MID-WESTERN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER

• Official Publication of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association •

University of Wisconsin–Whitewater

On the Cover

Founded in 1868, the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater is a leading comprehensive university serving more than 10,000 full-and part-time students with 43 undergraduate majors, and 16 master's and one educational specialist degree in the Colleges of Arts and Communication, Business and Economics, Education and Letters and Sciences. It has produced over 50,000 graduates with bachelor degrees and 10,000 graduates with master's degrees who have actively contributed to the growth of the state and our nation. Student learning is the paramount focus of the university's programs and services.

Throughout its 133-year history, University of Wisconsin–Whitewater has been an innovative educational leader in American higher education with the commitment to serve its students and the community beyond the campus. The University has been recognized through numerous awards as one of the best values and highest quality institutions in the Midwest and across the United States.

The state's second normal school opened its doors to the first class of 39 students and nine faculty members in 1868. Since its founding, the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater has been dedicated to the purpose that higher education not only serves to enhance the quality of an individuals' life but also benefits society.

This progressive spirit guided the development of the institution as it evolved from a normal school, which trained teachers for one-room schools, to Whitewater State Teachers College (1927), Wisconsin State College-Whitewater (1951), Wisconsin State University–Whitewater (1964) and as a member of the 13 four-year institutions in the University of Wisconsin System (1971).

Information for Contributors to the **Mid-Western Educational Researcher**

MID-WESTERN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER

Volume 14, Number 4   Fall 2001   ISSN 1056-3997

Editors' Note

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, DC, bilingual education will be a touchstone for the quality of multicultural awareness and sensitivity in the nation. Bilingual education encapsulates the issues that we as a nation must resolve in our relations with the world. How we welcome and educate new Americans and the tolerance, respect, and value we show for the languages and cultures that constitute the country, are directly related to the way we relate to the nations of the world. Historically, the United States has, like the Roman god Janus, smiled or frowned upon bilingual education at home depending on what the country saw on the international scene. The spectacle of the First World War in Europe aroused suspicion of Germans at home, a suspicion that fueled nativist paranoia resulting in the demise of the extensive bilingual education systems that had thrived during the nineteenth century. How will we look at the world now and how will that vision transform our view of the world cultures within our borders? Will we see enemies without and demand the shiboleth of English only as a pledge of unity within? Or will we converse with the world in its many languages, all of which we can easily speak with native proficiency if we choose to do so?

As the articles in this issue show, bilingual education policy is fluid and changing quickly. Issues of policy are inseparable from issues of definition, interpretation, and value. What is bilingual education and what is its purpose? Is it to support multilingualism in a multicultural society? Or, at the other end of the spectrum, is the purpose of bilingual education to foster the unity of the nation by ensuring literacy in a national language?

This special issue of the Mid-Western Educational Researcher features six articles that offer different perspectives on these issues. Tim Boals explores the landscape beyond the bilingual education/English Only debate, describing certification reform designed to ensure academic success for English language learners by demanding content area specialties of bilingual education/ESL teachers. Wallace Sherlock responds to Boals with an argument for including foreign language teachers among that group. Sharon Adelman-Reyes provides a review of the literature concerning two-way bilingual immersion programs. Narciso Alemán describes such a program, *El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra*, a proposed two-way bilingual charter school for Latino parents in Milwaukee; another local initiative, Hmong Language, Culture, and Learning, a course taught at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, is described by Donald Hones. The final article, an action research piece by ESL teachers Lori Petrie and Rebecca Sukanen, describes their experiences with collaborative approaches to ESL instruction.

We hope you find these articles to be informative and thought provoking, and that they inspire you to examine the approaches to and attitudes toward bilingual education in your communities. We welcome your response.

Anne D'Antonio Stinson,
Wallace Sherlock,
and Narciso Alemán

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

It was our intent with this issue to explore the political and pedagogical arguments in the field of bilingual education.

Ensuring Academic Success: The Real Issue in Educating English Language Learners

Tim Boals
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

For those of us who have followed for years the seemingly never-ending debate about whether language teachers should use bilingual or English Only methods when teaching English Language Learners (ELLs), the temptation is to succumb to cynicism. Too much valuable time has been wasted and these students are dropping out of our schools at two to three times the rate of white, English speaking Americans. Of late, my immediate reply to the question is "yes." After a pause, I go on to add that "We should use whatever helpful strategies are at our disposal to ensure the academic and linguistic success of English language learners." In many cases, for reasons I will expand upon within this article, those tools can and should include assistance in the native language. In other cases, formal assistance in the native language is impractical. In all cases, if we stop with this question we have stopped too soon, and we will have inadequately addressed the other issues that largely determine whether the support program we create will be truly effective.

The purpose of this article is to move beyond both the traditional language debate and the current political discussion. We need to consider what we must do to ensure the academic success of English language learners, not merely the acquisition of basic English skills. It will serve our purposes, however, to review both the current political context and the language debate, to better understand how we arrived where we currently are, and what we must now promote to make the educational future brighter for these students. James Crawford (1995) notes that when the U.S. Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act in 1968 it was essentially " . . . a leap of faith, an experiment based more on good intentions than good pedagogy" (p. 12). Certainly schools had been using children's native languages for instructional purposes since our nation's beginning, but few programs existed in 1968 that could serve as research models or give legislators a clear idea of what worked and why. The political consensus was that something needed to be done for children who did not speak English. Transitional bilingual education, designed to promote English acquisition and cultural assimilation, seemed better than the de facto policy of "sink-or-swim" which was prevalent at the time.

Today, thirty-three years after the Bilingual Education Act was signed into law, researchers have learned much more about how languages work, why English language learners need quality language assistance programs, and what programs are most effective in meeting their needs. Yet Crawford points out, paradoxically, that while the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 passed without a struggle, the concepts of teaching children bilingually, or assisting them with long-term, quality English as a Second Language (ESL) methodologies, are more politically controversial today than ever before (pp. 11–16).

Why is debate about educating English language learners more political than pedagogical? And why does it never seem to move beyond the language issue? Crawford's answer, based on an analysis of the historical and political issues involved in bilingual education, is that bilingual education ". . . appear[s] to contradict treasured assumptions about the 'melting pot,' or more accurately, about the Anglo-conformist ethic in American culture" (pp. 13–14). Opponents of bilingual education adamantly deny the charge of political interests, maintaining, as Linda Chavez does, that "my grandmother learned English perfectly without the help of bilingual education. Why do we assume that today's new Americans can't learn as quickly or as well?" (Amselle, 1995, p. 16). But it is precisely this insistence, sometimes from both sides of the debate, to frame the issue in terms of which approach is best for "learning English," that has misled educators and the public. "Learning English" simply is not enough when the rest of the school is learning math, science, social studies, the regular English language arts curriculum, and all the other subjects typically taught. Our insistence on seeing English skills as a pre-requisite for, rather than an outcome of, a meaningful school experience is costing English language learners valuable time they need to close the academic learning gap. Only after we examine what curriculum will be taught, how English language learners will learn it, and how long we will need to support their continuing academic progress should we begin to address the language of instruction issue. And, like it or not, local context will often determine when, where, and to what extent we use one language versus another.

Language Assistance Program Models Defined

The classic bilingual education debate has tended to revolve around two program models, Transitional bilingual education (TBE) and structured English immersion (SEI). Both typically have an English as a second language component where students learn to speak, read, and write English. The TBE program model, traditionally the federally sanctioned and supported approach, can be defined as a program that uses the child's native language to some degree in instruction in order to begin the reading process and clarify academic concepts, with the goal of transitioning English language learners to mainstream classrooms in English within three years. SEI programs, favored by political opponents of bilingual education, often allow students to respond to

teachers in their native languages while teachers are instructed to teach always and only in English using what is referred to as sheltered English methodologies. These methodologies seek to make English comprehensible to students while teaching, to the extent possible, the regular classroom curriculum. SEI, like TBE, typically aims for early-exit of students from the program—in three years or less. Researchers increasingly are in agreement that three years, be it in TBE or SEI programs, is not enough time. Programs that drop support too soon, just at the point where basic conversational English skills are learned, leave English language learners with insufficient academic and literacy supports to ensure success as students move toward the more difficult content covered in each succeeding grade (Crawford, 1995; Brisk, 1998).

Late-exit models have emerged as the favorites of the research community, mainly because of their philosophy of sustained support for academic progress, usually up to four to six years, or as long as it takes to be confident that the student knows what he or she needs to know to thrive academically. There are two bilingual examples of this model: developmental or late-exit bilingual education (DBE) and two-way bilingual education. Both examples attempt to fully utilize and "develop" the child's native language plus English, with the only difference being that two-way bilingual programs admit English speaking children in roughly equal numbers with English language learners and offer both majority and minority language students the prospect of becoming bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural (Brisk, 1998). Interestingly, while traditional bilingual programs are a difficult "sell" to the general public, two-way bilingual programs, advertised as special accelerated "enrichment" or magnet programs (often called International Schools), usually have waiting lists of families wishing to enroll their children. Two-way bilingual education is thus unique in its potential to create environments that integrate language majority and language minority populations. Late-exit, developmental (or maintenance) bilingual programs, differ from two-way bilingual programs in that they are created principally for language minority children and are usually found only in elementary settings (Nieto, 2000).

In schools where many languages are present and none predominate, most researchers would support a late-exit version of structured English immersion, where program students would receive ESL language instruction concurrently with what California educators have lately been calling Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE). Californians dropped the previous term, Sheltered English (Content) Instruction, seeking to emphasize that these methodologies begin lesson planning with grade appropriate academic standards, and then add the necessary linguistic "scaffolding" to ensure academic success. It is worth noting that in some of the most effective late-exit SEI programs, teachers and/or bilingual paraprofessionals, find creative ways to incorporate students' languages and cultures into

instruction, even when a formal bilingual program is not possible. Language choice need not be an all-or-nothing prospect (Lucas, 1994). If this array of program options and terms seems confusing, keep in mind that the major variables mentioned thus far are the amount of native language use, orientation toward accelerating academics, and length of time within the program. The question related to these principal program variables must then be, *to what extent will changing the variables influence the achievement of academic parity with English speaking peers?*

A Few Basics in Language Acquisition

To answer that question, it may be worthwhile to briefly review a few basics of language acquisition with respect to English language learners. Krashen (1996) postulates that in order for children to understand and thus benefit from classroom instruction, they must receive language input that is "comprehensible" to them. By definition, language that is incomprehensible cannot result in learning regardless of what is being taught. Children who enter schools not speaking English find, at least initially, that most everything they hear in English is incomprehensible. If English were the only subject learned in school, these students would simply have to learn to speak, read, and write their new language (a process difficult enough as those who have seriously studied foreign languages know!). While mastering English, however, they must also acquire literacy skills commensurate with their age and grade, and reach academic parity in the content areas taught in school (Krashen, 1996).

Cummins (1986) has postulated the language acquisition process as having both social and academic language dimensions. Social language skills, highly contextualized and involving a fairly basic vocabulary, are relatively easy for students to acquire within one to two years. This is the language typical of face-to-face, one-on-one conversations with peers. It is the more abstract and academically challenging language, however, that children must master, says Cummins, if they are to keep pace with the mainstream curriculum. Gee (1999) further suggests that each subject area presents its own unique "discourse issues" that involve distinct language, conceptual knowledge, and ways of behaving or relating to others. By its nature, each academic discourse requires that students possess a certain degree of conceptual background knowledge, attained in either their first or second language, to ultimately make comprehensible the curriculum presented to them. Research suggests that these skills, even with adequate support, take at least five to seven years to fully develop for most English language learners. The concept of academic discourse is useful in that it explains fairly well what most major research studies show: English language learners have relatively little trouble acquiring basic English skills in almost any program design, but have not, for the most part, achieved academic parity with successful English speaking peers (August and Hakuta, 1997).

These insights into language acquisition form the basis of researchers' belief that support programs must provide: (a) input that is comprehensible in English or the native language, or both, (b) early access to the same academic standards as English speaking peers, and (c) long-term academic support. Policymakers and the public remain largely unconvinced of both the role of the native language and the need for long-term support. They see the purpose of bilingual or ESL programs solely in terms of compensatory English skills instruction, not as an issue of access and mastery of the academic curriculum. So prevalent is this view of bilingual and ESL classrooms, many bilingual and English as a second language teachers have yet to appreciate fully their key role in making the common curriculum comprehensible. Rather they often see themselves primarily as teachers of compensatory English skills. Thus we see a preponderance of early-exit programs with the primary focus on remediating students' English deficit. This "quick fix" approach, whether all in English or partially in the native language, is largely disconnected from the curriculum of the mainstream classroom.

Research Evidence as Support
for Quality Curriculum

As was mentioned earlier, most traditional programs in the United States for English language learners can fit loosely into the TBE or SEI program definitions. It is not surprising, therefore, that most research studies of the last 35 years have looked at one or compared both of these models, usually with the goal of proving definitively that one is superior to the other. These two models share more traits, however, than researchers fixated on the language question have considered. Both are usually early-exit, mostly remedial in focus, and often taught through pull-out approaches where English language learners go with a bilingual or ESL teacher for a certain number of hours per week "to learn English." The primary goal of both programs is to "exit" English language learners to what is considered the "real classroom" and the "real curriculum." Early-exit remedial programs, arguably, become linguistic and cultural "ghettos" where children are isolated from content rich environments in the name of teaching them English (Crawford, 1995, pp. 102-138). Guadarrama (1995) writes about the dangers of defining programs based solely on the goal of learning English quickly while academic curricula are forgotten: "The issue is not so much whether students will learn English, because we know they will, but rather whether they will achieve academic success and engage as contributing members of our society in meaningful, productive ways (p. 45)."

Both traditional TBE and SEI programs create differentiated, compensatory bilingual or ESL curricula, largely failing to align themselves with what regular classrooms teachers teach in math, science, social studies, language arts, and other subjects. Given these considerations, it may come as no great surprise that, while a few studies have found advantages for one over the other, the majority of research studies have concluded that there is "no significant difference" between TBE and SEI programs.[1] The largest of these was a federally sponsored longitudinal study commonly called The Ramirez Report.[2]

The Ramirez Report, to date one of the most extensive studies of the effects of differing programs on language minority student achievement, was an eight-year project (1983–84 through 1990–91) in which data were collected in five states and 554 classrooms. The study compared achievement rates of children receiving no significant native language support (structured English immersion), limited native language support (transitional bilingual education), and more extensive native language support (late-exit, developmental bilingual education[3]). The Ramirez Report concluded that there was no significant difference between TBE and SEI programs when looking at achievement in mathematics, English language, and English reading. However, late-exit, DBE programs produced somewhat more growth in these areas than the other two program models (p. 39).

Gary Cziko (1992) points to the interesting fact that the Ramirez Report provides evidence for and against bilingual education, "or rather, *against* what bilingual education normally *is* (early-exit) and *for* what it *could be*" (late-exit) (p. 12, parenthetical program descriptors added). In the same article he maintains that it is difficult to summarize what he calls the "staggering amount of evaluative research on bilingual education." As an example, he writes of discovering 921 bibliographic entries (ERIC) using the descriptors "bilingual education and program evaluation" or "bilingual education and program effectiveness" (1966 through 1990) (p. 10). In spite of the immense volume of research, Cziko is justifiably reluctant to conclude that bilingual education is unconditionally superior to English immersion. He recognizes, however, the promise of both late-exit and more recent two-way, late-exit bilingual models, citing data from the San Diego bilingual immersion program that clearly show gains for language majority and minority student participants at or above grade norms in math and reading in English and the native language.

Cziko does not speculate as to why late-exit bilingual programs may be better. Bilingual advocates would say they are better because they use more of the native language than any other program model. Bilingual opponents counter that if this were the case, TBE programs should also be more effective than SEI programs, which is still debatable depending on whose research study one favors. Again, the notion that there may be something fundamentally different in the curriculum as typically practiced in late-exit programs has not been widely acknowledged, and until very recently, has hardly had any impact on the design or goals of most research in this area.

In the U.S., the same programs that are compensatory in their curricular focus are often also highly teacher-directed. This orientation, as opposed to student-centered approaches,

tends to be more tightly controlled by teachers and allows less time for students to engage in small group learning activities. It is not surprising that these bilingual programs have had a difficult time distinguishing themselves from equally ineffective, traditional English as a second language programs, or no program at all (Cziko, 1992, pp. 10–15). Two-way and late-exit bilingual programs, however, have been among the first bilingual program types to increase their emphasis on cooperative learning, experiential discovery-based approaches, integrated language arts, and interdisciplinary thematic teaching. All these methodologies emphasize acquiring language through the common core academic content and are highly interactive in their instructional design. Howard Gardner (1993) uses two metaphors to describe an enriched, authentic, and interactive classroom environment he believes all students need to promote "learning for understanding." He maintains that classrooms should resemble a combination of an apprentice's workshop and a children's museum. These metaphors also describe very well the contextually rich, hands-on environment language educators believe is needed to maximize student comprehension and learning (August and Hakuta, 1997).

