

Language War in Arizona

Hisao Arimura

ABSTRACT

In this brief paper, an attempt will be made to outline the inherent problems that Proposition 203 has. Like Proposition 227 which has divided the residents in the State of California, Proposition 203 will divide the state of Arizona. The Proposition could be conducive to the loss of a minority culture in the state. Of course, what could happen to one state in the United States, could have wide repercussions in the field of language policy.

I

The objectives of education in any modern society are undoubtedly multifarious. At each level in our school system, expectations and specific curriculum are constructed in accordance with what each level of education would like the students to learn. As far as elementary school education is concerned, it predominantly covers two academic areas: namely social science, and natural science. Under the umbrella of the social subject domain, the role of language education is one of the main pillars for the youngsters.

To put the content of education in a more specific manner, apparently, how math is taught is quite different from language education. What is expected of learning math is drastically different from that of language education. In the case of the former, the ultimate goal is to acquire specific mathematical knowledge and the skills which are required to solve so-called mathematical problems. Therefore, math education is specific goal oriented whereas the spectrum what language learning covers is much broader and far more general. Language learning requires far more psychological commitment in comparison with what is necessary for math education. It challenges the psychological aspect of the learning process. Therefore, what can be learned in the process of language education, psychological commitment is involved. This differs from the case of math education, for example, as one's psychological background e.g. as cultural identity is not challenged. The attempt to acquire a foreign language either shatters or solidify one's cultural identity. Acquiring linguistic skills in only three or four areas depending upon how much and in what one tries to concentrate upon cannot be the only targeted goal. Simultaneously, one's outlook on the reality and his or her life is inevitably influenced by the process of studying a foreign language.

Keep in mind that studying math certainly does not challenge your cultural background nor self identity. In other words, possible personality transformation does not happen in the course of studying math.

To introduce or maintain bilingual education has always been a major focal point at a large number of schools in the United States. In many instances, the discussion of this has unfailingly been controversial in nature. Let us take a look at a more concrete example.

The next segment of this paper will be on the necessity of developing bilingual education at school. This necessity derives from the overwhelming fact that linguistic diversity in the United States is not comparable with that of any other nation in the world. This very point is substantiated by the fact that so many different kinds of languages are being employed as a means of communication in such a large number of families throughout the United States. Take a look at the following data taken from MLS and ADFL sources which indicates the number of children who speak another language other than English.

The Census asks questions about language use at home to locate groups of people who speak a language other than English. Their isolation or integration into a primarily English speaking community can be determined by their ability to speak English proficiently.

Language Spoken at Home, 1990-2000

	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Only English	198,600,798	86.18%	215,423,557	82.11%
Spanish	17,345,064	7.53%	28,101,052	10.71%
Other Indo-European*	8,790,133	3.81%	10,017,989	3.82%
Asian Language**	4,471,621	1.94%	6,960,065	2.65%
Other	1,238,161	0.54%	1,872,489	0.71%
Total Population Age 5+	230,445,777	100.00%	262,375,152	100.00%

Population Speaking English Less Than “Very Well” in 2000

Language Spoken at Home:	Number	Percent
Spanish	13,751,256	48.94%
Other Indo-European*	3,390,301	33.84%
Asian Language**	3,590,024	51.58%
Other Language	588,826	31.45%
Total	21,320,407	8.13%

Population Speaking English Less Than “Very Well” in 1990

Language Spoken at Home:	Number	Percent
Spanish	8,309,995	47.91%
Other Indo-European*	2,844,409	32.36%
Asian Language**	2,420,355	54.13%
Other Language	407,743	32.93%
Total	13,982,502	6.07%

http://www.censusscope.org/us/chart_language.html

The above charts are sufficient enough to prove that the United States is undoubtedly a linguistically diversified nation. In this respect, the United States is exceptional in the sense that so many different languages are used in the country. It is at the same time surprising to learn that the number of families where another language other than English has increased from 1980s to 1990s.

It will be further intriguing to pay our attention to the fact that we even have a list which indicates the statistics of top 12 languages learned in the United States.

By deepening understanding with regard to some of the salient characteristics of linguistic mapping in the United States, it becomes easier to grasp what is really taking place in Arizona in terms of ideological confrontation caused by linguistic battle in the state. Obviously, Spanish continues to be the most widely taught language at American colleges and universities across the country.

