

Planning language-in-education in Arkansas: A case study

Felicia Lincoln-Porter
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

This paper will examine some aspects of language-in-education planning in the state of Arkansas and analyze some models of language planning that illuminate this case. I will give an overview of the state's educational planning process and describe how that process is then worked out in particular language planning situations. I will also examine Arkansas Language Planning in regard to Fishman's decision-making framework and Tollefson's centralized/decentralized distinction. In particular, this paper will examine the question: What is the place of language maintenance in a rural state where services are not tightly controlled and primary concern is with governing efficiency?

In the years since the passage of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) in 1968 and since the *Lau v. Nichols* decision (1974), much energy has gone into the consideration of how to educate children who do not speak the language of the schools. National statistics and almost all reliable sources show that language minority¹ students in this country are at risk. In spite of having higher SAT scores than African Americans, Hispanics (the largest language minority group) are less likely to finish high school or attend college than African American students (Grey, 1991).

Scholarship and writing in the area of Language Planning (LP) have tended to set forth theories, frameworks, and models that implied a preference for native language instruction, the valuing of culture, and language/culture² as one way of successfully attending to the problem of language minority students. Some of the most respected voices in the field hold the same opinion: language maintenance is important and native language instruction in bilingual education (BE) is the most effective, humane way to teach language minority students (Fishman, 1979; Wong Fillmore & Valadez, 1986; Holm & Holm, 1990; Morison, 1990). In the last few years, scholars have seemed to take this as given and have turned to issues of pedagogy,

such as how to allocate the two languages in school, length of instructional time in each language, and what content material should be taught in what language (Wong Fillmore & Valadez, 1986).

Tollefson argues that one of the constraints on language planning goals for English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction (as opposed to native language instruction) is the socioeconomic need to keep a large labor pool for entry level jobs. Spener also holds that "the insights gained from sociological and linguistic investigation seem to show that this goal (of hurried English acquisition) serves the interest of society at the expense of the needs of language-minority students" (cited in Grey, 1991:151).

However, in examining language education planning in the case of Arkansas, I find myself in the uncomfortable position of questioning the generalizability of this stance. Two questions that emerged are: 1) What happens when there is little or no minority language community to support, advocate or participate in language maintenance or little state support in terms of funding, legislation or human resources? 2) In a community that has had few immigrants, refugees, or migrants, that has in fact known little linguistic diversity ever in its history, what is the role of the enlightened language planner?

Kalantzis, Cope, and Slade maintain that the massive *internationalizing* and *universalizing* of western nations have created a pluralism that can not afford either to trivialize traditional culture by advocating a "superficial" maintenance (dance, food, etc.) nor can it afford to defend maintenance where it is no longer a viable option. The argument offered is:

Language is both determined by our social and natural being and creates or re-creates relations in our natural and social worlds for us....We should not prejudge the validity of a whole range of cultural-linguistic options. There might be wrong reasons in terms of association, desired community or even the perceived logistics of "getting ahead" to let an ancestral language drop. On the other hand, language maintenance might be a means of feeling a particular strength through community or of galvanizing support against the legitimacy within those broader structures, or as a transitional educational tool in acquiring a second language and continuing one's educational progress uninterrupted in the immigrant setting....*Language maintenance, however is not a value in itself* (1989:18; emphasis mine).

This argument is the same one that was offered both explicitly (on occasion) and implicitly (often) in the reasons and rationales given for the programs chosen and goals set for language minority children in schools in Arkansas.

Fishman describes LP in bilingual education as a four stage process of status planning:

- 1) decision-making as the "political process for arriving at a "final resolution,"
- 2) codification, which is the "formal statement of this resolution,"
- 3) elaboration, the authoritative formulated rules and regulations needed to put the "code" into operation,
- 4) implementation, which involves "the authoritative allocation of resources."

These rules can "reflect the unstated as well as the stated intent of the authorities involved." (1979). An example of the elaboration of unstated goals is the regulations of the Bilingual Education Act giving priority to programs with larger groups, thereby penaliz(ing) applications on behalf of smaller and less concentrated (non-urban) language groups" (1979:13-15).

Both the Official English Act (Ivers, 1987), and a higher education English proficiency bill, House Bill 1100 (House, 1987) appear to be a type of *codification* of a position by planners in the United States. It appears from these cases that much of that *code* is still in need of *elaboration*, but the fact that little money has been allocated for language minority instruction leaves the implementation factor a problem to be addressed in other ways and is again reminiscent of Tollefson's (1991) argument that the US has a policy of mandating English proficiency and inadequately funding that mandate.

