

THE BILINGUAL RESEARCH JOURNAL  
Summer/Fall 1995, Vol. 19, Nos. 3 & 4, pp. 353-367

**EDITORS' INTRODUCTION**  
**THE ESL COMPONENT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN**  
**PRACTICE: CRITICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF BILINGUAL**  
**CLASSROOMS AND PROGRAMS**

René Cisneros  
Boricua College, New York City

Beti Leone  
William Paterson College of New Jersey

In spite of the growing interest in bilingual education, especially among communities where more than one language is spoken, little systematic discussion has been carried out among K-12 educators in the US. Headlines, editorial pages, and talk shows often carry items initiating highly charged public debates, yet, for the most part, these public displays have not been informed by the reality of the classroom, nor grown out of any broader framework of ideas about learning, teaching, and second language learning. As a result, a host of issues of great importance to the role and implementation of dual language programs have been relegated to the margins of discourse in mainstream education and to trial and error attempts by isolated schools and programs. The purpose of this issue, then, is to focus on critical descriptions of dual language programs and classrooms in bilingual communities across the US with the goal of opening up a dialogue that often includes questions not yet answered, posed by persons involved first hand in ESL and bilingual education, the teachers.

## **I. The Special Issue: Its Goals and Contents How The Special Issue Evolved**

The authors of these articles are teachers, teacher trainers, and researchers who wrote them in response to a call for papers: descriptions of the ESL component of bilingual programs and classrooms. All authors wrote from their first hand experience with the classrooms and programs they describe, some during the time they were actually teaching in these classrooms, some after they had moved on to other positions, others while they were closely mentoring the teachers in the programs described.

The review process for the issue was intended to produce a panorama of actual dual language programs - some in the process of evolving and some already recognized as exemplary programs. The editors did not, however, attempt to include only exemplary programs, but sought to present diversity in program types, in areas of the country, and in community characteristics. Included are descriptions that adhere closely to the realities of the communities, the schools, and the dual language programs themselves, together with critical comments and recommendations forecasting directions for the future.

Consistent with a Freirean perspective on pedagogy, we announced our particular interest in papers that described the experience of persons directly involved in bilingual education classrooms and programs. A kind of insiders' or grassroots level of participation and naming of experience was sought. Further, we advised authors that papers focusing on descriptions of community, curriculum, and classroom, together with reflections on program effectiveness, were especially relevant. In the articles selected, we hear many teachers' voices about bilingual programs and classrooms, providing an occasion for reflection and change.

### **Naming Our Experiences and Reflecting For Change**

This special issue of the *BRJ* supports the notion that communities of bilingual learners and teachers collectively need to name their experiences, reflect on them, and act upon them to reshape and reform schooling that is more meaningful, effective, and equitable for their own

communities. Inherent in this naming process, the writers in this volume have chosen their own terms to talk about their own teaching and make sense of it. To participate in this construction of meaning, readers will share the experiences, knowledge(s), and multiple perspectives of the writers, thus facilitating an understanding of the role of bilingual schooling and its implementation in American society.

Our intent, then, is to provide a guide for bilingual and ESL teachers, staff, and program administrators in the process of moving classrooms and programs toward more meaningful, effective, asset-based, and equitable settings. Via these articles, it is hoped that our understanding of the different classroom "faces" of bilingual and ESL education and of the institutional contexts and societal factors influencing the successes and failures in the schooling of bilingual children will grow. With these new insights, educators can join in the construction of meaning in their own teaching situations. Once begun, it is hoped that this "conversation" about bilingual education will also stimulate reflection, both preconditions for action and reform. Because each paper is intended to catalyze dialogue and reflection, and ultimately, reform, several features of the issue are designed to support these functions. The first article is an analysis and discussion by Roberts of bilingual education program models. In addition, each article in the issue has a final section consisting of critical comments and recommendations which reflect on the program's effectiveness and suggest possible routes for continuation, change, or reform. The importance of the reflective component in the issue cannot be underestimated, especially in its role as a precondition for change.

### **A Focus on Diverse Communities**

The bilingual program descriptions in this issue mirror the diversity of communities and student populations in the United States. Some communities are undergoing rapid change and some are more established. Some are urban or rural, while others are suburban. Some communities are situated in manufacturing or service industry centers and some have more of an agricultural economy. Some schools have greater parental involvement and so are more supportive and accepting of bilingual programs and populations than others. The students who

attend the bilingual programs described in this issue may be part of families who are recent immigrants and speak one of 27 languages (e.g., New York City), or they may be from families who have lived in the US and spoken Spanish for three generations or more (e.g., San Antonio). In the case of the Alaska bilingual program, the students are from families who have been Yup'ik speakers since before European settlers ever ventured into the Western Hemisphere.