A good example of a practical classroom model of instruction that stresses access to the core curriculum and student interaction within the classroom is the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). J. Michael O'Malley and Anna Chamot (1986) developed this instructional model specifically for bilingual and ESL classrooms. It combines an experiential, student-centered orientation with academic content instruction and metacognitive awareness of the learning process to assist students in becoming more efficient, self-reflective learners. As methodologies like CALLA become more prevalent, both bilingual and ESL programs are demonstrating greater effectiveness and higher academic success rates for English language learners. Even with improved methods, however, four to six years is a more accurate assessment of how long quality support will be required for most English language learners, not the two to three typically advocated.

Moving Beyond the Language of Instruction Debate

In 1997, The National Research Council published *Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children: A Research Agenda*. This work summarizes more than thirty years of research into the education of English language learners and offers principles for new research priorities. The authors suggest the need for a more complex research agenda that looks at, among other topics, how English language learners acquire content area knowledge and skills. They state that "in the area of content learning, there exists very little fundamental research with English-language learners" (p. 6). In part, this is due to the heavy focus on the language of instruction issue.

As with most prior studies, Thomas and Collier's (1997) twelve-year longitudinal study began by attempting to re-

solve once and for all which language program model, or how much native language use, is optimal. They went beyond this question, however, and have attempted to define each program model not merely in terms of language, but also with regard to other program characteristics that appear to facilitate the acquisition of high quality curricula in core academic subjects. Their findings suggest that (a) long-term support is better than early-exit, (b) content-based support is superior to traditional language teaching and, (c) programs that develop native language skills are significantly better than English Only approaches. Krashen and Biber (1988) would agree with this, maintaining that successful language assistance programs share three principal characteristics: "(a) High quality subject matter teaching in the first language, without translation; (b) development of first language literacy; and (c) comprehensible input in English" (p. 25).

How much of this success is due to language use per se, and how much of it is because the late-exit design encourages grade-level, content-based curricula, and accelerated, as opposed to remedial, methods of instruction? It is, at least in large part, an issue of access to high quality curriculum. Which program can provide meaningful access sooner, and sustain the access longer? If academic success in the mainstream classroom is the ultimate goal of any program for English language learners, programs that begin teaching the common academic curriculum in the language students more fully understand enjoy an initial advantage. Without native language support as one of the tools, English language learners must first reach at least an intermediate fluency in English. This is the point where quality sheltered English content area instruction can provide the same curricular access. The advantage good bilingual programs enjoy, however, does not preclude SEI programs from also reaching high levels of academic achievement. To do so, these programs must look for ways to address the issue of grade-level academic content learning, as soon as reasonably feasible, and sustain quality, accelerated academic support for the long-term.

This could be seen as the good news in the continuing saga. Not that bilingual education, properly delivered with high quality curricular goals, should not be offered as the best possible option. After all, wouldn't most people consider literacy in two languages better that literacy in one? Rather, when the formal bilingual program option is impractical (as it frequently is), we can achieve solid results with English language learners if we think long-term, content-based support and accelerated access to mainstream content and performance standards.

The other necessary shift for meeting the needs of English language learners is away from isolated programs within schools toward integrated, inclusive programs throughout schools. Carter and Chatfield (1986) emphasize that: ". . . the complex interplay between program and school must be analyzed and powerful efforts toward radical school improvement must be undertaken" (p. 203). Griego-Jones (1995) is

even more direct in her assessment of the problem: "If a program cannot adequately be integrated into the system, it has very little chance of succeeding in accomplishing its instructional mission" (p. 2). Again, one could argue that access to a quality curriculum common to all learners is at the heart of these concerns for effective program integration within the larger school context.

Conclusion

Cziko writes, "For communities that have the good fortune to contain a sizable population of language-minority children, it would seem an almost inexcusable waste of community resources not to maintain and develop the language of the linguistic minority and not to consider sharing it with the majority" (p. 15). This, in the end, would seem to be bilingual education's best hope for more widespread implementation, where that implementation is feasible. The growing realization is that even though structured English immersion approaches can succeed, bilingual programs offer a bonus: bilingual and biliterate citizens.

Recent census figures conservatively estimate the number of English language learners at 4.5 million nationwide. Yet across the nation, in spite of Cziko's belief that quality language assistance programs are in communities' best interest, less funding is allocated per capita each year to both bilingual and SEI support programs. Dividing the U.S. Department of Education's annual budget allocation for assistance to local bilingual/ESL programs by the number of English language learners would come to less than $50 per child, per year. In itself this says very little as the overall federal investment in education is only six percent. At the state level, where education funding is crucial, expenditures typically vary from non-existent to under $500 a child. This simply is not enough. To fill the void, local funding provides the balance—frequently $2,000–$4,000 more for a quality program—increasingly in an era when funding one program means shortchanging another (Crawford, 1995). In this context, it is easy to see why many programs focus predominately on raising basic English language skills, rather than long-term academic support.

At a time when other special program budgets have fought to maintain level funding, support for programs serving English language learners is on the decline, perhaps in part because policy makers have grown tired of the never-ending language debate and the general perception that these students will learn English anyway. The traditional insistence of both sides in framing the debate simply around quick mastery of English versus maintenance of the native language has led most researchers and policy makers to repeatedly ask the wrong questions, wondering why the answers to those questions never seem to get any clearer. If we begin by defining the purpose of schooling in terms of academic success, and we see such success for English language learners as an issue both of long-term support and access to main-

stream curriculum, we are offered the prospect of creating programs that truly work for these students.

Footnotes

[1] Among the hundreds of studies and program evaluations, there are two meta-analyses of multiple studies bilingual proponents frequently cite to support their claim that TBE is superior to SEI. The first was conducted by Ann Willig (1985), the second by Jay Greene (1997). Information about both can be located at the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) at www.ncbe.gwu.edu. For opposing arguments, visit the Center for Equal Opportunity website at www.ceousa.org.

[2] Officially titled The Longitudinal Study of Structured English Immersion Strategy, Early-Exit and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language-Minority Children.

[3] The Ramirez Report refers to these programs as "late-exit transitional" rather than using the term developmental or maintenance. They are the same program types.

References

Amselle, J. (Ed.). (1995). *The failure of bilingual education.* Washington DC: Monograph from the Center for Equal Opportunity.

August, D., and Hakuta, K, (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brisk, M. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carter, T., and Chatfield, M. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. *American Journal of Education, 95* (1), 200-232.

Chamot, A., and O'Malley, M. (1986). *A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. 388 108).

Crawford, J. (1995). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice.* Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (1), 18-36.

Cziko, G. (1992). The evaluation of bilingual education. *Educational Researcher, 21* (2), 10-15.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). Keynote Address, "The Unschooled Mind." *Illinois Bilingual Education Conference.* Oakbrook, IL.

Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and methods.* London: Routledge.

Griego-Jones, T. (1995). *Implementing bilingual programs is everybody's business.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 388 089)

Guadarrama, I. (1996). Realizing democratic ideals with bilingual education. *The failure of bilingual education.* Washington DC: Center for Equal Opportunity.

Krashen, S. (1996). *The case against bilingual education.* Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Krashen, S., and Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual educations's success in California.* Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Lucas, T. and Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly, 28* (3), 397-419.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Thomas, W. and Collier, V. (1997). *Language minority student achievement and program effectiveness.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. [on-line]. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu

Don't Forget Who Your Friends Are!
A Foreign Language Teacher's View
of Teacher Certification Standards
for ESL/Bilingual Education

Wallace Sherlock
University of Wisconsin–Whitewater

When asked recently how English as a second language (ESL) and bilingual education (BE) programs in literacy will change in the next millennium, several leaders in the field responded with a vision of a multilingual, multiliterate society (Fitzgerald, García, Jiménez and Barrera, 2000). They cited research asserting the potential that dual language immersion programs hold for increasing the overall academic achievement of both mainstream and language minority students. The picture of current reality, however, does not resemble this holistic vision. Instead we see a collage of disparate program models, instructional approaches, teacher education programs, and licensure regulations. For the most part, ESL/BE remains a compensatory aspect of schooling for language minority children. It is characterized by a motley assortment of "pull-out" programs conducted by specialists for language-minority students rather than by mainstream teachers for all children. Even the specialized field of second language education is divided into separate teacher education programs and licensure standards for ESL and BE. In Wisconsin, the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) is moving to ameliorate this fragmentation by proposing new licensure standards that will unite ESL and BE licensure within one coherent framework.[1] Ironically, while the DPI proposal remedies the fracture line between ESL and BE, it widens the gap that separates ESL and BE from another major area of second language education: foreign language.

What Is Being Proposed?

The draft of the DPI proposal eliminates the so-called "stand alone" licenses. The ESL/BE license may be added to an elementary level license, or to a secondary level license in one of the core academic content areas: mathematics, science, social studies or English language arts. This desirable reform recognizes that the split between ESL and BE results from political divisions that in the past have overridden pedagogical principles. Best practices in both ESL and BE share a common source in the research on second language acquisition. The draft proposes a basic license that broadens the scope of the current ESL license to include all the fundamental principles needed to teach English language learners (ELLs) except first language instruction. An additional endorsement would be granted to teachers demonstrating linguistic and cultural competency in a second language, who would then be able to teach English and first language instruction in bilingual classrooms.

The DPI proposal is based on two major principles. First, English language instruction should be aimed at academic success. The intent of the proposal is to promote a content-based approach to ESL/BE that will help language minority students keep abreast with the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards that are the benchmarks for language majority students. Second, ESL/BE should be a collaborative school-wide effort. The intent is to promote collaboration between ESL/BE specialists and regular classroom teachers so that ELLs will achieve academic parity with language majority students.

Foreign language teachers face an additional requirement. In order to obtain an ESL/BE license, a foreign language teacher will have to show proficiency in one of the core academic subject areas. The DPI proposal purposely distances foreign language because it is not one of the subject areas tested in the fourth, eighth, and tenth grades on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE). The intent of this provision is to encourage subject area teachers to become ESL/BE licensed in order to assure that ELLs are supported in the key areas leading to educational success (as currently measured). These intentions are irreproachable, but they overlook the actual situation in the schools, and attempt to resolve an educational and historical dilemma by statute.

Conceptually, the draft proposal creates a continuum that begins with professional competence in teaching all ELLs and extends to special competence in a second language. Given the availability of actual teachers, however, the draft proposal will create a pyramid within the profession, with monolingual ESL teachers at the base and fully bilingual/bicultural teachers at the apex. If we are to approach the multilingual education system envisioned by the leaders in the field, we will have to invert the pyramid, so that monolinguals are in the minority and bilinguals form the base. But where are these teachers to come from?

What Is the Role of Foreign Language Teachers in ESL/BE?

Historically, foreign language teachers have provided support for ELLs in the absence of licensed ESL/BE specialists or have assisted in understaffed ESL/BE programs. Many (if not most) ESL/BE teachers come from a foreign language education background. Currently at UW-Whitewater, the largest teacher education program in Wis-

consin, all but a few of the ESL/BE candidates for secondary-level licenses are Spanish majors. The crux of the problem is that, on the one hand, DPI wants subject area teachers who are trained in ESL/BE, but, on the other hand, future teachers interested in ESL/BE for the most part come to the profession because they have an interest in language and culture, which leads them first into foreign language study and then into ESL/BE. This seems to be the case for all students regardless of their language background. The DPI proposal assumes that by closing the foreign language door, it can redirect the stream of future teachers interested in language and culture into the core academic subject areas in order to obtain ESL/BE licensure. This assumption is unrealistic, however, and it renders the proposal self-contradictory. The proposal recognizes that most teacher education programs in the state are based on a major/minor system, and it purposely makes the ESL/BE license an "add-on." Translating from DPI terminology to university terminology, an "add-on" license means a "minor." Undergraduates are often not aware of the fine points of licensure standards when they make decisions about what to major in. Those interested in second languages, literature, and culture will continue to major in a foreign language. It is equally unlikely that math, science, social studies, and English majors will suddenly take an interest in ESL/BE programs, which often have prerequisites and second language requirements that pose obstacles to a timely and affordable graduation.

But there is a much more important reason why the foreign language door to ESL/BE licensure should be kept open. The best practices of content-based instruction and collaboration that underlie the DPI proposal are based on the same second language acquisition research that supports foreign language instruction. Best practices in all three of these areas, ESL, BE, and foreign language, spring from a common research base, and they are natural allies in the second language education endeavor. If this is so, why does foreign language education stand so far apart in the picture? Why is foreign language theory and practice so seldom mentioned in ESL/BE discussions?

In view of the traditional position of foreign language in the school curriculum, the DPI proposal to close the door on foreign language teachers is not unreasonable. The intent of the proposal is to draw ELLs closer to the core curriculum. Rather than being a core academic subject that is essential for all students (and worthy, therefore, of periodic testing) foreign language is viewed as a highly specialized specific subject area, even less universally essential than music or art. The aim of foreign language instruction, it is pointed out, has traditionally been to understand the grammatical structure of the language rather than to acquire the language as a means of communication. Foreign language is viewed not as inclusive, but rather as elitist (a college prep course), and therefore occupying a position in the curriculum that is not merely distant from ESL/BE, but at the farthest remove from it. In this view, foreign language is a mirror image of ESL/BE. Its intent is bilingulism, but it serves a select group of already highly literate, successful students who belong to the dominant language culture, just the opposite situation from that in which ELLs find themselves. While the ESL/BE community has criticized foreign language education as a distortion of the highest aims of bilingual education, the foreign language community itself has recognized that the old ways no longer serve, and has undertaken to reform itself. The National Foreign Language Academic Standards movement begun in 1994 has undertaken to move foreign language education away from its elitist position by emphasizing language for communication, collaborative methods of instruction, proficiency-oriented assessment, and content-based integration with the core curriculum subjects. In short, foreign language education is redirecting itself toward the same instructional methods and inclusive aims that motivate ESL/BE, and it is drawing on the same research base to justify these aims and methods. As specialists in second language education, foreign language teachers should be the closest allies of the ESL/BE teacher. Unfortunately however, instead of a coherent picture of second language education, we see foreign language, ESL, and BE fragmented into three academic specialty areas. We see them in a tug-of-war for resources in a highly politicized atmosphere, a tug-of-war that has second language education tied in a knot of cross purposes.

Why the Tension between ESL, BE, and Foreign Language Education?

The tensions and affiliations between ESL and BE have been described at length (Crawford, 1995). In his article in this issue, Tim Boals points out that both fields have been confounded by the highly politicized debate over effective program models. Boals points out that both of the predominant models, transitional bilingual education (TBE) and sheltered English immersion (SEI), share the common (but shortsighted) goal of quick mastery of English. TBE is favored by advocates of BE because it allows for some degree of maintenance of the native language, while SEI is favored by opponents of BE who insist on a quick transition to English. Boals contends that the research intended to prove which of these models is more effective has drawn a red herring across the path to effective bilingual education by setting up a false dichotomy between these two models, which, upon closer inspection, have more substantive commonalties than differences. Boals cites the growing opinion among second language acquisition researchers that dual language education is the most effective and promising approach to second language education. Boals calls for a move beyond the TBE-SEI debate toward bilingual programs that support academic standards in inclusive, integrated curricula. The key question then becomes, "how can licensure standards promote those kind of programs?" The DPI draft proposal, I believe, runs the risk of simply masking the misguided BE versus ESL (or transitional BE versus sheltered English immersion) debate by throwing a legislative veil over it. Monolingual ESL teachers will continue to purse

the "quick English" approach regardless of the ostensible program model. It is only those teachers who actually are bilingual who will be agents of change in promoting dual language education. But how can bilingual individuals become models of academic language without advanced study of their own native language? We expect native English speakers to study English composition and literature in college in order to achieve the level of competence necessary to model literacy for students. For the current generation of bilinguals who are not being schooled in their home language the need for advanced college-level study in their native language will be all the greater. Teacher education programs for bilinguals will have to include advanced education in both (or in *all* we might even hope) of their languages. In the real world of credits for dollars, this may add up to a major in a non-English language.

While usually ignored in the academic debates over effective program models, foreign language teachers often play an active role in ESL/BE in the schools. The particular role that any given teacher plays depends on the situation in the specific school, and ranges from that of the accomplice in the worst cases of "submersion" ESL to that of the hero in the best cases of maintenance BE. The worst cases scenarios show the deficiencies of compensatory ESL/BE, while the best cases show the benefits of BE, and the measures that schools can take to move toward the direction of dual language education.

In the worst cases the foreign language teacher is called upon to act as an interpreter for the regular classroom teacher or monolingual ESL "pull-out" teacher, or even worse is asked to actually be the "pull-out" teacher. This is, of course, grossly unfair to both the child, who is shunted aside, and to the foreign language teacher, who probably is not familiar with ESL/BE curricula, materials, and methods.

