

Bilingualism at the Crossroads and in the Sights

EDWARD TORRICO

Gakushuin Girls' Junior & Senior High School

Abstract

Many people often wonder if being bilingual is advantageous or disadvantageous. This question has turned into a heated debate between exponents of bilingual programs and those who oppose bilingual programs. Both camps look at bilingual programs and being bilingual from various perspectives. The range is quite broad and includes those people who look at it from political, social, educational, and cognitive points of view. Most people who oppose bilingual programs look at bilingual programs from a narrow point of view. When looking at bilingual programs it is necessary to take a more holistic approach. One must also be aware that the discourse generated by the various minority groups is not commensurate with that of the dominant group. In this paper I will discuss the criticisms against bilingualism, and the criticism of the criticism. The paper concludes with an overview of bilingual programs in the United States.

Keywords: Criticism of bilingualism, Support for bilingualism, Discrimination, Minorities, Bilingual education

1. Criticisms of Bilingualism

Several authors have put forth the idea that bilingualism is disadvantageous. They contend that code-mixing and code-switching, something often observed in bilingual speakers, is detrimental to the student as well as to the overall social fabric (Appel and Muysken, 1987; Mclaughlin, 1984). Code-mixing refers to a process whereby the speaker uses both languages within a sentence; this refers to the use of one or more words of one of the two languages used by the speaker. Code-switching refers to changes that occur from sentence to sentence, that is to say an entire sentence is in one language while the next sentence would be in their second language. Appel and Muysken (1987) were quick to point to code-mixing as a sign of decay, both at the linguistic level as well as the social level. They surmised that code-mixing was a manifestation of the lack of mastery of either first or second language that was a reflection of

the learners' ability. These authors also point out that some monolinguals believe that not having 'mastery'¹ over the second language, the majority language, as is demonstrated in code-mixing, is a sign that the individual is not smart and or may be somewhat mentally deficient. In tandem with this general attitude toward the bilingual speaker committing errors, some people believe that English is losing its place as the 'national' language in the United States. That in some way it is being supplanted by other languages. It is believed that this process is accelerated by the slower acquisition of English (Crawford, 1998), as compared to previous generations and/or ethnicities.² Some have even said that bilingual programs are unnecessary and that students should be placed in total immersion situations and that they will succeed. Glaring examples put forth are the cases of Rodriguez and de la Pena (Krashen, 1996). These individuals were able to 'master' English within a short period. They are sighted as alternative paths to learning a language. Some have gone so far as to criticize the programs of bilingualism for being deficient in accomplishing their goal, that of making people bilingual. Russell and Baker (1996), after looking at over 300 studies, concluded that only 72 could be considered acceptable.

Some people have also argued that the inadequate language training provided through bilingual programs leaves the immigrants at the fringes of society and also does not push them hard enough to learn English. Basically they say that there is a correlation between the amount of English spoken by immigrants and the amount of influence and affluence they may achieve and/or obtain.³ This kind of comment is not uncommon to hear from the 'English-only' advocates. These attitudes are not recent. Mclaughlin (1984) sights a plethora of studies that talk about the research that was conducted over 60 years starting from 1900. Most of these studies tried to show that bilingualism was detrimental and affected the persons' creativity. This way of thinking was advanced by other studies as well (Arsenian, 1937 cited in Mclaughlin, 1984). Arsenian explains that 60% of the studies he looked at indicated that bilingualism was not helping the learner. One conclusion he arrived at was that being bilingual was indeed a drawback. He also concluded that the lack of full control over the second language led to social retardation, that is, the individual would not be able to advance as much as if he had full control over the second language. This points once again to learning two languages as the cause for the socioeconomic underdevelopment, or hindrance to the intellectual development of some non-English speaking minority groups. This line of reasoning is nothing new (Darcy, 1953 in Hamers and Blanc, 1989; Saer, 1923 in Hakuta, 1987).