Some schools attempt to meet the needs of their students and communities with one type of bilingual program (e.g., a two way program) and some with another (e.g., a modified bilingual program). Some large urban schools offer ESL and special classes in languages for native speakers. Other large urban schools offer a variety of different types of bilingual programs to meet the different language and literacy proficiencies of their students (e.g., Los Angeles). Certainly, this issue reveals the impact that diverse linguistic and cultural communities have on the structure of elementary and secondary schools that serve bilingual communities in the United States.

### **Organization of the Issue**

The issue is divided into two parts: Part I describes secondary school and adult bilingual programs and Part II describes elementary school bilingual programs. Secondary bilingual programs represent a relatively new phenomena, due in large part to an increase in immigration and an awareness that recent immigrants of high school age need to develop (or continue to develop) language and literacy skills rapidly to function in a new economic market. These secondary bilingual/ESL programs provide support of the native language as well as specially designed ESL classes to facilitate the acquisition and transfer of language and literacy skills across the subject areas.

In Part I, Chamot's paper showcases a successful program in Arlington, Virginia which assists beginning and intermediate level junior and senior high school students to achieve grade-level competencies in science and math by means of an innovative program called CALLA (cognitive academic language learning approach). CALLA incorporates grade level content instruction, English language learning, and explicit learning strategy instruction. Werner-Smith and

Smolkin describe a program for Hmong-speaking pre-college high school students in Wisconsin, which uses a storytelling component in the first language and culture to develop academic confidence and skills in English for high school students bound for college.

Also describing a secondary school program, Marsh presents a Spanish/English dual literacy program that provides schooling in New York City for recent immigrants from the Dominican Republic. There, a bilingual curriculum has been developed to respond to these students' unique linguistic and cultural experiences. Hewlett-Gómez and Solís describe a dual language program in Texas for recent immigrants in an agricultural community near the US/Mexican border. Teaching personnel from both Mexico and the US collaborate across international borders to implement the program bilingually. Gerner de Garcia tells how she developed a trilingual program for Hispanic deaf children in the Boston area, building on multiple sign languages and multiple literacies students brought with them. Her program, based on student-centered "kidwatching," questions techniques used in traditional deaf education classes and exemplifies holistic practices that worked with her students. To conclude Part I, Cordero-Martinez's contribution tells of a visual-spatial approach to teaching ESL in a bilingual program for deaf international college students in Washington, D.C. Special attention is given to the need to understand deaf education in its bilingual education (i.e. ASL/ESL) context and the need to use teaching methods which build on students' native languages and cultures.

Part II describes elementary school bilingual programs. They include examples of two-way programs, pull-out and resource rooms, and full bilingual programs. Elementary bilingual programs have a longer modern, continuous history in the US dating back to before the 1968 Bilingual Education Act and the *Lau vs. Nichols* Supreme Court decision of 1974. In contrast to secondary school programs, elementary school bilingual programs have had relatively more time to develop a variety of approaches to bilingual schooling, although there were a few secondary school programs developed in the 1960s, too. Schauber discusses a two-way, Spanish-English, elementary school bilingual program for urban poor and suburban middle class populations in New England. She envisions the program model as one that delivers equitable and effective education for two language and cultural groups who are

schooled together. Fern reports on a nationally recognized program of two-way English/Spanish bilingual education in a primary school that brings together affluent and inner city neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. The school's philosophy, strong parental involvement, curriculum, and dedicated teachers all contribute to the students' very high academic achievement. Zucker's paper tells of an exemplary two-way dual language program developed in a Chicago public school. The community-based school is recognized for its strong teacher-parent leadership and community involvement in decision making for the bilingual program. Schauber, Morissette, and Langlois present an exemplary French immersion program for anglophones in Montreal that emphasizes active participation in language activities meaningful to the students. The Canadian immersion program sheds light on the role of French and English schooling in a bilingual country.

In the next set of descriptions, pull-out or partial bilingual classrooms are described. Curtis discusses a budding bilingual program in a recently industrialized Chicago "collar community" that recently has become home for immigrant labor from Mexico. The program utilizes a combination of semi-contained and pull-out classes that pose a variety of challenges as they break ground in a school new to bilingual education. Leone describes a "bilingual resource room" in the process of identifying resources and paths for implementation. The program targets kindergarten and early elementary grades for a community of recent immigrants from Mexico who have settled in a Chicago suburb.