Also unfair is the common situation where ELLs are placed in foreign language classes where their knowledge of the language is completely uneven with that of the other learners. The language itself may even be in question with the teacher propounding an academic variant, and the students speaking various dialects even among themselves in one class. This situation creates tension for everyone; for the students who are confused and embarrassed about being different, and for the teacher who may be uncomfortable with native-speakers sitting in judgment. Some teachers can make the best of this situation, but it is a difficult one, and requires skill and confidence on the part of everyone, the teacher and the students. It is not an assignment for a new teacher.

The scenes just mentioned are what the DPI proposal is trying to avoid by distancing foreign language from ESL/BE. But these situations cannot be avoided by changing regulations, because subject area teachers and administrators turn to foreign language teachers out of desperation. Changing the licensure standards to exclude foreign language teachers will not resolve the conditions causing the desperation, and it will not assure that enough trained ESL/BE teachers are available. The DPI should, rather, set a policy that encourages foreign language teachers to be prepared for these eventualities. Including ESL in foreign language licensure standards would be a better remedy than excluding foreign language from ESL/BE licensure.

Foreign language teachers make a positive and much needed contribution to BE in those schools where they conduct special courses for minority language students. Although these courses fall short of dual language education because they are intended for the minority language students only, they do, nevertheless, support the goals of native language maintenance. Courses of this type could serve as the springboard to local experiments with genuine dual language education. The foreign language profession is actively encouraging teachers to pursue the kind of teaching and curriculum that could support dual language education. The *Wisconsin Model Academic Standards for Foreign Languages* (1997) (based directly on the *National Foreign Language Standards* (1996)) encourage teachers to pursue the so-called "5Cs" of curriculum: Communication (the traditional linguistic focus), Culture, Comparisons between the target language and the native language, Connections with other areas of the general curriculum, and Communities, that is, language use beyond the school walls. This approach to curriculum is consonant with the aims of dual language education. Furthermore, foreign language teachers are the best qualified to support the academic language development of minority language students because they are formally educated in linguistics and culture. A period of residency in a country where the language is spoken is a requirement for foreign language teacher licensure in Wisconsin. Ironically, non-native foreign language teachers may be better equipped to support academic language learning than native speakers who have been subjected to the subtractive BE that currently prevails in schools.

The irony and tragedy of the prevailing monolingual education system cannot be missed by the observer of a foreign language class where the teacher, a non-native speaker, instructs native speakers in the basic literacy skills of spelling and punctuation. The language that the teacher has labored long years to acquire and that confers on him or her a measure of status and access to a livelihood, is the birthright of the students, but a birthright that, if left in an uneducated condition, will become a barrier to status and livelihood. The piercing irony of these classes reveals the underlying racism in the situation. Society respects elitist foreign language bilingualism at least in part to justify the opprobrium it harbors for native bilingualism. Foreign language teachers find themselves in the scissors of this crux, and most of those whom I know support the inclusive aims of bilingualism and not the elitist aims. The DPI draft proposal will have the unfortunate effect of making this divide more acute.

What Should We Do?

The research generated by ESL and BE indicates that the best policy for realizing the intellectual potential of all children lies in promoting dual language education. The value and potential of such a policy has been demonstrated in Canada and other countries (Baker, 1996). In the US, dual language programs are attracting greater interest and growing in number. But they are still rare, and to increase their number we must do two things. First, we must marshall the efforts of all second language professionals, and second, we must recruit qualified bilingual teachers for all levels of education. Bilingual teachers are hard to find. Teacher education programs must find ways to recruit and prepare bilingual individuals who can model educated, academically sophisticated language for all school children. The proposed changes in the DPI licensure standards take a step in this direction by recognizing that ESL/BE is an important intervention in the early grades, and that language minority children must succeed in the core academic subjects throughout their education. This is not, however, the ultimate goal. The ultimate goal is for bilingual high school graduates to enter teacher education programs and then return to K–12 schools as bilingual teachers, academically prepared in both of their languages. The licensure standards should allow (better yet, encourage) bilinguals to become specialists in their own languages. In the context of English-dominant educational institutions that means that they should be allowed to major in a "foreign" language.

The change in licensure standards will set in motion a restructuring of teacher education programs. Combining ESL, BE, and foreign language in second language education (SLE) programs would lend much needed coherence and originality to teacher education (Lasley, 2001). An integrated approach would give students a global, research-based view of the field that would help alleviate the fragmentation characteristic of the profession as it is currently. Second language education programs would also foster originality in teacher education. In fulfilling their mission to local school districts, regional universities and colleges should create SLE programs designed to support the unique language and dialect resources of their locale. An example is provided by Donald Hones in his article in this issue. In response to the needs of the local community, a course in Hmong language and culture is an integral part of the ESL/BE minor at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh.

There are additional efforts being made to encourage bilingual high school graduates to become teachers. Wisconsin universities and local school districts are currently receiving federal funds to establish Career Ladder projects that recruit and support bilinguals in teacher education programs leading to K–12 licensure. The DPI has also received federal funds, and organized a bilingual Institute in May 2001 that holds promise for continuing collaboration between DPI, teacher education, school districts, and communities. The Bilingual Institute could investigate what schools currently offer foreign language classes for native speakers, and how these classes could be expanded. Such classes often come and go depending on staffing considerations. Second language personnel are spread thinly, but could join forces by taking advantage of distance education technology. Active local research and collaboration may then encourage specialists to bring their finding to their respective professional organizations, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), and the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Teachers who take a holistic view of second language education should establish committees within these professional organizations to maintain an inter-organizational conversation about reaching the common goal of a multilinguistic education system.

Footnote

[1] The draft proposal under discussion was prepared by the Bilingual/ESL Program Equity Mission Team of the State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

References

Baker, Colin. (1996). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (1995). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Fitzgerald, J., García, G.E., Jiménez, R.T., and Barrera, R. (2000). How will bilingual/ESL programs in literacy change in the next millennium? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35 (4), 520-523.

Lasley, Thomas J. (2001). Why Johnny can't teach: What Johnny's professors do. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 14 (1), 28-32.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the Twenty First Century*. Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Foreign Languages. (1997). Madison: State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Two-way Bilingual Immersion Programs: Toward a More Inclusive Agenda in Bilingual Education

Sharon Adelman Reyes
Saint Xavier University

The debate to maintain bilingual educational programs rages against a historical background of immigrant language loss. While right wing factions argue that English is in danger of losing its hegemonic status, immigrant languages continue to be replaced by English in households throughout the nation. This is not a recent phenomenon. Immigrant languages in the United States historically have not flourished. Although this country has been host to immigrant populations from across the globe, no other nation in the world has witnessed such a rapid loss of immigrant languages and a corresponding movement towards monolinguism (Hakuta, 1986, p. 166). The devaluation of immigrant languages and the simultaneous lack of status given to the study of foreign languages at the elementary, high, and university levels (Bialystok and Hakuta, 1994) point to a continuation of this trend. Paradoxically, however, while immigrant attained bilingualism is scorned, school attained bilingualism is admired (Hakuta, 1986).

In this context it is easy to understand why bilingual education has become such a controversial and politically charged issue, subject to fierce debate in the public arena. This debate, however, must take on new contours with the ongoing growth and development of two-way bilingual immersion programs in which both language minority and language majority children become bilingual in classrooms together. This approach to bilingual education promotes additive bilingualism in which a student's first language is maintained and a second language is added, as opposed to subtractive bilingualism in which a student's first language is eventually replaced with a second (Cummins, 1982). Such programs have as their goal that all children become bilingual and biliterate, that they achieve academically at or above grade level norms, and that they develop positive cross cultural attitudes (Christian, Montone, Lindholm, and Carranza, 1997). This paper takes a focused look at each of these three components which are essential to shaping quality two-way bilingual immersion programs. Language acquisition research lies at the heart of two-way models which promote developing bilingualism through context embedded content area instruction in a second language. Exploring the academic, cognitive, and metalinguistic development of bilingual children sheds light on the reasons behind the high levels of academic achievement noted in most two-way programs. An examination of the relationship between language and culture speaks to the promotion of positive cross-cultural attitudes.

Research has indicated multiple benefits to children participating in two-way bilingual immersion programs as opposed to their non-participating monolingual peers. Examining the theoretical underpinnings of such programs can bring about a fuller understanding of the reasons behind the linguistic, metalinguistic, cognitive, academic, and cross-cultural attitudinal success experienced by so many two-way bilingual immersion students. The course of future debate in bilingual education would be well served by a focused discussion of the benefits of bilingualism for all children, outcomes that are part of a well planned and clearly articulated two-way bilingual immersion program agenda.

Language Acquisition

According to Hakuta (1986) "children exhibit a remarkable ability to acquire a second language spontaneously in the absence of explicit instruction" (p. 232). Andersson (1977) repeats Montessori's assertion that "children can learn as many languages as are spoken natively in their environment" (p. 42). Evidence cited by Hakuta (1986) appears to substantiate this claim with his description of life in a multilingual community in the northwest Amazon.

There is less agreement over the optimal age to learn a second language. Research, although indicating that "the capacity for native-like proficiency diminishes with age" (Lindholm, 1992, p. 18), points to evidence cited by Cummins (1981) that "before puberty, it does not matter when one begins exposure to (or instruction in) a second language, as long as cognitive development in the first language continues up through age twelve, (the age by which first language is largely completed)" (Collier, 1989, p. 511). Children between the ages of eight and twelve are, in fact, said to have the edge over younger learners (ages four through seven) due to their more advanced cognitive structures (Collier, 1989). Yet two crucial factors could possibly counteract this advantage: learner motivation and a school learning environment more likely to promote active, communicative involvement (Reyes, 1998).

Collier (1989) notes "that the age question cannot be separated from another key variable in second language acquisition: cognitive development and proficiency in the first language" (p. 510). Collier also notes that Cummins and Swain (1986) indicate that as children "move from one grade level to the next…language becomes the focus of every con-

tent-area task, with all meaning and all demonstration of knowledge expressed through the oral and written forms of language…language in school becomes increasingly complex and less connected to contextual clues…"(p. 512). Thus, the issues of language learning and acquisition become intertwined with issues of cognition and academic achievement. A child with an earlier base in context embedded school and second language experiences such as those encountered in immersion programs may well be at an advantage in our current educational framework.

Two concepts remain central to a discussion of second language development in children. The first is the difference between simultaneous and sequential bilingualism. The second is the distinction between second language acquisition and second language learning. McLaughlin, Blanchard, and Osani (1995) note that children who are introduced to a second language before the age of three "are thought to be learning the two languages simultaneously; after the age of three, they are engaged in sequential bilingualism" (p. 1). According to McLaughlin (1978) the acquisition of a second language in a natural environment without formal instruction is considered second language acquisition, " the process of formal language education where one aspect of the grammar is introduced at a time, and systematic feedback with error correction is provided" is considered second language learning (Diaz, 1983, p. 29).

Sequential bilinguals involved in two-way immersion programs are engaged in learning their second language. However, the method for their learning has been through immersion in a target language environment. Although scattered occasions of more formalized language instruction could probably be uncovered in their formal schooling, the vast majority of their time in school has been spent in natural situations, outside the reach of formal language instruction. Thus a case could be made for language acquisition. What is most reasonable, however, is that they become bilingual through a mix of both language acquisition and language learning processes. Diaz (1983) supports this position when he notes that "there is some scattered evidence that certain features of language acquisition might ease the process of formal second-language learning" (p. 29).

Hakuta (1986) notes that some of the variables that may determine how rapidly children acquire a second language are personality, social factors, and individual difference in verbal ability. Saville-Troike (1973) cites attitudinal factors and motivation as playing a major role in child second language learning. However, insufficient information exists for the creation of viable theories in at least two of these areas: motivation and personality (Van Groenou, 1993). Yet, all children are unique, and their life circumstances, though mediated by home, school, and society, are their own. Likewise, their roads to bilingualism are their own. The important issue here is that they are provided with an environment conducive to developing bilingualism.

Academic, Cognitive, and Metalinguistic Development

During the first half of the century research on bilingualism focused on whether or not it had a negative effect on intelligence and was based on studies of immigrant populations in the United States. More recently research has focused on the positive aspects of bilingualism and has been based on middle class populations in Canada and Europe. Of course each group of researchers had a different motivation for their studies, used different methodologies, and came to different conclusions based on different interpretations of their data. For example, in the early 1900s such research in the United States was associated with anti-immigrant sentiments and the desire to restrict immigration (Hakuta, 1986).

Systematic studies on the relationship between bilingualism and intelligence began in the 1920s (Diaz, 1983) and found detrimental effects on children's cognitive, social, and emotional growth (Hakuta, 1986), and speech and language development (Van Groenou, 1993). These studies, however, have been criticized for serious methodological flaws, such as failing to control for the crucial variables of degree of bilinguality and socio-economic status (Diaz, 1983). Despite their predominance in the ideology of the time, Leopold's (1939-1949) work contradicted their conclusions and Vygotsky's early work noted the positive effects of bilingualism (Tunmer and Myhill, 1984). However, it was not until Peal and Lambert's 1962 study challenged claims of a negative correlation between bilingualism and intelligence and instead illustrated cognitive gains for bilingual children that the tide in research on childhood bilingualism began to turn.

Peal and Lambert's (1962) study may itself have been flawed in that "correlation does not imply causation" (Hakuta, 1986, p. 39); that is, we cannot know if balanced bilingual children scored higher on academic measures because they were bilingual or because they were more intelligent. We also cannot account for the motivation factor in terms of parental placement of children in bilingual programs. Yet, the challenge posed by Peal and Lambert set the stage for a new era in research in bilingualism in children.

Since that time research has indicated that there is no significant evidence of adverse effects on the speech and language development of bilingual children. Furthermore, benefits of bilinguals are said to include enhanced cognitive skills, superior developmental patterns, ability to employ necessary cognitive and social strategies, use of situational clues to understand what is happening, enhanced abilities in divergent thinking, ability to think flexibly and abstractly about language, the enjoyment of linguistic possibilities, the early emergence of the idea that there is more than one way of saying the same thing, and the transfer of skills and knowledge from one language to the other (Van Groenou, 1993).

This latter idea is crucial to understand, for it is one of two concepts that remain fundamental to theories suggest-

ing the advantages of bilingualism, theories stressing the relationship between language and thought, and based on second language acquisition research that "has found that (the) process of L1 (first language) development has a significant influence on the development of L2 (second language) proficiency" (Collier, 1989, p. 510). According to Cummins' (1978) interdependence hypothesis, development of the learner's L1 will have a direct impact on future acquisition of the learner's L2 and will further make possible the transfer of knowledge across the learner's two languages. This is possible, he theorizes, because of a common underlying proficiency existing beneath both languages. However, Cummins' hypothesis has been challenged by Hakuta (1986) who likens it to the view that there is a correlation between bilingualism and intelligence, an argument that has been used in the past to the detriment of bilingual children; he notes that this hypothesis has also been "criticized by Troike (1981) for failing to consider sociolinguistic circumstances and by Edelsky (1983) for adopting a test-based definition of language proficiency and literacy" (p. 94).

The second concept tied into the conditions necessary for the academic, cognitive, and metalinguistic advantages of bilingualism to accrue is based on Cummins' (1987) threshold hypothesis. It is theorized that a learner needs to attain a high level of native language proficiency in order to achieve a high level of proficiency in a second language, and that the attainment of high levels of bilingual language proficiency in turn pave that way for high levels of academic and cognitive benefits. It is important that both conversational (communicative) and academic language skills be developed in order for such benefits to accrue (Lindholm, 1992).

Whatever the reasons, and in spite of the limitations, evidence supporting the hypothesis that children who are learning two languages often demonstrate academic, cognitive, and metalinguistic gains in excess of their monolingual peers is both massive and impressive. As noted previously, this mounting pool of evidence is relatively recent in contrast to the antiquated and often flawed research of the past. Some examples from the comparatively contemporary literature base supporting such claims follow in abbreviated form.

Data supporting higher academic achievement in English language arts for immersion students, as measured by test score results, was indicated in data from a 1991 evaluation of Fairfax County's partial immersion program (Checkley, 1996). Goncz and Kodzopeljic (1991) found that children with bilingual preschool experiences were more successful than their peers in monolingual programs in terms of early reading achievement. They theorized that the development of some early reading functions (such as an analytical orientation toward language phenomena) are stimulated by early second language experiences. Tunmer and Myhill (1984), based on their review of recent research, suggest that bilingualism can positively effect academic achievement. Time and time again, immersion students have done as well as or better than their non-immersion peers on standardized measures of academic achievement (Lambert, 1990).