Some other arguments opposing bilingualism expressed concern for the bilingual students. Arguments posited that bilingual children were ambivalent because they were thinking in one language and speaking in another. Another argument claimed that bilingual individuals passive and active vocabulary were limited, and that they would develop a confused and mixed vocabulary, such as was indicated in a study by Smith (1939 cited in Mclaughlin, 1984) of Chinese-English bilingual children.

These authors and others who share a similar way of thinking believed that the overall society would be negatively impacted by these 'bilingual people'.⁴ Another reason why people are against bilingualism is that they consider it to be destructive to the social fabric of American society, the 'English Only' movement and advocates are a good manifestation of this mentality/belief. They contend that it is damaging to social cohesion and the identity of the American nation/culture. They also think that not speaking English directly correlates with the individuals' loyalties lying outside of America's interests. In order to make their objectives concrete, this group has placed forth several ballot initiatives, such as proposition 227 in California. They suggest that public opinion also favored their point of view and/or their argument. Around 16 states have already enacted some kind of 'English Only' laws (American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU], 1997). 'English Only' groups also claim that it is disadvantageous to the individual. They advocate full immersion programs, considering other programs deficient, which will help minority language individuals assimilate into American society and become successful.⁵ Assimilation seems an appropriate word to encapsulate some of the overall feelings generated by the research against bilingual education as well as by the 'English Only' movement. Another idea generated by this mentality is that the more learners are exposed to a language the greater the acquisition. They expect students to receive high/excessive exposure in English for a short time and exit the program as soon as possible.

2. Criticism of the Criticisms

There are many flaws with the above criticisms. Some of the older studies described in the previous section have been criticized by Peal and Lambert (1962). The testing done in these older studies was also criticized by Appel and Muysken (1987). Other Authors also explain the shortcomings of the various older studies pointing to their methodological weaknesses (Dunkel,1990; Krashen, 1996). It was pointed out that these studies did not consider and/or disaggregate the information in order to better interpret the results of the study, in other

words they did not differentiate the information and explain the results including categories for socio-economic status, age, sex, or degree of bilingualism. Appel and Muysken (1987) focus on socio-economic aspects in order to gain deeper understanding of the context in which the individual is learning the languages. They incorporate a socio-economic perspective, with which they were able to provide an added explanation as to why the bilingual students had low scores, in tests taken in both languages. Further elaborating on environmental factors affecting the learner, Mclaughlin (1984) adds to the analysis by intertwining environmental factors with socio-economic class.⁶

As criticism of the older studies mounted, some authors tried to 'correct' the testing by using the Pintner-Non-language Test and the Sperman Visual Perception Test. As Mclaughlin (1984) points out there was a need to establish the validity of the test. He also pointed out that the Sperman test was not standardized. Smith's studies compare English monolingual children with children from the Chinese community in Hawaii. These children used a kind of Pidgin English. The lower test scores were thought to be representative of a deficient vocabulary.

As we see in the criticisms some people feel that English is losing ground to other languages in the United States.⁷ Unfortunately this way of thinking is selective. Although rejection of a 'minority' language is a deep current in American history, there were educational programs dating to the 1900s that supported other languages in cities and rural areas.⁸ There were programs in elementary schools in which children received part or all of their instruction in German, French, Norwegian, and Czech (Kloss 1977).

Although Rodriquez and de la Pena are examples to counter bilingual education, they both exemplify several of the criteria used in bilingual programs to lead the students toward success in language acquisition and academic performance. Either one or both received comprehensible input, had exposure to English outside of the school, had plenty of resources such as books, and were more advanced than their peers in subject matter thus facilitating comprehension and transference (Collier and Thomas, 1989; Crawford, 1998; Krashen, 1996). These two individuals as well as students in bilingual programs fare better when they develop both playground and academic English. Critics want to limit the time that students spend in bilingual programs. This is a terrible idea because it takes many years before students can obtain an adequate level of literacy which they can use in both languages (Cummins, 1994; Krashen, 1997). First language literacy promotes second language acquisition, and that literacy skills in the native language are likely to transfer to the second language (Rivera,

1988). Being that it takes different amounts of time to acquire both of these skills, it is in the students best interest to have an education in such a way as to allow them to maximize the opportunity given to them throughout the school system⁹ (Collier and Thomas, 1989).