In the third set of papers, concerning full bilingual elementary classrooms, Hartley and Johnson describe reform in the schools of a Yup'ik community in Alaska which has used spoken Yup'ik for many generations. An innovative bilingual program has evolved in this community as a result of the community's participation and commitment to the preservation of its native culture. Another example of a "full" bilingual program is discussed by Leone who writes about a bilingual program for recent immigrants in a medium-sized Midwestern city with uneven administrative and staff support. A discussion of the use of two languages, social and academic ESL, and literacy classes in Spanish and English can be found in this article. Riojas-Clark presents a bilingual classroom that serves Mexican American students in San Antonio, a large, established, urban community that has been bilingual and

bicultural for many generations. A teacher-directed research project in progress there documents the program's success. Medina analyzes a bilingual Spanish and English program in a Mexican American community in Los Angeles, a city that has developed its bilingual programs over the past 25 years. The variety of program options for bilingual students in this large urban area reflects the school's response to a Spanish-speaking population with diverse linguistic, cultural, and ideological needs. To conclude Part II, Wink and her colleagues highlight the diversity of Central California schools, located in the agricultural valleys, the fastest growing region of the state. The second language programs for linguistically and culturally diverse students in these four schools range from classrooms with English-only teachers using integrated ESL approaches to those with bilingual credentialed educators using two languages for transitional bilingual instruction.

Finally, two items have been added to an appendix, the TESOL Statement on the Role of Bilingual Education in the United States and the TESOL K-12 Access Standards Statement. These items will provide an institutional perspective to the classroom and program descriptions and give an indication of ways that educators in bilingual education and ESL can work together toward change from an institutional vantage point, complementing the "grassroots" work of teachers and parents in the bilingual communities across the country.

At times it is difficult to assess the influence that particular bilingual education programs have on the schooling of a particular group of students, because bilingual programs vary widely in their implementation and administrative support. Nevertheless, research studies (Arias & Cassanova, 1993; Baker, 1993; Collier, 1994; Cummins, 1989; Padilla and Benavides, 1985) continue to report the growing evidence in support of superior cognitive and linguistic development achieved through bilingual instruction. However, in spite of overwhelming research evidence in support of bilingual education, one major question must be posed: how many students need bilingual and ESL instruction in US elementary and secondary schools and how many of them receive this special instruction?

The following demographic section provides a national context for the program and classroom descriptions in this issue.

## II. Demographics

To contextualize the bilingual/ESL programs described in this volume, we include a demographic sketch of linguistically and culturally diverse learners in the US. The main data sources are the publication *Numbers and Needs*, and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) of the US Department of Education, both of which use, analyze, and update data from the US Census Bureau.

### Speakers of Non-English Languages in the US

The numbers of speakers of non-English languages in the US was nearly 32 million in 1990, almost 13 percent of the US population. The language with the largest number of speakers is Spanish with 17,345,000 million, followed by "Other" (4,333,000) which includes Native American languages.

The distribution by age groups (5-17 years of age; 18-64 years of age; and 65+ years of age) for the total speakers of non-English languages and for Spanish speakers is shown in Table I. Two thirds or about 4.2 million of all young people (5-17 years of age) who speak non-English languages at home in the US, speak Spanish.

**Table I**  
*Home Speakers Of Spanish By Age Group*

<i>Language</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>5-17</i>	<i>18-64</i>	<i>65+</i>
<i>All</i>	31,845,000	6,323,000	21,708,000	3,814,000
<i>Spanish</i>	17,345,000	4,168,000	12,121,000	1,057,000

### The Largest Ethnic Group

Currently, the Hispanic/Latino population constitutes ten percent of the total US population, and by the year 2040, the Latino population will constitute almost 20 percent of the total US population. Table II shows the projected ethnic composition in the US, comparing 1990 to 2040 (*Numbers and Needs*, 2:6).



**Table II**  
*Projected Ethnic Composition of the US*

<b>Racial/Ethnic group</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2040</b>
White, Non-Hispanic	187.1	210.5
African American	30.0	44.1
Native American	2.0	2.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.3	34.5
Hispanic/Latino	22.4	64.2

### **Population Projections**

The total US population in 1990 was 248.8 million and the projected total for 2040 is 355.5 million (*Numbers and Needs*, 2:6). From 1980 to 1990, the number of persons who spoke languages other than English in the US increased approximately 38% (8.9 million), and it is projected that this number will almost triple, reaching 96.1 million, by 2040. (This number refers to only foreign-born immigrants and their native-born children in homes where a language other than English is spoken.) Table III shows that Hispanics alone (22.4 million in 1990) are projected to exceed 64 million by 2040 (nearly tripling in fifty years).

