson, 2010, p. 513). However, Johnson found that illustrating its purpose, Title III of NCLB has the statement that reads as, "developing the English proficiency of [ELLs] and, to the extent possible, the native language skills of such children" (Title III, Part B, sec. 3202, para.2). Therefore, Johnson argues that although Title III of NCLB focuses squarely on the development of English, this text suggests that native language instruction (including DL programs) can still be funded with Title III monies.

By analyzing Title III of ESSA, I contend that it still casts a strong English-only shadow by making attaining English proficiency the primary objective and by not mentioning bilingual or DL education at all. However, I also analyze the

guidance issued by the U.S. Department of Education, which provides states and local educational agencies (LEAs) with information to assist them in meeting their obligations under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by ESSA. In the document, I find the statement below:

This guidance can assist States, LEAs, and schools to support ELs in achieving college and career readiness, participating in our schools and society, and maintaining their bilingualism as an asset . . . Regardless of the language instruction educational programs (LIEP) that a State or local educational agencies (LEAs) chooses to implement, States and LEAs may wish to incorporate methods of supporting home language development. Research on language use in early childhood programs and in elementary school, and on supporting home language development, including fostering bilingualism, maintaining cultural connections and communication with family members, and the transferability of home language skills to English language acquisition, suggests that systematic and deliberate exposure to English, paired with supporting home language development within high quality educational settings, can result in strong, positive outcomes for children who are non-native English speakers, as well as positive outcomes for native English speakers. (U.S. Department of Education, pp. 5–20)

It is clear that the guidance for Title III under ESSA reflects a language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984) by claiming that ELLs' bilingualism is an asset and by addressing the importance of supporting ELLs' home language development for both ELLs and native English speakers. In my opinion, the language-as-resource orientation reflected in the federal policy, therefore, leaves ideological space for implementing DL programs.

In terms of funds, Title III funds under both NCLB and ESSA are provided to states using a formula that is based 80 percent on the number of ELLs and 20 percent on the number of immigrant children and youth in the state. Also, LEAs are free to use the grants to implement the programs of their choosing. However, even though the School Districts of both NYC and Philadelphia receive Title III funds, which can be used for DL programs, Title III funds are intended to supplement local and state funding (Title III Language Instruction for English Language Learners Students). To launch DL programs, public schools need local and state funding besides Title III funds.

In summary, at the federal level, even though Title III under both NCLB and ESSA do not promote DL education explicitly, there are still ideological and implementational spaces for DL programs (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). The boom of DL programs in NYC can be viewed as evidence of the ideological and implementational spaces opened by Title III. Because Title III funding is distributed to states based on a formula based on the number of ELLs and the number of immigrant children and youth in the state, each state presumably gets its fair share of funding. However, due to the fact that Title III funding is used to supplement state and local funding, I assume that policies at both the state and city levels have had an influence on the growth of DL education in NYC and Philadelphia. In the following sections, I analyze the ways that NYS and Pennsylvania, as well as NYC and Philadelphia, have responded to the ideological and implementational spaces opened up at the federal level.

Policies at the State Level

At the state level, I focus on New York State Education Department's (NYSED) Commissioner's Regulations (CR) Part 154 and Pennsylvania State's Basic Education Circulars (BECs) as well as teaching certification requirements in NYS and Pennsylvania.

In NYS, NYSED's CR Part 154 lists regulations and policies that govern education to ELLs. According to CR Part 154:

Each school district which has an enrollment of 20 or more students who are ELLs of the same grade level assigned to a building, all of whom have the same native language which is other than English, shall provide such students with bilingual education programs (§154-1.3).

Clearly, there are mandatory and explicit requirements for the implementation of bilingual programs in NYS. In Pennsylvania, the law equivalent to CR Part 154 is the BECs, which declare that:

Every school district shall provide a program for each student whose dominant language is not English for the purpose of facilitating the student's achievement of English proficiency and the academic standards under §4.12. Programs under this section shall include appropriate bilingual-bicultural or English as a second language (ESL) instruction (22 Pa. Code §4.26).

