

THE EVER-CHANGING FACE OF BILINGUALISM

DAVID LEHNER

ABSTRACT

This paper is divided into two parts dealing with bilingual issues. In the first section, certain relatively well-known facts about bilingualism are briefly mentioned in order to impart to the reader only things that are absolutely necessary for the understanding of this most complex area of study.

The 2nd section of this paper deals with some historical facts that have to do with the American experiences in bilingualism and efforts made, both supporting bilingualism and monolingualism.

The reader will note, at the outset, that bilingualism is not a new topic. It has been around for thousands of years, and many nations and peoples have endeavored to deal with it. It is an on-going issue.

It will also become readily apparent that this brief paper is not a complete dissertation about all of the issues involved in bilingualism. Indeed, for brevity's sake, only certain things have been dealt with. Not everything involved in bilingual studies has been dealt with here. That is reserved for the huge tomes of knowledge concerning this topic.

It will emphasize how America flip-flopped, first accepting bilingualism then rejecting it in the form of 'English only', monolingualism for the sake of national security. Bilingualism, again, is taking center stage these days.

It is hoped that this brief paper will introduce bilingual matters and concerns to the reader. It is further hoped that it will inspire a deeper look and investigation into this issue. Indeed, the use of two (or more!) languages is here at present.

I

The topic of bilingualism is a very important, yet complex one. It is very important because there are many, many persons who fall under the guise of being 'bilingual'. How is bilingualism to be defined? Many ways of doing this have been put forward towards this end. One cardinal point is whether one is discussing individual or societal bilingualism. Individual

bilingualism deals with (1) one person learning/acquiring/using two languages. While societal bilingualism deals with societies/groups using another language in addition to the ‘majority’ tongue (that is, the language used by the society as a whole; the main language). For the sake of brevity, individual bilingualism will be discussed in this paper, although this in no way detracts from the reality of group bilingualism. Although there are many areas of bilingualism in existence, for example, use of language skills, level, performance, competence, achievement, competence and ability, they all lead to the same basic question of the differences between them and how these should be addressed. Also, it must be noted that, at times, different authors/researchers have a tendency to use them in their own private way and with their own meanings. This can lead to some confusion. However, it can be broadly said that bilinguals can be looked at in the following interacting (and overlapping) areas:

- ability, both productive (able to speak/write in both languages). And more commonly, receptive (able to understand or read in two languages).
- use: an individual bilingual often uses different languages for different purposes. e.g. TV, phone, casual & formal conversation, school, home etc.
- balance: very rarely are bilinguals equal in their use of or ability in both languages. One is primarily used for one purpose and the other language is utilized for another. Only the so-called ‘perfect’ bilingual (one with equal ability in all four skill areas) would use either language in any case scenario. However, it must be noted that such an individual is a rarity in bilingual literature.
- context: some use both languages on a daily basis while others live in a more ‘one language’ environment and employ one language on less frequent occasions and one more often.
- culture: bilinguals become more bicultural in most situations. This competence is a necessary prerequisite for bicultural competence and language ability in both languages.
- age: the age at which bilingual ability is gained is determined by the age at which both languages are learned or acquired. It has been said that when children have and use two languages from birth, it is a case of ‘simultaneous’ bilingualism and that if one language is learned first and the other later in life, after the ‘first’ language’ has been acquired, it is a case of sequential or consecutive bilingualism.
- elective bilingualism: this is the label given to cases in which an individual has ‘chosen’ to learn another language. The most common example of this is language learning in the classroom.
- ability: the dominance and development of language ability in either language by bilinguals is often described as ‘productive’ or ‘receptive’. This varies from person to person and mainly describes if the bilingual is able to produce (speak & write) or simply, understand (read, understand speech etc.).

The question as to ‘what is bilingual ability?’ is a pertinent, yet, complex one. Basically, there exist four (4) skill areas in language: listening, reading, speaking & writing. Using this division one can determine (albeit, simply)

who is bilingual and who is not. Some understand, but do not speak a given language; others can speak, but not write. Some understand but cannot produce. Therefore, the classification

is murky.

The above mentioned 4 skill areas are not of the ‘all or nothing’ variety. They can be further sub-divided into various contexts: for example, one may listen and understand in one context (shopping) but be totally unable to understand/listen to something in another (e.g. academic) This demonstrates that there exists skill ability within a skill. This extends across the four (4) skill areas.