The 'English Only' movement is having enough of an impact to have the imposition of their views or mentality in communities and people that may have perceived their interest to coincide with the 'English Only' movements' interests. One of the reasons why they were successful has nothing to do with English per se but rather more so on the perception of the population they convinced, how the argument was presented, and the questions asked. The way the questions were designed predetermined the answers (Krashen, 1996). As in other times in which this kind of selective hysteria gripped the nation, so too it 'coincided' with a large migration of Latinos and Asians. Similar reactions occurred when Eastern Europeans, Southern Europeans and Asians migrated to the United States in the 1880s (ACLU, 1997). There have been many studies to show that the 'English Only' movement has little if any real excuse for its position. Several studies show that assimilation happens with or without bilingual education. It comes down to the individuals making their own decisions that are affected by socioeconomic factors (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001).

Following some of the 'English Only' logic, we ask ourselves if it is necessary to include the students' language and culture in schools as a way to help in their academic success, since this can be seen as a hindrance to the process of assimilation. It is important to consider the idea that assimilation, something considered natural or expected by the dominant culture, is in fact a process whereby the dominant culture creates the seeds of the self-destructive force within the student who is not part of the dominant culture. Learning can certainly be viewed as a process of assimilation if the approach taken by the instructor does not include and/or take into consideration the student's language or culture. They must be included in a way that does not denigrate the student or creates an asymmetrical understanding of his culture in relation to the dominant culture, whereby his own culture is viewed with disdain from within himself. This can easily be the case if the instructors are approaching the students as if the students' culture and language is to be superimposed upon by the dominant culture and language. In some way this will have a counterproductive effect on the learning process whereby the student does not perform as well. On the other hand if the students culture and language is used and/or incorporated in the process of learning, not only will the student feel a sense of belonging, but also a reduced sense of antagonism toward the dominant culture, and a sense of empowerment.

When students from bilingual programs were compared with students from English only programs, bilingual students did better. Although unintentionally, Russell and Baker (1996) help support bilingualism. Their work shows that bilingual students did as well as other students in all-English programs. Simply put, why not be bilingual if it does not hurt your academic development.

3. Bilingualism as Advantageous

As previously mentioned several authors looked at bilingualism as disadvantageous. On the other hand there are many other authors who think that being bilingual has several advantageous. When we look at code-mixing and code-switching from a more positive perspective we find these kinds of processes to be a sign by the user or its use in a meaningful and affective way. As Hoffman (1991) indicates, code-switching clearly denotes the awareness by the user of the two languages. It also highlights the users own specific and meaningful use of the language to highlight something specific. In other words the individual is using code-switching in order to make a point that has a specific historical and or social context. It also reflects the individual's own history. Siblings may communicate in two languages and the use of either language may be shared experiences. Code-switching may also be a way for the members of a group, as may be the case in minority groups,¹⁰ which use code-switching, to create, enforce, and/or re-enforce group solidarity. Code-switching may also be used to exclude others. It may also be done for the simple fact that the person is quoting someone. From the above we can say that there are, as Grosjean (1982) believes, clearly defined parameters for the production and/or use of code-switching. If viewed from within the context in which code-switching is used, it is possible to adduce that there are constraints in its use.¹¹

Other arguments in favor of bilingualism show that bilingual students got higher scores in intelligence test than monolinguals. Peal and Lambert (1962), in a study of French-English bilingual children, explain the results of this non-verbal intelligence test by attributing a degree of flexibility to the bilingual students. This is premised on the idea that bilingual students are more aware of the separation between the sound and its referent (Taylor, 1976). Ianco-Worrall (1972), using a semantic and phonetic preference test, highlights the idea that bilingual's especially at an early age, separate word sound from word meaning. Cummins and Gulutsan (1974) also show that bilinguals had higher scores in verbal intelligence test than did monolinguals.

