

PART TWO

LANGUAGE EDUCATION OF U.S. LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENTS

In Part 2, we will discuss the educational characteristics of language minority speakers, focusing on a subset of that group, those designated limited English proficient (LEP) students in U.S. government terminology. We will also survey the characteristics of English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual programs that serve language minority populations and illustrate typical U.S. bilingual classroom processes.

A number of areas essential to understanding ESL and bilingual education in the U.S. are not covered in this section. See August and Hakuta (1997) for a recent review of U.S. research in second language acquisition, discourse patterns in classrooms, cognitive processes in first-language content learning, program evaluation and effective schooling.

Language Minority Populations

Recall that in Part 1 we discussed home speakers of non-English languages, while in this part we will discuss a broader category, *language minority speakers*. Definitions of language minority vary slightly.²⁷ The definition used here is that of the source we consulted for 1980-1990 U.S. Census figures: "People in families or households in which one or more people speak a non-English language" (*Numbers and Needs*, March 1993, Vol. 3, no. 2).²⁸ Language minority estimates include more people with potential language education needs than do estimates of the number of home speakers of non-English languages. Language minority speakers may have limited English proficiency, they may be bilingual, or they may be essentially monolingual speakers of English who lack the necessary reading or writing skills to succeed in all English-speaking environments. (August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 16). The purpose of looking at language minority populations is to provide a benchmark for overall conditions and for the potential need for language services.

The language minority population increased by 36 percent from 1980-

²⁷For example, the U.S. Department of Education (1987) defined language minority children as "those who came from a household in which the household head and one other person spoke a non-English language" (Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 3B, para. 7). Another definition is those who live in households where a non-English language is dominant.

²⁸Language minority estimates were developed from the 5% public use microdata sample (PUMS) based on responses to the U.S. Census long form, which included language and school attendance questions (*Numbers and Needs*, July 1994, Vol. 4, no. 4). See Part 1, Footnote 7, for more information on census data.

1990, so that in 1990, one person in five was a member of a language minority group (*Numbers and Needs*, September 1995, Vol. 5, no. 5. Data from 1990 Census of Population.). Of these, approximately ten million language minority speakers were school age (5-17). Recall Table 8, introduced in Part 1, which shows the distribution of home language speakers among selected language groups. The young people of recently immigrated groups—for example, Hmong, Mon-Khmer, and Vietnamese—are much more likely to speak their native languages at home than are long-established groups who speak such languages as French or German. While the young people in recently immigrated groups will be more likely to need special language services, advocates also argue that the English speakers in language minority homes, for example the 1.8 million English-speaking young people in Spanish-speaking homes, and the 52,000 English-speaking youth in Chinese households, should also be considered in potential need of academic language support.

Non-English speakers who speak English less than *very well* are less likely to be enrolled in elementary or high school, and they are more likely to have lower levels of educational attainment as adults. Table 9 shows the school enrollment and educational attainment rates of three groups—monolingual English speakers, non-English speakers who rated themselves as speaking 'English' *very well*, and those who rated themselves as speaking English less than very well.²⁹ By high-school (ages 15-17), those with English difficulty are less likely to be enrolled and by college (ages 18-19) much less likely to be enrolled than either monolingual English speakers or bilinguals. Educational attainment among adult speakers with English difficulty reflects similar trends, with approximately 18 percent of those with English speaking difficulty having fewer than five years of education compared with under 2 percent of monolingual English speakers and approximately 3 percent of bilingual speakers. High school graduation rates show a similar gap: 43 percent of those with English difficulty have graduated from high school compared with 72 and 78 percent of bilingual and monolingual speakers respectively (*Numbers and Needs*, July 1995, Vol. 5, no. 4).

Speakers with English difficulty are somewhat more likely to be unemployed, and when they are employed, they are more likely to occupy service or blue-collar positions as shown in Table 10. In 1990, approximately 68 percent of those with English difficulty had occupations in service, farm-

²⁹ Note that a slightly different definition of bilingual is used in this table than is used in Table 5. In this discussion and in Table 9 that accompanies it, bilinguals are defined as those who speak a non-English language and report that they speak English *very well* (*Numbers and Needs*, July 1995, Vol. 5, no. 4); in Table 5, those who speak a non-English language in addition to speaking English *well* were also included in the bilingual category.

SIX NATIONS REPORT

ing, industry, and labor (job categories 3 - 6 in Table 10) compared with 39 and 40 percent of bilingual and monolingual English speakers, the majority of whom were engaged in managerial, professional, technical and administrative positions (categories 1 - 2).

Graduation rates vary by language background and by gender. As Waggoner summarizes it, "Non-English speaking people in the U.S. are much less well educated than their native-born and foreign-born counterparts in the general population, but their educational attainment varies considerably according to their place of birth, their home language, and their gender" (*Numbers and Needs*, July 1996, Vol. 6, no. 4). Table 11 shows differences in high school graduation rates among groups of non-English speaking people. A total of 15 percent have graduated, and of that group, 19 percent were native-born and approximately 14 percent were foreign-born. Rates of graduation among the Mon-Khmer, Portuguese, and Spanish-speaking groups were relatively low as compared with Korean, Polish, and Russian speakers. Asian-Indian-speaking males are about twice as likely to be high school graduates as Asian-Indian-speaking females while Spanish-speaking males and females graduate at approximately the same rate. Table 12 shows a complementary trend among adults with limited schooling. More foreign-born than native-born non-English speakers and slightly more non-English speaking women than men have limited schooling. Limited schooling for adult men and women ranges from 12 percent of Polish-speakers to 79 percent of Mon-Khmer speakers with less than 5 years of formal school.

In summation, these figures seem to suggest a relationship between ability to speak English and educational and economic opportunity. They could be seen as support for the promotion of the rapid acquisition of English for the purposes of employment. However, a number of social, cultural, ethnic and economic factors need to be considered in addition to English-speaking ability. Some of these include language and cultural distance in relation to U.S. society, social discrimination, geographical concentration, poverty, educational opportunities in native countries, resettlement and war experiences. All of these have a potential influence on educational attainment and employment. There is also a need to look at the role of limited economic opportunity structures available to non-English speakers and members of particular ethnic groups (Spener, 1988). It is possible that the U.S. economy structure requires an underclass, and the increasing standards for English language and literacy demanded by recent language education reforms actually function to maintain a pool of non-English speakers, particularly immigrant adults, to perform unwanted and low paying jobs (Spener, 1988, pp. 137-140).

The educational achievement of language minority populations is difficult to describe for several reasons. Until very recently, language minorities have been frequently excluded from national surveys such as the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 and the National Assessment

of Educational Progress (NAEP) because their English was often seen as insufficient to participate (*Numbers and Needs*, September 1992, Vol. 2, no. 5; August & Hakuta, 1997, pp. 275-304). Another reason that the educational achievement of language minority students is difficult to quantify is that smaller-scale surveys sometimes focus on multilingual speakers but do not aggregate achievement data by level of English proficiency. One recent example was the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), which found that the dropout rate for immigrants and children of immigrants was significantly lower than district-wide averages in the two urban areas sampled. It was also found that children of immigrants as a group outperformed the district norms, though large differences occurred in all outcomes by national origin (Rumbaut, 1998, pp. 17-21). CILS documents the rapid shift to English among the immigrants sampled and reports that students who had been classified as Limited English Proficient by schools (see discussion in the following section) remained associated with lower academic achievement and higher dropout rates than non-native students with English fluency (Rumbaut, 1998, p. 23).³⁰ Beyond these observations, however, the author uses ethno-national origin to aggregate data on GPA, educational and occupational aspirations, and other socio-cultural and psychological characteristics. Thus, from this otherwise very informative work, we cannot learn about the relationship of language proficiency (in English or non-English languages) to the predictors of achievement he examines. Ethnicity and/or nationality are sometimes assumed to be a surrogate measure for language, obscuring the language-related educational issues (Macías, 1994, p. 35). For example, in the analysis of the results of the U.S. IEA Reading Literacy Study (Binkley & Williams, 1996), ethnicity—but not language differences or proficiency levels—was reported on.