While Kalantzis and others look at the issue of maintenance from the perspective of the migrating culture, Fishman (1969) looks at the question of LP decision-making at the national level and from the viewpoint of the planners. He describes developing nations in terms of whether they have a Great Tradition, that is whether they have a literary and oral history, whether their goals are *nationism* (a pragmatic need for efficient government) or "nationalism" (a more symbolic need for authenticity), whether there is a language of wider communication (LWC), if their LP concerns are minor (standardization assumed), and if their bicultural/bilingual goals are transitional to mainstream. Fishman calls a Type A decision one that does not recognize an existing Great Tradition, sees language needs in terms of the pragmatic

nationism and the bicultural/bilingual goals as transitional to mainstream. That seems to describe the language planning process in Arkansas where the LWC is, of course, English.

Tollefson (1981) discusses decentralized and centralized planning. Decentralization, according to Tollefson, means that local authorities are allowed freedom to make decisions for their own situations. *Loose coupling* refers to the amount of interaction in planning and implementation that there is between state and federal planning levels. While the overall US educational frame seems to be one of decentralization and loose coupling between state and federal planning levels, if you examine Arkansas as an entity itself, there seems to be decentralization between state and local agencies (schools) as well. Not only were there several instances where the State Department of Education in Arkansas (SDE) did not seem aware of the district needs or the methods being applied to meet those needs, but also present were the diversity of methods and breadth of programming Tollefson described as characteristic of decentralized planning.

Ruiz (1984) talks about three types of language orientations: language as a problem, a right, or a resource. Ruiz believes that the attitudes or orientations toward a language's role in society affect trends in language planning. Defining or understanding orientations towards languages can help the planner to understand and predict planning and policy in this area.

Description of the State

Until recently Arkansas was called "The Land of Opportunity." Now it has been redesignated "The Natural State." Almost all of its industries are farming related. In the southeast, there is cotton, rice and soybeans. In the south part of the state, there is forestry and tomato farming, and west and northwest, there is poultry raising and processing; in the north (the Ozark mountain region), there is poultry farming and processing. The only other industry in the Ozarks to speak of is tourism. Real estate costs, taxes, and crime rates are low. Hospitality is still highly valued; people are held to be friendly—at least to each other.

Arkansas has had its troubled moments. In 1957, Little Rock Central High School was told to desegregate, and the National Guard was ordered up to see that they did so. More recently, the Governors' Delta Commission (Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission, 1989) introduced statistics on the Mississippi Delta region that indicated that region may be the poorest region in the US. Within that region, one

of the poorest area is south and west of Memphis, Tennessee, in Arkansas. Some of the statistics for the state read like those of developing nations (i.e., infant mortality, teenage pregnancy, and literacy rates).

The state nicely divides itself by drawing a line from the northeast corner to the southwest corner of the state. The northwest is mountainous and traditionally its population has been all white. Many towns have not had a minority family live there since the exodus of the Native Americans and some only recently. The southeast part of the state is dedicated to farming and has traditionally had a large black population, dating back to the Civil War and before. While relations between the majority and Blacks has been characterized by oppression toward blacks, this area of the state has a history of minority populations.

So what attracts immigrants and migrants to Arkansas? It has a good climate and good farming. The Hmong who settled briefly in Fort Smith, Arkansas, said the climate and land were the closest to their home they had seen since they left Laos (Downing, 1984). Poultry processing provides jobs—jobs that most Arkansans do not want. Besides farming, Arkansas has a history of poverty, and those are two things the migrant knows well. Often they have known little else.

Procedure

Beginning with the census, I examined areas of Arkansas that had language minority populations. I used the 1980 census because the 1990 information on languages is not available yet. I marked the places in Arkansas that reported numbers of language minorities and began calling those school districts for information. I also spoke with two people at the Arkansas State Department of Education. I spoke with personnel in several school districts: Mena, Fort Smith, Springdale, Paragould, Little Rock, Pulaski County. I read the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) Study of the Hmong in Fort Smith (1984), and called Dr. Bruce Downing at the University of Minnesota for information on the present whereabouts of that Hmong population. I also called the Migrant Student Record Transfer Service (MRSTS). I made several calls to the office of the *Arkansas Democrat* and *Arkansas Gazette* (now united in one office) for information in their archives on Arkansas' Official English Statute and language issues in recent state history. Also in reference to the Official English Statute, I called the Issues Department of the *Clinton for President* office and the records department of the state legislature.

From this information and other information (studies and news reports), I have tried to construct a picture of the way language planning occurs and what motivates it in the state of Arkansas. I have selected three cases to use for evidence and support of the LP picture I present: the Hmong in Fort Smith, the Springdale School District, the Paragould Junior High School.