When we look at bilingual students, it is obvious that they must learn two words for the same referent, at least one in each language. This means that their total vocabulary was much larger than those of students who only spoke one language (Lambert, 1972). Although bilingual students may not have an extensive vocabulary, as oppose to the monolinguals, in the case of the majority language, their conceptual vocabulary was greater. It has also been pointed out that in the long run long term negative consequences are not apparent. The conclusion was that the bilingual students extended vocabulary was much larger than that of monolinguals.

There are other studies that also highlight the positive aspects of bilingualism. Appel and Muysken (1987) talk about cognitive flexibility. When they tested divergent thinking, bilingual students did better than monolingual students. One way they tested divergent thinking was by giving the students a word and asking them to give answers that would indicate various uses for the word (Appel and Muysken, 1987). Other authors, looking at cognitive flexibility, indicate that bilingual children did better in creative tests as well. What many authors saw was that bilingual students have access to two sets of experiences and cultures, in other words two language systems. Cummins and Gulutsan (1974), and Ben-Zeev (1977) also support the idea that bilingual students have greater cognitive flexibility. Their studies deal with the interpretation of sinuous designs. As can be expected bilingual students provided greater number of interpretations than monolingual students. Hakuta (1987) found similar results for mainland Puerto Rican children. Other studies also show the effectiveness of bilingual education (Cummins, 1989; Krashen, 1996; Willig, 1985).

The basic concept put forth by many authors, especially Cummins (1989), is that the individual is part of an overall society which provides him/her with the support and understanding of him/her self as an individual member of that group that has its own characteristics. Therefore having a positive attitude and also a positive self-concept contribute to the individuals' success.¹² As previously discussed, this means that the individuals' language and culture, as presented to him/her in a way that it is not subsumed to the dominant culture, provides the learner with a positive attitude of himself as well as toward the overall society he is a member of. Also, learning that takes place in a way that incorporates another language and culture, in this instance the dominant language and culture, that is not detrimental to the learner, creates a positive environment for the minority students.

The best way to understand what we mean by the 'dominant' group, especially in this

specific context, is to take a broad historical approach to the plight of the indigenous/aboriginal people. Cummins and Corson (1997) show that the struggle of the American Indians is deeply intertwined with the way they see themselves and the educational policies of the dominant government. This self-perception is global in so far as it affects all aspects of their lives. It encompasses the way they feel about themselves, their language, their culture, and in a way it predetermines their future. It also explains how the dominant groups have systematically, covertly and overtly, destroyed the indigenous people's identity.¹³ One of the ways was to prohibit the use of their language and culture in all of its manifestations and to assimilate them into the dominant culture. Of course they were not assimilated in terms of sharing the benefits and power held by the dominant groups but rather they were just made to reject who they were. Various permutations of these dynamics have been going on for more than 500 years. Language helps minority groups to preserve their language and culture (Fishman, 1991). In many instances it serves to 'reconstruct their identity' (Giroux, 1983).

Those who oppose bilingual education have not looked at all of the possible reasons why the bilingual programs have produced students that have succeeded or have not succeeded. Other arguments deal with the type of access to effective bilingual or English as a second language instruction. Also, students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds may have difficulty if instruction presumes middle-class experiences. Other students may have learning difficulties stemming from linguistic or cultural differences. Some authors, such as Valdes and Figueroa (1994), also include that the students 'limited' English affects their learning. Students learning English are disadvantaged by a scarcity of appropriate assessment instruments and a lack of personnel trained to conduct linguistically and culturally relevant educational assessments.