Turning from national assessments of achievement to the census, we have data about self-reported English proficiency, but we know very little about the non-English language resources of language minority students (Macías, 1994, pp. 35-36; Wiley, 1996, pp. 78-79). Two exceptions to this focus on English proficiency are the 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS), which oversampled Latinos and provided English and Spanish versions of the questionnaire, and the National Chicano Survey (NCS), which collected self-reported information about literacy in English and Spanish from the Mexican-origin population (Wiley, 1996, pp. 80-92). Re-

³⁰ CILS studied the social, cultural and psychological adaptation, over a three-year period, of 5,200 foreign and U.S.-born children of immigrants enrolled in high schools in two large school districts, one in southern California and the other in Florida. Seventy-seven nationalities were represented in the sample: In California, the largest number of students were from Mexico, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and in Florida, the majority of students were from Cuba, Haiti, Jamaica, Colombia, and other Latin American countries.

sults are striking. According to Macías (1988) and Wiley (1990), for example, the NCS shows an overall Chicano literacy rate of 74 percent for the U.S.: 32 percent English literacy dominant, 20 percent English/Spanish biliteracy, and 22 percent Spanish literacy dominant. If only English literacy were measured, the literacy rate would have been under-reported as 52 percent (cited in Wiley, 1996, pp. 92-93).

Pending reform in national data collection and analysis, we are not able to describe educational achievement, attainment, and literacy rates of language minority populations with much assurance. A number of specific reforms have been suggested and are now underway (August & Hakuta, 1997, pp. 275-306; Macías, 1994; Wiley, 1996; Olson & Goldstein, 1996). Somewhat more specific data are available on students identified by schools as limited English proficient, described in the following section:

Educational Characteristics of Students Identified as Limited English Proficient

Until recently, most national educational policy has referred to the *limited English proficient* (LEP) student population. Title VII of Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, following earlier U.S. government precedent, defines an LEP individual as one who has "sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language and whose difficulties may deny such individual the opportunity to learn successfully" in English-only classrooms for one or all of the following reasons: the individual was born outside the U.S., comes from a home where a non-English language is dominant, is a native American or Alaska native or from another outlying area, is migratory and whose native language is other than English.³¹

Counts of LEP students are necessary in order to guide federal policy-making, to focus federal training and technical assistance, and to report to the general public concerning LEP populations and their needs (Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 7A, para. 2). However, the available statistics often differ significantly from one another. One reason is the use of different methodologies, which can be generally categorized as either school (SEA)-based or census-based.³² An example of school-based research is the "Sum-

³¹ See Appendix B.

³² The terms *school-based* and *census-based* are from Hopstock and Bucaro (1993), a review and analysis of thirteen different LEP student population estimates. School-based methods synthesize LEP student data collected by individuals as well as state and local agencies that are responsible for LEP programming. Discrete counts are summed in order to create a national estimate. Especially important are reports from State Educational Agencies (SEAs). SEAs who receive federal support for LEP programs must reply to an annual Department of Education survey, the results of which are included in the "Summary Report" mentioned above. According to Hopstock and Bucaro (1993), the advantages of school-based methodology in-

mary Report of the Survey of the States' Limited English Proficient Students and Available Educational Programs and Services 1994-1995," from which many figures cited in this paper are drawn. Statistics concerning LEP students' linguistic and geographical distribution, enrollment, English proficiency, educational achievement, and socioeconomic characteristics are briefly discussed in this section, elaborating on the following generalizations:

- (1) Approximately 3.5 million students identified as LEP are enrolled in U.S. schools, and the number has been steadily increasing since the mid-1980s. California and Texas have the largest LEP student populations.
- (2) Most LEP students who are enrolled in federally supported special language education programs attend public school. The majority are Spanish-speaking elementary school students.
- (3) Some research indicates that LEP students as a group achieve at lower than average levels and are retained a grade more often. However, the data on the educational condition of LEP students are insufficient to draw firm conclusions.
- (4) The poverty level of LEP students and their attendance in underfunded schools are two of the most important contextual educational issues.

clude that it makes use of a more precise definition of LEP; it is grounded in educational contexts; and it is often tied to assessment. The disadvantages are that the definition of LEP and the method of collecting data on LEP students vary among the reporting agencies; biases may influence the counts; and responses are often incomplete (1993, sect. 2B).

Some federally sponsored researchers also use a type of school-based methodology. For example, Fleischman and Hopstock (1993) sampled LEP coordinators at state educational agencies, local school districts, individual schools and teachers, through mail-in surveys supplemented by telephone surveys, and site visits. The researchers weighted their data to be nationally representative.

Census-based methods use the information about language use collected on the Sample component (Long Form) of the decennial census, described in Part 1, footnote 7 of this report. Such research does not examine actual LEP populations but estimates the potential number of LEP students within an age range based on answers to questions about English speaking ability; for example, persons ages 5-17 who live in household where languages other than English are spoken and who speak English less than well may be considered to constitute the LEP population (Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 2A, paras. 2-3). Others relate census data to English proficiency survey data by means of an LEP/LM (language minority) percentage (Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 3B.3, para. 1). According to Hopstock and Bucaro, census-based methods have the advantage of applying a consistent definition of LEP across groups and of covering all geographic areas and school-age populations. Drawbacks of census-based methods are that they lack a valid measure of English proficiency and they are likely to undercount language minority people who live in urban areas or who are undocumented (1993, sect. 2A).

SIX NATIONS REPORT

(1) Estimates of the LEP student population range from 1.355 million to 3.685 million, with a best estimate of 3.5 million³³ according to Hopstock and Bucaro's review and analysis of LEP counts. Based on 1990 census data, 2,388,243 school-age children, ages 5 - 17, had difficulty speaking English³⁴ (cited in Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 3C, para. 2). The SEA summary report for the 1989-90 academic year reported a similar number— 2,154,781 LEP students (Macías, 1998a, Table 1).

The LEP student population is increasing both numerically and as a proportion of the total U.S. student population. The most recent SEA report says that 3,452,073 LEP students were enrolled in 1996-97, representing 7.4 percent of total student enrollment (Macías et al., 1998, para. 1), up from 6.7 percent in 1994-95. The LEP student population has grown by approximately 3 percent annually according to census-based methods (Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 4B, para. 2). School-based methods show an average annual increase of between 8 and 9 percent (see Table 13).

Several explanations are offered for the difference between census-based and school-based increases. Undercount and imprecise self-rating may have contributed to the smaller increase reflected in the census-based data (Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 4B, para. 4), while more complete reporting and changes in definitions of LEP status may have produced the sharper increases reported by SEAs. Although it is not known precisely how much these factors contribute to the SEA-reported increase, "the consistency of the increase argues for a large proportion resulting from population change" (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 5, para. 1).

Reflecting the trends in census data reported in Part 1, states with the largest overall populations tend to have the largest populations of LEP students (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 2). Table 14 shows total student enrollment and LEP enrollments by type of schooling for the academic year 1994-95, the last year for which we have detailed analysis of SEA reports. Table 15 lists states with the highest percentage of LEP enrollments in 1994-95. These tables show that approximately 54 percent of the total national LEP student enrollment that academic year was in California and Texas and about two thirds of the national total was enrolled in schools in four states. Besides the outlying jurisdictions,³⁵ states with the highest concentrations of LEP enrollment are New Mexico, Alaska, and California, with 24 percent, 23 percent, and 21 percent respectively.

(2) Just over 90 percent of LEP students (3,132,201) were reported to be enrolled in public schools in 1994-95 (see Table 14). However, many SEAs

³³ From the Council of Chief State School Officers (1991), cited in Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993, sect. 3D, para. 1.

³⁴ "Difficulty with English" is defined here as speaking English less than *very well*.

³⁵ Outlying jurisdictions include American Samoa and Palau, with 97 percent and 82 percent LEP student enrollments respectively. See Table 15.

report that nonpublic school data is not gathered systematically or is voluntarily submitted; in addition, nonpublic schools do not classify students as LEP as frequently as public schools do. Thus, enrollment figures for private schools are probably underenumerated (Macías & Kelly, 1996).