Based on the case studies of four children in his school, Van Groenou (1993) noted that "bilingualism and cognitive growth interact favorably when there is mutual appreciation in the cultural domains—regardless of the child's age and stage of development" (p. 34). Hakuta (1986) notes that advanced bilingualism has been found to have a positive correlation with cognitive flexibility and divergent thinking. Ricciardelli (1989) uncovered evidence of heightened verbal and non-verbal abilities and creative thinking in proficient bilingual children and found that fluent bilingualism enhanced children's cognitive growth. Although Ben-Zeev (1977) found lower vocabulary levels in bilingual children she also found that they exhibited more advanced processing of verbal material as well as more advanced perceptual abilities. Diaz (1983) found that balanced bilingual children outperformed monolingual children on measures of concept formation, field independence, and divergent thinking skills. In her review of two-way bilingual immersion programs, Lindholm (1992) concludes that "bilingual development may facilitate cognitive functioning" (p. 206). Along similar lines, Tunmer and Myhill (1984) noted a positive correlation between bilingualism and cognitive growth based on their review of the literature.

Metalinguistic development has been defined by Goncz and Kodzopeljic (1991) as "The development of an awareness of linguistic operations and the development of the ability to analyze linguistic phenomena in an objective fashion" (p. 138). Cummins (1993) notes that "…the trends suggesting some bilingual superiority in aspects of metalinguistic development are so overwhelming in studies carried out during the past 20 years that the research findings collectively are persuasive to many researchers" (p. 57).

Galambos and Goldin-Meadow (1990) conducted research that suggested "that the experience of learning two languages hasten the development of certain metalinguistic skills in young children but does not alter the course of that development" (p. i). Although their 1988 study involved low-income Latino children who were native Spanish speakers, the Galambos and Hakuta (1988) study is relevant to this one in that it provided support for the hypothesis that bilingual experience enhanced metalinguistic awareness. Ricciardelli (1989) found that proficient bilinguals outperformed less proficient bilinguals and monolinguals on measures of metalinguistic awareness. Diaz (1983) cites numerous studies which point to advantages for bilinguals in terms of metalinguistic ability.

Studies by Feldman and Shen (1971), Ianco-Worral (1972), and Cummins (1978) all emphasized the metalinguistic advantages of bilinguals. Central to their findings was the concept advanced by both Vygotsky and Leopold that bilingual children were able to differentiate between word sounds and meaning much earlier than their

monolingual peers. In other words, these children demonstrated a clearer understanding of the arbitrary relationship between an object and the word used to represent that object. Their understandings focused on the semantic rather than the acoustic features of words. They demonstrated a heightened awareness of the arbitrary nature of language.

When viewed collectively, the academic, cognitive, and metalinguistic gains of bilingual children as supported by the research are impressive and point to the formation of an intriguing question. Are academic achievement, cognitive functioning, and metalinguistic awareness intertwined in the bilingual learner? Although separated here for the purpose of discussion, there is some evidence to suggest a positive interaction between these three elements.

Collier's (1989) research would tend to support the hypothesis that these functions are connected. She notes that if bilingual children "continue cognitive development in both languages throughout the elementary school years, they frequently outperform monolinguals on measures of cognitive flexibility, linguistic and metalinguistic abilities, concept formation, divergent thinking skills, creativity, and diversity" (p. 511).

Tunmer and Myhill (1984) pose a similar question when they ask how the superior metacognitive/metalingustic functioning of fully fluent bilingualilsm brings about higher levels of academic performance. While noting that current research suggests positive connections between learning to read and metalinguistic abilities, as well as between high levels of bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness and between fully fluent bilingualism and academic achievement, they indicate that much work is still needed to examine the relationship between the three factors of fluent bilingualism, academic achievement, and metalinguistic awareness. They speculate that heightened metalinguistic awareness may be central to accruing increased benefits in the other mentioned areas (p. 184-185).

Gonz and Kodzopeljic (1991), as noted earlier, suggested a positive relationship between second language experience and success in early reading. They theorize that more rapidly developed metalinguistic abilities will facilitate early reading and would in turn be enhanced by successful experiences in reading, causing a circular causality aiding "in the fuller realization of the pupil's (meta) linguistic potentials. All this is capable of having a great influence on subsequent classroom learning in all decontextualized situations where linguistic symbols alone must be relied on" (p. 160).

In sum, a case can be made for a positive relationship between academic, cognitive, linguistic, and metalinguistic abilities. The active use (as opposed to passive exposure) of two different language systems causes children to compare and contrast aspects of the two languages and to put cognitive effort into separating them; thus strengthening cognitive as well as linguistic and metalinguistic ability. This, in turn, has positive effects on academic achievement, in a manner similar to that hypothesized by Goncz and Kodzopeljic (1991) in regard to the relationship between metalinguistic ability and academic achievement in reading. The circular causality is thus nearer to completion with the interrelated factors of academic achievement, cognitive skill, and linguistic and metalinguisitc ability.

Another factor that appears to contribute to cognitive development in both languages is parental effort to raise children bilingually. Social class of the parent may be irrelevant, as it has not been a significant indicator of student academic achievement in two-way bilingual programs (Collier, 1989). Fagan and Eagon (1990) discovered that the effect of the home could not be overlooked in the ability of students in French immersion programs to teach themselves to read and write in English. As did Cashion and Eagon (1990) they discovered that, without formal instruction, children in French immersion programs developed strategies to teach themselves how to successfully read and write in English.

Children involved in the Cashion and Eagon study "constantly sought meaning and monitored themselves. They were able to describe what they did when they came to an unknown word" (p. 30). Children in both the Fagan and Eagon and the Cashion and Eagon studies were immersed in an English environment outside of school. Learning to read and write in English was self-initiated and a natural, expected occurrence.

Yet, after all this, Hakuta (1986) points to the pitfalls of generalizations based upon research findings, for how well children do on tests could very well have to do with who is being tested, who is doing the testing, and what tests are being used. Variables such as socioeconomic level and literacy in the home may be strong determinants of test results. What is, perhaps, more important is the influence that success in academic, cognitive, and metalinguistic skills has on shaping children's' attitudes toward bilingualism and biculturalism, a theme that will be addressed in the next section.

Language and Culture

Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) point out that "Few of us…learn a second language as an end in itself…Mostly we learn second languages to gain access, through verbal interaction, to cultural dealings with people who lay claim to that language" (p. 161). Language is an integral aspect of culture and some studies suggest that by the age of six children have already begun to develop cultural identities (Hamers and Blanc, 1992). Although the home environment is the primary source of cultural identity in children the school can play an important secondary role. The bilingual child does not develop two separate cultural identities, however. Rather they are merged into one unique whole. The relationship between bilingualism and cultural identity is circular. Bilingualism affects cultural identity, which in

turn affects further bilingual development (Hamers and Blanc, 1992).

Lambert (1987) acknowledges this phenomenon when he points out that research supports the belief that positive attitudes towards other ethnolinguistic groups have a correspondingly positive impact on acquisition of that group's language. It seems logical that successful experiences in that language would in turn promote opportunities for cross cultural understanding and thus foster positive associations with another culture.

When the child's environment places value on both cultures and permits dual cultural or ethnic membership, such as occurs in immersion and two-way bilingual programs, the child is able to integrate elements of both cultures into one harmonious whole. As Hamers and Blanc (1992) observe, "Bilingual experience influences ethnic attitudes… A perfectly balanced bilingual can be perceived as a member of either one of his ethnolinguistic groups provided that no non-linguistic ethnic clues interfere" (p. 133–134).

Hamers and Blanc (1992) suggest that there are cultural identity characteristics of balanced bicultural bilinguals. These include positive identification with both cultural/ethnic communities, the valorization of both languages, perception of the relative status of both cultural groups as dynamic, and the perception of no apparent contradiction in dual group membership. As mentioned earlier, a strength of the two-way bilingual immersion approach lies in the integration of students from linguistic majority and minority backgrounds in the same classroom. As the Bilingual Education Office of the California State Department of Education's (1990) document on bilingual immersion education points out, Baecher and Coletti (1986) and Lindholm (1987) report that such programs are "expected to improve intergroup attitudes, and attitudes toward the target language and culture, of both language minority and language majority children" and that one expected outcome of their two-way programming is "enhanced psychosocial development and cross-cultural skills and attitudes" (p. 9).

Research indicates that there are positive long-term attitudinal effects from the two-way bilingual approach (Collier, 1989) and that the earlier children begin in such programs, the greater are their gains in attitudinal measures (Genesee, 1987). This theme is echoed repeatedly in the literature describing the effects of two-way immersion bilingual programs on developing positive cross cultural attitudes. Lambert (1987) found that more positive cross cultural attitudes developed in children educated in immersion programs from early on than in children who had not participated in such programs. Genesee, Tucker, and Lambert (1975), also studying language majority children learning a minority target language, found support for their hypothesis that "children educated in a nonnative language would be more sensitive to the communication needs of listeners than children educated in their native language" and that "a total immersion experience would have a greater impact on the development of social sensitivity than would partial immersion" (p. 1013). Studies by Lambert and Tucker (1972) and Swain and Lapkin (1982) report that children in bilingual programs are able to identify positively with both cultures.

Lambert (1990) examined " the effects of developing high-level skills in another group's language on students' attitudes and social perspectives" (p. 200). Research conducted on elementary and high school students in French immersion programs in Quebec found that "the immersion experience broadened pupils' 'social perspectives' more than conventional education did in the sense that immersion students asked more searching questions of society" (p. 218). Furthermore, immersion students stressed the necessity for learning not only the other language, but the culture of the group associated with that language. Thus a strong connection is seen between language and culture. It is important to point out that this occurred without any negative impact on the immersion students' feelings about their own ethnic group. Lambert notes that the main conclusion drawn from the study was that early bilingual and bicultural experiences produced not only bilingualism but "changes in the realm of attitudes and ideas about intergroup coexistence" (p. 216).

Immersion educators have promoted the development of positive cross cultural attitudes with positive results. These findings are not accidental but the fruition of carefully planned and implemented programs with, among other components, specific agenda items related to the promotion of positive cross cultural attitudes. The social context for learning is a crucial factor in such a model. Both languages and cultures represented need to be viewed with equal value and children from all backgrounds need to be respected and well treated as well as integrated in the same classrooms (Lindholm, 1992) within the context of an overall school climate that respects and places value on bilingualism and biculturalism. In programs where children from the target language group are not represented or represented only poorly, respect and value for the target language and culture are equally crucial.

Returning to the model of circular causality proposed by Goncz and Kodzopeljic (1991) and expanded to include the interrelated components of academic achievement, cognitive skill, and linguistic and metalinguistic ability, this same school climate factor emerges. When these components connect within the context of an overall school environment supportive of bilingualism and biculturalism, positive cross cultural attitudes can result. Cross cultural respect, as well as a motivating and stimulating learning climate, can lead to positive student interpretations of a bilingual/bicultural environment and thus healthier cross cultural attitudes. Herein lies a possible connection between academic and cognitive gains and cross cultural attitude. When students experience both social and academic success within a bilingual/bicultural environment, positive attitudes towards bilingualism have a firm foundation in which to grow. Goncz and Kodzolpeljic's circular causality is thus rounded out and completed.

Two-Way Bilingual Immersion: Blending Theory and Pedagogy

As noted earlier, two-way bilingual education is grounded in language acquisition research. Of fundamental importance is the belief that language learning can occur in non-language arts subjects. Content, therefore, need be covered in only the target language. As in first language learning, the learner progresses at her/his own rate through the curriculum. Other beliefs organizing the curriculum include keeping the two languages distinct during instruction, adjusting the language input to the level of the child, utilizing the child's special language capabilities, and ensuring concentrated exposure to the target language (Lindholm, 1992). Immersion, notes Cummins (1982) attempts to replicate with the target language the manner by which children acquire their first language.

Morgan (1982) notes that the immersion environment is stimulating and activity based, and stresses experience, interaction, and dialogue. Immersion models necessitate extended time to facilitate maximum cognitive, academic, and linguistic advantages. For this reason many programs begin in the preschool years and extend through the eighth grade. As previously indicated, immersion programs aspire to high levels of language proficiency in both languages, academic achievement at or above grade level, and enhanced psychosocial development and cross cultural attitudes (Bilingual Education Office, California State Department of Education, 1990).

Two-way bilingual immersion education places linguistic minority and majority children in the same classroom, in an environment in which the language and culture of both groups are valued and respected. Cummins (1982) notes that, given student motivation and adequate exposure, the transfer of academic skills for both language minority and majority children is from the minority to the majority language.

Two-way bilingual immersion programs can be successful for both language minority and majority children for a host of reasons. Speakers of the target language growing up in an English dominant society may not have had their native language skills sufficiently developed. In a two way program these skills can be strengthened and then used as a bridge to the second language. With a firm linguistic base in their first language these children can more efficiently and successfully acquire English. Because speakers of the target language usually become orally proficient in English by the time any instruction in that language occurs, instructional lags are not significant.

For language majority children the context embedded environment of the two-way bilingual classroom, particularly in the early years, provides for successful experiences in the second language. The comprehension skills of these children develops rapidly in this natural language environment, thus permitting assimilation of educational information from the start. Yet, the influence of the dominant society facilitates the continuing development of their linguistic ability in English.

Not to be overlooked is the importance of daily interaction between speakers of the minority and majority languages. Children have the opportunity to develop both their native language and metalinguistic skills through teaching their native language to others. At the same time they are able to develop their second language skills by learning from their peers. In this manner everyone in the classroom becomes both a teacher and a learner, a powerful and motivational force in the educational process.

Saville-Troike (1973) recognizes the important function of motivation in second language learning. She states that "Every child learns a great deal of his language from his peer group, and one of his strongest motivations for learning language is his desire to communicate with them…Children from diverse language backgrounds will readily learn to communicate with one another when they have both need and opportunity to do so" (p. 31).

In her review of current two-way bilingual programs, Christian (1996) notes that school staff have pointed to specific elements that they feel have contributed to the success of their programs. Similar to the factors previously mentioned, these educators have praised the integration of children from varying linguistic and ethnic backgrounds, the corresponding respect for others and for bilingualism, the attention given to developing student self esteem, as well as high levels of parental involvement and the focus on academic excellence.

In the preschool and early primary years, immersion programs may utilize anywhere from 80% to 100% of the instructional time in the target language. As students progress through the grades, instructional time in the majority language generally increases, often until a ratio of 50/50 is reached in the middle or upper grades (Bilingual Education Office, California State Department of Education, 1990).

Research on two-way bilingual immersion programs has been promising, with students showing linguistic, academic, and attitudinal gains. Beginning with the St. Lambert Experiment in Quebec and continuing to the present, the evidence supporting such programs rolls in.

The St. Lambert Experiment, labeled a "classic" by Swain in 1976 (Andersson, 1978) was initiated in Quebec by English dominant parents who wanted to offer their children the possibility of becoming French/English bilinguals in a linguistic environment more natural and effective than that provided by traditional foreign language instruction. The English dominant children enrolled in the ensuing program developed native-like literacy and linguistic abilities in French with no loss to their native language development. They experienced kindergarten and first grade instruction completely in French and only one hour of instruction in English through grade four (Andersson, 1978).

Since that historic experiment, evaluation of immersion programs has been overwhelmingly positive. Although Swain and Lapkin (1981) have some reservations in regard to the quality of French grammatical structures acquired, Cummins (1982) notes that Early French Immersion programs have consistently produced high levels of French language proficiency without a corresponding academic loss. He further points out that this is true of almost all research findings investigating the instruction of linguistic minority and majority students through the minority language.

Collier (1989) takes this a step further when she indicates that children in early total immersion programs reach national norms in reading and math on English standardized tests once English is introduced into the curriculum and then proceed to score above national norms for the remainder of their elementary schooling. Christian (1996) sums it up when she asserts that where comparisons are possible, students in two-way immersion programs are generally doing as well or better academically than students in other programs.

Despite their high potential for success, immersion and two-way bilingual educators do encounter significant obstacles not the least of which is the English prevalent societal environment in which they exist. Christian (1996) found that English was the predominant language used by children in two-way immersion programs when they spoke among themselves. Other obstacles include a shortage of qualified teachers and of appropriate instructional materials.

Immersion programs continue to flourish, even in the face of such obstacles, and recent studies have demonstrated their potential for promoting high levels of bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic achievement. Such studies have provided a closer, more detailed glimpse into schools such as Francis Scott Key Elementary in Arlington, Virginia, River Glen Elementary in the San Jose (California) Unified School District, and Inter-American Magnet in the Chicago Public School system (Christian, Montone, Lindholn, and Carranza, 1997). They have likewise highlighted the success of immersion programs housed in elementary schools such as the Japanese immersion program in Portland Oregon where students' academic achievement proficiency test scores were consistently above state and district averages (Gilzow, 2001), and the Amigos Two-way Immersion Program in Cambridge, Massachusetts, which also has demonstrated positive cross-cultural attitudinal gains (Cazabon, Nicoladis, and Lambert, 1998).