It is obvious that being bilingual provides benefits to the individuals. Being bilingual is not just about speaking two languages, it is also a way to look at the world, that is, it helps to become open minded and tolerant. Arguments in favor of both minority and majority students keeping their mother tongue and become bilingual are various. They range from socio-cultural to psychological to those that focus on cognitive flexibility. Schools play a vital role in the lives of people. Schools must think in terms of the students intellectual development as well as their personal development and the society overall. The school system must address the needs of all of its members, these needs must be met in such a way that both minority and majority students benefit and grow.

Bilingual programs, programs with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students, must not only address the issue of the students' language development, but also several other areas from the academic to the social. These programs must also be sensitive to the students needs, not only in the academic sphere but also in the personal sphere. They must have a bicultural approach, and sensitivity and understanding of the student in his/her totality.

The next section deals with bilingual programs in the United States.

4. Bilingual Education in the United States

In the United States we can see five major programs that have affected the development of bilingual education. The programs are as follows: Transitional, Immersion, Maintenance, Two-way, and Submersion programs.

Transitional programs, as its name indicates, are programs in which the limited English proficiency students are expected to move into mainstream English only programs. In the transitional programs students are given instruction in both their native language and in English. This is good for the students because it means that their education in their first language continues. Instruction in the students' native language maintains the students at grade level and with skills which they either acquired previously or which they acquired at the time of their stay in the program. Once the proficiency level is high enough to allow the students to take other subjects in English, the students are then transferred to an English only program, in which all subjects taken by the student are taught in English. This would be an ideal situation. Unfortunately students are usually transferred out of the program before they acquire high enough academic skills in their L1 to attain good scores in exams.

A salient example of this kind of program was developed in Massachusetts. The reforms specified the number of years that the students need to be in or could be in the program. It also specified which language would be used and what percent of the time would instruction be in such language. They felt that 3 years was sufficient time. The three years were subdivided as follows: In the first year they would be taught in their native language for 95% of the time; in the second year they would be taught 50% of the time in their native language; in the third year instruction in their native language would be about 10%. Besides these types of specifications, the Massachusetts program also asked that the parent be involved in this process.¹⁴

The immersion program is a program whose focus was on the majority students. The aim

of the program was to immerse the students in the second language. It was assumed that given enough instructions the students would learn the vocabulary and grammar. This kind of program exposed the student to the target language in various subjects.

The maintenance program, as can be discerned from the title, is a program that tries to maintain the students' first language. As we all know there are skills and strategies that we all learn as we are being educated. The basic objective was to educate the student in both his first language and the target language. Ideally this program should last until the student finishes his/her high school education. Unfortunately the reality is otherwise. Great efforts are made to have the student leave the program, even if it is too early for them. Besides the fact that their English ability tends to be somewhat deficient.

The two-way program is a program that has both minority and majority students in the same class. The program not only looks at language but it also looks at the social benefits that accrue from having students from various backgrounds participate and work together. The environment which the program tries to create is one in which students can benefit not only in the area of language but also in the social area as well. A good example of this program can be found in the Oyster Elementary School in Washington D.C.. Their aim was to put an equal number of students from each language group in the same classroom. Instruction was divided equally between the two languages.

The submersion program, as its name indicates is a swim or sink program. That is, LEP students are placed into English only lessons. They are expected to succeed without any assistance in their own language or any ESL programs. There is a total disregard for the students' first language and culture.

Two-way programs provide the greatest overall benefits to the students. In this program students are expected to be in the same classroom as majority language students and also to use their own language. Thus they are not only given exposure to the target language through the interaction with the teacher, but also with their classmates as well. They have good self-esteem as their language is used and respected not only by the teachers but also by their peers (Christian, 1994; Krashen, 1997). Several researchers point to the positive results of the two-way programs as is shown through improved standardized test scores (Collier, 1994; Lindholm and Gavlek, 1994).

Of the five programs mentioned above, the two-way program provides the greatest benefits at the same time to both the majority and minority students. Other programs fall short.