Approximately 73 percent of LEP students being served in special language education programs in 1991 were Spanish speakers according to a survey by Fleischman and Hopstock (1993). Smaller populations of 19 other language groups—including Vietnamese, Hmong, Cantonese, Cambodian, and Korean—were represented (see Table 16), suggesting that a large concentration of a single language group may be related to higher level and diversity of instructional programs. According to the same study, in terms of total population and total numbers of LEP students, there were more LEP students in lower grades, as shown in Table 17.

(3) We lack sufficient school-based data to examine on a national scale the educational achievement of LEP students. According to Macías and Kelly (1996), not enough information was submitted by the SEAs to draw conclusions about grade retention, dropout rates, and academic test performance.³⁶ The 33 SEAs that did reply to questions about test performance represented approximately 40 percent of the total LEP population in 1994-95. Of that group, 27 percent of LEP students were reported to be below state norms in English reading and 18 percent below state norms in math (1996, sect. 3, para. 7). However, of those agencies that did report on achievement, the degree of consistency of measures across state agencies is unknown as are the standards used in reporting (1996, sect. 3, para. 8). Likewise, Hopstock and Bucaro (1993) report that "national level information on language proficiency levels of LEP students has been inadequate for policy-making purposes" (1993, sect. 8, para. 1).

Other research suggests that LEP students achieve at lower than average levels. Based on two years of a six-year longitudinal study of LEP and language minority students, Moss and Puma reported that the third-grade cohort of LEP students received scores that were significantly lower than average on standardized achievement tests: "In reading, they obtained a mean percentile score of 26, compared to 56 for 3rd graders overall. In math, 3rd grade LEP students obtained a mean percentile score of 31, compared to 55 for all 3rd grade students" (Moss & Puma, 1995, p. i-9). They also report that, compared to third-grade students in general, third-grade

³⁶In 1994-95, only 33 of the 53 participating SEAs replied to the question about grade retention, representing approximately 19 percent of the total LEP population. Approximately 2.3 percent of those students (13,906) had been retained in one or more grades (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 3, para. 4). The 32 SEAs that reported on dropouts represented 21 percent of the total LEP population; 1.5 percent (10,180) had dropped out of school in 1994-95 (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 3, paras. 3-6).

SIX NATIONS REPORT

LEP students were about half as likely to receive a grade of *excellent* in reading or math (1995, p. i-9). In schools with high concentrations of LEP students, almost 25 percent of third-grade LEP students had repeated a grade, compared to an average third-grade retention rate of 15 percent (Moss & Puma, 1995, p. i-10). Similarly, Fleischman and Hopstock found that LEP students in 1991-92 were educationally disadvantaged, especially in higher grades. For example, they found that 27 percent of high school LEP students were assigned to grades two years below norms, compared to 11 percent of all students (1993, p. 6)

(4) The poverty level of LEP students and their attendance in underfunded schools are two of the important contextual issues in language minority education according to August and Hakuta (1997, p. 16). LEP students are more likely to be enrolled in schools located in low-income areas. Macías and Kelly report that in 1994-95, about 47 percent of LEP students were served through Chapter 1/Title I, ESEA programs, which are intended to support students in school districts with high concentrations of low-income children; participation by the LEP population in these programs increased by 16 percent over the previous year (1996, sect. 4, para. 8). Also, Chapter 1, Migrant programs—intended to provide financial assistance to meet educational needs of migratory agricultural workers and fisherman—served another 10 percent of the LEP population (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 4, para. 7).³⁷

LEP students enrolled in schools in low-income areas are even more likely to achieve at lower-than-average levels. In the longitudinal study mentioned above, Moss and Puma examined the effects of Chapter 1/Title I on LEP students, focussing on their enrollment in *high-poverty schools*.³⁸ They found that 43 percent of first-grade and 51 percent of third-grade LEP students attended high-poverty schools compared with 13 percent of all first and third graders (1995, p. 2-1). They also found that third-grade LEP students who were enrolled in high-poverty schools with high concentrations of LEP students scored "lower than students in schools with lower level of poverty and LEP concentration" (1995, p. 3-6). For example, over two years, third-grade LEP students achieved a mean percentile of approximately 15-16 percent in high-poverty schools as compared with a 25-28 mean percentile for schools with moderate (50-74 percent) poverty

³⁷ LEP students' enrollment in federal, state and local language programs including Chapter 1/Title I programs is discussed below in the section *Instructional Programs for Language Minority Students*. See Table 19.

³⁸ High-poverty schools are defined as "schools where at least 75 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the National School Lunch Program" (Moss & Puma, 1995, p. i-3).

and a 44-53 mean percentile in schools with relatively less (20-34 percent) poverty (Moss & Puma, 1995, Exhibit 3.2A).

ESL and Bilingual Education Programs

Given that language minority student enrollment is increasing, it is not unrealistic to expect that in the near future virtually all school districts will have language minority students in their student populations (LaCelle-Peterson & Rivera, 1994). These school districts will need to provide special services both to meet the needs of these students and to meet federal and state guidelines. This section will examine several aspects of ESL and bilingual education programming, including the identification of LEP students, program structures and goals, training and supply of teachers, and assessment.

Schools are faced with a number of difficulties in meeting language minority students' needs. One problem is the changing composition of the language minority student population. A second problem schools face is the potential variety of educational backgrounds, especially at the secondary level. Lacking adequate information, schools frequently place youth who have recently immigrated in grades by age rather than according to academic preparation. Another problem, especially in secondary schools, is that many language minority students enter "at risk" of academic failure because of a lack of literacy in their own language, an unfamiliarity with typical American school requirements, and possible conflicts between family culture and school culture. Many have had their education interrupted for long periods of time. Additionally, schools must deal with high turnover rates (Pendas Whitten, Mitchell, Hoppe, Stone & Lawson, 1996). Language minority students' socioeconomic status creates another level of difficulty, as students tend to come from families who live in low-income areas. Given that much of the funding for public schools comes from local property taxes based on assessed real estate values, most school districts in low-income areas must rely on outside sources of funds to provide special educational services. Confronted with all of these difficulties, schools and school districts alone cannot usually meet the varied needs of language minority students, and so they rely on a variety of sources. Despite the challenges faced by school districts and schools, most language minority students are provided with some form of special language education service.

Identifying LEP Students

A troubling statistic is that 20 to 30 percent of language minority students may not be served by special language education programs. Moss and Puma state

Most (80-90 percent) LEP students receive some form

of supplementary education through federal, state or local programs. However, 30 percent of LEP students in 1st and 3rd grade do not receive ESL/bilingual instruction from any source, largely because they attend schools that do not provide services. (1995, p. i-4)

Where services are provided, there is the question of how schools, school districts, state departments of education and the federal Department of Education identify students in need of LEP services. Bilingual education is endorsed by an act of Congress, and funds for bilingual programs are authorized by Congress, which also provides an operational definition of limited English proficiency (see Appendix B); however, there is no legally mandated definition of limited English proficiency (Macías & Kelly, 1996).

As there is no uniformly prescribed definition, the determination of LEP status is largely left up to state and local educational agencies and schools. Some states use the federal definition. According to the SEA reports, 8 of the 47 states that responded to the 1994-95 school year survey did so. Some states use only some of the criteria. For example, 34 used "non-English language background," 23 used "difficulties with English speaking, reading, writing, and understanding," and 20 used both (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 2, para. 13). Table 18 lists the methods used by states to identify LEP students in 1994-95, including language proficiency tests and various forms of informal assessments.

Anstrom (1996) provides an additional illustration of the different ways states identify LEP students. California, New York, and Texas all use a home language other than English as a determinant, and they also all use proficiency test scores. In California, the test publisher determines the normed score, while New York sets the norm at the 40th percentile. Texas does not use normed scoring; instead, the student's English language proficiency is judged against their native language proficiency. If their native language proficiency is higher, they may be classified as LEP. In addition, Texas uses teacher referrals, parental input and student interviews to determine LEP status (Anstrom, 1996, paras. 8-12).