Top 12 Languages Learned in the U.S.
(based on Fall 2002 Enrollments in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education)

Language	% of Enrollment	Language	% of Enrollment
1. Spanish	53%	7. Chinese	2.4%
2. French	14.4%	8. Latin	1.9%
3. German	7.1%	9. Russian	1.7%
4. Italian	4.5%	10. Ancient Greek	1.5%
5. American Sign Language	4.3%	11. Biblical Hebrew	1%
6. Japanese	3.7%	12. Arabic	0.7%

http://www.vistawide.com/languages/us_languages.htm

Data are from MLA Newsletter (Spring 2004) and ADFL Bulletin, Vol. 35.2-3 (Winter-Spring 2004).

Where you have a large number of families who employ languages other than English as a means of communication, the chances are that English is not a dominant language which is a majority language outside of their immediate family circumstances. Once these children with this type of linguistic environment start going to school, they inescapably encounter academic problems because of the language handicap. These children with bilingual environment are categorized as Limited English Proficiency students. As a result of this language problem, these children are inclined to stay behind in their academic work.

This is the precise reason why an official proposition such as 227 in California and 203 in Arizona becomes a public controversy. The following figures reflect this linguistic conundrum. In other words, those students who have academic problems are said to have limited English proficiency.

The fact that many different languages have been used at home has contributed to the development of some classroom problems. The problem of linguistic incompetency of many students unfortunately contributed to the increase of those students who drop out in the middle of their educational endeavor. A great number of students are labeled as "Limited English Proficiency." Due to the limited language proficiency on the part of the minority students, many of them drop-out. Gonzalez has this to say (2004), "One stark reality which can be drawn from the above statistical evidence is that those children whose speak different language other than English at home are understandably having academic problems at school. Gonzalez (2004) has this to say." ...dropout rates represent low levels of minority participation in school, the picture of minority participation in education in Arizona is discouraging. The data show that 3.6 percent of minority

students in seventh and eighth grade dropped out of school during the 2002-03 school year. Of particular concern is the 5.5 percent dropout rate among Native American eighth graders (Table 1). This rate is nearly three times the norm for non-Hispanic White students.”

It is extremely significant to pay our discreet attention to the fact that from 2000 to 2003 75 percent of the minority dropouts were Hispanic. This results from the reality in which a great many students leave school because the linguistic barrier is too difficult to overcome.

On November 7, 2000, Arizona Proposition 203, English for Children was passed by 63%. This particular legislation makes an attempt to put a limit on the kinds of instruction which are offered to English Language Learner students. In the state of Arizona, there are 1,742 public schools where close to 50% of the students are from linguistic minority, 16% are ELL students. Before the passing of Proposition 203, schools had freedom as far as the choosing and employing of various kinds of pedagogical methodologies and teaching materials were concerned. The unbalanced proportion of the population of minority students does present a rather serious problem. To put it more concretely, the percentage of those young children whose home language is other than English are suffering from a lack of understanding in English. Therefore, they are left behind in education. The following statistical illustration should give us a clearer picture of those children who are similarly suffering at the national government level. The following is the summary of the Proposition 203.

Proposition 203: Text of Proposed Law

This law proposed by Assembly Bill 1168 (Statutes of 1996, Chapter 1) is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article XVI of the Constitution.

This proposed law adds sections to the Education Code; therefore, new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

Table 1: School Dropout Rates, Grades 7-12, 2002-03

Grade/Category	Non-Hispanic White			Minority		
	Enrolled	Drops	Rate	Enrolled	Drops	Rate
7	43,800	909	2.1%	43,640	1,575	3.6%
8	42,198	760	1.8%	39,731	1,449	3.6%
<i>Total Elementary</i>	<i>85,998</i>	<i>1,669</i>	<i>1.9%</i>	<i>83,371</i>	<i>3,024</i>	<i>3.6%</i>
9	44,930	1,703	3.8%	44,887	4,627	10.3%
10	41,782	2,005	4.8%	37,263	3,832	10.3%
11	39,329	2,284	5.8%	31,060	3,353	10.8%
12	37,063	2,620	7.1%	29,603	3,986	13.5%
Ungraded Secondary	2,956	748	25.3%	3,802	1,358	35.7%
<i>Total High School</i>	<i>166,060</i>	<i>9,360</i>	<i>5.6%</i>	<i>146,615</i>	<i>17,156</i>	<i>11.7%</i>
<i>Total All Grades</i>	<i>252,058</i>	<i>11,029</i>	<i>4.4%</i>	<i>229,986</i>	<i>20,180</i>	<i>8.8%</i>