Case Studies

In January of 1987, the Arkansas state legislature passed a statute making English the Official Language of the state. It passed 91 to 0 in the House and 29 to 2 in the Senate, clearly an overwhelming victory. Before the statute (Act 40) passed, the two representatives who introduced the bill said "this is not a major problem" but "...other states have been *forced* to use other languages in business and education because of the large number of immigrants" (Official English, Jan. 22, 1987, emphasis mine). The legislators appear to have won only *half* the battle. The statute made two statements: 1) English is the official language of the state of Arkansas, and, 2) this statute can not be used to prohibit the education of students in the state. With the addition of the education rider, most people I talked to in the state felt the law will have little effect on decisions regarding the education of language minority students.

The timing of the bill is interesting. It came at the end of 1986, when the nation from coast to coast seemed to be having a "language attack." Passage that year (1986) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act, and in California, the passage of Proposition 63, both indicate a nationwide interest in numbers of immigrants and control of language/culture spread. There were repercussions in small ways, too, such as the passage of Official English legislation in many states and the putting up and tearing down of foreign language street signs in several places (Philadelphia, for one [Stone, 1992]).

In Arkansas, this legislation appears to be a "knee jerk" reaction to the actions taken in other states. One senator offered the argument, "It would have virtually no effect," as reason to pass the bill. Another called it, "Frivolous legislation" (Official Language, Jan. 23, 1987). Another said he didn't want "documents...to have to be printed in more than one language...." but that the bill was not intended "to damage bilingual education or inhibit foreign language instruction in schools" (Committee Favors, 1987, January 21). From the embarrassed, unsure remarks the bill's sponsors made, it appears that they knew little of the bill's implications.

Still, the passage of Act 40 can be seen as a possible index of the state's view of language minorities. The fact that it was originally seen by at least some as beneficial to avoid native language instruction is interesting. It may provide a picture of an attitude in the state toward bilingual education programs and to planning for language education in the state in general. The message seems clear—English comes first.

There has been little else mandated by the state in the area of language education. There is no certification requirement (or provision) for ESL or BE instructors. There is no mandate for or against minority language education. The only other piece of related legislation was a bill also passed in 1987, requiring college professors to be able to speak English. How the bill would be implemented was not specified. The lack of centralized planning or authoritative elaboration of the legislation leaves the field open for an agency that is a main actor in the language planning for education in the state, the State Department of Education (SDE).

I spoke to Grier (1992), the SDE Foreign Language Advisor who became BE advisor/Title VII coordinator in the mid 1980s. Grier says the SDE has no official count of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students.³ A few years ago, a survey was sent out by SDE to schools. About 75% answered, but it was apparent that some school district officials were not familiar with the terminology used in the survey, and therefore, had difficulty in responding. Grier estimates that the state has about 2000 permanent non-English speaking residents.

According to Grier, the SDE receives "15-25 calls each year from school districts with LEP students. The SDE provides technical assistance by telephone, sends a large packet of materials designed to meet the needs of the individual school district situation, and refers the school district to the appropriate Multifunctional Resource Center for additional assistance" (follow up correspondence, Grier 12/11/92).

I asked what Grier did when districts called for help. She tells them:

1. The district should put the children in with the most sympathetic and interested teachers they have.
2. The district should mainstream the children (in the absence of a formal BE/ESL program and with small numbers of LEP students).
3. The children can not be put in Special Ed; if they are tested for Special Education, they must be tested in the native language (NL) of the child.
4. The SDE will train teachers if necessary.⁴

5. There is no money except for the programs for migrant children.
6. LEPs can be exempt from state-wide tests with parents' permission only. They can not be treated differently than other children unless the parents say it is all right. The SDE informs school districts of their legal obligations to LEP students.

Grier believes that school districts want to serve LEP students, but in many cases the districts do not have trained staff members or experience in serving LEP students. Districts are unaware of the resources available to them.

The Equity Center of the SDE has assisted school districts by supporting teacher training and by offering technical assistance. Guerrero of the Equity Center is now the SDE BE advisor/Title VII coordinator.

Guerrero (1992) and the Equity Center of the SDE deal with the legalities of educating children (e.g., civil rights, national origin issues, issues concerning treatment of children with learning disabilities). Guerrero, a bilingual himself, becomes involved with schools when legal injustices are suspected (as in the case of an occasional anonymous phone calls alleging inadequate treatment for LEP students or when there is non-compliance with federal laws). To help districts better serve this population, Guerrero is preparing a manual to aid districts.

However, for all his interest and concern, he does not believe BE/ESL belongs in his department. He wants to see it stay in the Instructional Program of SDE with other curricular programs. He feels that although issues of inequity are one aspect of serving these children, they are only one. Concerns about content and instruction should be addressed in their appropriate contexts.

Guerrero seems to state his concerns from a "language as right" perspective or perhaps "education as right." He believes that these students should be served like any other children—with education appropriate for their particular needs and circumstances. However, he does not see BE as a possibility in Arkansas. Whereas Grier notes the schools' lack of trained ESL teachers and experience with LEP students as the concern, Guerrero views educators' lack of training as fact to be legally addressed (interview, 1992).