The discourse in BECs differs from CR Part 154 in the following ways: BECs declare that appropriate programs for English learners should be provided but do not favor bilingual programs over traditional ESL programs at all; BECs do not put forward any specific requirements for the implementation of bilingual programs. By contrast, if there are more than 20 students who speak the same language other than English at the same grade level, schools in NYC are required to open a bilingual program for these students. In other words, BECs only provide schools with the opportunity (Cooper, 1996) to implement bilingual programs. However, the decision of whether or not to open bilingual programs is in the hands of each individual Philadelphia school even if the school has a large group of English learners who speak the same language other than English. In comparison, CR Part 154 provides schools with both opportunity and incentive to implement bilingual programs by making clear that it is compulsory for some schools in NYC to open bilingual programs under specific conditions. The difference in means of achieving acquisition goals may contribute to the fact that NYC has many more bilingual programs (including DL programs) than Philadelphia.

Another difference in state level policy is in the teaching certification requirements. In NYS, citizenship is not a requirement to apply for a teaching certification (Office of Teaching Initiatives, 2019), so international students who graduate from universities in NYS can become certified teachers after graduation and start to work in the School District of NYC. In comparison, by law (PA School Code §1202), all standard instructional certificate holders in Pennsylvania must be U.S. citizens. The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) will, however, allow non-U.S. citizens to teach under an *Alien Provisional Certification*

for a maximum of six years. The Alien Provisional certificate will convert to a standard certificate once U.S. citizenship is attained. In order to qualify for an Alien Provisional Certificate, the candidate must be a resident alien (green card holder) and file a “declaration of intent” to become a U.S. citizen. In other words, holding a green card and intending to pursue citizenship are prerequisites for being certified as a teacher in Pennsylvania. However, for an international student, it can take more than ten years to get a green card in the United States, so it is almost impossible for international students with bilingual expertise to find a teaching job in public schools in Pennsylvania. By analyzing the teaching certification requirements in the two states, I argue that minority-language speakers’ first language is viewed as a resource (Ruiz, 1984) in NYS since the state policy regarding teaching certification is friendly to immigrants who are not U.S. citizens and enables them to work as teachers and bring their language assets to the public schools in NYS. However, the state policy in Pennsylvania does not seem to reflect the *language-as-resource* orientation (Ruiz, 1984) since this policy inhibits non-U.S. citizens who have bilingual expertise from teaching in public schools in Pennsylvania.

Besides the obstacles that prevent non-U.S. citizens from becoming certified, Pennsylvania does not offer bilingual certification at all (Certificates in Pennsylvania). As a result, Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) in Pennsylvania do not have the motivation to offer bilingual education programs. In Philadelphia, where a number of universities are located, few IHEs provide bilingual education courses for prospective teachers. By contrast, NYS does not only offer bilingual certification, however, NYSED also encourages IHEs to offer high quality bilingual courses. For example, an NYSED program called The Clinically Rich Intensive Teacher Institute (CR-ITI) provides funding for IHE with the goal of supporting teacher candidates in their pursuit of the Bilingual Extension Certification (ELL/MLL Educator Certification). Many universities in NYC, such as Columbia University, New York University, the City College of New York, Hunter College, and Hofstra University, provide teacher training programs for prospective bilingual teachers. Drawing on Cooper’s (1996) three means of attaining acquisition goals, I contend that the Pennsylvania state policy that does not offer bilingual education certification fails to create either opportunity or incentive for IHEs to offer bilingual education training programs. By contrast, the state policy in NYS, which offers not only bilingual certification but also funding for supporting teachers in their pursuit of the Bilingual Extension Certification, provides both the opportunity and incentive for IHEs to open bilingual education courses, and for teachers to pursue bilingual education certification.

According to the U.S. Department of Education (2015), a growing number of DL programs in the United States and a scarcity of teachers with the necessary language skills have led to a shortage of qualified DL teachers. A report issued by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Postsecondary Education (2015) indicates that 16 states identified DL education as a teacher shortage area for the 2015–16 school year. Given the fact that there is already a shortage of qualified DL language teachers nationwide, it will be extremely difficult for schools in Pennsylvania to recruit DL teachers without creating certification pathways for non-U.S. citizens, offering bilingual certification, and providing bilingual education programs at IHEs.