Grade/Category	African American			Hispanic		
	Enrolled	Drops	Rate	Enrolled	Drops	Rate
7	4,627	187	4.0%	31,578	107	3.4%
8	4,094	138	3.4%	28,369	980	3.5%
<i>Total Elementary</i>	<i>8,721</i>	<i>325</i>	<i>3.7%</i>	<i>59,947</i>	<i>1,087</i>	<i>3.4%</i>
9	4,420	321	7.3%	32,102	3,253	10.1%
10	4,017	324	8.1%	26,358	2,737	10.4%
11	3,617	325	9.0%	21,683	2,369	10.9%
12	3,442	478	13.9%	20,508	2,858	13.9%
Ungraded Secondary	536	217	40.5%	2,660	945	35.5%
<i>Total High School</i>	<i>16,032</i>	<i>1,665</i>	<i>10.4%</i>	<i>103,311</i>	<i>12,162</i>	<i>11.8%</i>
<i>Total All Grades</i>	<i>24,753</i>	<i>1,990</i>	<i>8.0%</i>	<i>163,258</i>	<i>13,249</i>	<i>8.7%</i>

Grade/Category	Native American			Asian		
	Enrolled	Drops	Rate	Enrolled	Drops	Rate
7	5,661	280	4.9%	1,774	38	2.1%
8	5,551	305	5.5%	1,717	26	1.5%
<i>Total Elementary</i>	<i>11,212</i>	<i>585</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>3,491</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>1.8%</i>
9	6,487	1,020	15.7%	1,878	33	1.8%
10	5,148	729	14.2%	1,740	42	2.4%
11	4,117	605	14.7%	1,643	54	3.3%
12	3,948	552	14.0%	1,705	98	5.7%
Ungraded Secondary	538	186	34.6%	68	10	14.7%
<i>Total High School</i>	<i>20,238</i>	<i>3,092</i>	<i>15.3%</i>	<i>7,034</i>	<i>237</i>	<i>3.4%</i>
<i>Total All Grades</i>	<i>31,450</i>	<i>3,677</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>10,525</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>2.9%</i>

Source: Arizona Department of Education Dropout Rate, Study. Retrieved May 6, 2004, from

PROPOSED LAW

SECTION 1. Part 66 (commencing with Section 100000) is added to the Education Code, to read:

PART 66. PUBLIC EDUCATION BONDS

Chapter 1. Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996

Article 1. General Provisions

100000. This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996.

Article 2. School Facilities Program Provisions

100010. (a) Two billion twenty-five million dollars (\$2,025,000,000) of the proceeds of bonds issued and sold pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund.

100015. All moneys deposited in the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund shall be available to provide aid to school districts of the state in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene State School Building Lease-Purchase Law of 1976 (Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10), and of all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to provide aid to school districts, county superintendents of schools, and county boards of education of the state in accordance with Sections 100020, 100025, 100030, and 100035, to provide funds to repay any money advanced or loaned to the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund under any act of the Legislature, together with interest provided for in that act, and to reimburse the General Obligation Bond Expense Revolving Fund pursuant to Section 16724.5 of the Government Code.

100020. Of the proceeds from the sale of bonds pursuant to this chapter, not more than nine hundred million dollars (\$900,000,000) may be used for one or more of the following purposes:

(a) The acquisition of portable classrooms for use in accordance with Chapter 25 (commencing with Section 17785) of Part 10.

(b) The reconstruction or modernization of facilities pursuant to Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10. In addition to the current program requirements, the State Allocation Board may allocate funding pursuant to this subdivision for the reconstruction or modernization of any existing structure, including the wiring and cabling in that structure, to enable that structure to accommodate computers and other high technology equipment.

(c) The purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment and insulation materials, and related costs, pursuant to Section 42250.1, for schools operated on a year-round multitrack schedule in a manner that increases school capacity and reduces or eliminates the school district's need for the construction of additional classroom space.

(d) Project funding for applicant districts under Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10 that have incurred or will incur enrollment increases due to the locating or expansion of state or federal prisons.

(e) The acquisition of relocatable child care and development facilities for the purpose of providing extended day care services pursuant to Article 22 (commencing with Section 8460) of Chapter 2 of Part 6.

(f) Project funding, without regard to funding priorities, for applicant county boards of education under Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10 that are eligible for that funding for classrooms for severely handicapped pupils.

(g) Project funding for applicant districts under Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10 that are eligible for that funding, but that lack funding priority due to the size of pupil enrollment in the district.

(h) Project funding for high priority roof replacement projects.

(i) Construction projects or the purchase of furniture or equipment designed to increase school security.

(j) The identification, assessment, or abatement in school facilities of hazardous asbestos pursuant to either Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10 or Section 39619.6 and of lead.