As a consequence of the various definitions of LEP, some students in need of special services targeted at LEP students may not be provided with services that a similar student receives in another school district or state. At issue, then, is how to collect "comparable, accurate and reliable data" that will ensure that all students in need of LEP services receive them (Anstrom, 1996, para. 5).

Instructional Programs for Language Minority Students

Language minority students are provided services through a number of federal, state and local programs. In surveying the various types, we find that similar programs often have different labels and different

programs often have similar labels. Therefore, instead of defining program types abstractly, we will review three typologies of ESL and bilingual program structures which are used in the U.S.: (1) program terms used by federal, state and local agencies, (2) labels for instructional programs provided by schools and school districts, and (3) categories of instructional services actually received by students.

Federal, state, and local programs. As mentioned in Part 1, the federal government provides grants for a variety of programs under Title VII of the Improving America's Schools Act.³⁹

- **The Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) Program**—assists LEP students in elementary and secondary schools to acquire English language, mathematics, and science skills and also to meet the promotion and graduation standards by providing content area instruction in the native language to the extent necessary;
- **The Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE) Program**—are[sic] full-time instructional programs which provide structured English language instruction and instruction in a second language. These programs must help students achieve competence in English and a second language while mastering subject matter skills;
- **The Special Alternative Instructional Program (SAIP)**—offers specially designed curricula to meet the linguistic and instructional needs of LEP students in elementary and secondary schools. In such programs the native language of the LEP students need not be used;
- **The Family English Literacy Program (FELP)**—assists LEP adults and out-of-school youth to achieve competence in English. Classes may be conducted in English only or in English and the students' native language. Preference for inclusion in the program is given to the parents and immediate family of LEP students assisted under the Bilingual Education Act; and
- **The Special Populations Program (SPP)**—assists preschool, special education, and gifted and talented programs serving LEP students. (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 4, para. 2)

Table 19 lists the percentages of LEP student enrollment in these five major federal programs provided under Title VII as well as the percentages of enrollment in state and local programs reported by SEAs in 1994-95. Only about 9 percent of the total LEP student population participated in Title VII federally funded programs. Most of those students—i.e., 6 per-

³⁹Title VII of the Improving America's Schools Act is the most recent revision of the Bilingual Education Act.

SIX NATIONS REPORT

cent of the total LEP population—were enrolled in transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs.⁴⁰

States and local educational agencies (school districts) also report on specific language education programs, which they describe as either bilingual or ESL stand-alone programs. Table 19 shows that 77 percent of the students identified as LEP and receiving special language services in 1994-95 were enrolled in state and local programs. A slightly higher number of students were enrolled in bilingual education (38 percent) than were enrolled in ESL stand-alone programs (30 percent). Other than the basic distinction between ESL and stand-alone, not much information is known about the particular character of the state and local programs.

Instructional programs provided by the schools. Using funds received from various federal, state, and local agencies, schools design instructional programs to meet their particular goals and objectives. These programs can be classified into seven generic program labels proposed by August and Hakuta (1997), which may best describe the various types of programs schools provide. The authors classify programs according to "native-language use, the mix of the students' linguistic backgrounds, and the goals of the program" (19).

- [1] *English as a second language (ESL)*—Students receive specified periods of instruction aimed at the development of English-language skills, with a primary focus on grammar, vocabulary, and communication rather than academic content areas.
- [2] *Content-based ESL*—Students receive specified periods of ESL instruction that is structured around academic content rather than generic English language skills.
- [3] *Sheltered instruction*—Students receive subject matter instruction in English, modified so that it is accessible to them at their levels of English proficiency.
- [4] *Structured immersion*—All students in the program are English-language learners, usually though not always from different language backgrounds. They receive instruction in English, with an attempt made to adjust the level of English so subject matter is comprehensible. Typically there is no native-language support.

⁴⁰ As discussed in the previous section, of the available federal programs, language minority students are more frequently served through Chapter 1 programs than through Title VII. Chapter 1 funding is intended to provide "instructional and support services to educationally disadvantaged students in school districts with high concentrations of low-income children" (Macías & Kelly, 1996, sect. 4, para. 6).

- [5] *Transitional bilingual education*—Most students in the program are English-language learners. They receive some degree of instruction through the native language; however, the goal of the program is to transition to English as rapidly as possible, so that even within the program, there is a rapid shift toward using primarily English.
- [6] *Maintenance bilingual education*—Most students in the program are English-language learners and from the same language background. They receive significant amounts of their instruction in their native language. Unlike transitional programs, these programs aim to develop English proficiency, but also to develop academic proficiency in the native language.
- [7] *Two-way bilingual programs*—About half of the students in these programs are native speakers of English, and the other half are English-language learners from the same language group. The goal of the program is to develop proficiency in both languages for both groups of students. (August & Hakuta, 1997, pp. 19-20)⁴¹

According to August and Hakuta, of these seven program types, ESL-only and transitional bilingual education are the most common while maintenance and two-way bilingual programs are relatively rare (1997, p. 20).

Based on survey data, Fleischman and Hopstock (1993) identified nine types of special language instructional services schools provided in 1991-92. The authors classify programs according to whether LEP students were provided with special instructional service, whether that service was specifically intended for LEP students, how intensive the service was, and what language was used in instruction.

Type 1 - No special or additional services. This type is defined by the absence of any special instructional services for LEP students. It may or may not include special monitoring of such students.

Type 2 - Additional services not specific to LEP students. This type includes a range of special services but which are not specifically designed for LEP students. These services may include in-class aides, Chapter 1 or other resource teachers, tutoring or special education.

Type 3 - Some special services provided all in English. This type includes a range of services specifically designed for LEP students, but provided in instructional contexts not designed for such students. Virtually all instruction is in English. Services include special aides for LEP students, special LEP Chapter 1 or other resource teachers, or ESL instruction provided for less than 10 hours per week.

Type 4 - Some special services with some instruction in the native language. This type of service is similar to Type 3, except that some instruc-

⁴¹ Numbers added in brackets correspond to types of program structures listed in Tables 21-23.

SIX NATIONS REPORT

tion is provided in the native language (i.e., less than 50 percent use in one academic subject, or less than 25 percent use in math, science, and social studies combined).

Type 5 - Some special services with significant use of the native language for instruction. This type of service is similar to Types 3 and 4, except that a significant amount of instruction is provided in the native language (more than 50 percent use in one academic subject, or more than 25 percent use in math, science, and social studies combined).

Type 6 - Intensive special services provided all in English. This type includes a range of special services which are specifically designed for LEP students and are provided primarily in contexts focused on LEP students. Virtually all instruction is in English. Services include ESL instruction for 10 hours or more per week and content instruction in other academic subjects which is specifically designed for LEP students.

Type 7 - Intensive special services with some instruction using the native language. This type is similar to Type 6, except that some instruction is provided in the native language (i.e., less than 50 percent in one academic subject, or less than 25 percent in math, science, and social studies combined).

Type 8 - Intensive special services with significant use of the native language for instruction. This type is similar to Types 6 and 7, except that a significant amount of instruction is provided using the native language (more than 50 percent use in one academic subject, or more than 25 percent used in math, science and social studies combined).

Type 9 - Unknown services. Sufficient information could not be obtained to categorize these services. (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993, pp. 23-26)

The most frequently offered service was Type 3, in which some service specifically designed for LEP students was provided using English as the language of instruction (see Table 20). Type 3 services were offered by 49 percent of the schools; followed by Type 8, intensive services designed for LEP students with significant use of the native language in instruction, offered by slightly more than 20 percent of the schools; and finally Type 6, intensive services designed for LEP students using English as the language of instruction, offered by 20 percent of the schools.

August and Hakuta's claim that ESL-only programs and transitional bilingual education are "the two prevalent models" is generally supported by the Fleischman and Hopstock survey data for programs provided: Type 3 may be seen as analogous to ESL-only; Type 8 may be seen as corresponding to transitional bilingual education; and Type 6 as analogous to sheltered instruction, which is all in English with modification for comprehensibility. However, when we examine the data from the perspective of services received by students, a somewhat different picture emerges.