To sum up, at the state level, CR Part 154 in NYS has mandatory requirements for bilingual education when there are over 20 students in the same grade who speak the same native language other than English, whereas BECs in Pennsylvania does not. Therefore, Pennsylvania BECs only provide schools with the opportunity (Cooper, 1996) to implement bilingual programs, whereas CR Part 154 provides schools with both opportunity and incentive. Also, teacher certification requirements in NYS allow non-U.S. citizens who have bilingual skills to apply for teaching certificates, which reflects a *language-as-resource* orientation (Ruiz, 1984), whereas Pennsylvania only allows U.S. permanent residents (green card holders) to become certified. Furthermore, Pennsylvania does not offer bilingual certification at all. However, NYS offers bilingual certification, and NYSED encourages IHEs to offer high-quality bilingual education courses. In other words, NYS provides both the opportunity and incentive (Cooper, 1996) for IHEs to implement bilingual education courses and for teachers to pursue bilingual education certification.

Policies at the Local Level

At the local level, the School District of Philadelphia lists guiding principles for instructional programs and policies for ELLs in the English Learners Program Handbook (Office of Multilingual Curriculum and Programs, 2017). For example, the first principle is “students’ languages and cultures are valuable resources to be tapped and incorporated into schooling,” and the fourth principle is “students’ academic language development in their native language facilitates their academic language development in English” (p. 6). Similarly, the School District of NYC also provides guiding principles for ELL success (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, 2014). The fourth principle in the NYC document states, in part, that “districts and schools recognize that bilingualism and biliteracy are assets” (p. 3). Since the guiding principles in both NYC and Philadelphia make clear that ELLs’ home languages are valuable resources and assets, it is fair to say that the principles in both cities reflect a *language-as-resource* orientation (Ruiz, 1984). However, in the document released by the School District of NYC, there are specific procedures following the guiding principles for ELL success. For example, districts and schools should provide:

- a) opportunities to participate in language learning or language support programs that lead to proficiency in English and other languages, b) opportunities to use and develop academic language and content knowledge both in English and in languages other than English, including the student’s home language, and c) rigorous bilingual education programs for ELLs aimed at maintaining and developing the home language and attaining English proficiency as well as biliteracy. (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, 2014, p. 4)

By contrast, the School District of Philadelphia does not elaborate what should be done to meet the goals of the principles (Office of Multilingual Curriculum and Programs, 2017). When discussing the layers of LPP, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) highlighted the situations where “guidelines proposed in one administration may not be enforced by those that follow” (p. 410), and the lack of specific procedures may have resulted in the gap between policy goals and their implementation.

Based on my analysis of the guiding principles for instructional programs and policies for ELLs, I see a gap between policy goals and their implementation in the School District of Philadelphia because while the principles view minority students' home languages as assets, no specific procedures have been followed to ensure the achievement of these goals. However, the School District of NYC not only demonstrates a language-as-resource orientation in its guiding principles for ELLs, but also provides specific procedures to put these principles into practice.

In addition, all bilingual programs in NYC receive extra funding—of which DL programs receive more—in order to create an incentive, than new transitional bilingual education programs (Chin, 2016). Specifically, schools receive a \$25,000 planning grant for implementing DL programs but only receive a \$10,000 grant for implementing transitional bilingual education programs. For both types of bilingual programs, schools receive an extra \$5,000 to create classroom libraries in the target language (Chin, 2016). By contrast, I could not find any information about whether extra funding is even available for Philadelphia schools to implement DL programs. I thereby argue that funding at the city level provides schools in NYC the incentive (Cooper, 1996) to implement DL programs, an incentive that, by contrast, appears to be missing in Philadelphia.