(k) The reconstruction or modernization of facilities pursuant to Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10. Notwithstanding Section 17721.3, the State Allocation Board may allocate funding pursuant to this subdivision for the reconstruction or modernization of an existing structure in an amount that exceeds 25 percent of the replacement cost of that structure in order to finance structural improvements needed to avert future earthquake damage.

100025. Of the proceeds from the sale of bonds pursuant to this chapter, not more than one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) may be used for seismic retrofit projects of existing public school facilities.

100030. Of the proceeds from the sale of bonds pursuant to this chapter, not more than forty million dollars (\$40,000,000) may be used for projects for school districts that agree to contribute 60 percent or more of the cost of those projects.

100035. Of the proceeds from the sale of bonds pursuant to this chapter, not more than twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) may be used for projects that include joint use of facilities pursuant to Section 17750 or 17751.

Article 3. Higher Education Facilities Program

100110. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) California's economic and social prosperity relies on a higher education system that keeps pace with California's growth. In the coming decades, the state's economic prosperity will depend on increasing the productivity of the work force and on the ability to compete successfully in the world marketplace.

(b) The system of public higher education in this state includes the University of California, comprising nine campuses, the California State University, comprising 22 campuses, including the California Maritime Academy, a specialized institution, the California Community Colleges, consisting of 71 districts and 107 campuses, the Hastings College of the Law, and their respective off-campus centers. Each of these institutions plays a vital role in maintaining California's dominance in higher education in the United States.

(c) Over the last several years, studies have been completed by the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges to assess their long-term and short-term capital needs. Those studies demonstrate that the long-term and short-term needs total, in the aggregate, several billion dollars.

(d) The purpose of this article is to assist in meeting the capital outlay financing needs of California's public higher education system.

100115. Nine hundred seventy-five million dollars (\$975,000,000) of the proceeds of bonds issued and sold pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the 1996 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund, which is hereby created.

100120. The Higher Education Facilities Finance Committee created pursuant to Section 67353 shall be and is hereby authorized to create a debt or debts, liability or liabilities, of the State of California pursuant to this chapter for the purpose of funding aid to the University of California, the California State University, the California Community Colleges, and the Hastings College of the Law for the construction, including the construction of buildings and the acquisition of related fixtures; the equipping of new, renovated, or reconstructed facilities; funding for the payment of preconstruction costs, including, but not limited to, preliminary plans and working drawings; renovation and reconstruction of facilities; and the construction or improvement of off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990, including the acquisition of sites upon which these facilities are to be constructed.

The addition of the Hastings College of the Law to this section is not intended to mark a change from the funding authorizations made by Section 67354, as contained in the Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986, or Section 67334, as contained in the Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988, but is intended to state more clearly what was intended by the Legislature in those sections as well.

100121. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall consider the historic significance of community college district buildings that are 50 years of age or older if those buildings are to be renovated, reconstructed, or demolished in connection with the construction of buildings utilizing the funds provided by this chapter.
Article 4. Fiscal Provisions

100125. (a) Bonds in the total amount of three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000), not including the amount of any refunding bonds issued in accordance with Section 100175, or so much thereof as is necessary, may be issued and sold to provide a fund to be used for carrying out the purposes expressed in this chapter and to reimburse the General Obligation Bond Expense Revolving Fund pursuant to Section 16724.5 of the Government Code. The bonds, when sold, shall be and constitute a valid and binding obligation of the State of California, and the full faith and credit of the State of California is hereby pledged for the punctual payment of both principal of, and interest on, the bonds as the principal and interest become due and payable.

(b) Pursuant to this section, the Treasurer shall sell the bonds authorized by the Higher Education Facilities Finance Committee created pursuant to Section 67353 at any different times necessary to service expenditures required by the apportionments.

100130. The State School Building Finance Committee, created by Section 15909 and composed of the Governor, Controller, Treasurer, Director of Finance, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, or their designated representatives, all of whom shall serve thereon without compensation, and a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum, is continued in existence for the purpose of this chapter. The Treasurer shall be designated to chair the committee. Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, and two Members of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, shall meet with and provide advice to the committee to the

extent that the advisory participation is not incompatible with their respective positions as Members of the Legislature. For the purposes of this chapter, the Members of the Legislature shall constitute an interim investigating committee on the subject of this chapter and, as that committee, shall have the powers and duties imposed upon those committees by the Joint Rules of the Senate and the Assembly. The Director of Finance shall provide the assistance to the committee as it may require. The Attorney General of the state shall be the legal adviser of the committee.