Instructional services received. Based on the above data, one might assume that more students are receiving instruction exclusively through the medium of English, but this is not the case (See Table 20). In the same Fleischman and Hopstock (1993) survey, schools reported that 21 percent of LEP students were receiving at least some instruction through their native language (Types 4 & 7) and 37 percent were receiving significant amounts of instruction in their native language (Types 5 & 8), for a total of 58 percent. On the other hand, only about 31 percent were receiving instruction only through English (Types 3 & 6).⁴² So the majority of schools that offer special services are providing programs through English-only medium of instruction while the majority of students are receiving at least some instruction through the medium of their native language. One explanation might be that districts with large populations of language minority students generally provide bilingual education. Another explanation may be that students receive instruction from classroom aides who use their native languages.

Program goals vs. program structures. The lack of uniformity in program terminology makes adequate comparisons difficult. There also appears to be a gap between program design and implementation (cf. Hornberger, 1991, pp. 216-221). One way of addressing these issues and facilitating a general understanding of the many ways that bilingual education is implemented in the United States (and elsewhere) is to make a distinction between program goals and program structures (cf. Hornberger, 1991, pp. 221-227).

Viewed from the perspective of program goals, there are basically three models of bilingual education for language minority students in the United States: transitional, maintenance, and enrichment. First, there are bilingual programs whose primary goal is to transition students to monolingual, English-language classrooms. Although some of the students' home language(s) may be used to facilitate this process, the overarching goal of *Transitional Bilingual Education* (TBE) is for students to shift from the home, minority language to English literacy as quickly as possible. This model also implies goals of cultural assimilation and social incorporation of language minorities in the national society (cf. Spener, 1988). In contrast, *Maintenance Bilingual Education* (MBE) aims to assist students to maintain and oftentimes develop their literacy skills in the home language as they simultaneously develop literacy skills in English. Whereas the goal of transitional programs is English literacy, the goal of maintenance programs

⁴² Variables that Fleischman and Hopstock identify as the strongest predictors of instruction in students' native language are the presence of a teacher who speaks the students' language and having a high percentage of students who speak the same language, particularly Spanish (1993, p. 27).

is bilingualism and biliteracy (see Hornberger, 1989 for definition and discussion of biliteracy). The MBE model also implies goals of strengthened cultural identity and the affirmation of civil rights for ethnic groups in the national society. Similarly to MBE, the goal of *Enrichment Bilingual Education* (EBE) is to develop bilingualism and biliteracy, but in this case not only for language minority students, but also language majority students. The EBE model implies goals of cultural pluralism, intercultural understanding and an integrated national society based on autonomy of cultural groups (see Fishman, 1976, pp. 34-36, for an early discussion of EBE). These three types of goals correspond to the three language orientations mentioned earlier: TBE with a language-as-problem orientation, MBE with a language-as-right orientation, and EBE with a language-as-resource orientation (Ruíz, 1984).

On the other hand, from the perspective of program structures, there is a myriad of possibilities for implementing the above bilingual education models. Any attempt to define bilingual education program structures must include consideration of a wide number of structural and contextual characteristics such as the numbers and types of students involved, the language(s) spoken, the classroom strategies and program sequencing used, the material and human resources available to carry out the programs, the external political pressures, and many other factors (Hornberger, 1991, pp. 223-225). The seven generic types suggested by August and Hakuta (1997) identify the most commonly used program structures in the United States, but there are many more (possible and actual) structures. We will return for a glimpse of how some program structures look in actual practice in the section on Classroom Practice below. First, we will discuss two other areas of importance in providing special language education programs.

Teacher Training and Supply

Teachers, of course, greatly determine the quality of the educational services language minority students receive. There is, however, a severe shortage of teachers with the skills needed to serve the increasingly linguistically diverse student population, a shortage which is likely to continue for some time (Boe, McMillen & Bobbitt, 1990). It is estimated that 170,000 - 175,000 additional bilingual teachers will be needed by the year 2000.⁴³ In California alone, according to the National Forum (1990) study, approximately 20,000 ESL and bilingual teachers were needed, and more than half of the existing bilingual teachers were teaching under *waivers*, i.e.

⁴³The following figures are cited by August and Hakuta: "Macías (1989, cited in Leighton et al., 1993) estimates a need for approximately 170,000 additional teachers to serve English-language learners by the year 2000. In its 1994 report on limited English proficiency, the General Accounting office (U.S. GAO, 1994) cites the National Education Association's estimate that 175,000 additional bilingual teachers are needed" (1997, p. 252).

special licenses granted on a temporary basis (cited in August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 252). In addition, the Association for School, College and University Staffing (1990), in their national survey of teacher placement officers, ranked bilingual education the highest in terms of teacher shortage and teacher demand (cited in Milk, Mercado & Sapiens, 1992, para. 4).

Many teachers who are teaching language minority students lack sufficient training. Fleischman and Hopstock found that only 10 percent of the teachers of LEP students in 1991-1992 were certified in bilingual education and only between 8 and 9 percent were certified to teach ESL, with the greatest numbers being certified at the elementary level (1993, p. 46, Table V-4). Significantly, fewer teachers were certified at the middle and high school levels, especially in bilingual education. For example, approximately 16 percent of elementary teachers surveyed had bilingual education certification compared to 4 percent of high school teachers (Fleischman & Hopstock 1993, p. 46, Table V-4).

Teachers of LEP students often do not speak their students' native language. In the same Fleischman and Hopstock study, it was found that only 41 percent of teachers of LEP students shared a non-English language with them. Approximately one half of the elementary and middle-school teachers shared a non-English language with their LEP students as compared to one quarter of high school teachers.⁴⁴ If a child speaks a language other than English or Spanish, the teacher is even less likely to speak the child's language. Moss and Puma found that fewer than 15 percent of first-grade and approximately 25 percent of third-grade LEP students in classes where the predominant language was not English had teachers who were fluent in that language (1995, p. 4-14).

Even though teachers may not receive training in ESL or bilingual education during their initial teacher preparation programs, they may have opportunities for in-service training. Fleischman and Hopstock found that teachers of LEP students had received an average of 13 hours of in-service training related to LEP instruction (1993, p. 41). Time spent in training "ranged from 34 hours in the districts with the largest numbers of LEP students to 9 hours in districts with the smallest numbers" (1993, p. 41). Ongoing professional development is not limited to district or school sponsored in-service training. Teachers often take college courses, and some districts, especially those with larger numbers of LEP students, offer financial support enabling teachers to take additional courses.

Though opportunities exist for continuing professional development, many teachers of LEP students may not take advantage of them. Fleischman and Hopstock report that within the last five years "only 55 percent of all

⁴⁴ Elementary teachers, 45.8 percent; middle school teachers, 47.9 percent; and high school teachers, 25.5 percent (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993, p. 47, Table V-5).

SIX NATIONS REPORT

teachers of LEP students had taken relevant college courses or had received recent in-service training related to teaching LEP students" (1993, p. 42). Even when teachers receive in-service training it may not be effective. Research on staff development and pre-service programs suggests that what teachers receive through in-service training doesn't resemble what has been learned about effective professional development. Typically, in-service programs amount "to short-term superficial workshops that expose teachers to various concepts without providing the depth of treatment or connection to practice necessary for lasting effects" (August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 255).

One way in which states are attempting to overcome the critical shortage of trained teachers is through the issuance of alternative certificates, which enable professionals in other fields to become teachers. About half of the states have adopted some form of alternative certification to increase the bilingual teacher supply. To be eligible for alternative certification, candidates typically must hold a bachelor's degree, pass a standardized test, and attend an intensive training program. In addition "these teachers take about 200 classroom-hours of pedagogy and have some type of support, such as a mentor" (Pendas Whitten, et al., 1996, para. 52).⁴⁵

School districts and individual schools attempt to overcome the shortage of teachers who are able to speak the languages of their students by using classroom aides. Moss and Puma found that, for 1991-92, over 40 percent of the LEP students in first and third grades had reading teachers who used aides (1995, p. 4-12). They also reported that of the first-grade LEP students in math classes with classroom aides, four-fifths of those students had aides proficient in the students' non-English language, while in reading classes, fewer than half had aides who spoke their native tongue (1995, p. 4-14). Fleischman and Hopstock's data suggests a possible relationship between the intensity of service provided and the aides' knowledge of a non-English language. They found that "78 percent of instructional aides primarily serving LEP students were fluent in a native language, while 42 percent of the instructional aides serving some LEP students were fluent in a native language" (1993, p. 40).