Fort Smith

Although there may be lack of direction from the state, the Fort Smith school district was able to get BE money for their district. Fort Smith is the only district in the state to date that has actually received Title VII money. Bilingual Education falls in their

Compensatory Education Program, which also includes Chapter 1, Title V (Indian Education), Elementary Compensatory Education (children not covered by Chapter 1), an after school program for Junior and Senior High, and Chapter 2.

The ESL program in Fort Smith is now a district program, not a federal one; however, it still generally follows the original BEA guidelines with which it started in 1982 (Soucy, 1992). The program serves 600 children in the classroom and 600 students who are not ESL in the district. Those students not in the ESL classrooms are involved in cultural/community programs. The elementary program is a pullout ESL-bilingual program. At the secondary level, they offer bilingual ESL. They have five levels of ESL and receive two English credits for those: one at the ninth grade level and one credit in the year of their choice. They receive three credits in other areas of study. They offer other options as well as bilingual tutoring. Before they received Title VII money, they had 23 instructional staff; afterwards, they had 26 staff, not all instructional. During the time that they had Hmong, they had five Hmong staff (not instructional). They now have a total staff of 24 people.

Soucy reported that one thing they have wanted to institute and can not seem to "get going" is NL instruction in their own language. Part of the reason for that is that parents do not support the program. They are concerned that their children will not be able to get good jobs unless they speak English. Another reason is that in Fort Smith, the language minority communities are not self supporting. They do not even have a "Lao Town"; as they prospered, the Laotians have moved out and are not congregated in one area.

According to a study prepared for the Office of Refugee Resettlement, the Hmong came to Fort Smith in the late seventies and early eighties as part of a secondary migration from California (Downing, 1984:30). They left California, according to the ORR report, because they saw their children becoming dependent on that state's strong welfare program. The Hmong word for being "on welfare" is "no arms, no legs". They began looking for a place with less public assistance. Arkansas fits that description.

They also chose Arkansas because they had known an American in California who had been their friend. These particular Hmong were Christians, converted by missionaries in Laos. This man had befriended the Hmong and was also a Christian. He had eventually moved to Fort Smith. When the Hmong began to think of leaving California, they thought of this man and contacted him (Downing, 1984).

In 1982, there were 88 Hmong children scattered throughout the city. The district received Title VII money for three years to serve the Hmong. (They received

Title VII money for three more years for their other programs.) Since the Hmong were dispersed and there is no busing, they were served by an itinerant ESL instructor. The ESL program had one person with a graduate degree in ESL and linguistics, two American personnel and three Vietnamese. According to ORR, the district had thought for two years that the Hmong were Vietnamese.

The experience of the Hmong epitomizes some of the problems addressed by Tollefson (1991). In Fort Smith there were no time, no funds, and no facilities for learning English, so they worked in chicken processing plants. Sometimes two or three family members worked long and inconvenient hours. They had no opportunity to learn English and no chance for advancement without it.

They also fell victim to some persecution, called "rednecking" by locals—a type of harassment that usually stops at violence, but not much else. For example, the Hmong had cooperatively bought some land outside the city; some of their farm buildings were burned and fences torn down (Downing, 1984).

Teachers in the Fort Smith school district reported that the Hmong children worked hard, but did not perform as well in school as the other Asian children, probably because of their lack of previous education. Also Downing reports that some of the students were working nights at the chicken processing plant and going to high school during the day. At the time of Downing's report, only one child had dropped out of school. Some teachers had believed that the Hmong students would really benefit from the proposed bilingual education program (Downing, 1984). However, when I talked to Nguyen in the ESL Department of the Fort Smith schools, she said one of the problems with native language instruction for the Hmong population was the lack of professional people to draw from for bilingual educational support or professional staff, a problem they did not have with other language populations (Nguyen, 1991).⁵

Other educators cited cultural differences as causes of student school problems. Some parents arranged marriages, expected their children to work long hours, and refused to allow their children to attend extracurricular activities and study sessions. Kalantzis, Cope and Slade (1989) discuss the problems immigrants have when they move from their original society to the new one in deciding which of their cultural practices they can keep and which must go. The Hmong dilemma here seems to be just such an intersection for decision-making of both the Hmong and the schools.

In Fort Smith, with apparently little community support for language/culture maintenance, few opportunities for adults to learn English and a history of some hostility to language minorities, the question becomes: what is the role of maintenance?