**Table III**  
*Population Projections in Millions*

<b>Racial/Ethnic group</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2040</b>
Hispanic	22.4	64.2
Speakers of Other Languages	45.5	96.1
Total US Pop.	248.8	355.5

### **Enrollment (K-12) In US Schools**

The term "limited English proficient" (LEP) refers to students who are not yet at a near-native or native level of proficiency in listening/speaking and/or reading/writing skills in English'. The precise number of students in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States who are labeled LEP is not easy to determine because definitions vary widely from state to state. "In 1980, for example, estimates ranged from 1.7 million to 5.3 million" (*Numbers and Needs*,

1991). US Department of Education estimates of the LEP student population in 1990-91 follow, in Table IV.

**Table IV**  
*Enrollment in K - 12*

Total students: Public & private schools	40,471,612
LEPs: Public & private schools	2,263,682
LEPs in Title VII programs	250,958

Based on Table IV numbers, it is apparent that the number of LEP students served in K- 12 Title VII bilingual education programs in the United States is small: about eleven percent of the total LEP population. However, data are also needed concerning numbers of students served in state and locally funded bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) programs (Cf. Olsen, 1993).

It is important to note that many states also support bilingual and ESL classes through state and local funding. The above Title VII statistics reflect only the numbers of students in federally-funded Title VII programs, funded through an annual competitive grant-writing process.

### **Identification Needs**

Due to the broad definition of "limited English proficient" in the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) and the lack of clearly outlined procedures for identifying LEP students, future re-authorizations of federal legislation will need to define such terms and clearly outline procedures for identification of LEP students. The BEA re-authorized in 1994 does include improved guidelines for identification of students.

### **Enrollment State by State**

Table V lists the ten states with the highest enrollment of LEP students, based on data collected by State Education Agencies (SEAs), reported to the US Department of Education (ED) and used by ED for national estimates. These numbers do not reflect the number of LEP

students enrolled in bilingual or ESL programs, simply the number of LEP students enrolled in K-12 schools in the US.

**Table V**  
*States With Highest LEP Enrollments*

California	986,462
Texas	313,234
New York	168,208
Florida	83,937
Illinois	79,291
New Mexico	73,505
Arizona	65,727
New Jersey	47,560
Massachusetts	42,606
Michigan	37,112
TOTAL	1,897,642

---

From OBEMLA, 1992.

### **Misclassification of LEP Students**

According to the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) (1988), one of the biggest problems regarding the collection of data on numbers of linguistically and culturally diverse students is misclassification. According to NELS, teachers fail to recognize the language minority backgrounds of many students in US schools who come from homes in which languages other than English are spoken. Teachers also fail to identify for special language services many language minority students who rate their own English proficiency as low or moderate. "Misclassification of students who need help with English undoubtedly contributes to the small proportion of students who receive special language assistance or participate in programs employing their home languages to help them progress in school" (*Numbers and Needs* 2:5).

According to the NELS (1988), "teachers misclassified 47% of Asian and Pacific Islander eighth graders as coming from monolingual

(English) homes and 41% of Hispanic/Latino eighth graders, when in reality they came from homes where non-English languages were spoken" (*Numbers and Needs*, 2:5). "Of these 'unrecognized' students, almost 25% of the Asian/Pacific students and a greater percent of Hispanics had difficulty with English, according to students' self-ratings" (*Ibid.*).

Further, among these "unrecognized" eighth graders, at least 30% rated their own English proficiency as low or moderate (*Numbers and Needs*, 2: 5). This is significant, since these eighth graders' self ratings correlated with their reading and math achievement tests; and even those who rated their English proficiency high nevertheless continued to have problems with reading and math tests in school (*Ibid.*).

### **Discontinuation of Schooling**

Using the same NELS 1988 study as a source, it was found that "American Indian, African American, and Hispanic students who were eighth graders in 1988 were more likely not to be in school in 1990 than whites or Asians who were eighth graders in 1988" (*Numbers and Needs*, 2:5). For example, in 1990, 6% of all children who had been enrolled in eighth grade in 1988 were not enrolled two years later; but for American Indians, of the same group of 1988 eighth graders, 10.5% were not enrolled two years later whereas for Asians, those who discontinued school from the same group represented only 3%.