100135. (a) The bonds authorized by this chapter shall be prepared, executed, issued, sold, paid, and redeemed as provided in the State General Obligation Bond Law (Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 16720) of Part 3 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code), and all of the provisions of that law apply to the bonds and to this chapter and are hereby incorporated in this chapter as though set forth in full in this chapter.

(b) For purposes of the State General Obligation Bond Law, the State Allocation Board is designated the “board” for purposes of administering the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund.

(c) For purposes of the State General Obligation Bond Law, each state agency administering an appropriation of the 1996 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund is designated as the “board” for projects funded by those appropriations.

100140. (a) Upon request of the State Allocation Board from time to time, supported by a statement of the apportionments made and to be made for the purposes described in Sections 100015, 100020, 100025, 100030, and 100035, the State School Building Finance Committee created pursuant to Section 15909 shall determine whether or not it is necessary or desirable to issue bonds authorized pursuant to this chapter in order to fund the apportionments and, if so, the amount of bonds to be issued and sold. Successive issues of bonds may be authorized and sold to fund those apportionments progressively, and it is not necessary that all of the bonds authorized to be issued be sold at any one time.

(b) The Higher Education Facilities Finance Committee created pursuant to Section

67353 shall authorize the issuance of bonds under this chapter only to the extent necessary to fund the apportionments for the purposes described in Section 100120 that are expressly authorized by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act. Pursuant to that legislative direction, the committee shall determine whether or not it is necessary or desirable to issue bonds authorized pursuant to this chapter in order to carry out the actions specified in Section 100120 and, if so, the amount of bonds to be issued and sold. Successive issues of bonds may be authorized and sold to carry out those actions progressively, and it is not necessary that all of the bonds authorized to be issued be sold at any one time.

100145. There shall be collected each year and in the same manner and at the same time as other state revenue is collected, in addition to the ordinary revenues of the state, a sum in an amount required to pay the principal of, and interest on, the bonds each year, and it is the duty of all officers charged by law with any duty in regard to the collection of the revenue to do and perform each and every act which is necessary to collect that additional sum.

100150. Notwithstanding Section 13340 of the Government Code, there is hereby appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury, for the purposes of this chapter, an amount that will equal the total of the following:

(a) The sum annually necessary to pay the principal of, and interest on, bonds issued and sold pursuant to this chapter, as the principal and interest become due and payable.

(b) The sum that is necessary to carry out the provisions of Section 100165, appropriated without regard to fiscal years.

100155. The board may request the Pooled Money Investment Board to make a loan from the Pooled Money Investment Account, in accordance with Section 16312 of the Government Code, for the purpose of carrying out this chapter. The amount of the request shall not exceed the amount of the unsold bonds that the committee has, by resolution, authorized to be sold for the purpose of carrying out this chapter. The board shall execute those documents required by the Pooled Money Investment Board to

obtain and repay the loan. Any amounts loaned shall be deposited in the fund to be allocated by the board in accordance with this chapter.

100160. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, or of the State General Obligation Bond Law (Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 16720) of Part 3 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code), if the Treasurer sells bonds that include a bond counsel opinion to the effect that the interest on the bonds is excluded from gross income for federal tax purposes subject to designated conditions, the Treasurer may maintain separate accounts for the bond proceeds invested and for the investment earnings on those proceeds, and may use or direct the use of those proceeds or earnings to pay any rebate, penalty, or other payment required under federal law or take any other action with respect to the investment and use of those bond proceeds that is required or desirable under federal law in order to maintain the tax-exempt status of those bonds and to obtain any other advantage under federal law on behalf of the funds of this state.

100165. (a) For the purposes of carrying out this chapter, the Director of Finance may authorize the withdrawal from the General Fund of an amount or amounts not to exceed the amount of the unsold bonds that have been authorized by the State School Building Finance Committee or the Higher Education Facilities Finance Committee to be sold for the purpose of carrying out this chapter. Any amounts withdrawn shall be deposited in the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund and the 1996 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund. Any money made available under this section shall be returned to the General Fund, plus an amount equal to the interest the money would have earned in the Pooled Money Investment Account, from proceeds received from the sale of bonds for the purpose of carrying out this chapter.

(b) Any request forwarded to the Legislature and the Department of Finance for funds from this bond issue for expenditure for the purposes described in Section 100120 by the University of California, the California State University, or the California Community Colleges shall be accompanied by the five-year capital outlay plan of the particular university or college and shall include a schedule that prioritizes the seismic retrofitting needed to significantly reduce, by the 2002-03 fiscal year, in the judgment of the particular university or college, seismic hazards in buildings identified as high priority by

the university or college.