Conclusion

Bilingualism carries with it the potential for a richer life. Unfortunately much of the current public debate does not focus on such benefits. Brisk (1998) notes that a bilingual education has been regarded as a compensatory education for linguistic minority children. She asserts that this view and corresponding educational practice must change so that a bilingual education is seen as a quality education. Perhaps changing public perception of the quality of bilingual education could help shift public perception. What could be equally significant would be a shift in public perception to view bilingualism as an asset for both language minority and language majority children

The growth of two-way bilingual immersion programs represents a hopeful trend in this direction. Currently, at least 248 immersion programs in 23 states and the District of Columbia have been documented by the Center for Applied Linguistics. Considering that the first immersion program emerged in the U.S. in 1963, that fewer than 10 new programs were documented before 1981, and that the majority of current programs have been developed in the past two decades (Howard and Sugarman, 2001), this may represent a significant development in contemporary bilingual education. Furthermore, the number of target languages represented in two-way programs is increasing. Although Spanish is the most prevalent target language utilized, two-way programs are currently in existence in Cantonese, Korean, Japanese, Navajo, Russian, and French (Christian, 2000).

Perhaps two-way bilingual immersion programs can pave the way for a more clear-sighted public vision of bilingual education. It may well be impossible for immersion programs to move bilingual education out of the political arena, for any educational movement that has as its goal the valorization of minority languages and cultures is inherently political when it exists within a nation confronted with issues of race, class, language, and culture. Yet, two-way bilingual immersion education can illuminate the notion that there are multiple stakeholders in a bilingual educational agenda and that these stakeholders can represent both minority and majority populations.

It is important here to remember that two-way bilingual programs are not only made up of middle class white and low income Latino children. Children of diverse cultural, racial, and socio-economic backgrounds, in many different combinations, can make up a school's student population. African-American children, for example, may not be linguistic minorities, but they certainly do not represent "mainstream" America. Furthermore, not all children are members of only one linguistic, racial, or cultural group. Not all middle-class children are of European-American background and many English dominant children are of Latino background. Our world is complex. We need to look to new ways of educating and socializing children to meet the challenges of an increasingly culturally complicated world. Two-way bilingual classrooms and schools are one logical place to begin.

Hakuta (1986) speaks to the importance of "convincing the public of the pedagogical value of bilingual education…" (p. 233). He asserts that this is a matter that speaks to the core of not only our educational system, but to our nation and that "the linguistic and cultural pluralism of the country depends on the success of such programs" (p. 230); programs which recognize the gifts that speakers of immigrant languages and native English speakers can give to each other.

As the number of language minority students in U.S. schools increases, the future of bilingual education in the United States promises to become even more visible in the public eye. Issues of bilingual education often promote intense public debate that is not grounded in solid research but rather in personal and professional belief systems. Yet, research that clearly spells out the benefits of bilingualism to our students exists and is being successfully implemented in classrooms throughout our nation. This information needs to be purposefully disseminated in order to contribute to an intellectual and research grounded discussion of bilingual education that promotes an additive rather than a subtractive model of bilingualism and that highlights the pedagogical and personal benefits it offers children of all racial, cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds.

References

Andersson, T. (1977). *A guide to family reading in two languages: The preschool years.* Los Angeles: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Andersson, T. (1978). Early childhood: The best time to become bilingual and biliterate. *Childhood Education, 54*(3), 155-161.

Ben-Zeev, S. The influence of bilingualism on cognitive strategy and cognitive development. *Child Development, 48*(3), 1009-1018.

Bialystok, E., and Hakuta, K. (1994). *In other words.* New York: BasicBooks.

Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1990). *Bilingual immersion education: A program for the year 2000 and beyond.* Working draft.

Cashion, M., and Eagon, R. (1990). Spontaneous reading and writing in English by students in total French immersion: Summary of final paper. *English Quarterly, 22*(1-2), 30-44.

Cazabon, M., Nicoladis, E., and Lambert, W. (1998). *Becoming bilingual in the* Amigos *Two-Way Immersion Program* (Research Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. 424 754)

Checkley, K. (1966). Making a case for foreign language study. *ASCD Curriculum, Winter,* 2-3.

Christian, D. (1996). Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *Modern Language Journal, 80*(1), 66-76.

Christian, D. (2000). Bilingualism for all: Two-way immersion education in the United States. *Theory into Practice, 39*(4), 258-266.

Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K., and Carranza, I. (1997). *Profiles in two-way immersion education.* Miller Parkway, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co.

Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(3), 509-531.

Cummins, J. (1978). Bilingualism and the development of metalinguistic awareness. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 9* (2),131-149.

Cummins, J. (1982). Through the looking glass: What really happens in an immersion classroom. *Interchange on Educational Policy, 13*(2), 40-44.

Cummins, J. (1993). Bilingualism and second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13,* 51-70.

Diaz, R. M. (1983). Thought and two languages: The impact of bilingualism on cognitive development. In E. W. Gordon (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education No. 10.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Fagan, W., and Eagon, R. L. (1990). The writing behavior in French and English of grade three French immersion children. *English Quarterly, 22*(3-4), 157-168.

Feldman, C. and Shen, M. (1971). Some language-related cognitive advantages of bilingual five-year olds. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 118,* 235-244.

Galambos, S. J., and Goldin-Meadow, S. (1990). The effects of learning two languages on levels of metalinguistic awareness. *Cognition, 34,*1-56.

Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education.* New York: Newbury House.

Genesee, F., Tucker, G., and Lambert , W. (1975). Communication skills of bilingual children. *Child Development, 46*(4),1010-1014.

Gilzow, D. (2001). Japanese immersion: a successful program in Portland, Oregon. *ERIC/CLL New Bulletin.* [online], *24*. Available: www.cal.org

Goncz, L., and Kodzopeljic, J. (1991). Exposure to two languages in the preschool period:

metalinguistic development and the acquisition of reading. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 12*(3), 137-163.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language.* New York: BasicBooks.

Hamers, J., and Blanc, M. (1992). *Bilinguality and bilingualism.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, E. R., and Sugarman, J. (2001). Two-way immersion programs: Features and statistics. *Eric Digest.* [online]. Available: www.cal.org/twi/directory

Ianco-Worral, A. D. (1972). Bilingualism and cognitive development. *Child Development, 43*(4), 1390-1400.

Lambert, W. (1987). The effects of bilingual and bicultural experiences on children's attitudes and social perspectives. In D. Aaronson, P. Homel, and M. Palij (Eds.), *Childhood bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic, cognitive, and social development.* Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Lambert, W. (1990). Persistent issues in bilingualism. In P. Allen, J. Cummins, B. Harley, and M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiencey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambert, W., and Tucker, G. (1972). *The bilingual education of children.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Leopold, W. (1939-1949). *Speech development of a bilingual child, I-IV.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Lindholm, K. (1992). Two-way bilingualism/immersion education: theory, conceptual issues, and pedagogical implications. In A. Benavides and V. Padilla (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on bilingual education.* Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press.

McLaughlin, B., Blanchard, A. G., and Osani, Y. (1995). *Assessing language development in bilingual preschool children.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Morgan, G. (1982). Yes! We should have bilingual immersion programs. *Interchange on Educational Policy, 13* (2), 44-49.

Peal, E., and Lambert, W.E. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 76*(27), 1-13.

Reyes, S. A. (1998). "!'Mami, yo toqué una mariposa!"An alternative to linguistic and cultural loss. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago.

Ricciardelli, L. (1989). *Childhood bilingualism: Metalinguistic awareness and creativity.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Adelaide, Adelaide.

Saville-Troike, M. (1981). *Bilingual children: A resource document.* Arlington, VA: The Center for Applied Linguistics.

Swain, M., and Lapkin, S. (1981). *Bilingual education in Ontario: A decade of research.* Toronto, Ontario: Toronto Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Swain, M., and Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study.* Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Tunmer, W. E., and Myhill, M. E. (1984). Metalinguistic awareness and bilingualism. In M.L. Herriman, C, Pratt, and W.E. Tunmer (Eds.), *Metalinguistic awareness in children: Theory, research, and implications.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Van Groenou, M. (1993). Interaction between bilingualism and cognitive growth. *Montessori Life, 5*(1)*, 33-35.

Telpochcalli Irma Guerra, La Escuela Preparatoria Progresiva

Narciso L. Alemán
University of Wisconsin–Whitewater

The growth of the Latino population in the United States has been confirmed by the 2000 Census (Pabst, 2001). At the same time the high dropout rate for Latino students is sounding an alarm for the Latino community, educational policy makers, and society as a whole. While school age pregnancies are declining among the general population of teenagers in the public schools, they continue to increase among Latino teenagers. In this article I examine the educational foundations for a proposed community based, bilingual/bicultural charter school designed to meet the unique needs of Latino adolescent parents, based on research and best practices, with the goal of increasing their graduation rates and their transition to post secondary education. In addition to outlining a rationale for the charter school, this paper advocates for more effective dual language instruction within a holistic, family-oriented, cultural context. Contemporary research indicates that two-way language instruction is the most effective way to develop and strengthen bilingual/bicultural students' English and academic language proficiencies (Crawford, 1995). However, as a fundamental framework for developing a bilingual/bicultural curriculum to meet the needs of Latino adolescent parents, dual language instruction must be examined in a cultural context.

The proposed two-way bilingual/bicultural charter school for adolescent Latino parents, *El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra, La Escuela Preparatoria Progresiva*, is a collaborative effort currently in the formative stages. The proposed school's mission is to increase academic achievement and graduation rates for this target population in a culturally sensitive bilingual learning environment. That is why the name of the school is so significant. The term *telpochcalli* is Nahuatl, the original language of the *Mexica* (Mexicans), and it means "youth" (*telpochtli*) and "house" (*calli*); therefore, "house of youth; where the youth are educated" (Simeon, 1999, p. 465). The term *preparatoria*, in Spanish, literally means "preparatory." In the Mexican school system, it is the equivalent of a junior high school in the United States and it prepares its students for further academic or vocational education. Here the term *preparatoria* is used in a broader sense than in the Mexican school system. Here it means education that will help young Latinos prepare to meet the duality of roles they will face in society as students and young parents. It means preparation of young people, females and males, who are defining themselves, their families, and their future.

El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra

This *telpochcalli* will honor the life of Irma Guerra who died on November 24, 2000, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, as in the refrain of a Mexican song, "far from the land where she was born." She was part of a generation of Mexican workers who traveled back and forth across this country to work in the agricultural fields of the United States to survive and to support growing families. As she traveled throughout the country, she fought for fair wages, humane living conditions, and the dignity of workers who earned their pay from sun-up to sundown. She was, in the definition of her times, the 1960s, a *Chicana*. In the midst of the civil rights struggle for *Chicanos* and *Latinos*, Irma Guerra demanded that women be treated as *compañeras* and not simply as appendages, cooks, or afterthoughts of the men. It was not an idea or a concept immediately embraced by the predominantly male leadership of the movement. She persisted and through this perseverance, Irma Guerra and *las compañeras* prevailed. Irma Guerra started her family before she finished high school. She then went on to earn undergraduate and graduate degrees in nursing, and went back for a graduate degree in anthropology. Irma Guerra knew the struggles of a Mexican woman earning a formal education while facing the inordinate number of tasks and roles expected of her.

Irma Guerra was a mother, a sister, a friend, and a teacher. She was concerned that efforts to teach the young people their history, culture, and heritage were insufficient and ineffective. She died fighting injustice at the personal, political, and institutional levels. In dying, she left a memory for all to respect and an example for all to emulate. Irma Guerra's perspective of her role in the world may be best characterized in its international application to the struggle of women everywhere:

> *Y las mujeres no hemos escatimado nada, ni la vida, ni la sangre, ni el amor. Hemos juntado toda nuestra capacidad organizativa y administrativa y hemos florecido en los más diversos grupos de sobrevivencia, de defensa de la vida, de defensa de la paz, por los derechos humanos, por el reconocimiento de quinientos años de resistencia al invasor extranjero, preservando lenguas y costumbres. Las mujeres nos juntamos para discutir y para estimarnos, para ennoblecer nuestra sexualidad, para reafirmar la dignidad de género y para empuñar el fusil necesario. (Third Continental Conference of Women, 1988, p. 3)*

[And the women, we have not scrimped on anything, neither in life, nor in blood, nor in love. We have united all our organizational and administrative capacities and we have flourished in the most diverse groups of survival, in the defense of life, in the defense of peace, for human rights, for the recognition of five hundred years of resistance against the foreign invader, preserving our languages and our customs. As women, we come together to discuss and to appreciate each other, to ennoble our sexuality, to reaffirm the dignity of our gender, and to take up the rifle when it is necessary.]

That is why this school is *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra, la Escuela Preparatoria Progresiva.*

Defining Ethnicity and Culture

For purposes of this article, the term "*Latino*" will refer to all of the groups that comprise the Mexican, Puerto Rican, Caribbean, and Central and South American populations. Latinos in the United States come from a number of ethnic/cultural backgrounds. This is important because each group of Latinos has its own experiences and reasons for living in the United States, and its own diversity with regard to ethnic/racial mixtures, countries of origin, religions, levels of education, and socioeconomics; Latinos are multi-variate and are not uniform, nor stereotypical, even within each racial/ethnic/cultural grouping (Mayden, Castro, and Annitto, 1999).

The published report of the Child Welfare League, *First Talk: A Teen Pregnancy Preventive Dialogue Among Latinos*, describes the diversity within the Latino population:

The Latino population in the United States is ethnically and racially diverse. The term Latino is often used in the research to include people of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Central and South America, Cuban, or Spanish descent. In 1997, the U.S. population was 63% Mexican American, 11% Puerto Rican, 4% Cuban, 14% Central and South American, and 7% other Latino origin. Differences among subgroups may be more dramatic than differences between other racial groups; however, the subgroups also share many similarities. Each country's immigrants and additionally, each generation of immigrants, have come from a different level of education and economic conditions, have a different level of English proficiency, have different cultural values and traditions, and have different reasons for migration, whether political, social, or economic. Patterns of relocation in the United States, whether urban to rural, southwest to northeast, may also account for some differences in subgroup's experiences with the U.S. culture. (Mayden, et al., p. 8)

Language and customs form the basis of an identified culture. The underlying framework for the proposed charter school hypothesizes the importance of understanding one's cultural identity as a contributing factor to improved academic achievement. The values and traditions of the culture are the underpinnings of the educational approach for the *telpochcalli*.

Stivalet (1996), in "a document of conceptual clarification," defined the origin and the use of the term and the concept of "culture" from a Mexican perspective:

La palabra **cultura** puede ser usada a nivel personal o a nivel social. Cuando se refiere a nivel human **personal**, se utiliza para significar el **'conjunto de conocimientos poseidos por alguien'**, es decir, el 'saber de una persona', la 'instrucción adquirida por un ser humano'. En lo referente al nivel humano **global**, <<CULTURA>> se refiere a **'conjunto de estructuras sociales, económicas, políticas y educativas caracteristicas de una sociedad que se manifiestan en la ciencia, la tecnología y las humanidades generadas por esa sociedad'**. Es en este sentido que se puede hablar de la cultura china, cultural francesa, cultura olmeca, cultura teotihucana, cultura maya, cultura nahua. [Emphasis in the original] (p. 9)

[The word "culture" can be used at the personal and at the social levels. When it refers to the personal human level, it is used to signify "the totality of the knowledge possessed by someone," that is, a "person's knowledge," the "instruction acquired by a human being." In reference to the "global" human, "culture" refers to the totality of the social, economic, political, and educational structures of a society which are manifested in the science, the technology, and the humanities created by said society. It is in this sense that one can speak of a Chinese culture, French culture, Olmec culture, Teotihuacan culture, Mayan culture, and Nahua culture.]

It is in this context that the *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra* will acknowledge the culture(s) of the students, the families, the community, and the faculty and interns participating in this educational program.

Teenage Pregnancy in a Cultural Context

Social scientists and politicians have considered the cultural values of various non-European groups as detrimental or obstructive to their assimilation into American mainstream culture (Acuña, 1988). For Latinos, one of those values is *la familia*, which emphasizes the family, children, and the traditional role of women as care givers and mothers. In 1999, the National Council of Latino Executives and the Child Welfare League of America's Florence Crittenton

Division convened two symposia in New York City to address the growing problem of teenage pregnancies among young Latinas. The conferees found that daughters who were less acculturated to United States mainstream culture were less likely to engage in premarital sex or to have multiple sexual partners and that second generation and more acculturated Mexican American daughters engaged in more sexual activity at an earlier age and with more sexual partners than those who remained closely tied to traditional familial values. It was also determined that Latinas who adhered to the traditional values of respect for self, family, and elders were less likely to engage in early premarital sexual activity or risk-taking activities (Mayden, et al., 1999).