The lack of qualified teachers also has a direct impact on the types of programs schools provide. Many schools with limited resources attempt to cope with the increased demand for special language services by using *ESL pull-out programs* in which language minority students, individually

⁴⁵ Most states do not have ESL or bilingual certification. To attempt to meet the need for ESL and bilingual education teachers, states permit teachers who are certified in content areas and who have minimal qualifications (such as training in teaching a foreign language or ability to speak a foreign language) to obtain an endorsement that allows them to teach in ESL or bilingual classrooms. The California CLAD and B-CLAD are examples of endorsement systems.

or in groups, are taken out of some mainstream courses (e.g., math, science, social studies) for ESL instruction. These pull-out programs are the most prevalent form of ESL instruction, yet they are generally inadequate for developing English language proficiency, and they may also negate the benefits students could derive from mainstream classes. Citing Handscombe (1989), Anstrom states that students often assume "the short period of pull-out instruction is the learning for the day, while the time spent in mainstream classes is merely a waiting period until proficiency is acquired" (1997, para. 9). Furthermore, according to Anstrom, pull-out time is often devoted to completing mainstream homework rather than to instruction in English (1997, para. 9).

The shortage of teachers with the special training and skills necessary to meet the needs of language minority students may be "the single greatest barrier to the improvement of instructional programs" (Gold, 1995, p. 224). Even if we could attract people into teacher preparation programs, institutions entrusted with training teachers do not know enough about how to best train them. People closely aligned with ESL and bilingual education perceive a great need for teachers, given the increasing language minority population; however, others appear not to view the demand in the same way. Except for those directly involved in providing services for language minority students, educators in the U.S. have not given much consideration to the teaching of language minority students. Increasing attention, however, is being given to creating appropriate assessments for language minority learners. It is to assessment that we now turn.

Assessment

Like language majority students, language minority students are assessed for program placement, achievement, and eligibility for advancement. In addition, several of the purposes for assessment are unique to language minority students:

- Identification of children whose English proficiency is limited
- Determination of eligibility for placement in specific language programs (e.g., bilingual education or English as a Second Language [ESL])
- Monitoring of progress in and readiness to exit from special language service programs (August & Hakuta, 1997, pp. 113-114)

In the context of the recent U.S. focus on standards-based reform, assessment has become a central issue. Developing assessments that can appropriately measure language minority students' placement and achievement is of special concern because many standards-based reform efforts and the assessment systems that support them do not specifically account for the language learning context of language minority students. The as-

sumption seems to be that if we reform education across the board, language minority students will benefit without attention to their special needs. LaCelle-Peterson and Rivera argue against the latter assumption in pointing out, first of all, that language minority students have experienced "disproportionate assignment to lower curriculum tracks on the basis of inappropriate assessment" (1994, p. 56), and secondly, that in order to reform such inequity, specific attention to the assessment needs of language minority students is necessary.

Given the implications of assessment for language minority students, the types of instruments used to measure their English language proficiency and academic progress should be sensitive to the language learning context. Many commonly used language proficiency tests, however, measure "a limited range of decontextualized grammatical and structural skills" and set low language and literacy standards (August & Hakuta, 1997, pp. 116-118). Discrete item tests are useful, but they often do not assess the full range of language knowledge and skills that a child may have. Therefore, the validity of these tests to adequately measure language minority students' second language proficiency is in question. Alternative assessments such as oral interviews, story retelling and portfolios have increasingly been used. These more authentic assessments reflect the multifaceted nature of language that varies according to task demands and content area, and so have greater validity; however, they are difficult to administer and score objectively, which can affect their reliability (August & Hakuta, p. 117).

Possibly a greater challenge lies in assessing language minority students' academic achievement in appropriate and equitable ways. Until recently, language minority students were often excluded from state and national assessments, though efforts have recently been made to increase inclusion (Olson & Goldstein, 1996). According to August and Lara (1996), only 5 states required language minority students to take statewide assessments, while 36 states exempted them (cited in August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 119). In 1994, Improving America's Schools Act required that language minority learners be included in assessments of all students "to the extent practicable and in a manner that yields the most accurate results" (NCBE, 1997, para. 4). Also in 1994, Goals 2000: Educate America Act called for "valid, nondiscriminatory, and reliable State assessments (Sec. 306 (c) 1)(B)) that are aligned to State standards, involve multiple measures of student performance, and include all students" (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1998b, sect. 3, para. 10). An issue critical to increasing the inclusion of language minority students in statewide assessments is deciding what accommodations are appropriate for testing. Examples include considering the language minority learner in constructing the individual test questions, using native language versions of tests, and modifying the test administration by allowing extra time or by modifying instructions (NCBE, 1997, paras. 24-26).

A major hindrance to assessing language minority students' academic

achievement is the level of their English language proficiency. The major factor affecting Spanish speaking students' performance, for example, is the presence of unknown vocabulary in test questions and answer choices (García, 1991, p. 388). García's study as well as other studies indicate that language achievement and aptitude "can be seriously underestimated if the test taker is not proficient in the language in which the test is being given" (August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 121), with the result that language minority students may be wrongfully assigned to a lower educational tracks, as mentioned above.

Several approaches have been used to overcome the language bias in measuring achievement (August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 122). Native language assessments have been attempted; however, translating the test does not necessarily imply that it is equivalent to the English version and may not provide for dialectic differences. Another strategy is to reduce detail and simplify grammar, but simplification may not be of significant help. Alternative assessments may be used, but "there is evidence that scorers may pay attention to linguistic features of performance unrelated to the content of the assessment. Thus, scorers may inaccurately assign low scores for performance in which English expression...is weak" (August & Hakuta, 1997, 122). With the use of alternative assessment, the rating of language minority learners' performance will depend upon the scorers' background knowledge of the process of the language acquisition process and related factors (LaCelle-Peterson & Rivera, 1994, 65). Thus, no single approach seems to address the problem of language bias. Saviile-Troike suggests that a sociolinguistic framework would be a more appropriate way to account for "the complexity of factors affecting achievement" (1991, para. 40).

Over the past several years, much research and discussion has been devoted to developing assessment systems for language minority students that are valid and reliable (Anstrom, 1997; August & Hakuta, 1997; Garcia, 1994; NCBE, 1997). Ultimately, the goals of any assessment should be to hold language minority students to high standards for both English language proficiency and literacy and academic achievement.

Summary

With growing numbers of language minority school children, teachers and administrators are faced with the daunting challenge of providing the special educational services these students need to develop their English to a level that will enable them to achieve academically. Most students identified as LEP receive some type of special language services, but 20 percent or more may not. There are also those who are not identified as LEP but remain in need of special language instruction or language-related assessment modifications. While there may be a number of reasons for underidentification, one factor identified here is the lack of a uniform, consistently applied definition of limited English proficiency.

Once students have been identified, they must be enrolled in appropriate programs to meet their language needs, receive instruction from qualified teachers and be assessed fairly. ESL and transitional bilingual education are reported to be the most frequently used program structures; however, in practice there is little uniformity among programs, making comparisons difficult. Our review of the data suggests that the most commonly provided instructional services are in English-only while the majority of students are receiving a major share of their ESL and bilingual instruction in their native language. Overall, we may obtain a clearer picture of the nature of ESL and bilingual programs if we keep the distinction between program goals and program structures in mind.

A shortage of teachers adequately trained in ESL and/or bilingual education may be one of the biggest challenges in providing special language education services. The current, significant shortage of bilingual and ESL teachers is projected to continue and probably worsen in the foreseeable future. More also needs to be learned about how to best prepare teachers to meet the needs of language minority students.