The immersion program does not provide any benefits to the majority students. We can

also assume that the minority students in this kind of program, if they are not quick enough to acquire the majority language and the subject matter being taught, will be unsuccessful (Goldenberg, 1996). This program has had a high dropout rate as well as low achievement by minority students. This program not only affected the students academically but it also influenced the way they see themselves and their culture. They had low self-esteem and felt a sense of dissonance between their culture and themselves. The fact remains that it is not the quantity of language that you get but the quantity with the quality (Krashen, 1996).

A transitional program, by its very nature, does not keep the students for a long time. It also does not support the development or awareness of who the student identity which includes his/her culture. Of course some advocates believe that within two years the students will have a command of the target language, at least at the interpersonal level. They believe that students will develop the language skills necessary to interact with other students and people. A few more years of instruction will lead the students to developed greater academic language proficiency, this is know as CALP, cognitive academic language proficiency. At this stage it is necessary to introduce the threshold hypothesis as developed by Cummins (1980). Cummins explains that in order for CALP skills to be able to transfer from the students' first language, the students must have a degree of CALP developed within their own native language. The point Cummins makes is that if the learner is learning a second language and at the same time developing their CALP, the time they are removed from the program may be extremely critical to the learners CALP development in English. This is especially true if the students have not, as of the date in which they are being moved out of the program, acquired CALP in their native language (Cummins, 1982; Hakuta, 1990; Saville-Troike, 1984).

A program that proved to be beneficial to minority children in pushing toward the direction of becoming bilingual was the maintenance program. In the United States this programs' aim was developed for children to be able to gain a high level of proficiency in their L1. The program was also important because it did not make the students feel that their own language was being rejected.

The immersion program, on the other hand, favored 'majority' students. Some of their results were more promising for 'majority' students then other programs. Another interesting result is that children who participated in this program were more sensitive to the speaker and the whole process of interaction between the speaker and listener (Genesee, Tucker, and Lambert, 1975). Although this program seems to be a great success for 'majority' students, there are some limitations. It was found that the majority students had not gained mastery in

grammar or phonology (Crawford, 1989).

The two-way bilingual program showed greater results than the other bilingual programs. This program was of greater benefit to 'minority' and 'majority' language students. The interaction between these two groups created an atmosphere in which both groups felt an added sense of self-confidence. In this kind of program, 'majority' language students were able to understand just how difficult it was for their fellow classmates to learn a new language. 'Minority' language students were able to develop friendships with 'majority' language students. Having students share each other's culture and language works to create mutual respect and understanding.

What we see from the various programs is that the exclusion of the minority language, as well as the exposure to content and language that is beyond the individuals comprehension, is to the detriment of the learner (Hakuta, 1990; Krashen, 1992). Language programs that include the minority languages, in a way that is supportive of the student, have a greater overall effect on the students (Collier, 1989; Collier and Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1982).

Studies by Collier (1989), and Lindholm and Fairchild (1988) show that bilingual programs do help students and that the students are, given an adequate bilingual program,¹⁵ able to meet both social and academic challenges. Although we seem to be moving toward test taking atmosphere, in order to deal with the ever growing disparity between various ethnicities, this does not mean that the language minority student will benefit from any results which may indicate that they are not doing well in relation to the national average (Coltrane, 2002). After all they are a language minority which means that testing should, in some way, be made to match their situation and thus not hamper their development.¹⁶ Besides, there are many issues such as class and cultural background that can influence the individual, the teacher, and the program that is administered. Also testing content in the L2, content which may have been introduced in the learners L1, may not lead to an appreciation of the student's knowledge and/or ability. Giving the students a topic for an essay may invariably involve cultural, ideological and or sociopolitical presuppositions and biases, some of which may not be part of the students' discourse and or antithetical to the students discourse.¹⁷

Notes

¹ By any stretch of the imagination ‘mastery’ of a language is extremely relative. It is obvious that the absence of code-mixing or code-switching does not automatically mean that the individual has mastery of the language. In one sense, this idea of ‘mastery’ just means that the communication process does not involve code-mixing or code-switching, which is viewed in pejorative terms. It is quite clear that code-mixing and code-switching is a style that in many instances carries with it specific meaning to both the listener and speaker (or in all instances to the speaker, whether it be conscious or subconscious).