Additionally, I find another difference when analyzing the media discourse regarding DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia. For example, news titles such as “NYC to add 50 bilingual programs, the latest in a push to help English learners” (Veiga, 2018) are common in the media coverage of DL programs in NYC. Also, city leaders' names frequently appear in the news regarding DL education (e.g., Toure, 2019; Veiga, 2018). For example, Schools Chancellor Richard A. Carranza announced the opening of 48 new DL and transitional bilingual education programs in 2018, and he highlighted his own experience as an ELL and his hope of making sure every ELL in NYC has the same experience he did growing up (Chancellor Richard A. Carranza Announces Bilingual Programs Expansion, 2018). Similarly, in 2014, city leaders in NYC pledged to provide bilingual classes to every student who is learning English by next year (Russo, 2018). By contrast, I cannot find much information about Philadelphia city leaders' involvement with the development of DL education programs. There is a piece of news about Mayor Kenney's visit to a Spanish DL school (DeNardo, 2017). During his visit, Mayor Kenney said, “the argument that we should speak English only is really a silly argument, and these children have an opportunity to be multilingual in a global economy.” Mayor Kenney's remark aligns with most media discourse about DL education in Philadelphia, which tends to frame DL education as an opportunity for all students to become more competitive in the global job market rather than an opportunity for ELLs to succeed (Killion, 2016). Drawing on Ruiz's framework of three types of orientations (1984), the media discourse regarding DL education in both cities reflects a *language-as-resource* orientation, but there is a difference. In NYC, it seems that city leaders view DL programs as *language-as-resource* oriented mainly for ELLs, whereas in Philadelphia, the mayor views DL programs as *language-as-resource* oriented mainly for English speaking students. It seems likely that in a city where the goal of DL programs is to meet the needs of ELLs, the number of DL programs are likely to be proportional to the number of ELLs. This is the situation in NYC where there are a large number of ELLs and also a good number of DL programs. By contrast, in a city where the goal of DL programs is to

mainly serve English-speaking students, the number of DL programs might not be proportional to the number of ELLs. This seems to be the situation in Philadelphia where there are also a large number of ELLs but only six DL programs.

In summary, at the local level, even though the guiding principles for ELLs' education in both NYC and Philadelphia School Districts view ELLs' home language as a resource rather than a problem (Ruiz, 1984), NYC provides specific procedures following each principle, whereas Philadelphia does not. It might be the lack of specific procedures that may have resulted in the gap between the guiding principles—which views minority students' first language as assets—and the implementation of DL programs in the School District of Philadelphia. Also, there is extra funding for opening bilingual programs, particularly DL programs in NYC, and it provides schools with the incentive to implement DL programs. However, there is no such funding in Philadelphia. Additionally, NYC city leaders seem to actively get involved in the development of DL education programs, and the media frames DL education mostly as a way to help ELLs thrive. The focus on ELLs seems to motivate NYC, with a large group of ELLs, to launch a great number of DL programs to serve them. By contrast, Philadelphia city leaders' names do not frequently appear in the news about DL education, and also, the development of DL education in Philadelphia is often framed as a way to save the public school system and prepare students for the global job market of the future. Since the focus of DL programs seems not to be on ELLs, Philadelphia, despite also having a large group of ELLs, may not be motivated to implement DL programs to serve ELLs. The media discourse regarding DL education in both cities reflects a language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984), but there is a difference. In NYC, it seems that city leaders view DL programs as language-as-resource oriented mainly for ELLs, whereas in Philadelphia, the mayor views DL programs as language-as-resource oriented mainly for English speaking students.

Conclusion

This article examines the language policies that impact the number of DL education programs in NYC and Philadelphia. It is an attempt to find reasons for the uneven growth of DL programs in the two cities.

As the analysis demonstrates, while the language policies in both cities have adhered to the Title III of NCLB and then Title III of ESSA, there is great disparity in the ways these have been interpreted, appropriated, and instantiated across multiple levels. In other words, policies at the federal level do not favor DL education explicitly, but allow ideological and implementational spaces (Johnson, 2010) for the development of DL programs. It is primarily the differences in policies at the state and local levels that seem to contribute to the significant difference in the number of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia.

Specifically, at the state level, Pennsylvania BECs only provide schools with the opportunity (Cooper, 1996) to implement bilingual programs. However, New York CR Part 154 provides schools with both opportunity and incentive to implement bilingual programs by making clear that it is compulsory for schools in NYC to open a bilingual program for these students if there are more than 20 students who speak the same language other than English at the same grade level. In addition, NYS policy views minority-language speakers' first languages as a resource (Ruiz,

1984) and accordingly has developed teaching certification requirements friendly to immigrants who are not U.S. citizens. However, the Pennsylvania policy does not seem to reflect the *language-as-resource* orientation (Ruiz, 1984) since it prevents non-U.S. citizens from being certified as teachers. Lastly, Pennsylvania does not offer bilingual education certification, thus, fails to create either opportunity or incentive for IHE to offer bilingual education. By contrast, NYS provides both the opportunity and incentive (Cooper, 1996) for IHEs to implement bilingual education courses and for teachers to pursue bilingual education certification.