It is well documented in the literature that someone who is equally competent in terms of ability in all four (4) of the skill areas in two (2) languages is a ‘balanced’ bilingual.

Fishman early on (1971) made the observation that only rarely will someone be equally competent in both languages in every skill area. Most bilinguals utilize their languages for different purposes. This is a very important fact!

This has been made further difficult because of the fact that the level of ability one has in either (both) language is not clear. To illustrate this, please note that one may be ‘equally’ proficient in ‘ALL’ skill areas. However, the said ability is rudimentary at best. Such a person fits the definition of ‘balanced’ because ability in both languages is the same, but of an extremely low level. Is such a person, truly, a balanced bilingual? It is this writer’s contention that a so-called balanced bilingual must be of a certain ‘high’ level of ability.

It must be noted that a ‘true’ balanced bilingual of the highest level variety is a rarity. Very few, truly, exist. This, in no way, detracts from language ability. Bilinguals typically divide efforts between languages. This makes common-sense.

Individual bilingualism is a very complex matter and, therefore, measurements of bilingual ability are extremely difficult. There are, however, some areas wherein bilingual ability assessments over-lap.

It is a difficult matter to say who is bilingual and who is not. In surveys, people, in various countries, say they are bilingual-that two language are commonly used in their homes. These appraisals are typically of the ‘home assessment’ variety and are made by the subjects themselves. This has problems in, and of, itself.

Different methods of assessment to determine level of bilingual ability have been attempted. However, the most efficient and reliable tests seem to be those administered by the school systems. In institutions of learning, a variety of assessment tests have been utilized. Included herein are language proficiency tests; norm referenced tests and criterion referenced tests (to name just a few). The complaint of ‘unfair’ is often heard when comparing monolingual and bilingual children. This stems from the fact that many of the questions have reference to things in, for example, English only and do not give an accurate translation of the English word into the other language.

THE EVER-CHANGING FACE OF BILINGUALISM

Language tests, utilizing phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon have been employed. Assessment tests are very important because ‘...they tend to accent what a child CAN do, rather than typical classroom tests that focus on what CANNOT BE DONE. (Emphasis mine) (Baker, pg.25). Baker also contends that language tests should/must provide information in the following areas:

- identifying children or students for accelerated learning classes.
- openly discussing the standards utilized in designing curriculum based on certain subjects.
- decisions for WHAT to teach and WHY this is important.
- finding those students that require some sort of support; the kind they need and why.

There are cases wherein students’ are asked to assess their own language weaknesses & strengths in the languages they can use. However, in such cases, problems exist in the following areas:

- A) Labels-when test scores create a label for someone (usually ‘low’ achievement). And can (often are) seen by the student as something ‘bad’ and therefore, lead the student to fulfill these assessments, thus affecting their language ability and progress in detrimental ways.
- B) Not sensitive to change-tests must show accurate measurements. Things DO CHANGE and often for the better. This must be emphasized. Last year’s assessment may not be (and often is NOT) accurate for this year.
- C) Self-awareness- all self-centered assessments require deep, accurate knowledge of oneself. This will vary according to circumstance in each individual. For example, one may think they are very good in non-academic situations but very poor in academic ones. This may not be true. It leads to difficulty in accurately assessing bilingual competence. This may, in fact, be due to the reality that the bilingual may be very good at using both languages in some contexts but not in others. (Not simply academic situations as opposed to those of a more everyday nature).
- D) ambiguity-some expressions or words like ‘write’, ‘read’, ‘understand’ and etc. possess great levels of proficiency and this is related to Bloomfield’s (1933) idea concerning ‘native-like’ ability in two languages. It is next to impossible to test for the total sum of bilingual (multilingual) proficiency.

When trying to assess a given bilingual’s competence in both languages, it is very common to look at so-called ‘book’ knowledge of the languages themselves, for example, grammar, spelling, lexicon and etc.

However, perhaps a more accurate appraisal of linguistic ability is to investigate a bilingual’s real communicative abilities. That is, not simply ‘language’ per se but rather how

well a bilingual; can employ knowledge of social situations in a 'down to earth' manner. That is, knowing what is acceptable in a given 'real-life' situation-like congratulations on the birth of a new born or offering condolences on the occasion of a death. People are NOT, typically, going to focus on small 'mistakes' in word choice, grammar and etc. They tend to listen to language's appropriateness. The way it deals with 'real-life' situations.