² I can’t imagine any other language but Spanish causing such apprehension in the ‘majority’ group. The number of Hispanics (as well as other minorities) has risen dramatically. This in turn has led to the impression that the ‘majority’ is losing their culture, or that the American culture is being diluted. Is Spanish spoken by most Americans as a second language? And the answer is--of course not. It is the generally held belief/impression that the ‘majority’ language, in this instance English, must also accompany a sense of cultural integrity. This sense of cultural integrity is elusive to the ‘majority’ because they assume that their way is the only way. In their view the inclusion of any other way of thinking means a loss to them. The ‘majority’, by the very nature of their dominance has created a paradigmatic presupposition that automatically views change with distrust. This should be a difficult point to uphold in the United States since it a culturally diverse nation of nations.

³ If language is correlated with wealth then why do we have poor people that are English only speakers?

⁴ Indeed we are fortunate that they did not consider the persistent legacy of racism either overt or systemic as a possible detriment to society.

⁵ This sounds like nativism without the natives.

⁶ He does provide enough for the reader to understanding that society could be subdivided into several classes, with each class having certain attributes that in some instances clearly affects their language. Of course we must also assume that there is a degree of fluidity between the classes, that is, even though they may be mutually exclusive in many respects, this does not stop people from moving between classes.

⁷ I suppose it really means Spanish.

⁸ Since we are talking about society we must consider and admit to the fact that people make/formulate policies at all level in society and thus to some degree each individual is responsible for the outcome. In other words, different ethnicities may be under various types

of structural constraints. As we know decisions made in a society are not made in a vacuum. Decisions carry with them, in most instances, the proclivity of the ideological framework or presuppositions underlying their arguments, the arguments of the policy makers, whether it be pedagogical predispositions or socio-political ones. We make our world, thus either through action or inaction we contribute to shaping our society, including bilingual programs and perceptions of such programs. In other words discrimination is as much a product of history as it is a product of individual inaction.

⁹ This is, of course, with the assumption that all settings, from teachers, to facilities, to neighborhoods, will be in their best condition.

¹⁰ This can also apply to the group that is dominant. They may use language in a way that highlights their own thinking as to how to separate themselves from 'minorities'. Hoffman does not explicitly consider the dominant group to be a minority but this can very well be the case, and as such some of the ideas explaining code-switching may also apply to them.

¹¹ I would like to caution the reader that it is very important to have a clear understanding of the context in which code-switching occurs. Not only to better understand the function of code switching, which is a foregone conclusion, but also to gain greater depth in understanding the discourse with its nuances as it develops.

¹² Cummins (1989) really looks at the student from the social as well as the academic side. He wants the students to feel empowered.

¹³ These problems, as explained in the various chapters of the various volumes, focus on the European global expansion which sets into motion a kind of dynamic which various minority groups are still struggling with.

¹⁴ It goes without saying that instructors should be bilingual.

¹⁵ Orfield (1988) and Castellanos (1980) discuss several of the dilemmas facing minority students, especially Hispanic. In a nutshell, the educational system fails the Hispanic population.

¹⁶ Let me add that if a program does not work it should not be considered a program that benefits the learner. The point is that we need to understand how to test various groups so that language does not become a factor in evaluating whether or not the student is intelligent and or if they should be placed in one program over another.

¹⁷ Of course there is a need for testing. The question is how to test and how to evaluate the result in order to be able to arrive at a reasonable remedy that can ameliorate the conditions that have produced students that obtain such scores.