The *First Talk* report indicates that while teenage pregnancies have been declining in the United States for most of the population, the birthrate among adolescent Latinas is twice that of White adolescents and has surpassed the birthrate among African American adolescents. The report states that young women with below average academic skills, who come from families with incomes below the poverty level, are 500% more likely to be teenage mothers than those with solid academic skills from middle class families. The report finds a strong correlation between the lack of or the limited alternatives in life for young Latinas and early pregnancies. Latinas are less likely than Whites to have birth control and contraceptive information and twice as likely as Whites to give birth. Pregnant adolescent Latinas are less likely to stay in school and more likely to be poor.

Teenage Pregnancy in a Geographic Context

Pregnant adolescent Latinas are currently dropping out of the Milwaukee Public Schools at the fastest rate of any at-risk population (Harris and Mueller, 2000; Harris and Owens, 2000a, 2000b) . This trend is linked to the growth of the Latino population in Wisconsin, a population that has more than doubled in the last decade (Johnson, 2001). In Milwaukee, a school for pregnant teenage parents has existed since 1966. It was established by a committee of 40 African American women concerned with the growing number of adolescent mothers in inner-city Milwaukee. The school, Lady Pitts High School, has been open to young women of all races, colors, and ethnic origins. For a significant number of low-income school-age teenage parents, Lady Pitts has represented an alternative to the regular schooling from which many teenage parents drop out. Over the years, educators at Lady Pitts have developed an expertise in meeting the needs of pregnant teenagers. For the school year 1999-2000 they initiated several efforts to reduce the dropout rate for the school's target population (Lady Pitts High School, 1999). One of Lady Pitts' primary resources is its experienced and dedicated support staff who closely monitor students' attendance and health in a preventative effort to keep the students in school. Lady Pitts provides on-site child care services for its students so that the infants are safe, well-cared for,

and readily available to the teenage parents. It also provides a school-based health clinic that cares for the health of the expectant mothers as well as the infants after delivery. The curriculum design allows for accelerated academic programming so that teenage parents do not fall behind on their scheduled graduation dates. The school calendar permits late enrollments and still provides students the opportunity to earn academic units toward fulfilling their graduation requirements. Whenever students are absent for extended periods of time due to health care needs, specialized child care needs, or crises situations, they are permitted to take time off from their schooling to attend to their pressing needs and return to the school afterwards to continue with the learning modules they had been working on before their extended leave.

One problem for pregnant adolescent Latinas is that Lady Pitts High School is located on the city's north side, and most Latinos live in the city's south-side neighborhoods. Given the history of segregation in Milwaukee, populations do not readily mix in housing or in school attendance. While Lady Pitts lists an enrollment of 23 students from South Division, 32 from Pulaski, and 15 from Hamilton (all southside high schools) over the last three years, the Wisconsin School Performance Reports for Lady Pitts High School indicate a gross under representation of the Latino population; according to the reports, only two Latinas attended Lady Pitts in the 1997-1998 school year and none in 2000-2001 (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1998, 2000).

Of the fourteen Milwaukee public high schools, the three with the highest enrollment of Latino students are South Division (66%), Pulaski (37%), and Hamilton (17%) (Harris and Mueller, 2000; Harris and Owens, 2000a, 2000b). All three schools rank in the top ten of fourteen high schools in Milwaukee in terms of the frequency of student parenthood. South Division ranked third highest in student parenthood (7.4%), Pulaski ranked eighth highest (3%), and Hamilton (2%) ranked ninth. Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) data also indicate that the overwhelming number of school age parents identified were female, with only a small number of the young men stepping forward to admit parenthood. MPS does not collect the racial and ethnic data concerning these parents, though the data collected suggest that the majority of the student parents in these schools are Latinos, e.g., South Division, the school with the highest Latino population is also the school with the highest number of student pregnancies and the second highest number of student parents who drop out of school (14.4% as opposed to 9.4% for Pulaski and 17.9% for Hamilton) . One final point needs to be emphasized: the majority of the reported pregnancies in these data are to first-time parents enrolled in the ninth and tenth grades. Clearly, effective intervention to enhance the possibilities of their finishing high school and preventing repeat pregnancies while they remain in school is critically important.

The Community Partnership

The success of this venture is dependent on the partnership between the school, the families, and support service agencies that reinforce the cultural identity of the students. The proposal for the *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra, La Escuela Preparatoria Progresiva* was made by SER-Jobs for Progress, Inc., a private, nonprofit, social service agency which has served the Latino community on the south side of Milwaukee for the past 29 years. By the time SER had established itself in Milwaukee, the number of industrial jobs was beginning to wane as multi-national corporations began to seek lower-wage labor pools in other parts of the United States and overseas. SER has served three generations of newly-arrived and second- and third- generation Latinos seeking orientation, preparation, and training for entry-level jobs in the service and technological fields in Milwaukee. SER has served as a nurturing and training crèche for production-line workers and for Latinos on their path to professional work experience. Many of SER's alumnae have achieved success in the labor market, the labor unions, entrepreneurial ventures, and professional careers. SER has collaborated on, supported, sponsored, and initiated many spin-off agencies, organizations, and projects which have taken on lives of their own. SER's current executive director originated in the migrant labor experience and acquired his social service expertise in each of the different jobs at SER over the past twenty-four years. Its track record and familiarity provide SER the credibility and the stature to propose this *telpochcalli* for pregnant adolescent Latinas, their families, and the young fathers involved in relationships with the young women and their families.

El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra is a collaborative effort between the Latino community; SER, a social service agency; MPS, the largest school district in Wisconsin; and three postsecondary institutions: Milwaukee Area Technical College, the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. The unique partnership that is creating the *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra* is providing a new context for the discussion of the importance of bilingual/bicultural education. First, the two-way bilingual component of the curriculum is parent-to-student; however, while other two-way bilingual schools exist within the Milwaukee school system, the *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra* will be Milwaukee's first intergenerational dual language program. Second, the students' potential for academic success is directly linked to their cultural identification and self-esteem, defined in part by academic achievement. Their cultural identification and self-esteem can be increased through dual language instruction in a bicultural context. Instruction that supports cultural values and reinforces academic success can lead to improved chances for graduation; improved graduation rates should correlate with increased potential for college or technical training, and reduced levels of poverty. In addition to aiming for increased graduation rates, a second-

ary goal will be the reduction of repeat adolescent pregnancies for this student population.

Bilingual/Bicultural Education
at *El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra*

The academic foundation for the *telpochcalli* is based on research supporting successful dual language instruction within a cultural context, bilingual/bicultural education, teenage parent programs, and charter schools. The general mission of the *telpochcalli* will be to address the needs of young Latinos and Latinas who are involved in relationships that have resulted in pregnancies and subsequent parenthood and who are at risk for dropping out of high school. The specific details of the *telpochcalli*'s mission will be developed by the students, the parents, the faculty, the board of directors, and the community service agencies who will form the *telpochcalli*.

The review literature on adolescent Latino parents, as illustrated by the *First Talk* report, along with data from the experiences of other schools for pregnant teenagers, such as Lady Pitts, illustrates the need for intervention strategies that combine cultural sensitivity, academic skill building, and a focus on *la familia* (Mayden, et al., 1999). To be effective, a curriculum that is bilingual and bicultural must also be concerned with academic success, school readiness, and family involvement in the educational procedures adopted. The student population in need of remedial academic skills development must be identified and targeted for special attention; the literacy levels of their parents must also be taken into account so that the parents' academic skills are developed in tandem with those of the students. Thus, families can be drawn into the educational process as a nurturing force to encourage and support the teenage parents. Life skills, health, and nutritional care for the young parent and the developing fetus should be included when developing holistic programs; likewise, the intensity of need should be gauged for each student and her family.

Fundamental to the discussion of curriculum development is the consideration of achievement variables, i.e., the importance of improving the self-esteem of the young people by improving their academic experiences. The research that produced the *First Talk* report indicated that these success factors cannot be examined outside of a cultural context, i.e., separate from a discussion of the sociocultural factors that lead to increased levels of pregnancy among adolescent Latinas (Mayden, et al., 1999). This research indicates that close identification with traditional familial values among Latinos delays sexual experimentation by young people, while assimilation into the mainstream society, combined with a lack of firm grounding in cultural identity and values, increases the frequency of early sexual experimentation, pregnancy, and academic failure. Thus, the curriculum for the *telpochcalli* will incorporate research on the communicative and cognitive styles of bilingual/bicultural students

and address questions and issues that pertain to the bilingual/bicultural students' note of their environment, the symbols they prefer to use in solving problems, and whether they listen or read when seeking information (Nieto, 2000; Simoes, 1976; Timm, 1999). Additional questions and issues concern the level of comfort and the academic proficiency that the bilingual/bicultural students feel with their native language. It is also important to consider the level and extent of interaction that the bilingual/bicultural students seek or need with peers, how they make decisions, and the influence of family members in terms of opinions, judgments, and behavior (Nieto, 2000). In addressing the communicative and cognitive styles of the students, the curriculum becomes truly culturally sensitive.

The Argument for Dual Language Instruction

Contemporary research indicates that two-way language instruction is the most effective way to develop, encourage, and strengthen bilingual/bicultural students academically (Crawford, 1995). Thus, two-way language instruction for the target population of adolescent Latino parents should lead to increased self-esteem and increased success in academic endeavors. As a foundation for the *telpochcalli,* two-way language instruction will be examined in the context of family literacy development and cultural identification.

Best practice in two-way language instruction necessitates a long-term commitment to the development of the students' academic language proficiency. Bilingual proficiency is achieved in educational programs that last four to seven years (Cummins, 1993; Nieto, 2000). In *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra* this will be a crucial factor because the students' families are included in the educational program. The learning environment must be an additive bilingual one; students perform better in circumstances that strengthen their native language and transfer concepts, vocabulary, relationships, and meaning to a second language and this enhances self-esteem and respect for other languages and cultures (Cummins, 1993). An important factor in the learning environment is the empowerment that results when genuine dialog among teachers, counselors, learners, and their families concerning learning objectives and their attainment reinforces the validity of the first language and culture and places it in the context of the second language and culture (Nieto, 2000).

Lindholm (1992) indicates the central role that high quality teachers play in reaching the high standards of two-way language learning. Teachers must be academically competent and proficient in the languages taught to optimize learning moments in and out of the classroom. Second language instruction should be comprehensible in language arts and academic subject matter, presented at the students' and the parents' functional levels, and still be sufficiently challenging to hold their attention and stimulate their efforts to learn. Languages are learned best through context imbedded instruction, that is, through the use and application of terms, meanings, and concepts related to the learners' everyday world rather than through decontextualized grammar exercises (Lindholm, 1992). Best practice indicates that strong fundamental skills in different languages are developed through extended periods of monolingual instruction. At *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra*, for example, it could be possible to provide instruction in English during the day classes and instruction in Spanish during the evenings and weekends, when the parents will be joining the students. Most of the teenage parents will be monolingual in English and most of their parents will be monolingual in Spanish. This balance of language groups will permit each of the primary language groups to develop cognitive academic proficiency in subject matter in both languages. Since practice is the best way for minority-language and majority-language students to become proficient in a second language, English-speaking teenagers will practice Spanish with their parents and Spanish-speaking parents will practice English with their children in the process of learning academic subject matter, concepts, vocabulary, relationships, and issues important to each of them. Each group will be encouraged to develop academic proficiency in both languages, thus avoiding stagnation of either language for either group.

These practices at *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra* will convey the importance of the educational process to the students and their parents who are engaged in mutual development and concern for the next generation. These procedures will also enhance the value of native language and culture and reinforce high academic expectations. Students and parents will be able to gauge the degree of administrative support for the program and its educational environment by the resources allocated to the *Telpochcalli* and the efforts expended to seek additional resources for its students, staff, and community.

Given the bicultural context for the *telpochcalli*'s development, and the importance of home-school collaboration in the reinforcement of cultural values, the design of the *Telpochcalli Irma Guerra* calls for the inclusion of the families of the students as a requirement for acceptance and continuation in the *telpochcalli*. To support the long-term commitment necessary to increase student achievement, students will set goals and develop individual educational plans (IEPs). Classroom instruction will be scheduled to meet the family needs of the students, with some of the classes scheduled during the day and some scheduled in the evenings and on weekends. The objective will be to make it possible for working parents to attend classes with their children. Additionally, the *telpochcalli* will enroll any student who meets the qualifications and wishes to attend. Many of these students may be monolingual in English and the conjunction of English monolingual Latinas, as well as the large number of Spanish monolingual parents, will enable the two-way language instruction at the *telpochcalli*.

Conclusion

El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra presents a unique opportunity to learn, educate, and work with a segment of young people who are coming of age while struggling with difficult relationships and in situations in which they are forced to make monumental decisions about themselves and their future. Their teaching, learning, and growing will take place with their families, teachers, and counselors, in the context of support systems that encourage them to value themselves and their future and therefore their education. Each of these stakeholders will have an opportunity to participate in the evaluation and assessment of the process, the school, its personnel, and its mission. Furthermore, the *telpochcalli*'s unique intergenerational dual language approach will provide important opportunities for the research community. It is no longer enough to fulfill the minimal requirements of institutionalized systems.

El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra, La Escuela Preparatoria Progresiva will provide a high quality, supportive, and successful educational experience for the target population and their families. The *telpochcalli* will operate in the context of the community of people, the agencies, and institutions that make up the southside community of Milwaukee.

Irma Guerra, herself, stated:

Y con la legitimidad que otorgan las convicciones logradas en la práctica llamamos, por lo tanto, a nuestras hermanas del Caribe y de America Latina a seguir creando fuerza, a seguir desplegando voluntad, a reafirmar nuestras organizaciones con un trabajo cada vez más riguroso, a seguir pensando, discutiendo, estimándonos. (Third Continental Conference of Women, 1988, p. 4)

[And with the legitimacy granted by convictions learned through practice we call, therefore, our sisters of the Caribbean and Latin America to continue strengthening, continue displaying will, to reaffirm our organizations with work each time more rigorous, to continue thinking, discussing, and appreciating ourselves.]

That is *El Telpochcalli Irma Guerra,* La Escuela Preparatoria Progresiva. *Mexica tiuhui*. People. Together. Moving forward.

References

Acuña, R. (1988). *Occupied America: A history of Chicanos* (3rd Ed.). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Crawford, J. (1995), *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

Cumins, J. (1993). Bilingualism and second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 51-70.

Harris, S. L., and Mueller, G. (2000). Report of status of school age parents: Hamilton High School, District School Age Parent Program, Milwaukee Public Schools.

Harris, S. L., and Owens, J. (2000a). Report of status of school age parents: Pulaski High School, District School Age Parent Program, Milwaukee Public Schools.

Harris, S. L., and Owens, J. (2000b). Report of status of school age parents: South Division High School, District School Age Parent Program, Milwaukee Public Schools.

Johnson, M. (2001, May 10). Mexican growth in state spurs overall Hispanic increase. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel,* B3.

Lady Pitts High School. (1999). Lady Pitts high school annual report. Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Public Schools.

Lindholm, K. (1992). Two-way bilingualism/immersion education: Theory, conceptual issues, and pedagogical implications. In A. Benavides and V. Padilla (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on bilingual education*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press.

Mayden, B., Castro, W., and Annitto, M. (1999). *First talk: A teen pregnancy prevention dialogue among Latinos*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Pabst, G. (2001, July 16). Census data show the impact for Latinos. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, A6.

Simeon, R. (1999). *Diccionario de la Lengua Nahuatl o Mexicana* [Dictionary of the Nahuatl or Mexican Language], Siglo Veintiuno, S.A., de C.V.: Mexico, D.F., 465.

Simoes, J. (1976). Bilingual children and educational cognitive style analysis. In *The bilingual child: Research and analysis of existing educational themes*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Stivalet, T. (1996). Document of conceptual clarification, *The Civilization, The Culture*. Universidad Nahuatl: Ocotepec, Morelos. [Translation by N.L. Alemán]

Third Continental Conference of Women, (October 1988), Final Declaration, Habana, Cuba, 3, 4. [Translation by N.L. Alemán]

Timm, J. (1999). The relationship between culture and cognitive style: A review of the evidence and some reflections for the classroom. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 12*(2), 38-44. .

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, (1998). *Wisconsin school performance records for 1997-1998*. Madison, WI: Department of Public Instruction.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, (1998). *Wisconsin school performance records for 1999-2000*. Madison, WI: Department of Public Instruction.