Because I had read the ORR Study of the Hmong people, I asked Mr. Soucy what had happened to the Hmong since 1984. He said they had all moved. I called Dr. Downing to follow up on them. He said they are in Atlanta now: The government offered them incentives to move (1992). Research indicated that other Hmong were doing well in Atlanta and moving up and out of entry level positions. Therefore, the Hmong went there. Downing hopes to do follow up on them in 1993. It will be interesting to see if they have been able to study English and how they have managed to break out of entry level positions.

Federally funded bilingual education was not able to meet the needs of these Hmong children. They report success with the other language minority students in the program. Perhaps the Hmong's needs were not recognized in time, possibly because these educators had so little experience with language minority children or because of the educational background of the Hmong. Very likely, all of those issues conspired together to thwart the Hmong in Fort Smith.

Springdale

Fort Smith has had Title VII money in the past; in Springdale, Arkansas, the effect of federal funding is still to be seen. Located in the northwest corner of the state, this is an Ozark mountain region that has always been populated by Whites. I spoke with Dr. Jones, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction who has this year written a grant proposal for Title VII money (1992). She was very open and enthusiastic about the program. They are developing a transitional ESL program, not bilingual, according to Jones, because there are too many languages represented. They serve 100 non-English speaking and LEP children out of 8000 children in the district. They have not been concerned about languages spoken at home but just the perceived need of the children. The children are informally identified, but if Springdale is awarded the grant, the school will do on-site tests for reading/writing and speaking/listening.⁶ They have some Spanish speaking bilingual tutors, but they have children from the Marshall Islands and Laotians as well. They have offered their teachers some training workshops.

Jones said that pressure to apply for Title VII had come from two counts: 1) a high school counselor⁷ told Jones, "we've got kids suffering. They need help," and, 2) there had been a *little bit* of parental concern. A few parents had come and said, "I think you must educate these children. You have to overcome the barriers to education." She said it is a civil rights issue.

Jones felt the state had been remiss in not applying for Title VII money and suggested that I talk to Andre Guerrero at the SDE. She said he had been very helpful to her. They have taken most steps to serve these students based on what they felt were civil rights issues.

In closing, I asked if there was anything she could think of that I should know about the Springdale program. Jones said:

It is important for you to know that philosophically the intention of our program is to integrate the students as quickly as possible, enculturate them as quickly as possible. Our area is middle America. This place is not used to foreigners. So these students must adapt to middle America. We don't want to invalidate their cultures, but it's not like southern California where they offer a lot of Mexican American history.

It was apparent from talking to Jones that she had read the literature on language and culture; she had simply not seen it as relevant (or perhaps possible) for her educational situation. The need to avoid *language ghettos* and assimilation problems, possibly of the kind experienced by the Hmong in Fort Smith, made the fastest transition seem the best. Jones appears to view these children's language needs as a problem. In a later communication, she discussed with me the difficulty of providing NLI when there are five students and no textbooks. She said that while the diversity might well be "a resource; it could not be a right." In contrast, the next case while still clearly having bicultural transition to the mainstream as a goal is a clear example of a language as resource orientation.

Paragould

Paragould, Arkansas is in the northeast corner of the state. It, too, is in a largely white section of the state that is completely unused to language minorities (Clark, 1992). There had never been any language minority students, until October, 1985 when Rusty Clark, principal of a junior high school in Paragould, came to school to find two Mexican migrant worker's children waiting. The father was with them but spoke virtually no English; an older brother (a teenager) had come to translate. He spoke *some* English.

The district was completely unprepared for two junior high age Hispanic children, a boy and a girl. Clark said he was told (by the district) "to fix it, we've got to do something, be creative" and to "forget the grades." He said he had a really strong Spanish program and placed them there. He never received a transcript and was never sure where they had come from.

At first the two children spent most of their time with the Spanish teacher. For the first four or five days, they never spoke. Then the girl, Aida, began to open up in all her classes. She began to attend math, chorus, physical education and loved art. The boy, Albert, seemed comfortable only in music and Spanish, where he really excelled. He laughed and joked. Whistle, the Spanish teacher, reported (Interview, 1992) that he had a good sense of humor and often supplied synonyms for the vocabulary learned in class. The Anglo teachers wrote the children's assignments in English and the Spanish teacher translated. They assigned peer tutors to the children for help with English. Aida and Albert tutored the Anglo children in Spanish ("Paragould Students," 1985).