Finally, instruments used to assess language proficiency and academic achievement further compound the problems faced by language minority students. Historically, either language minority students' achievement has not been assessed due to language difficulties, or the same assessment systems that are used for mainstream, English-speaking students are used to assess language minority students with little consideration for the special linguistic challenges and resources of the latter. Although much work has recently been done, research remains to be done toward the goal of developing valid and reliable language minority assessments.

Classroom Practice in Bilingual Education

This section will examine some of the bilingual program structures commonly used in the United States from the viewpoint of classroom practice. Our discussion will be organized according to program goals, i.e., transition, maintenance and enrichment. Narrative vignettes are provided to elucidate how bilingual education is experienced in complicated, real-life scenarios. In our descriptions, we move away altogether from using *LEP* and *language minority*, instead preferring *English-language learner* (ELL) to describe those whose first language is not English and who are in the process of learning English in the schools. Tables 21, 22 and 23 present many of the different types of bilingual programs that are currently available to ELLs, adapting and expanding somewhat on the typology offered by August and Hakuta (1997).

Transitional Programs

Table 21 examines programs whose goal is to transition ELLs from flu-

ency in their native language to English language proficiency. These programs all aim for students to acquire English language proficiency, but they use different types of program structures to realize this goal. For example, *submersion programs* typically immerse the ELL in mainstream classrooms with native English speakers. As mentioned in the earlier section on instructional programs, ELLs in submersion programs are often pulled out of mainstream classrooms and given focused English language instruction.

A variation on content-based ESL is the *sheltered instruction* or structured immersion approach. In this approach, teachers modify all content matter instruction so that it is accessible to students' levels of English proficiency. In *transitional bilingual education (TBE)* programs, students are initially placed in a classroom where a bilingual teacher provides all content-area instruction in the child's home language along with ESL instruction. In *early-exit* programs, students enter mainstream English classes within one to three years; in *late-exit* programs, students enter mainstream English classes within three to six years.

Maintenance Bilingual Education

Table 22 examines programs that share the common goal that all students become bilingual and biliterate. These programs differ according to student population and instructional approaches. For example, the *TBE program with a second language component* appears very much like the TBE program described above. However, as ELLs transition into mainstream classrooms, they continue to study their home language for specific periods in the day. Often these programs provide native English speaking students the opportunity to learn the home language of the ELL population. This program is described in the Philadelphia vignette below.

Programs that are explicitly referred to as *Maintenance Bilingual Education (MBE)* programs differ from TBE programs in the quantity of subject matter instruction that ELLs receive in their home language. Typically, MBE programs involve ELLs from similar language backgrounds, and they place greater emphasis than do TBE programs on the students' development of academic proficiency in their first language over longer periods of time (7 to 13 years).

Enrichment Bilingual Education

Enrichment bilingual education (EBE) is realized in *Two-way bilingual and immersion programs* that involve ELLs and native English speakers (Table 23). Although these programs vary, the overall goal of two-way programs is for each language group to acquire academic proficiency in English as well as the home language of the ELL population. Typically these programs follow one of two structures in terms of language sequencing. The first is the *fifty/fifty* structure, where half of the instructional content is taught in the minority language, and the other half is taught in English. The sec-

ond is the *ninety/ten* structure, where about 90 percent of the instruction is in the minority language in the primary grades. The latter structure often increases English instruction to the *fifty/fifty* structure by the time students enter the upper elementary grades.

Bilingual Education Classroom Practice in the United States

Tables 21, 22 and 23 offer a simple classification system that highlights many of the general differences between bilingual program structures; however, they do not account for the detailed differences that exist in real-life scenarios. There are many ways that teachers actually teach bilingually, using varying degrees of the students' first language and English within varying classroom formats. For example, according to Faltis and Hudelson (1998), teachers may decide to allocate languages by day of the week, time of day, by course content (i.e., language arts in native language and math in English), or by type of classroom talk (preview in one language, content instruction in another). Teachers may use English and allow learners to use their native language. Alternatively, teachers may begin the year in the native language, gradually increasing their use of English in instruction, or they may translate concurrently or switch from one language to another without translation. Team teaching—pairing monolingual English with bilingual or native-speaking teachers—may be used. The overall approach to language allocation may be modified in individual or small group interaction in order to scaffold students' learning or build rapport (Faltis & Hudelson, 1998, p. 53).

To give a picture of how bilingual language and literacy learning actually takes place, the following vignettes, based on actual U.S. classrooms, are provided. All of them describe programs at the elementary level because the majority of programs are provided at that level. For more information on bilingual programs at the secondary level see Lucas, Henze & Donato, 1990.

Los Angeles, California: Content-based ESL, language arts. Mr. Hass is a fifth-grade classroom teacher at New Leaf newcomer school in Los Angeles. There are several *newcomer schools* in the Los Angeles area designed to meet the needs of students for whom it is their first year in the United States. Newcomer schools often reflect the diverse immigrant population of the city, with the greatest numbers of students from Chinese and Hispanic backgrounds. Students are bussed from all over the city to attend this special school, and teachers are highly trained in methods for teaching English language and academic content. All students in this program will spend their first year of public education at the newcomer school, and then they will attend schools that are located in their respective communities.

During the morning hours, Mr. Hass teaches mathematics, science, and language arts to an entirely Chinese classroom. Mr. Hass is Anglo-American of European descent and has no Chinese fluency. Though most of the

students' work is in English, he does allow time for students to speak and write in their native language. He believes that it is important for children to construct meaning in the language they are comfortable in and that using their native language will contribute to English language proficiency. Mr. Hass works with Ms. Lee, his assistant, who is fluent in Chinese and English. Ms. Lee helps students understand Mr. Hass's instructions, grades student papers that are written in Chinese, and acts as a translator between Mr. Hass and the students' parents or caretakers.

Many of Mr. Hass's English language lessons involve art projects. He feels that hands-on lessons facilitate English language acquisition. For example, one of his favorite units takes place during Halloween when he asks students to make life-size skeletons out of paper. Students acquire English vocabulary words—such as *paper, glue, scissors, draw, cut, and paste*—necessary to describe the art project tasks. Following this art lesson, the students are expected to invent characters for their skeletons and describe their characters orally to one another. Then, each student is asked to write a description of his or her skeleton. Mr. Hass assists students with their English writing by providing them with a highly structured paragraph form: "My skeleton's name is _____. He lives in _____. He likes to eat _____."

In the afternoons, Mr. Hass's Chinese students mix with students from other classrooms who speak other languages for intensive ESL instruction. Mr. Hass collaborates with two other teachers, who divide up their classrooms according to low, intermediate and high levels of oral proficiency in English. Mr. Hass teaches the high-level ESL students in the afternoon, when he focuses on the complexities of English language grammar and pronunciation.

The teachers at the newcomer school are proud of their program, but they worry about sending their students back to their local schools, where students are often placed into mainstream classrooms with little provision made for newcomers. Mr. Hass and other teachers feel limited by the one-year period they have with students, which offers little time to create relationships with the students' families. Newcomer teachers are usually unable to follow the progress of their students beyond their first year in the public school system. In all, Mr. Hass hopes he has prepared his students with sufficient English language grammar and academic content skills to survive in their local public schools.

San Francisco, California: Dual immersion. Ms. Gonzalez is an educated native speaker of Spanish who was born, raised, and schooled through the university in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Ms. Gonzalez immigrated to the United States at age 23, when she began to take English language classes at a community college in San Francisco. Once she acquired proficiency in English, she pursued a bilingual teaching credential to serve the large Spanish-speaking student population in California.

SIX NATIONS REPORT

Ms. Gonzalez works at a dual immersion program in San Francisco, where there is both an educated, middle-class, native-English speaking community (Anglo, African American, and third generation Latino) as well as a working-class, recent-immigrant population, mostly from Mexico. Ten years ago, the school adopted the dual immersion program structure as a means to serve both populations so that native English speakers could learn Spanish and native Spanish speakers could learn English. Given the power of English in the United States, the school decided to adopt the 90/10 structure described above, where children learn almost exclusively through Spanish in the early grades and gradually increase to the 50/50 structure by the third or fourth grade.