Hmong Language, Culture and Learning:
A Course for Teachers

Donald F. Hones
University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh

Hmong Language, Culture, and Learning is a new required course within the English as a Second Language (ESL) and Bilingual Education minors at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. It is a course designed to familiarize teachers and others with the language, culture, and educational issues relevant to Hmong people in the United States. Areas of exploration include the nature of Hmong language, Hmong history, the traditional family and clan structure, child-rearing mores, healing practices, marriage and funeral practices, and educational beliefs and practices. Contemporary developments and adjustment issues within the Hmong communities are discussed, especially school achievements and challenges, intergenerational conflicts, youth gangs, and the need to provide high expectations and supportive educational environments for Hmong children, youth, and families.

Rationale

Supporters of America's "secret war" inside Laos, Hmong refugees began arriving in the Fox Valley area in 1975, and today their children comprise approximately 10% or more of many area schools. Previously, local districts had called for a one credit course to help teachers better understand the world of Hmong children and adolescents. In the last few years, many teachers and students have also expressed an interest in learning basic Hmong language as part of such a course. To meet the need of language study as well as in-depth study of the history and culture of the Hmong, we created a 4-credit course, and offered it for the first time in the summer of 2001. Unfortunately, our university does not have a Hmong professor at present who could teach the language. Therefore, we recruited Txerthov Vang, who, besides working as a bilingual interpreter and liaison for the schools, and producing a community access television show, teaches Hmong language to Hmong children and youth in the community. Mr. Vang and I became co-teachers for the new course.

The Hmong have been a presence in area schools and communities for over 25 years, and the students in this course, most of whom were experienced classroom teachers, had some background knowledge about why the Hmong had come as refugees to the United States; the students were also aware of some of the issues facing the Hmong community in transition in this country. However, an in-depth study of the history, culture, and community issues was quite revealing for students and for myself as well. We learned, for example, that not all the Hmong inside Laos sided with Vang Pao in his support for the American CIA's "secret war" against the Vietnamese communists. As a result of a decades-old

clan rivalry among the Hmong people, some Hmong sided with the Vietnamese and the Laotian communists (Quincy, 2000).

We were also forced to try to comprehend the scale of the tragedy of the Hmong people as we listened to stories of the war from Txerthov Vang and other Hmong elders. Txerthov was recruited to fight at the age of 12 in 1969. He spent the next 10 years of his life as a soldier, serving General Vang Pao, and later, within the Chao Fa resistance. He told of working sentry duty, alone, locked inside a small bunker, having to stay awake and fight against any encroaching enemy until help arrived. He told of his escape from Laos in the late 1970s, walking for days through the trackless jungle in order to avoid army patrols and land mines; of encountering the many dead along the trail, as young and old alike finally succumbed to a lack of food and water, and sat or lay down, never to arise again. Txerthov said, "Each time I saw a dead body, I was so surprised that I had not joined them yet. . .I was still alive." After finishing his harrowing tale, he reminded us that it was a common story, and that we could hear it from any Hmong person of about his age.

Objectives and Requirements

Through classroom discussions, research, participant observations in schools and community settings, presentations, and written assignments, our goals were that students would demonstrate the following knowledge, performances, and dispositions: (a) knowledge of the historical relationship between the Hmong people and the U.S.; (b) knowledge of the Hmong journey from Laos to the United States; (c) knowledge of and respect for Hmong history, culture, and religion; (d) knowledge of and respect for the multiple challenges facing Hmong children and their families in America; (e) ability to utilize techniques that can assist teachers in providing successful learning experiences for Hmong students; and (f) ability to utilize strategies that can help educators and community leaders to assist the Hmong to become full partners in the U.S. society while preserving important aspects of their culture. In addition, through participation in language lessons, computer-assisted learning, and community-based research, we expected students to develop basic oral and written communication skills in the Hmong language and demonstrate ability to utilize Hmong-English bilingual materials and books in classroom settings.

Our students met these objectives through the following required activities: (a) conducting ethnographic research within the Hmong community and shared their results through

a paper and oral report, (b) discussing various issues of Hmong language, culture, and learning in the classroom and on a website discussion board, (c) observing and volunteering in bilingual Hmong/English classrooms and assisting teachers with curriculum materials, teaching, and assessment, and (d) analyzing the bilingual Hmong/English program at the school where they volunteered in critical discussions and in a paper. Graduate students prepared a two-week curricular unit about the Hmong based on their research.

Txerthov Vang, our Hmong language instructor, focused on teaching basic greetings, extending and accepting hospitality, listening to and giving directions, and learning vocabulary for family relationships. Our goal was that teachers would learn enough Hmong to make children, as well as parents and other relatives, feel welcome when visiting or attending classrooms. We also wished to prepare students for visits to Hmong homes. The written script taught in our class was the Hmong Roman Phonetic Alphabet (RPA), the most commonly used Hmong alphabet in the United States.

Course Themes

There were several common elements, that ran through each class meeting. We opened with a Hmong folktale, followed by a discussion (Livo and Cha, 1991); students copied down a Hmong proverb and receive an English translation of it (Heimbach, 1980); and, during the last part of class, students received approximately one hour of Hmong language instruction. The rest of each class was devoted to the study and discussion of themes in Hmong history, cultural practices, family, and educational issues (Faderman, 1998; Hamilton-Merritt, 1993; and Thao, 1999). Fourteen themes were elaborated through lectures, videos, discussions, and guest speakers, and included the origins of the Hmong people, Hmong History in China and Laos, the Hmong role in the wars in Southeast Asia (1950s-1975), Hmong resistance and exodus from Laos (1975-1989), life in refugee camps; relocation and acculturation in the United States, traditional Hmong cultural practices, extended family and clan networks, Shamanism and Christianity, and Hmong Cultural change in the United States as well as educational issues, generational issues, gender issues, and Hmong/English bilingual efforts.

An ongoing dialogue within our course involved the complex changes going on within the Hmong cultural community in the United States, and educational efforts to support Hmong children, youth, and families. The changing role of Hmong women, the generation and language gap between youth and elders, traditional practices such as shamanism and Christianity, socioeconomic concerns, and educational achievement. This dialogue began in the classroom and continued during our stay in St. Paul, where we could address questions to Hmong school personnel and community members.

St. Paul Hmong Community Visit

A special feature of the summer course was a one-week visit to St. Paul, Minnesota, the cultural heart of Hmong America. There students did participant observation at two charter schools, Hope Community Academy and the St. Paul/ACORN Dual Language Academy. Outside of these school experiences, students attended workshops and collected data on cultural, historical, political, and linguistic themes, and participated in homestays with Hmong families in the Twin Cities.

The Twin Cities of Minnesota are home to the largest enclave of Hmong refugees in the United States. In St. Paul, there is the Hmong Chamber of Commerce, the Hmong Cultural Center, the Hmong Language Association of Minnesota, the Hmong Times newspaper, and various other organizations. There are also two relatively new charter schools which primarily serve children of the Hmong community: the St. Paul/ACORN Dual Language Academy, an elementary school with an approximately 50% Hmong student population; and the Hope Community Academy, a K-3 school with approximately 90% Hmong students. Each of these charter schools arose out of the Hmong community's concern that their children receive a strong academic education, as well as classes in Hmong language and culture. Each school was in session in late June, and each welcomed a visit from our students.

During our visits to the Hope and ACORN academies, the content and structure of the Hmong language and culture classes at these schools proved interesting to observe. At Hope, the language teacher weaves the arts and storytelling into each of her Hmong lessons. After reading a story in Hmong and English, she typically has students engage in an art project related to traditional practices in Hmong culture. Around her room are many photographs and scenes of life in Laos, and she consistently seeks to remind students of the way of life of their grandparents and relatives still living in Southeast Asia. At the ACORN Academy, the Hmong instructors have developed their own curriculum, which they are extending to 8th grade, as the school will expand to include middle school next year. The Hmong curriculum is connected to the state standards; thus, for the middle school grades, students in the Hmong class will be researching the origin and life of the Hmong people in China. For students from the Fox Valley area of Wisconsin, visiting these schools was a great opportunity to see how an educational program might be better structured to serve Hmong children and youth.

During our week-long stay in St. Paul, our students spent their mornings at the Hope and ACORN Academies, with each student being placed two days in each school. In the afternoons, we would reconvene for workshops with the academies, Hmong language and culture teachers, program directors for English as a Second Language, and commu-

nity activists for women's health and teen pregnancy prevention. We also made site visits to the Hmong Lao Association, the Hmong Times Newspaper, the Center for Hmong Arts and Talent, the Hmong Language Association of Minnesota, the Hmong ABC Book Store, and the Hmong Culture Center. In the evenings, homestays with Hmong families were available, and for many of our students this family experience was the most enlightening aspect of the course.

A Pahau Hmong Language Lesson

It is a sweltering late afternoon in St. Paul, Minnesota. The thermometer, which has hovered around 100 degrees all day dips back down into the mid-90s. But as I sit with about 30 others in an unmarked storefront house in the Frogtown neighborhood, a large fan blowing listlessly at my back and a gaping hole above the door where the air conditioner was supposed to go, it somehow seems hotter than the street temperature. My students, my colleague Txerthov Vang, and I are attending a Pahau Hmong language lesson at the headquarters of the Hmong Language Association of Minnesota. Having Txerthov Vang accompany us to St. Paul opened many doors into the Hmong community, not least of which was his connection to the Pahau Hmong language. I had noticed that when he took notes, he used the Pahau script. He shared with me that he learned to read and write by learning the Pahau in Laos. By making a few phone calls, he set up our evening at the Pahau language lesson.

The teacher is a young man dressed in traditional clothing. His students, varying in age from approximately 9-15, are all Hmong. Several Hmong adults and teenagers come in and out of the house, or talk quietly in the back of the room. On the walls are pictures and photographs from Laos, including a series of photographs of notable Hmong leaders, including Touby Ly Fong and Vang Pao. In the back, near the door, is a flag of the Chao Fa movement, a spiritual as well as military threat to the communist government in Laos. In the front of the room, on either side of the blackboard, are the characters of the Pahau writing system, the system being taught in this classroom. In the upper right corner of the room, in a place of honor, is a large photograph of Shong Lue, an illiterate farmer who first taught the Pahau to other Hmong villagers in the 1960s. Some believe he invented this complex writing system, while others accept his own story, that he was taught the Pahau by two angels from heaven (Smalley, Vang, and Yang, 1990). Txerthov Vang, introduces me to one of the leaders of the Hmong Language Association of Minnesota. He is a small man with graying hair, probably in his forties or fifties, yet his eyes have a brightness I have seldom encountered. The Chao Fa flag, the Pahau lesson, the attentive students learning how to write their language, the stifling humidity inside the room, the bright eyes and calm voice of this Hmong elder? How does one separate the language lesson from the spiritual path of Shong Lue's followers, or the revolutionary aims of the Chao Fa, still fighting inside Laos? Such questions occur to my students and myself many times as we try to learn about Hmong language and culture in the heart of the Midwest.

On our last morning in St. Paul, I discovered Txerthov Vang in conversation with another Hmong elder in the lobby of our hotel. Txerthov introduced me to Chia Koua Yang, a leading disciple of Shong Lue, the first teacher of the Hmong Pahau script. Like the elder I had met at the Pahau lesson, I was impressed with the brightness of Chia Koua Yang's eyes, and the calmness of his voice, incongruous in some ways with the noisy lobby of the downtown hotel.

Response to the Course

Students shared their reflections about this course through classroom and website discussions, through reflective papers, and in final evaluative comments. Their response, generally, was very favorable. The course readings, videos, and guest lectures were valued, and Mr. Vang's contributions as a language and cultural expert were highlighted. Yet, it was the experience of St. Paul's Hmong community which caused the most comments from students. A kindergarten teacher wrote, "It was an incredible educational journey, that began in our classroom and with our reading. We then were able to take this a step further and actually learn about the Hmong culture first hand. My head is still spinning with all I learned last week." A high school English teacher wrote, "Not only did I learn about the language and culture of the Hmong, I was endowed with the knowledge of their history. . .Mr. Vang's offerings were awesome. He was an excellent addition to the class and the instruction. He made everything much easier to relate to." "Visiting the schools," wrote a fourth grade teacher, "taught me so much, not only being with the students, but the teachers, community helpers, and assistants. . .I would recommend this trip to everyone to learn first hand the background on and the Hmong focus for the future." Finally, a high school social studies teacher wrote, "The St. Paul trip did for me what a great educational experience should do: It created more issues for me to think about and inspired a desire to continue learning about the Hmong culture so that I can be an effective educator when dealing with Hmong students and their families."

The students also made several valuable recommendations for the course. These included ideas about organizing the language lessons, and teaching the language in the first hour of class when students were fresh; suggestions for the homestays, including ideas about what to bring, staying in pairs, and seeking out both progressive and traditional families; and arranging additional visits to the schools during the academic year, in order to compare the charter programs with regular public schools which serve large Hmong populations. In addition to these supportive comments and useful suggestions from students, we were able to talk to personnel at the two academies about their evaluation of

our visit. The principals and teachers of the two schools responded very favorably; they were impressed by our students, and would like to continue the relationship we have started, perhaps involving bilingual student teachers from our university at some time in the future.

Future Directions

Our Hmong Language, Culture and Learning course will be offered yearly at our university, and we hope to continue to build on the success of this first experience. With the support of Mr. Vang, we hope to develop more opportunities for student projects locally in the Fox Valley, including ethnographic work with Hmong families. In addition, we continue to build up our library of Hmong language resources, including Hmong bilingual books, and hope to encourage within the schools in our area which serve Hmong students and families. The teachers who took our summer course have developed curricular units focusing on the Hmong culture, and we need to document how these units are delivered in schools, and encourage greater dialogue about the need for such cross-cultural focuses among all teachers. Finally, students in this summer course have inspired us to make plans to offer it some day in Southeast Asia, with the possibility of visiting Hmong communities in Laos. The success of multicultural and bilingual education, however, will come through local initiatives. The Hmong have made a great journey, and are in our midst. We only need to step outside our door and welcome them to begin our own journey of linguistic and cultural discovery.

Acknowledgment

References

Faderman, L. (1998). *I begin my life all over: The Hmong and the American immigrant experience.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Hamilton-Merritt, J. (1993). *Tragic mountains: The Hmong, the Americans, and the secret wars for Laos, 1942-1992.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Heimbach, E. (1980). *White Hmong-English dictionary.* Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asian Program Productions.

Livo, N., and Cha, D. (1991). *Folk stories of the Hmong: Peoples of Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam.* Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Quincy, K. (2000). *Harvesting Pa Chay's wheat: The Hmong and America's secret war in Laos.* Spokane, WA: Eastern Washington University Press.

Smalley, W., Vang, C. K., and Yang, G. Y. (1990). *Mother of writing: The origin and development of a Hmong messianic script.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thao, P. (1999). *Mong education at the crossroads.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Combining Forces: Collaboration between Bilingual/ESL Teachers and the Regular Classroom Using an A Priori Approach

Lori Petrie
Manitowoc Public Schools
Rebecca Sukanen
Monroe Public Schools

The standards-based movement of recent years has brought about renewed interest in how to effectively teach the same academic content to English language learners (ELLs) as is taught to all other children within our schools. Title I of the Improving America's Schools Act (1994), the largest federal program serving ELLs, addresses this problem by requiring that states include ELLs in statewide academic assessments. This stipulation has proven to be much more difficult to achieve than anticipated. Nonetheless, the standards movement is encouraging bilingual education (BE) and English as a second language (ESL) teachers to move beyond language teaching and testing to content-based approaches. In addition, they must ensure that the content being taught is aligned with the standards and expectations of the mainstream classroom (August and Hakuta, 1997).

Bilingual and ESL teachers realize that they must do more than increase their students' English proficiency and their native language literacy. ELLs must not be allowed to fall behind their peers in terms of content area learning while they are gaining fluency in English. The content learning gap must be closed. Ideally, bilingual and ESL teachers working in self-contained classrooms would be able to effectively teach content area material at grade level. However, this has been more problematic for schools with small percentages of ELLs as it is seldom possible to maintain self-contained bilingual/ESL classrooms in such environments (Simich-Dudgeon and Boals, 1997).

Over the past two years, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has increased BE/ESL professional development in content area learning strategies. Acknowledging that ELLs are not blank slates, that they do come to our classrooms with experiences and knowledge that can and should be used to scaffold content area learning, this professional development has focused on schema-building approaches that enhance students' prior knowledge of topics to be covered in content area classrooms. These strategies, like those presented within the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), provide BE/ESL teachers with lesson structures and methodologies that build and activate students' knowledge before the students are exposed to content in the mainstream classroom (Chamot and O'Malley, 1994). Thus, students are better prepared for academic success.

Gonzalez (1994) refers to such schema-building teaching as "*a priori*" teaching. He suggests that BE/ESL support teachers utilize verbal and highly interactive strategies to build and activate student prior knowledge. By pre-teaching key concepts, skills, and relevant academic language, ELLs are primed for academic success as their English skills continue to grow. While Gonzalez would probably agree that inclusionary BE/ESL support within the content area classroom has advantages over pull-out programs, he maintains that with careful *a priori* alignment, pull-out can be more effective than it has been at ensuring ELLs' success in the content areas.