From the descriptions provided by Clark, it is obvious that these children were living in economically difficult circumstances. Clark was concerned with their coping skills. He wanted them to be able to buy groceries, instead of eating fast food and was concerned about their health and hygiene. He said he was primarily concerned with two things. First, the children should not be ostracized; they should be socialized into US culture, and the "other kids" learn to accept their differences. Clark felt his Anglo children had no idea that the differences they saw between themselves and the Mexican children were cultural. The Anglos laughed at the migrant children because of "simple proxemics, the Mexican children stood too close and touched too much. The other kids just couldn't handle that." Clark tried to educate both groups. It is true that the Anglo children need to learn to recognize differences and appreciate them, but Clark felt that the learning process should not be at the expense of the two migrant children. His second goal was that these two children regain self-esteem. He said he saw that as a "big deal" and that was why the Spanish classes were so important. The children could be useful there. He said when he studied languages, he hated tapes and that the children were very helpful as models of Spanish speech. Clark believed that Aida and Albert needed to be socialized quickly. His program, though enlightened, creative, and humanistic in approach, was still transitional and assimilationist.

When asked what he knew about theories or approaches to language teaching. He said "I can tell you in one word: nothing." He had not had time to learn anything. They just did what seemed sensible; they also experimented. The children were not there long. He does not know where they went. They are migrants.

There are some interesting points here. Clark appears to have intuitively seen the value of the children's native language in their education. In all the talk, not once did he discuss the role of the English teacher in these students' instruction. In other

schools I have seen (and taught in), a non-English speaking student is often placed in English classes all day long (not ESL, these are schools where those classes do not exist). That option seems to never have occurred to Clark. When asked about how he felt about receiving these children, he said, "We were excited. We wanted to hire Aida to tutor Spanish students in the high school. They simply were not here long enough." At the end of the interview, I talked a little about language orientations. He was amazed, "Language as problem? Why in the world?" That idea simply had not occurred to him (Clark, 1992).

When I asked him if he would use this approach again, Clark said in sixteen years these were the only two non-English speaking students he had had. One time he had a German student, but he had spoken several languages fluently—English was one. Clark doubted if this would ever be an issue again.

Discussion

The fact that Arkansas is a decentralized LP situation enables these three school districts to create entirely different contexts for second language learners. Although all seem to set assimilation as goals for their students, their methods for helping students are different. Fort Smith created a ESL-bilingual pullout. Springdale intends to provide as much simple ESL instruction as possible. Paragould sees their language minority students as both a chance to serve and be served and implemented a program involving more native language instruction and utilizing the Hispanic children as tutors as well as students.

Intuitively Clark felt that native language instruction had value for education and for building self-esteem as well. He also understood that languages and cultural diversity have something to contribute to the mainstream population. Still it is important to note here that, had Paragould not had a strong Spanish program, a different program and possibly a more problem-type orientation might have resulted. In addition, when discussing the Paragould case with people in the state, at least two different informants made the point that while two migrant children were exciting and exotic, two hundred might have been something else again. So again, the question is: Where there are no community/school resources available, what is the role of language maintenance? Additionally, what is the role of the school towards maintenance?

As is often the case with minority populations, the people most affected do not seem to have been asked what their goals are for themselves and their children. Only

Jones, in Springdale, solicited community input. Other questions then are: what do these language minorities want for themselves, and what do they think is reasonable to expect of schools?

Fishman (1979) maintains that socioeconomic and political issues can not be separated from linguistic ones. That is apparent from the cases examined here. Jones, in Springdale, obviously considered the issue in her district to be unrelated to language in its own right. For societal and economic reasons, she wanted minority language children integrated into "Middle America" as quickly as possible. Clark, too, felt that the issue was social, economic, psychological, and even physical well-being; language was a means to an end. In Fort Smith, the situation of the Hmong (while very complex) seemed to be one of socioeconomic issues first and language needs second, at least as it is perceived by the language minority community, the ORR, and the schools.

Tollefson's decentralized language planning, especially the idea of loose coupling, allows for a wide range of programs for diverse needs; but in Arkansas, there also seems to be a need for closer communication among actors. In certain circumstances (in the case of MRSTS and the SDE, for one), the right hand needs to know what the left hand is doing—especially if the left hand has the money in it. The issue of money was very difficult to clarify. Few of the educators I talked to seemed to know that the Migrant Office had Chapter 2 money that was possibly available for teacher training in BE. There seemed to be confusion over whether there was money or not and where to get it. Since the initial research for this was done, two districts which applied for Title VII grants have been turned down. The SDE has offered two training sessions on the writing of Title VII grants; perhaps this will lead to successful Title VII grant writing by Arkansas school districts and cooperatives. One informant who was turned down said that another problem that rural areas had was that in states like California, when one district wrote a successful grant, it was passed around from district to district. In Arkansas, there is no such network. They are beginning at zero. Again the decentralized nature of planning seems to be an issue here. Tighter networking is called for.

Fishman's decision-making typology (1969) was very helpful too for understanding the language planning done in Arkansas education, if we look at Arkansas as a "State" and not a "state," and a State that often resembles a developing nation. As in Type A developing nations, the elites (or actors) in Arkansas certainly seemed not to consider there to be an "indigenous Great Tradition" (113). Also, there appeared to be no conflict among the actors as to the type of decisions to be made.