There is a grave danger in simply looking at language from an academic perspective. Of course, totally incorrect grammar is unacceptable, but minor mistakes that take nothing away from the speaker's intent, should be (and usually are) ignored.

Skehan (1988, pg. 125) sums up the idea of communicative competence:

'Genuine communication is interaction based, with more than one participant, unpredictable and creative, i.e. genuine communication may take the participants in unforeseen directions; is situated in a context which is both linguistic/discoursal and also sociocultural; has a purpose, in that participants will be trying to achieve something by use of language, e.g. to persuade, to deceive, etc.; uses authentic stimulus materials, and avoids contrived, specially produced materials; is based on real psychological conditions, such as time pressure; and is outcome evaluated, in that successful performance is judged in terms of whether communicative purposes have been achieved.'

A test, that covers Skehan's ideas of communicative competence is most likely next to impossible to come up with. There are too many differing situations to be dealt with. However, something along these lines should be developed.

Language testing is not really a passive, neutral entity. Language itself is related to ideological, educational, political, social and cultural agendas. Indeed, language use cannot be separated from user upbringing, values and beliefs. Such things form 'real' language exchanges between people.

Bilinguals must be measured in their language ability from both a linguistic and 'real-life' belief perspective. Both will influence language choice, word choice and affect assessment. Both language appropriateness and proficiency must be examined. Indeed, issues such as language balance, dominance and beliefs must be examined.

Bilinguals exist in every nation within the world. They come from all age groups and social classes. Bilinguals (and multilinguals) outnumber monolinguals and make up somewhere between half and two thirds of the world's population.

From the above, we know that bilingualism is the norm these days with people using only one language in the minority. Indeed, it is this writer's belief that, in the future, monolingualism will be a real rarity.

THE EVER-CHANGING FACE OF BILINGUALISM

It seems that many children around the world grow up bilingual, learn another language in school or in some other manner. They speak, understand and use more than one (1) language.

Those who are labeled bilingual as children are referred to as simultaneous bilinguals. Those others who learn another language sequentially are examples of bilingualism, as well.

Kindergarten children often can learn another language without formal instruction (See Baker & Jones 1998; Thompson, 2000).

In many pre-school situations children can acquire a second language with no formal instruction. When surrounded by children speaking the majority language (the main tongue), they become bilingual-speaking both their own 'home' (minority language) and the main vernacular.

In the opposite way, children (not infants exposed to another tongue) are able to acquire (learn) another language through instruction. Krashen (1985) makes a distinction between informal acquisition and formal, instruction in a classroom setting. However, it must be noted that the difference between learning language in a classroom situation and acquiring one in a natural one, is not clear.

Thus, the distinction between becoming bilingual naturally (because of parental language input) and doing so in a formal, classroom situation, is very blurred. There are various similarities. Indeed, although natural language acquisition has more layman credit in terms of success, there are more formally taught 'bilingual persons' these days, as language teaching/learning techniques become more effective.

Public servants, parents and politically motivated persons are often 'set' in their minds that the acquisition of two languages is somehow, detrimental to a child's growth. In short, many, with clout, believe that infant bilingualism is 'BAD'.

However, to successfully acquire languages from birth, it is necessary for the baby to be able to (1) store the languages for both output and input and (2) be capable of making a distinction between the languages. The literature supports the idea that infants are capable of both (1) & (2). (See the bibliography).

In summary, A). children are the most ready to become bilingual; B). children can store languages of a different type and tell the difference between languages acquired in a natural or simultaneous setting.

C). The 'one person one language' use by parents almost always leads to successful bilingualism.

Bilinguals very often employ code-switching (where both languages are employed by a

bilingual when interacting with another bilingual that employs the same languages. Such a technique is reserved for bilinguals and often leads to enhanced, ‘better’ conversation.

II

It is commonly held that bilingual education started in the US in the 1960’s. This, however, is NOT TRUE. History shows that bilingualism started long before 1900. The false assumption that bilingual education began in the US in the 1960’s is very dangerous because it does not take into account the fact that bilingual education (and bilingualism) did not start in America. It does not realize that this erroneous assumption will operate on a mistaken concept. It is a fact that, bilingual education began more than 5,000 years ago (Interested readers should see Mackey, 1978).