At the local level, even though the guiding principles for instructional programs and policies for ELLs in the School District of Philadelphia view minority students' home languages as assets, no specific procedures have followed to ensure the achievement of the goals of the principles. However, the School District of NYC not only demonstrates a *language-as-resource* orientation (Ruiz, 1984) in the guiding principles for ELLs, but also provides specific following procedures. Moreover, extra funding at the city level provides schools in NYC the incentive (Cooper, 1996) to implement DL programs, whereas this type of incentive might be missing in Philadelphia. Lastly, the media discourse in NYC frames DL programs as a resource mainly for ELLs, whereas in Philadelphia, DL programs are viewed as a resource mainly for English speaking students.

My analysis shows that at the state and local levels, policies in NYS and NYC reflect a *language-as-resource* orientation and also creates both the opportunity and incentive for the development of DL education. By contrast, policies in Pennsylvania and Philadelphia do not always reflect a *language-as-resource* orientation and also fail to create the incentive for the development of DL education. According to Ricento and Hornberger (1996), LPP is a multilayered construct. From this analysis, it seems that the differences in LPP at the state and local levels contribute to the huge difference in the number of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

My conclusion is based on my analysis of relevant policies and news texts. I examined DL policies on the federal, state, and local levels, but not how language planning agents, levels, and processes interact with one another. Metaphorically speaking, I only present multiple layers of the LPP onion rather than slicing through it (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). While this analysis clearly points to important state and local policy differences, to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of how policies on different layers contribute to the uneven development of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia, an ethnographic approach to LPP (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007) would be beneficial. In particular, these are two issues that could be investigated through an ethnographic approach.

First, the School District of NYC and Philadelphia are two of twenty school systems under mayoral control, in which a city's mayor replaces an elected school board with a board that he or she appoints—as a strategy to raise urban school performance (Wong & Shen, 2013). Mayoral control and accountability are two of very few major education reforms that aim at governance coherence in our highly fragmented urban school systems (Wong & Shen, 2013). The mayor of NYC, Bill De Blasio, used the rapid rollout of the city's dual language pre-K programs as evidence of mayoral control's success, saying, "it's so important that we continue

mayoral control of education so we can keep making this kind of progress” (Veiga, 2019). In comparison, the mayor of Philadelphia, Jim Kenney, has not demonstrated much interest in taking advantage of “mayoral control” to facilitate DL education. Only through an ethnographic study can I know more about the city leaders’, particularly mayors’, attitudes towards DL education, and therefore, understand how their attitudes possibly contribute to the uneven development of DL programs in NYC and Philadelphia.

Also, I am interested in conducting interviews with principals and teachers of DL schools in order to know more about how they think of DL programs, their interpretation of DL education policies at different levels, and the possible challenges that they face.

Finally, to sum up, language policy must be evaluated not only by official policy statements or laws but by language behavior and attitudes in situated contexts (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). This proposal focuses on evaluating DL education policies based on official policy statements, but future research should focus more on understanding these policies in situated contexts.

Acknowledgements

I thank Professor Nancy Hornberger and the members of the 2019 Language Policy and Planning seminar for their invaluable feedback. I am grateful to the reviewers and WPEL editorial team for their helpful comments throughout the revision process. I also thank Bo for taking care of Amelia when I was working on this article.

Peizhu Liu (peizhu@upenn.edu) is a PhD student in the Educational Linguistics division at the University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education. As a former dual language teacher in Massachusetts, her research interests lie in dual language education, particularly Chinese dual language education and English language learners' education in dual language programs.