Few even mentioned the need for extensive native language instruction.⁸ Again, Official English legislation and its easy passage seem to be an example of a Type A "early, unconflicted arrival" at decision (113).

The concern in Arkansas is more "nationism" than "nationalism," Official English notwithstanding. There is a concern on the micro level (schools) with "operational efficiency" ("we have too many languages" for BE) and only English (the LWC) is seen as fulfilling nationwide (statewide) purposes on a permanent basis (114). Bilingualism is viewed as having no nationwide function by the planners and as having a transitional role.

Jones' wish to incorporate minority language children as quickly as possible and to find ways to see that they "adapt to middle America" parallels Fishman's description of decision makers who are in "search of new and effective ideological and behavioral systems that promise rapid integrative returns on a large scale" (116). While this is Fishman's model of a Type A nation, it is also an accurate description of what I found in Arkansas.

To return then to Kalantzis, Cope and Slade (1989), a people's language and culture (at least at the simplest level) are seen as the pragmatic solution they make to social and physical need. Humanity is, therefore, not duty bound to preserve what is not useful or necessary to life. That is expressly the position held by most of the planners in Arkansas.

In a planning situation such as schools in Arkansas where educators often go many years without seeing a language minority student, it seems unrealistic to expect them to be prepared to educate and preserve those students' language and culture. When the language minority community is made up largely of migrants and refugees, it is not realistic to expect schools to be able to find professional staff to serve the educational needs of these students. The minority populations surveyed here worked long hours, often nights and weekends, and could find little opportunity to study English themselves. What hope is there, then, of finding adequately educated personnel to hire as bilingual instructors and tutors? Also, given that budgets are already overextended in most school districts, how can planners expect there to be resources for training and implementing bilingual education programs?

There is little question that native language instruction offers valuable benefits to communities that can supply and support it. Indeed, Clark, in Paragould, understood (without seeing research or viewing the literature) the value to self-esteem that native language instruction offered, both to the language minority students and the Anglo children as well. However, when the Hispanic community consists of one family, what

is the likelihood of maintaining their culture? Jones, too, understood the need to affirm cultural values in her students, but with several languages represented among only 100 students, the priority became quick integration into "middle America."

The question then is still "what is the value of language maintenance in a setting such as the one described above?"

Conclusion

Maintenance may not be a practical alternative in Arkansas. The state lacks funding resources at the state level and lacks educators who are trained in adequate means of identifying, testing and teaching language minority children. The State Department of Education does not have adequate, trained personnel to support a maintenance education program, and the community does not have an adequate professional pool of minority language speakers from which to draw support.

The federal government could mandate maintenance as a goal. With the federal government's posture toward bilingual education, that does not appear likely. Even if the government did take that stance, Arkansas' decentralized process would inhibit systematic implementation. State history towards Federal pressure also throws doubt on the success of such a mandate. The state resisted desegregation in the fifties and sixties until it received a final, authoritative order. When it did integrate public schools, in those parts of the state most affected, segregation gradually reappeared through white flight and the institution of private schools.

Arkansas is a state with limited financial resources. Historically, it has had some of the poorest paid teachers in the US. Again, historically students in the state have scored low on nationwide tests. Already burdened schools would probably view creative programming for a few immigrant children as attending to "brush fires" or as neglect of the many for the benefit of the few.⁹

Kalantzis, Cope and Slade (1989) believe language maintenance is not a value in itself. Others like Wong Fillmore and Valadez (1986) and Holm and Holm (1990) argue that it must be a priority. While BE is very possibly the ideal, when viewed in an urban context, or a context with the resources for incorporating language minority students, it may not be so in insular rural settings for whom diversity is a novelty. Dr. Jones and the actors in Arkansas seem to hold culture/language maintenance as worthwhile, but indicate that they view it as a luxury that they can not afford. Both Jones and Clark were concerned about the community and student acceptance of these children. That, of course, is of concern in any environment. Educators and

enlightened planners know that discrimination does not disappear because minority communities get larger. Still, there is the proverb about "safety in numbers." In communities where there is no minority culture to turn to, assimilation may be the expedient answer. Assimilation is certainly the goal in the minds of the actors in the Arkansas situation. According to Fishman (1969), "Our need, both for practical and for academic purposes, is to know the processes and the circumstances through which human decisions influence their adoption, cultivation, displacement and replacement (of national languages or the LWC)" (1969:124). The need in Arkansas and places like it is certainly "to know the processes and circumstances" necessary for better language planning and, consequently, better education of language minority children.