100170. All money deposited in the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund, the Education Technology Fund, and the 1996 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund that is derived from premium and accrued interest on bonds sold shall be reserved in the fund and shall be available for transfer to the General Fund as a credit to expenditures for bond interest.

100175. The bonds may be refunded in accordance with Article 6 (commencing with Section 16780) of Chapter 4 of Part 3 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code, which is a part of the State General Obligation Bond Law. Approval by the electors of the state for the issuance of the bonds described in this chapter shall include approval of the issuance of any bonds issued to refund any bonds originally issued under this chapter or any previously issued refunding bonds.

*100180. The Legislature hereby finds and declares that, inasmuch as the proceeds from the sale of bonds authorized by this chapter are not “proceeds of taxes” as that term is used in Article XIII B of the California Constitution, the disbursement of these proceeds is not subject to the limitations imposed by that article.*Article 5.
Miscellaneous

100185. (a) Any remaining funds resulting or derived from the sale of bonds pursuant to Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 16400), Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 16500), Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 16600), Chapter 12 (commencing with Section 16700), Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 16800), Chapter 15 (commencing with Section 17000), Chapter 16 (commencing with Section 17100), Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 17200), Chapter 18 (commencing with Section 17300), Chapter 19 (commencing with Section 17400), and Chapter 20 (commencing with Section 17500), of Part 10, shall be transferred to the State School Building Lease-Purchase Fund and may be apportioned by the State Allocation Board for the purposes of the Leroy F. Greene State School Building Lease-Purchase Law of 1976 (Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10).

(b) Any unsold bonds, authorized for issuance under Chapter 9 (commencing with

Section 16400), Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 16500), Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 16600), Chapter 12 (commencing with Section 16700), Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 16800), Chapter 15 (commencing with Section 17000), Chapter 16 (commencing with Section 17100), Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 17200), Chapter 18 (commencing with Section 17300), Chapter 19 (commencing with Section 17400), and Chapter 20 (commencing with Section 17500), of Part 10 may be sold by the Treasurer, upon authorization by the State School Building Finance Committee for the purposes of the Leroy F. Greene State School Building Lease-Purchase Law of 1976 (Chapter 22 (commencing with Section 17700) of Part 10).

The People of Arizona find and declare:

1. The English language is the national public language of the United States of America and of the state of Arizona. It is spoken by the vast majority of Arizona residents, and is also the leading world language for science, technology, and international business, thereby being the language of economic opportunity; and
2. Immigrant parents are eager to have their children acquire a good knowledge of English, thereby allowing them to fully participate in the American Dream of economic and social advancement; and
3. The government and the public schools of Arizona have a moral obligation and a constitutional duty to provide all of Arizona's children, regardless of their ethnicity or national origins, with the skills necessary to become productive members of our society. Of these skills, literacy in the English language is among the most important.
4. The public schools of Arizona currently do an inadequate job of educating immigrant children, wasting financial resources on costly experimental language programs whose failure over the past two decades is demonstrated by the current high drop-out rates and low English literacy levels of many immigrant children.
5. Young immigrant children can easily acquire full fluency in a new language, such as English, if they are heavily exposed to that language in the classroom at an early age.
6. Therefore it is resolved that: all children in Arizona public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible.

II

In putting forward any public Proposition such as the Proposition 203, justification in so doing always has two sides, positive and negative as well. The positive side, of course, is to enable

those minority students to meet academic expectations. On the other hand, placing a much greater emphasis upon what is called monolingual education could cause a language loss of the minority students. Looking back upon the process of the loss of indigenous languages is a powerful component to substantiate this negative upshot of the encouragement of monolingual education.

Obviously, the necessity of the Proposition 203 in Arizona derives from the linguistic reality that an incredibly large number of children in the state are not proficient in English. Developing one's competency in language certainly fosters an overall academic competency. Bayless has this to say (2000)," For many years all of us have worked hard to try to end Arizona's failed system of Spanish-only "bilingual education" which has inflicted so much educational harm on tens of thousands of innocent Hispanic children. None of Arizona's politicians or educational bureaucrats would listen to us, or to the many other Hispanic parents begging the public schools to teach their children English. Today, nearly a hundred thousand children in Arizona public schools don't know English, and less than five percent of these students successfully learn English most years. Ninety-five percent of the Arizona students who start a school year classified as not knowing English end that same school year still classified as not having learned English." Due to the fact that so many children are not given appropriate language education, an extremely large number of school children leave school without having acquired the English language. Bayless also comments on this (2000)," Many of these children eventually leave school not able to read English, write English, or sometimes even speak English properly."