A long time prior to the time when European peoples immigrated to the US, the land had many native (Indian) languages. Estimates put the number in the thousands.

When European immigrants themselves arrived in America, they brought with them their native languages (and customs). There was much tolerance and acceptance of different customs and languages spoken. (McCarty, 2004)

Through WWI differences in languages used by immigrants were accepted, although there were some exceptions. ‘Benjamin Franklin’s anti-German stance in the 1750’s, the California legislation mandating ENGLISH-ONLY (emphasis mine) instruction in 1855 and the ruthless language suppression policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the 1880’s. (Baker, pgs. 189-190) spring readily to mind.

Only recently has a very much accepted and debated language policy in the US been prevalent. In short, now there is a greater acceptance of other languages, again. This acceptance of immigrant language diversity partly stemmed from the competitiveness among educational institutions for student numbers.

However, despite acceptance of language diversity in big cities, English language monolingualism, overall dominated in the latter half of the 1800’s. At the start of the 20th century, a change in attitude to persons’ having another language (not simply English) occurred. Several factors helped lead to this change and there was a lessening of bilingual education opportunities:

The United States’ entrance to WWI in 1917 led to increased anti-German sentiments, with a resulting pressure for English language. Also, the concept of a ‘melting pot’ of cultures with a strong emphasis on English language prevailed. German language was viewed as a ‘threat’. Linguistic intolerance became the norm and emphasis was placed upon English rather than any other language. To be an American became equal to an

THE EVER-CHANGING FACE OF BILINGUALISM

‘ENGLISH-ONLY’ attitude. (emphasis mine).

In the year 1919, the Bureau of Education Americanization Department of the United States recommended the adoption of a policy wherein ‘all States prescribe that all schools, public and private, be conducted in all English language and that all instruction in the elementary classes of all schools be in English.’ (Barker, pg. 191)

By the year 1923, 34 states had declared that the English language MUST BE the only medium of instruction in all elementary schools.

The sheer number of immigrants increased at the beginning of the 20th century. In many public schools, classes were mainly comprised of immigrants and this led to a fear that they (immigrants) were a threat to America in some way.

Such a situation gave rise to more assimilation of foreigners. The best way to accomplish assimilation (it was thought) was through the English language. The immigrants’ lack of English ability was a prime source of economic, political and social concern. How could such people be truly American? A call for ‘Americanization’ was made and competence & ability ‘was equal to’ loyalty to America.

The 1906 Nationality Act made it a requirement for immigrants’ to speak/understand English for them to become naturalized American citizens. There was a strong belief that a centralized control of sorts was necessary and that a common language must be utilized in compulsory education.

In 1957, however, the Russians launched Sputnik. This led to American deep thoughts and debates concerned with US education quality, competence and the ability to compete with other nations. There was a realization of the need for other languages to be used and understood by Americans-not simply English monolingualism.

1958 saw the passage of the National Defense and Education Act. These called for the learning of foreign languages at all levels of education. This, and various other situations, led to a resurgence and realization of the need for bilingual schools in the US.

In the late 1960’s a part of an Amendment to the 1965 Elementary Education Act was introduced. This Bilingual Education Act demonstrated and called for bilingual education acts to be part of federal educational policy. It authorized federal fund money to be used for the education of speakers of other (not English) languages.

The 1974 amendments to the Bilingual Education Act required any and all schools that were receiving grants of any kind to add teaching material in the students’ ‘home’ language and culture. This was thought to better enable the student to pass through the educational system. (See Weise & J. Garcia, 2001)

In essence, effective progress and achievement in the educational system could occur in either English or the students' 'other' language. Such a situation resulted in heated debates about to what extent a students' native language (not English), should be utilized in education. (Rhee, 1999).

President Reagan and his Administrative staff were very much against bilingual education. He was quoted about this as follows: 'It is absolutely wrong and against the American concept to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly, dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so that they can get into the job market.' (Quoted in the New York Times on March 3, 1981).

The above quote demonstrates that Reagan was not in favor of bilingual education. He seems to have believed that any and all bilingual programs would neglect English language ability. Reagan favored submersion and transitional programs of 'forcing' (this writer's opinion) the English language on immigrants.