Half the students in Ms. Gonzalez' third-grade classroom are Hispanic, though only 30 percent are native Spanish speakers and 20 percent are third-generation Mexican Americans who are native English speakers. The other half of the class includes native speakers of English from African American or Anglo backgrounds. Ms. Gonzalez team-teaches with Mr. Arnold, a native English speaker who has been studying Spanish since college. Although Mr. Arnold teaches in English, his Spanish fluency enables him to communicate with the Spanish dominant students and their parents when necessary. Mr. Arnold and Ms. Gonzalez have divided up the curriculum so that students are instructed in Spanish and English each for 50 percent of the school day.

The two teachers collaboratively designed a social studies project whereby students would learn how to carry out library research to create a Spanish language report on different immigrant populations in the United States, including information about the immigrants' countries of origin. Ms. Gonzalez and Mr. Arnold were aware of the great disparity in educational backgrounds between the immigrant students and the native-born American students. Whereas most immigrant students and their parents had seldom been exposed to the process of writing a library research report, most American-born students and/or their families had had prior exposure to this kind of schooled activity. For this reason, the teachers took a great deal of classroom time to model to all students the explicit process of preparing a library report, from collecting data at the library to writing it up and presenting one's findings. Ms. Gonzalez found that despite ample discussion in the classroom, immigrant students still struggled to accomplish an adequate report, one that relied on multiple library sources and followed the format of a social studies presentation. On the other hand, while the American-born students had mastered the format of the report, they struggled to use the appropriate Spanish grammar and vocabulary to communicate their findings. Ms. Gonzalez concludes that it will take many years before both groups have mastered the schooled language and literacy practices necessary to be bilingual and biliterate. With the recent passage of Proposition 227 in California, which virtually dismantles bilingual education programs in the state, Ms. Gonzalez worries that her stu-

dents will not receive the five to seven years of ongoing bilingual education they need to become truly biliterate in Spanish and English.

Denver, Colorado: Transitional bilingual education, late-exit. There are large letters and numbers, colorful pictures and student work all over the walls of Ms. Dunn's first-grade classroom at Drew Elementary School in Denver. In the corner of the classroom, there are three bookshelves full of Spanish language literature, a carpet, and multicolored beanbags where her students go to read when they have finished their assignments. Ms. Dunn is a native English speaker who acquired Spanish during college but says that she learned "real" Spanish in the classroom. Ms. Dunn continues to study Spanish vocabulary in mathematics, social studies, and science in order to teach standard Spanish to her students. However, she is often frustrated because the textbooks she uses are written in different versions of Spanish from Mexico, the Caribbean, and Spain. This often complicates teaching and learning with her students, most of whom come from rural towns in Mexico and often speak a nonstandard variety of Spanish that is not found in the textbooks and literature Ms. Dunn uses in her classroom.

Three quarters of the students at Drew Elementary School are Latino; smaller numbers of Anglo, Asian, African American and Native American students are also in the class. Approximately two thirds of the Latino students at Drew participate in the Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education program, designed to provide Spanish language instruction to students in kindergarten through the second grade, at which time students are to transition out of the bilingual program and into all-English, mainstream classrooms. However, there is a high rate of transience in the school population at Drew; students often leave Drew before they have finished the second grade. Likewise, immigrant students often arrive from Mexico in the second or third grade, when it is too late for these students to enter into the three-year bilingual program.

Ms. Dunn introduces a new literacy lesson in Spanish each morning for fifteen minutes. At this time, she will teach explicit skills in grammar, vocabulary, and syntax. Following this lesson, students are required to set their goals for the day: what book they will read, what story they will finish writing, what spelling and vocabulary words they will study. Ms. Dunn asks that students work independently on their projects while she works with small groups of four to five students at a time to really monitor the progress of each individual child in her classroom.

In the afternoons, she uses the same small-group format to teach students in English. She divides her small groups up by oral English ability level and rotates through three groups every thirty minutes. During the afternoon she has assistance from a young woman named Ms. Cross who is a native English speaker. Ms. Cross supervises two thirds of the class while Ms. Dunn works intensively with one third of the students. In this way, students in Ms. Dunn's classroom spend at least two hours a day on

SIX NATIONS REPORT

Spanish language instruction and two hours a day on English language instruction. However, Ms. Dunn admits that oftentimes her afternoon program is cut short due to schoolwide events or shortened school days. Ms. Dunn feels that it is most important that these students acquire literacy skills in their first language in order to make a successful transition into English literacy.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Transitional bilingual education, early-exit, with a second language component. Ms. Quinn is a second-grade classroom teacher at Porter Elementary School in Philadelphia. The school community is populated by African American and Hispanic students, most of whom are of Puerto Rican descent. Ms. Quinn is Anglo-American of European descent who has acquired partial fluency in Spanish by taking classes at the local university and taking a few summer trips to Mexico. This year, she has 28 Puerto Rican students and 1 student from the Dominican Republic in her transitional second-grade classroom. At Porter Elementary School, *transitional* means that students who have been receiving content instruction primarily in Spanish will begin receiving content instruction in English, with Spanish language support from the classroom teacher and assistant. Once these students have entered English language classrooms, they will continue to study Spanish for one period of the day with their native English-speaking peers. In this way, the school promotes Spanish language maintenance among native Spanish speakers and encourages Spanish foreign language study among the native English speaking student population.

As she plans her mathematics curriculum this year, Ms. Quinn discovers several contradictions between the expectations she perceives from the district officials and school administrators, the needs of her classroom students, and her own language abilities. Although according to the bilingual program, Ms. Quinn is expected to teach mathematics in English, school administrators have encouraged her to teach some mathematics in Spanish so that students can continue to take the Spanish-language version of the end-of-the-year mathematics exam. The Philadelphia superintendent has made clear that students in the school district must show improvement on test scores from one year to the next, regardless of the language in which they take the exam.

The textbook coordinator gives Ms. Quinn the new math series texts in Spanish. Ms. Quinn is grateful that the textbook is in Spanish because she feels that the English textbook would be far too complicated for the second language proficiency levels of her students. However, she feels limited in her ability to teach this material in Spanish. She frequently turns to her classroom aide, Andrea, for assistance. Andrea is a native Spanish speaker who was raised and educated in Honduras. At times, Andrea encounters differences between the Spanish language she learned in Honduras, the Spanish language used by the textbook companies, and the Puerto Rican

Spanish used by the students.

School administrators have decided that when Ms. Quinn's students enter third grade, they will use English language textbooks and take the English language exam. The teacher's greatest concern is that students' test scores will not reflect all the teaching and learning that has gone on in her classroom. She feels that until these students receive several more years of bilingual instruction, they will not be prepared to perform well in any exam that is administered strictly in one language or another.

Summary

We have just reviewed several examples of what goes on in specific bilingual classrooms in the United States. Not surprisingly, given the statistics on U.S. language minority populations reviewed in earlier sections of this report, three out of four of the above examples took place where the ELL population was native Spanish speakers.

Each teacher described above struggles with how to implement bilingual education in the classroom. For example, Mr. Hass felt limited by the short, one-year program offered to his students. Ms. Gonzalez is concerned about the disparity in educational background between her immigrant and American-born students. She is also frustrated by recent political decisions in California that may negatively affect her students' biliterate growth. Ms. Dunn is often frustrated with her textbook materials that use several varieties of standard Spanish that are unfamiliar to her students. Finally, Ms. Quinn is concerned about her limited Spanish proficiency in some of the academic domains. Ms. Quinn is also frustrated by annual assessments that do not and cannot reflect the bilingual language abilities and academic skills her students have acquired.

In sum, bilingual classroom practice is affected by several different variables including the teachers' proficiency in the students' language, the availability of a monolingual or bilingual assistant, the classroom and school population, community attitudes, available funding and resources, the training available for teachers, the political context, and many other factors. For this reason, bilingual education cannot be described simply according to program labels; rather, an authentic understanding of bilingual education must also take into account the sociocultural, political, historical, and economic contexts in which it takes place.