This study has raised more questions than it has answered. Some questions for continued study and consideration are:

- 1) To what extent can minority language/culture be expected to be maintained in any majority culture?
- 2) If a level of maintenance is to be desired, whose responsibility is it to maintain it?
- 3) What role do schools play in that, especially if there is no sizable population extant?
- 4) What role should the minority cultures play in language planning?
- 5) Can culture/language be maintained when there is no corresponding minority society to maintain it within?
- 6) How realistic a hope is maintenance when there are few economic and social incentives?
- 7) At what level of (percentage?)/or representation of the population does maintenance become an option?

For language planners who believe that maintenance is valuable for minority language children, there are some serious issues to be considered. If maintenance and native language instruction are not realistic possibilities, teachers must then find ways to integrate students into mainstream culture humanely. They must educate the students in the language of school in such a way that they do not become isolated from their own cultural identity. Research is needed to describe and assess the possibility for other types of treatment for language minorities in these situations. Especially needed are ethnographic long term studies of Arkansas students and students in rural and/or isolated settings to describe what the school experiences of

language minority students actually are. Another equally important consideration is how to prepare these rural schools and other agencies involved to be able some day to offer native language instruction. Perhaps maintenance as right can be viewed as a long-term goal of planners in Arkansas. Maybe in Arkansas, language maintenance is simply an idea whose time has not yet come.

¹ I am using the term language minority populations. I do not like the term as it defines the population in respect to the majority population; however, other terms are more objectionable. When reporting conversations with others, I will follow informants' usage.

² "Maintenance," "native language instruction" (NLI), and "bilingual education" obviously do not all mean the same thing. For the purpose of this paper, I see NLI and BE as parts of maintenance and, therefore, the terms will sometimes be used interchangeably.

³ However, the SDE has received a Title VII SEA grant and will be conducting a statewide count in the near future (follow-up correspondence with Grier, 12/11/92).

⁴ One informant said they do about seven hours of training. "As you probably know, that's not very much."

⁵ In fact, because of their experience, Nguyen told me Fort Smith staff had been useful in training in other places in the state.

⁶ Springdale did not receive their grant; the other Arkansas applicant was also turned down. Possible reasons for this may be politics and/or lack of networking in grant writing. Both schools were surprised and disappointed.

⁷ Jones said, "Counselors tend to tune in well".

⁸ The only possible exception is the Paragould case and there Clark seemed to still be considering how to acculturate quickly, albeit humanely. He may somehow be the exception that proves the rule of "diversity" in decentralized language planning.

⁹ In fact, that complaint has been lodged even in an urban area when one group was singled out through civil legislation for special services and other also needy group were not recipients (Skilton, 1992).

References

- Committee favors language proposal. (1987, January 17). *Arkansas Gazette*.
- Downing, B. (1984). *The Hmong Resettlement*. Office of Refugee Resettlement.
- Fishman, J. (1969). National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. *Anthropological Linguistics*. 11 (4):111-135.
- Fishman, J. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *English Worldwide* 1 (1):11-24.
- Grey, M. A. (1991, Fall). The context for marginal secondary ESL programs: Contributing factors and the need for further research. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*. Vol. 9, 75-86.
- Grier, S. (1992, December 12). State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas. Follow-up correspondence.
- Holm, A. & Holm, W. (1990, March). Rock Point, a Navajo way to go to school: a valediction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. (*English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education*), pp. 170- 184.
- House approves bill limiting access to state employee personnel records. (1987, February 5,). *Arkansas Gazette*
- Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission. Interim report of the lower Mississippi Delta development commission. (1989, March 16).
- Ivers, D. (1987, February 14). It's official: Only English spoken here. *Arkansas Democrat*. 6D.
- Kalantzis, M., Cope, B. & Slade, D. (1989). *Minority languages and dominant culture: Issues of education, assessment, and social equity*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Morison, S. (1990, March). A Spanish-English dual-language program in New York City. (*The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*). *English Plus: issues in Bilingual Education* (pp. 160-169).

- Official English garners 79 sponsors. (1987, January 22). *Arkansas Democrat*, p. 6F.
- Official language. (1987, January 23). *Arkansas Gazette*.
- Paragould students swap lingual aptitudes. (1985, October 7). *Arkansas Democrat*.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*. 8 (2):15-34.
- Skilton, E. (1992, April). Acquisition policy planning and litigation: Language planning in the context of Y.S. v. the school district of Philadelphia. Paper presented in ED 927. University of Pennsylvania [published in *WPEL: Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*].
- Stone, H. (1992, March). Korean maintenance language planning: An English Only environment. Paper presented in ED 927, University of Pennsylvania.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: language policy in the community*. New York: Longman.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1981). Centralized and decentralized language planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 5 (2):175-188.
- Wong Fillmore, L & Valadez, C. (1986) Teaching bilingual learners. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, (3rd ed.), (pp. 648-685). New York: MacMillan.