President's Reagan and George H.W. Bush (Bush senior) were very much in favor of submersion, mainstreaming and transitional bilingual education. The 'right' to an education in a minority language didn't bear fruit in these administrations.

When Bill Clinton was elected President in the early 1990's, bilingual education was given a 'shot in the arm'. Clinton had run a campaign favoring bilingual education.

In 1994, an extensive program of reform acknowledged that any student for whom English was the Second Language; Limited English Proficiency (LEP) should be expected to attain high academic standards.

In the period between 1978 and 2000, the number of LEP students grew from 1/4 of a million to 1.4 million. These speakers came from a vast variety of different nations. California, hence, became a place wherein bilingual education experiments and experiences were many.

A very famous piece of legislation came to the forefront at about this time: Proposition 227. It was intended to effectively deal with and improve instruction in English language education for children. It was basically intended for children who required English language ability for employment and other economic based opportunities. It really was intended to eliminate bilingual education in California.

Proposition 227 said: '...it resolved that: all children in California public schools shall be taught English as rapidly as possible and in that language.' Sounds great, doesn't it? However, it virtually got rid of any bilingual education programs and replaced them with sheltered/structured English language immersion programs that were put in their place.

THE EVER-CHANGING FACE OF BILINGUALISM

(See Orellana et al., 1999; Quazada et al., 1999 & Crawford, 2004).

Proposition 227 passed on June 2, 1998 by a vote of 69% to 39%. It was subsequently shown that many Latinos were against this, but the final result was that bilingual education was, for all intents and purposes, in the dead letter box. Bilingual education had been eliminated. It was made virtually against the law. Any and all administrators and/or teachers found guilty of violating Proposition 227 in any way were liable for court action against them which could result in financial loss for those deemed in violation of the precepts of said proposition.

In 1998, the US Secretary of Education, Riley, said that he did not support Proposition 227. He believed that under the provision (basically, no bilingual education) spelled out by it fewer children would be learning English and that it would leave many, many of them 'lagging behind' in studies in the academic field.

Riley (1998) stated that the commonly held notion that 'one size fits all' in education was not an accurate one. In essence, the Bilingual Educational Act was replaced with 'No Child Left Behind' legislation for the following reasons

- :Language minority students underachieving especially in English language test scores.
- :Higher Hispanic drop-out rates.
- :The need to raise the expectations of language minority children.
- :Need for standardization of treatment for all language minority students
- :Many poor quality and under-resourced bilingual programs.
- :The implementation of bilingual schools following a transitional or compulsory model.
- :A shortage of qualified bilingual teachers.
- :Variability and insufficient accountability in bilingual programs across states.
- :The need for emphasis on measuring success, that is, outputs rather than inputs or process, with less excuses for contextual differences.
- :The centrality of competence in English at an early age as possible so as to succeed in school, society and employment.
- :The need for language minority students to be annually measured and monitored for English language progress, with rewards, and punishments for achieving (or not) that goal.
- :Fears about ethnic segregation, national disunity, and potential community divisiveness when perpetuating immigrant languages. The need for integration and assimilation. (Baker, pg. 198).

The current US President George W. Bush's (son of the previous Bush President) administration replaced Proposition 227 with this 'No Child Left Behind' (NCLB) legislation for the above reasons. It was approved on December 13, 2001 and basically reauthorized the Bilingual Education Act for 6 years.

Much can be said about it but the most important point in this author's opinion is that it says, in essence, bilingualism is a good thing. Nothing in NCLB legislation discusses by name bilingualism and/or monolingualism. It is important for a variety of reasons but most importantly because it sent a message that bilingualism is important and should be protected and promoted.

CONCLUSION

This paper has endeavored to discuss a very interesting point about bilingualism-namely, how feelings and governmental policy have basically changed.

In the beginning, bilingualism was accepted in America. American society accepted the idea of other languages. Later it was considered detrimental to the child's intellectual development. Then WWI came along and this led to a belief that other language use was 'un-American' Hence, America went to a policy of monolingualism (English only).

Recently, there has been a change back to the basic, 'good' points of bilingualism. The ideas behind NCLB legislation, seems, to this writer to be good!. It basically goes against the idea of Proposition 227: that said that English language only should be used for educational instruction.

This writer believes that bilingualism is a good thing and welcomes the idea of ability to use more than one (1) language. The use of only one (1) language is too restrictive. It makes a nation be in the unenviable position of being forced to wait for other nations to learn its language and come to it. The potential problems this poses are readily apparent.