### **Conclusion**

It is important that this volume should be placed in a broad context. As can be seen, numerous educational and demographic reports point out the continued population growth of ethnolinguistic communities throughout the United States. It is now predicted that by the year 2000, over 10 million children with limited English will be in our schools.

At the same time, current educational research consistently highlights the importance of developing the home language to promote cognitive and linguistic development in a second language (Collier, 1994). Fortunately, the growing population of bilingual students has not been neglected completely by national, state, and local school policies

and practice and by the accumulated decisions from federal court cases, even though these policies have not kept up with the growing body of research providing evidence in support of bilingual education.

Based on current and projected numbers of speakers of non-English language populations in the US and on the increasing evidence of the effectiveness of bilingual/native language support programs (v. TESOL Statement on Bilingual Education, Appendix A), it is clear that, more than ever before, educators need to learn more about how to provide appropriate and effective instruction, to maximize students' linguistic, cultural, and cognitive development. TESOL's Access Standards can guide us on ways to ensure quality and equity (v. Appendix B), and the program and classroom descriptions which follow, with their rich contextual information, will serve to foment reflection and focus local, regional, state, and national attention on the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students and communities. The results of this attention will be conversations and reflection, which we hope will lead to action and reform.

### References

- Arias, M. B. & Casanova, U. 1993. *Bilingual education: Politics, practice, and research*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Collier, V. (1994). *Sociocultural processes in academic, cognitive, and language development*. Plenary address, TESOL 1994 Convention. Baltimore, MD.
- Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue*. New York. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

- Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. (1992). *The condition of bilingual education in the nation*. Washington, D.C.: OBEMLA, United States Department of Education.
- Olsen, R. (1993). *Enrollment statistics of limited English proficient students in the United States (1985-1993)*. Arlington, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Padilla, R.V. & Benavides, A.H. (1985). *Critical perspectives on bilingual education research*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe.
- Waggoner, D. (1992, November). *Numbers and needs: Ethnic and linguistic minorities in the United States*. 2 (6). Washington, D.C.: Numbers and Needs.
- Waggoner, D. (1992, September). *Numbers and needs: Ethnic and linguistic minorities in the United States*. 2 (5). Washington, D.C.: Numbers and Needs.
- Waggoner, D. (1995, January). Personal communication.

### **Editors' Note**

The editors of this special issue would like to thank the authors included in this volume with whom we have worked over the last two years and from whom we have learned much. Our lives are much richer because of our collaboration with them. We would also like to thank TESOL for the special project grant in January, 1992 which helped us begin the collection of articles and NABE for helping us conclude this journey of soliciting, reading, writing, revising, editing, and mentoring of writers that the project has entailed. Thanks also go to Helen Kornblum and TESOL for their assistance with the TESOL publication review process and for permission to reprint the two TESOL documents in Appendices A and B.

For comments on the entire manuscript of articles, we would like to thank Joel Gómez and Minerva Gorena of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, The George Washington University, and Betty

Mace-Matluck and her colleagues at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas. For comments on the introduction, we thank Barbara Gerner de García, Gallaudet University, Beth Hartley, Anchorage School District, and Dorothy Waggoner, *Numbers and Needs*, Washington, D.C. For comments on selected manuscripts, thanks go to Jack Richards, TESOL Publications Committee and Shelley Taylor, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Most of all, thanks are due to Cheryl Roberts for her inspiration in the conception of the collection and her collegiality and hard work during the first three years of the project. Special thanks go to Nancy Zelasko, National Association for Bilingual Education and Richard Ruiz, Editor of the *Bilingual Research Journal*, whose support and genuine appreciation of this special group of papers helped make the publication of this volume a reality.

Lastly, we want to thank the BRJ Editorial Board and Editorial Assistants for their time and energy at various stages in the review and preparation of the manuscript. However, we take responsibility for any final editing oversight, even though we have revised and edited the entire volume with attention to preserving the authors' distinct voices and styles while also satisfying the need for evenness throughout the issue.

### Notes

1. The March, 1993 issue (Vol. 3, no. 2) of *Numbers and Needs* defines LEP and other terms used in counting linguistically and culturally diverse populations in the US. The editors of this volume have chosen not to use this term given its negative connotation, although individual authors vary in the terms they use. The US Department of Education uses the term "LEP," and so federally funded programs usually must use the term as well.

2. Unfortunately, each state collects enrollment data in slightly different ways, depending to a large degree on different ways students are identified as LEP.