The only solution to solve the language incompetency of youngsters is to offer strong monolingual English education. In order to promote English education, so called bilingual education has to be denied. Bayless quotes Unz by saying (2000)," My name is Ron Unz, and in 1998 I led the campaign for Proposition 227, California's "English for the Children" initiative. It replaced a failed system of so-called "bilingual education" programs with classes using intensive sheltered English immersion. I am supporting the Arizona initiative because of my own personal immigrant background. Although my mother was born in Los Angeles, she grew up in an immigrant family, not speaking a word of English, but then learned English quickly and easily as a young child. This allowed her to go on to do well in college and graduate school."

For the sake of emphasizing the degree of success of language education in the state of California, it might not be completely inappropriate to indicate (Bayless: 2000)," Because of the victory of our California initiative, nearly all immigrant children there are now being taught in

English as soon as they begin school. As a result, immigrant students are doing much better in school. The test scores of 1.4 million immigrant students in California increased an average of 20% after less than one year of the new program.” It is no wonder why those originally against monolingual education became devout believer in the educational system where bilingual education is not highly thought of. Bayless (2000),” Many opponents of our California initiative have now changed their minds and endorsed English immersion, including the founding president of the California Association of Bilingual Educators.”

By implementing an educational system through which the number of L.E.P. students will be decreased, the number of people who can contribute to the betterment of economy will be on the rise. In this respect, education has definitely an economic side. Hooft, State Coordinator, is a representative advocate and supporter of the Proposition. His assertion has an economic component in supporting the Proposition. Hooft has this to say (2000),” I have worked to make Arizona’s education system better for more than 30 years. I have served on the Chandler School Board, the State Board of Education and the Arizona Board of Regents. As a businessman, I understand a strong education system means a strong economy and a better state. Thinking back on my years of service, I now realize that we have failed to build a strong foundation for our youngest children. First Things First will create that critical foundation so all children have a fair start and that they are ready for success.”

There is a group of people who are absolutely against Proposition 203. As an opposed idea of which the main thrust of contention is that these children acquire English as a second language, to deny a bilingual linguistic environment is nothing but an aberrant assertion. To those children to learn and acquire English as their second language should be encouraged rather than discouraged. Guaranteeing them a bilingual environment is crucial. Bayless asserts (2000),” Students who are learning English as a second language have the fundamental right to the most appropriate and suitable method for learning English in school; this proposition eliminates that right. All students deserve an education that culminates in their fluency in English and their mastery of academic content. For students learning English, a foundation in literacy and academic concepts in their native language provides them equal footing as they move through a program of language acquisition.”

Kotterman, President, Arizona Education Association makes an attempt to approach this Proposition from teacher’s point of view. She firmly believes that a Proposition of this kind can

easily interferes with one's teaching methodology. She articulates (2000)," Furthermore, teachers could find themselves threatened by the law for using their professional judgment. If a teacher determined that a student did not understand a concept explained in English, this proposition would legally prohibit her from teaching that concept in the child's native language. State government has no business intruding into professional decisions made in the classroom... Please vote "no".

Guzman offers a list of reasons on which she bases her "no" to Proposition 203 (2000)," This proposition is not feasible for the children of bilingual families in Arizona for the following reasons:

- More students will drop out of school at an earlier age due to language frustration.
- Fewer students will graduate high school with the implementation of the AIMS testing.
- Fewer students will enroll in college because they couldn't grasp K-12 curriculum without bilingual classes.
- Parents will no longer have the right to choose programs like bilingual education, ESOL, LEP.

Bilingualism is a highly marketable skill to possess in this age of global marketing and technology. The abolishment of this program would be detrimental not only to the future of the children that stand to lose much, but to our own futures as well.

For the future of Arizona as well as for the future of the country, we must prepare our youth to communicate globally. Proposition 203 will place Arizona students at a disadvantage from the graduating students in the rest of the country"

Krashen et al (1995) do not believe in the bilingual education in the state of Arizona have this to say (1995), "In this paper, we provide a very brief review of research on bilingual education system in Arizona. We restrict our survey to controlled scientific studies in which the progress of a group who experienced bilingual education is compared to a control group, focusing specifically on English language acquisition." They made an attempt to present a fairly complete description of a few study projects including the actual test scores, as this data may not be easily available to all readers.