References

- American Civil Liberties Union. (1997). *Briefing Paper Number 6*. New York: Department of Public Education.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Arsenian, S. (1937). *Bilingualism and mental development: A study of the intelligence and the social background of bilingual children in New York City*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ben-Zeev, S. (1977). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive strategy and cognitive development. *Child Development*, 48, 1009-1018.
- Castellanos, D. (1980). *The best of two worlds: Bilingual-bicultural education*. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.
- Christian, D. (1994). *Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two Languages*. (Educational Practice Report No.12) Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Collier, V.P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 509-532.
- Collier, V.P. (1994). *Promising practice in public schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Baltimore, MD.
- Collier, V.P., & Thomas, W.P. (1989). How quickly can immigrants become proficient in school English? *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 5, 26-39.
- Coltrane, B. (2002). *English language learners and high-stakes tests: An overview of the issues*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED470981)
- Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education; History politics theory and practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Company.
- Crawford, J. (1998). *Ten common fallacies about bilingual education*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424792)
- Cummins, J. (1980). The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. *NABE Journal*, 4 (3), 25-59.
- Cummins, J. (1982). *Test, achievement, and bilingual students*. Arlington, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329130)

- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association of Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (1994). Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 103-125). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J., & Corson, D. (Eds.). (1997). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Volume 5 Bilingual Education*. International Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Cummins, J., & Gulutsan, M. (1974). Some effects of bilingualism on cognitive functioning. In S. Carey (Ed.), *Bilingualism, biculturalism and education*. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta Press.
- Darcy, N.T. (1953). A review of the literature on the effects of bilingualism upon the measurement of intelligence. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 82, 21-57.
- Dunkel, P. (1990). Implications of the CAI effectiveness research for limited-English-proficient learners. *Computers in the School*, 7, 31-52.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual matters.
- Genesee, F., Tucker, G.R., & Lambert, W.E. (1975). Communication skills in bilingual children. *Child Development*, 46, 1010-1014.
- Giroux, H.A. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53, 257-293.
- Goldenberg, C. (1996). *Latin American immigration and U.S. schools: Social policy report, 10(1)*. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research in Child Development.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hakuta, K. (1987, October). Degree of Bilingualism and Cognitive Ability in Mainland Puerto Rican Children. *Child Development*, 58, 1372-1388.
- Hakuta, K. (1990). *Bilingualism and bilingual education: A research perspective*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321584)
- Hamers, J., & Blanc, M. (1989). *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. London: Longman.

- Ianco-Worrall, A.D. (1972). Bilingualism and cognitive development. *Child Development*, 43, 1390-1400.
- Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Krashen, S.D. (1992). Sink-or Swim 'success stories' and bilingual education. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English Controversy* (pp.354-358). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Krashen, S.D. (1997). *Why bilingual education?* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED403101)
- Lambert, W.E. (1972). *A social psychology of Bilingualism: Language psychology and culture*. CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lindholm, K.J., & Fairchild, H.H. (1988). *Evaluation of an exemplary bilingual immersion program*. Los Angeles, CA: CLEAR.
- Lindholm, K.J., & Gavlek, K. (1994). *California DBE projects: Project-wide evaluation report, 1992-1993*. San Jose, CA: Department of Education.
- Mclaughlin, B. (1984). *Second language acquisition in childhood. Volume 1: Preschool children*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Orfield, G. (1988). *The growth and concentration of Hispanic enrollment and the future of American education*. Presented at National Council of La Raza Conference, Albuquerque, NM.
- Peal, E., & Lambert, W.E. (1962). The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76 (27), 1-23.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R.G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rivera, K. (1988). Not "Either/Or" but "And": Literacy for non-English Speakers. *Focus on Basics*, 1, 1-3.
- Russell, G., & Baker, R. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30, 7-74.
- Saer, D.J. (1923). The effects of bilingualism on intelligence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 14, 25-38.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 10-18.

- Smith, F. (1923). Bilingualism and mental development. *British Journal of Psychology*, 13, 271-282.
- Taylor, I. (1976). *Introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Valdes, G., & Figueroa, R.A. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood, NJ: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 269-317.