A closer examination of America's bilingual experiences will lead, this writer believes, to a greater awareness and understanding of the merits of bilingualism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abedi, J., 2004 The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues
Educational Researcher 31 (1), 4-14.
- Abedi, J, Hoffstetter, C.H. & Lord, C. 2004, Assessment accommodations for English Language Learners: Implications for policy-based research. Review of Educational Research 74 (1), 1-28.
- Ada, A.F. 1997 Mother-tongue literacy as a bridge between home and school cultures. In J. V. Tinajero & Alma Flor Ada (eds), THE POWER OF TWO LANGUAGES:LITERACY and BILITERACY for SPANISH SPEAKING STUDENTS. New York: MacMillan/McGraw Hill.
- Baker, C. 2006 Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 4th Edition Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Bialystock, E., 1987 Influences of bilingualism on metalinguistic development. Second Language Research
- Bialystock, E., 1987b Words as things: Development of word concept by bilingual children. Studies in Second Language Learning.9, 133-140.
- Brisk, M.E. 1998 Bilingual Education from Compensatory to Quality Schooling. Mahwah, NY:

THE EVER-CHANGING FACE OF BILINGUALISM

- Lawrence Earlbaum
- Bull, B.L., Fruehling, R.T. & Chattergy, V., 1992. *The Ethics of Multicultural and Bilingual Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cook, V.J. 2002a, Background to the L2 user. In V. Cook (ed.) *Portraits of the L2 Learner..* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. 2004 *Educating English Learners: Language Discovery in the Classroom*, Los Angeles, CA, : Bilingual Education Services.
- Delpit, L.D. 1995 'Other People's Children:Cultural Conflict in the Classroom'. New York: New York Press.
- Fishman, J.A. 1971 *The Sociology of Language*. In J. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 1. The Hague:Mouton.
- Garcia, E. 2002, Bilingualism and schooling in the United States. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Genesee, F. 2002 *Portrait of the Bilingual Child*. In V. Cook (ed.), *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Genesee, F. 2003 *Rethinking bilingual acquisition*. In J-M DEWAELE, A. HOUSEN & LI WEI (eds.) *Bilingualism Beyond Basis Principles..* Clevedon:Multilingual Matters
- Grosjean, F. 1982 *Life With Two Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. 2001 *Bilingualism, Individual*. In R. MESTHRIE (ed) *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Kloss, H. 1997, *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kloss, H. 1998, *The American Bilingual Tradition*, McHenry, IL.: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Krashen, S. 1985, *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*.
- Lewis, E.G. 1981 *Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lyons, J.J. 1990 *The past and future directions of Federal bilingual policy*. In C.B. Cazden & C.E. Snow (eds.), *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.
- Mackey, W.F. 1978. *The importation of bilingual education models*. In J. ALATIS (ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable: International Dimensions of Education*. Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press.
- McCarty, T.L. 2004, *Dangerous Difference: A critical-historical analysis of language education policies in the United States*. In J.W. TOLLEFSON & A.B.M. TSUI (eds.) *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Miguel, G.S. 2004 *Contested Policy: The Rise and Fall of Federal Bilingual Education in the United States 1960-2001*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Orellana, M. F. Ek, I. & Hernandaz, A. (1999) *Bilingual education in an immigrant community: Proposition 227 in California*. *International Journal Bilingualism* 2 '(2) , 115-130.
- Ovando, C.J. 2003, *Bilingual Education in the United States: Historical development and current issues*. *Bilingual Research Journal* 27 (1), 1-24.
- Quezada, M., Wiley, T.G. & Ramirez, J.D. 1999, *How the reform agenda short-changes English learners*. *Educational Leadership* 57 (4), 57-61.
- Perlmann, J. 1990. *Historical legacies: 1840-1920*. In C.B. CAZDEN & C.E. SNOW (eds.) *English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education*. London: Sage.
- Rhee, J. 1999. *Theories of citizenship and their role in the bilingual debate*. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems* 33 (1), 33-83.

Schmidt, R. 2000. *Language Policy and Identity Policy in the United States*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wiese, A-M & Garcia, E.E. 2001 The Bilingual Education Act: Language Minority students. and US Federal educational policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 4 (4) 229-248.