References

- Anticipated Bilingual Education Programs. (2019, February 12). Retrieved from <https://data.cityofnewyork.us/Education/2017-2018-Anticipated-Bilingual-Education-Programs/ydbx-4ufw>
- Bialystok, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent. *Language and Cognition*, 12(1), 3–11.
- Certificates in Pennsylvania. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.education.pa.gov/Educators/Certification/PAEducators/Pages/PACerts.aspx>
- Chancellor Richard A. Carranza announces bilingual programs expansion, 48 new programs opening this fall. (2018, May 15). *NYC Department of Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.schools.nyc.gov/about-us/news/announcements/contentdetails/2018/05/03/chancellor-richard-a.-carranza-announces-bilingual-programs-expansion-48-new-programs-opening-this-fall>
- Chin, H. (2016, April 07). DOE funds dozens of dual language programs, including in Sunset Park. Retrieved from <https://bklyner.com/doe-funds-dozens-of-dual-language-programs-including-in-sunset-park-sunset-park>

- Cooper, R. L. (2000). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- DeNardo, M. (2017, December 13). Hola! Mayor Kenney visits students at bilingual charter school. *CBS Philly*. Retrieved from <https://philadelphia.cbslocal.com/2017/12/13/hola-mayor-kenney-visits-students-at-bilingual-charter-school>
- ELL/MLL Educator Certification. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.nysed.gov/bilingual-ed/ellmll-educator-certification>
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2015). Applying corpus linguistics to language policy. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide* (Vol. 7, pp. 107–117). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509–532.
- Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 61–79.
- Johnson, E. J., & Johnson, D. C. (2014). Language policy and bilingual education in Arizona and Washington State. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 92–112.
- Jong, E. J. D., Yilmaz, T., & Marichal, N. (2019). A multilingualism-as-a-resource orientation in dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, 58(2), 107–120.
- Killion, C. (2016, November 13). Using language to help save Philly schools. *ALDIA Education*. Retrieved from <https://aldianews.com/articles/politics/education/using-language-help-save-philly-schools/36318>
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43–60.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Howard, E. (2008). Language development and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 177–200). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion programs benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 167–186.
- Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages. (2014). *Blueprint for English language learner/multilingual learner success*. New York, NY: Author.
- Office of Multilingual Curriculum and Programs. (2017). *English learners program handbook*. Philadelphia, PA: Author.
- The New York Department of Education. 2018–2019 *English language learner policy and reference guide*. New York, NY: Author.
- New York State Education Department. (2019). *Pathways to certification*. Retrieved from <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/certprocess.html>
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401–427.

- Ruiz, R. (1984) Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
- Russo, J. (2018, September 17). Bilingual expansion in NYC schools. *Center for Integrated Training and Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.citeonline.com/bilingual-expansion-nyc-schools>
- The School District of Philadelphia. (2017). *Dual language handbook*. Philadelphia, PA: Author.
- Title III Language Instruction for English Language Learners Students. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.nysed.gov/budget-coordination/title-iii-language-instruction-english-language-learners-students>
- Toure, M. (2019, February 05). City announces expansion of dual language pre-K programs. *Politico*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/newsletters/politico-new-york-education/2019/02/05/city-announces-expansion-of-dual-language-pre-k-programs-172448>
- 2017–2018 Anticipated Bilingual Education Programs. (2019, February 12). Retrieved from <https://data.cityofnewyork.us/Education/2017-2018-Anticipated-Bilingual-Education-Programs/ydbx-4ufw>
- US City Populations 2019. (2019). Retrieved from <http://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2018). *Philadelphia, Pennsylvania population*. Retrieved from <http://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/philadelphia-population/>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2017). *New York City, New York population*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/newyorkcitynewyork>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*, Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2016). *Non-regulatory guidance: English learners and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*, Washington, DC: Author.
- Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of four instructional programs designed to serve English learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(4), 612–637.
- Veiga, C. (2018, January 17). New York City will add dual language options in pre-K to attract parents and encourage diversity. *Chalkbeat*. Retrieved from <https://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/ny/2018/01/17/new-york-city-will-add-dual-language-options-in-pre-k-to-attract-parents-and-encourage-diversity>
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391–430.
- Weise, E. (2019, January 12). *Full U.S. Mandarin immersion school list*. Retrieved from <https://miparentscouncil.org/full-mandarin-immersion-school-list>
- Wong, K. K., & Shen, F. X. (2013, March 22). Mayoral governance and student achievement. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2013/03/22/56934/mayoral-governance-and-student-achievement>