Krashen et al illustrate De la Garza and Medina carried out a research (1985) in which they compared children in a bilingual program to English-dominant children in an all-English program. The study was done in Tucson. Approximately eighty percent of the bilingual education children were classified as LEP, but 94% of the comparison students were English-dominant. In addition, the socio-economic class of the English speaking children may have been higher (37% received

free lunches, versus 76% in the bilingual group).

With reference to the arrived conclusion as a result of this research project, they have found out the bilingual education students outperformed the comparison students. Krashen et al pass their judgment by saying, (1995),” here the difference was statistically significant and quite large. These results should be interpreted cautiously, however, because of the small sample size and the fact that the grade 3 sample was reduced from grade 2. Still, they are impressive.”

The second projects Krashen et al made an attempt to introduce Power’s (1978) study. In it the progress of graduates of bilingual education in Nogales was examined. These students were tested at grade 5 on the Stanford Reading Test and at grade 7 on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. They know only that these subjects in the study had been in bilingual education for three to five years, and that in grade 1 85% of instruction was in Spanish, and in grades 4 and 5, 30% was in Spanish. Comparison students were Mexican-American students who did not receive any bilingual education.

In spite of the fact that the upshots of this study are only suggestive, Krashen et al (1999) state, (1999),” These factors could act to underestimate the effect of bilingual education.” The implication of this quotation is more than pellucid. The bilingual education should be the only option and to abandon it is nothing but a preposterous proposition. Krashen et al continues (1999),” When children are tested during bilingual programs or immediately after they are exited, bilingual education shows a clear advantage. Results for the highest grade for Saldate et. al (1985). are quite positive, and de la Garza and Medina (1985) show that bilingual education students do as well as English-dominant students. The results of studies done with graduates of bilingual education are also encouraging, with graduates performing at national norms in one case.

Conclusion

The present paper has made an attempt to describe the nature of Proposition 203. With reference to the discussion of its legitimacy or lack thereof, it has been found that one group of advocates place a greater emphasis upon acquiring English for economic reasons. Thus, the implication of this is that the existence of the minority language is thought to be inferior to that of the majority. It might not be completely irrelevant to state that the gain of economic equality and climbing the social ladder here will force the minority child to abandon a very culturally important component: LANGUAGE. In order to sustain the linguistic pluralism orientation in

America, both human endeavor and financial investment become necessary. While this is undoubtedly true, the author of the present paper strongly believes that linguistic pluralism should be fully acknowledged and maintained. Any effort to challenge this belief should be minimized.

REFERENCE

<http://www.azsos.gov/election/2006/Info/PubPamphlet/english/Prop203.htm>
Emporium

ARGUMENTS “FOR PROPOSITION 203

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

James Crawford's

Language Policy Web Site & Emporium

<http://ade.az.gov/researchpolicy/DropoutInfo/>

Arizona Department of Education

Adopted by Arizona voters 7 November 2000

<http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/english/prop203.htm>

ARGUMENTS “AGAINST” PROPOSITION 203

<http://phoenix.about.com/b/2006/10/08/on-arizonas-november-ballot-first-things-first-for-arizonas-children.htm>

Arizona Proposition 203: First Things First for Arizona's Children

<http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/english/prop203.htm>

2000 Ballot Proposition

September 2000

BETSEY BAYLESS

http://www.censusscope.org/us/chart_language.html

Census Scope

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCrawford/T7obit.htm>

The Bilingual Education Act 1968-2002 James Crawford 2002

<http://74.125.153.132/custom?q=cache:PPgUuu4OmfQJ:www.eagle.tamut.edu/faculty/lrincon/Web%2520pages/Word%2520docs/Making%2520Sense%2520of%2520Census%25202000.doc+James+Crawford+Making+Sense+of+Census+2000&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&client=pub-1415334591037307>

James Crawford Making Sense of Census 2000

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4147870,00.html>

States' language policy, says James Crawford

Language War in Arizona

<http://72.14.235.132/custom?q=cache:nLsj3qEZYLAJ:eps1.asu.edu/aepl/EPSL-0405-108-AEPI.doc+the+dropout+rate+of+L.E.P.students+in+Arizona&cd=10&hl=en&ct=clnk&client=pub-1415334591037307>
by Joseusez M. Gonzades 2004

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3722/is_199704/ai_n8781661/
Language wars : The ideological dimension of the debates on bilingual educaiton

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3722/is_199704/ai_n8780322/?tag=content;col1
Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts
Ricardo Garcuia

<http://www.language-policy.org/content/census/countypop/index.html>
Source: Compiled by the Language Policy Research Unit, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University using U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data.

<http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/english/prop203.htm>
2000 Ballot Proposition
September 2000
BETSEY BAYLESS