In this article we describe our experiences as ESL teachers attempting to employ *a priori* teaching strategies and collaborative approaches in two public elementary schools in Wisconsin.

A Priori Teaching

There are two alternatives to self-contained bilingual or ESL programs; schools may either provide support within the regular classroom or use a pull-out approach. Pull-out remains the most widely used program model for ESL in our region. However, in addition to the disadvantages of physical separation from the content area classroom, for both student and teacher, pull-out teachers simply do not have the time to communicate and collaborate with mainstream classroom teachers, making curriculum alignment difficult if not impossible. This separation has often encouraged BE/ESL teachers to create their own separate language-based curricula, or at best, provide students with the former plus some homework assistance in what often seems to be a losing battle to keep up with their peers.

Gonzalez (1994) refers to this lack of collaborative planning time as the instructional "mop up model;" in spite of the best of intentions, he says, the closest thing to curriculum alignment that many programs achieve is to mop up after regular classroom assignments are given. Often this occurs after ELLs have failed to complete assignments or pass tests in the regular classroom. Additionally, learners who are absent from the regular classroom during content area instruction in order to work on the remediation of skills

fall further behind in terms of content area learning and miss opportunities for critical thinking (Brisk,1998; Thomas and Collier, 1997).

Questions about curriculum quality and alignment can be addressed through the collaborative, *a priori* approach that Gonzalez (1994) advocates. Greater collaboration with regular classroom teachers and content-based BE/ESL instruction delivered prior to classroom discussion, is potentially beneficial within any size support program. Perhaps it is of most benefit where support time and funding is limited and therefore difficult to initiate. In any case, support teachers must be given time to collaborate closely with regular classroom teachers so that they can pre-teach key components of the grade-level curriculum.

Combining Forces:
A Third Grade Collaboration Success Story

Lori is an ESL teacher serving two elementary schools in the Manitowoc (Wisconsin) Public School District. Twelve percent of the elementary students in this district are of Hmong decent; more than four hundred of these students are enrolled in ESL programs. While many of them are able to function socially, they lack the academic language proficiency necessary for school success, a phenomenon well documented by researchers in second language acquisition (Cummins,1979; Thomas and Collier, 1998). English language learners often experience difficulty in the intermediate elementary grades, when the content and reading become more abstract. ESL programs need to shift from English skills to academic content to ensure students' success. Lori is currently providing services to forty Hmong students and three Latinos, recent arrivals from Mexico. Lori needs to collaborate with the classroom teachers closely because her time is split between two school sites.

English language learners (ELLs) attending Madison Elementary School had been clustered in an attempt to allow for more inclusive services. This system made team teaching and inclusion much more manageable. At the first staff meeting of the 2000-2001 academic year, Lori stated her intention to shift the focus in ESL from teaching language to teaching language through content. She explained that she would be using the district curriculum guide and state standards to plan her lessons and that she would pre-teach grade-level content.

Cathy, a veteran third grade teacher at Madison Elementary School, welcomed the opportunity to work closely with Lori to ensure the academic success of her ELL students through collaborative *a priori* teaching. Of the twenty-five students in Cathy's 2000-2001 third grade class, five were English language learners. Jim, and Chiang were beginners with limited vocabularies and minimal social language skills; both were reading below grade level and received Title I services. Nina and Chang Pao were nearing exit from the ESL program but benefitted from support in the content areas. Laura displayed intermediate English language profi-

ciency but lacked sufficient background experiences and knowledge to succeed in content area classrooms. This group was joined by four additional ELLs from another third grade class: Nina and Johnny were proficient at the intermediate level, Rosa had just arrived from Mexico and was struggling with basic communication, and Kia was nearing exit but lacked the confidence to participate in the regular classroom. Despite their diverse linguistic needs, all of these students benefitted from content based pre-teaching.

Lori employed a collaborative *a priori* teaching methodology within Cathy's unit about the Pilgrims in the New World. Knowing that some of her students would have difficulty with the content due to their lack of background knowledge concerning the story of the first Thanksgiving, she began by activating the students' knowledge of Native Americans and building new schema for understanding this aspect of American history.

Using the KWL strategy (What do you know? What do you want to find out? and What did you learn?) (Ogle, 1992), Lori began the unit by focusing on what her students already knew about Native Americans. She then focused on key vocabulary in context (academic language) so that students could transfer the learning to the regular classrooms. Interestingly, while her original intent was to help the ELLs recognize the Native Americans as the first people to live in the United States and understand their ongoing relationship with the white settlers who arrived later, Lori soon realized that another objective was for students to avoid stereotyping Native Americans. She began this unit several weeks before Cathy.

In one activity Lori gave each student a stick person on an otherwise blank sheet of paper. She asked the students to use the stick figure as the basis for an illustration of a Native American third grader. Nina, Kia, Chang, and Laura drew traditional feathers and leather loincloths; Jim drew a kid that looked much like himself. Lori then shared a story about a Native American school in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, that serves students who are both similar to and different from the Madison students in many ways. The students were able to recognize the stereotypical images in their drawings after learning that Native American children are a lot like them.

In another lesson Lori presented the students with a historical description of the relationship between the Native Americans and European settlers in Wisconsin. Working in pairs, one student read the passage aloud while the other created a picture timeline of the passage; thus, students were constructing their own knowledge and creating their own understanding of what happened between the Indians and the French. After the timelines were completed, and again after several days had passed, the students used them to retell the passage. Because they had internalized the passage by creating their own version of it in drawings, the students were able to retain much of this previously unfamiliar information.

As soon as Cathy began the Pilgrim unit, the benefits of this collaborative, *a priori* approach were apparent. Cathy noted that students who were only beginning to develop proficiency in English were able to answer some of her questions even before she began teaching the concepts. Cathy said that the ELLs displayed confidence in knowing things that other students had never learned before. "How many times are ELLs ahead of their peers in content studies?" she queried. Throughout the duration of the unit, Cathy kept Lori posted on the students' progress. Chang Pao, Nina, and Chang all showed significant growth in their test scores for social studies; on average, they scored above sixty percent. Lori began to feel that what she was doing was making a difference, not just in her own opinion, but in documentable ways.

Lori and Cathy continued their collaborative teaching relationship into a second social studies unit on local government. Lori began by creating a simulation of a city in the ESL classroom. First, the students chose a name for their city, and then, in an effort to help them learn more about the structure of local government, Lori presented them with a film about the job of mayor and a checklist she had created outlining the duties of the mayor. While watching the film, students checked off which duties they thought they could perform if they were mayor; students then used these checklists to determine whether or not they wanted the job. Chang, Rosa, and Jim became candidates for mayor, despite the fact that all three were at the lowest level of English language proficiency.

The next project was for each candidate to choose a campaign manager and begin working on a short campaign poster and commercial. Kia and Nina intended to run for city council after the mayoral race, so they decided to create a voting booth and ballots for this first election. During this stage in the unit, the students began to develop an understanding of the purpose of government and the importance of civic action. Even Rosa, who was struggling to communicate, had ideas of what she would do if she became mayor. She wanted to build more parks for people to enjoy and she worked closely with Laura, another Spanish speaker, to articulate her goals.

After an initial videotaping of the commercials, students used rubrics based on both content and speaking skills to evaluate each other's work. Students were able to see their mistakes easily when watching themselves on video. After many revisions the group watched the final commercials and had a mock election. Each student was given a ballot and entered the voting booth. Behind the curtain, they cast their ballots. Chang, a beginning language learner, became the new mayor.

This experience engaged not only the students, but their parents as well. Lori showed the commercials on open house night. The parents appreciated seeing their children speaking confidently in English. Chang's father, who in the past had been highly critical of the ESL program for "merely remediating his son," was very impressed with the video; he asked for a copy to keep and share with his family. Because Lori's government unit was closely aligned with the Wisconsin model academic standards for fourth grade social studies, Chang was not missing out on challenging academic learning during ESL instruction; Chang's father was able to see this.

School Wide Collaboration: Gerardo's Story

Like Lori, at the start of the 2000-2001 academic year, Rebecca began shifting her focus from language-based ESL lessons to content-based support. Rebecca knew that in her ESL classroom, in order to provide content-based instruction she would have to collaborate with her students regular classroom teachers. Gonzalez's (1994) *a priori* approach provided practical ideas for how this collaboration would take place and what her role as an ESL teacher would be.

Gerardo came to Rebecca's ESL program in February as a sixth grader. He seemed to work diligently in the mainstream classroom. He was verbal, outgoing, and liked by his classmates; however, as the curriculum became more challenging, Gerardo's work became less acceptable. More than once, he submitted several pages of incomprehensible English sentences.

Gerardo was new to the district. He had come from a Texas school where he had entered kindergarten as a non-English speaking student, but was not in a bilingual or ESL program until the latter part of second grade. As a third grader, Gerardo was gregarious and had a ready smile that helped him please teachers. He had learned some basic, social English which helped him get by. Unfortunately, as is too often the case with children like Gerardo, this helped him cover up his inability to comprehend what he read and also restricted his acquisition of basic skills and academic vocabulary. Gerardo was promoted to the fourth grade because he blended into the crowd: he was a hard worker, spoke some English, could follow directions, and was not a discipline problem. Gerardo learned to read out loud with passable pronunciation so that his teachers would be pleased, but he never understood what he was reading.

Although Gerardo had been born in Texas, he grew up in a Spanish-speaking environment. In school he learned survival English. At home there was little help with school work in English because of the parents' limited English proficiency. However, there was a reverence for education, teachers, and learning.

During the fifth grade his work had steadily deteriorated, and his grades reflected the decline. Gerardo worked harder. He wrote longer answers, did extra credit, and memorized vocabulary words, but it was not enough. Often times his work was incomprehensible.

When Gerardo came to Rebecca's class, he was enthusiastic and wanted to learn, but he was also bewildered as to why he couldn't keep up with his classmates. He and Rebecca

talked about general topics and particular subject areas he was studying. He had the book *Where the Red Fern Grows* with him. She asked him a few pertinent questions but he seemed to have no idea what the story was about. She tried a few more general questions, and again received a blank stare. His decoding skills were adequate, but he comprehended very little of what he read. He once stated, "Oh, I can read the words for the teachers, but I don't have a clue what I am reading. I try hard and I listen so that maybe I can pass a test but. . ." Gerardo was navigating the system as best he could and managing to please his classroom teachers. Unfortunately, he lacked the academic English needed to succeed.

His sixth grade teacher recognized both Gerardo's language difficulties and his coping mechanisms. She was confident that could be a capable student with appropriate support. Another teacher had initiated a referral for special education services so that he would have "somewhere to go." Fortunately, as a result of a properly implemented referral process that took into account language and culture issues, Gerardo was not classified as learning disabled. The recommendation was to continue his mainstream placement with ESL support services.

Gerardo's profile seemed tailor-made for an approach emphasizing the pre-teaching of essential academic concepts and language. Rebecca began brainstorming with other teachers in the building who taught her ESL students and formulated a plan. They began *a priori* collaboration for Gerardo but soon expanded implementation for other students receiving ESL support. Rebecca noted increased self-esteem among the ELLs and better grades. In a few cases, students actually moved up academically one grade level. Overall, the ELLs were moving forward both academically and linguistically, due not only to hard work on the part of the learners themselves, but in no small part their teachers' commitment to collaborative *a priori* teaching.

The first step Rebecca and her colleagues took was to identify specific content areas that were familiar to the students in their own native languages. Specifically, they wanted to begin in areas that were of interest to their students. The students were at a variety of stages of language acquisition from no English to beginning English readers and writers. The teachers brainstormed and identified plausible goals at various competency levels and chose three content areas that could be applicable for all the grade levels. These areas included topics from previous academic experiences and essential elements of the school's curriculum. This provided a wide enough range of subject topics within which Rebecca reinforced and built meaningful, conceptual knowledge and academic language.

Rebecca followed Gonzalez's (1994) suggestion to create practical learning experiences that stimulated learning through interactive, hands-on activities, always delivered prior to a topic's introduction in the regular classroom. She emphasized a multitude of visual and verbal cues. This en-

couraged student enthusiasm with content focused and context rich units. She worked to design and present lessons that allowed the students to succeed academically, continue growth in academic English proficiency, and develop confidence in their new language.

Besides the acquisition of necessary content and language in all four language skill areas (i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing), Rebecca's students became more inquisitive, confident, and self-motivated. Gerardo's confidence soared as his grades and understanding in the content areas improved and he noticed this same improvement among the other ELLs. One day he burst into Rebecca's class and said, "Ah-ha, the Romanian boy has now taken over the social studies class and is teaching the Americans!"

Suggestions for Successful Implementation

Those who choose to implement this approach should remember that administrative support is integral, and the responsibility to garner that support will fall on the shoulders of the BE/ESL staff. This will include educating administrators on the language learning research and principles that support this pedagogical shift. Once administrators understand the need for collaborative *a priori* teaching methodologies that ensure ELLs' continuing academic language and content area knowledge development, implementation will be more easily facilitated. Staff development is also crucial. Any shift of focus within a program needs to be clearly explained to the staff as a whole. Regular classroom teachers need to understand the barriers to content area learning for ELLs, and be willing and able to work collaboratively with support teachers to insure the students' academic success. The success of the program depends on supportive relationships between the ESL and classroom teachers.

Furthermore, the shift to collaborative *a priori* teaching should be made gradually. Choose one subject area to focus on in the beginning and slowly begin to experiment with other content areas as needed. Collaboration takes time. The structure of the teachers' day reinforces the isolation between classrooms. Depending on the culture of the building, collaboration could be threatening to teachers who are accustomed to closing their doors and "doing their own thing." Commitment to collaborative *a priori* teaching on the part of all involved it critical to its success.

Conclusion

Our experiences demonstrate the benefits of shifting from a language-based curriculum to a content-based curriculum, made possible by closer collaboration between BE/ESL support programs and regular classroom teachers. The *a priori* approach offers particular strategies for such a collaborative effort. Alignment of curriculum between the program and the regular classroom is central in this approach. When the support teacher comes to get the students, the classroom teacher knows that what is taught will directly help

them succeed in the regular classroom. This leads to fewer conflicts with scheduling. The classroom teachers appreciate that without pre-teaching their job will be harder and their ESL students will be less successful. Collaboration also counteracts teacher frustration with the frequency of pull-out instruction. Teachers are confident that when their students come back from the ESL room, they will be better prepared for success in the regular classroom. This confidence, which the students also exhibit, comes from the pre-teaching of key concepts, skills, and specific academic language.

It is obvious that ELLs benefit from this collaboration. When they receive regular pre-teaching of content concepts they have a better chance of understanding what is happening in their classrooms. Students who are normally too shy to participate due to low oral skills, are excited to enter into a discussion about a story that has already been read in ESL class. Students feel more confident because they are more apt to answer questions correctly. They are able to learn concepts before other students have even been exposed to them. This is the one time that ELLs may feel like they are ahead of their peers.

This collaborative *a priori* approach has positively affected our colleagues, our students, and their parents. *A priori* teaching directly contributes to the students' English language acquisition and to their academic success as well. *A priori* teaching has also affected our professional attitudes. We no longer feel alone as professionals. Collaboration has spread throughout our schools. We feel that we are part of a team.

As methodologies become more content-based and teachers implement collaborative frameworks throughout schools, the next step will be to provide all teachers of ELLs with a straightforward mechanism for ensuring that what they teach and how they assess academic progress is aligned with district and state standards. In Wisconsin, models for standards-based classroom assessment will drive the curriculum alignment process and provide focus for staff development over the next two to three years. In the past staff development for BE/ESL classroom teachers has been separate and different. Classroom teacher training has involved more content while BE/ESL training has been more focused on methods. This separation has reinforced the "us" versus "them" mentality that the collaborative approach seeks to break down.

Regular classroom teachers need to realize that it is their responsibility to help all students learn, ELLs included. At the same time, BE/ESL teachers need to learn the content that is taught in the regular classroom and be prepared to share that content with their students. This can only be accomplished through long-term staff development that integrates BE/ESL and regular education methodologies, and provides teachers time to combine forces.

References

August, D., and Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brisk, M. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chamot, A., and O'Malley, J. (1994). *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cummins, J. (1979) *Cognitive/Academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimal age question and some other matters.* (Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 19). Toronto: Bilingual Education Project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 334).

Gonzalez, G. (1994). A priori *teaching.* Professional development workshop conducted for Perry Township Schools, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Ogle, D. (1992). KWL in action. In E. Dishner, T. Bean, J. Readence, and D. Moore (Eds.), *Reading in the content areas: Improving classroom instruction* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

Simich-Dudgeon, C., and Boals, T. (1996). Language and education policy in the state of Indiana: Implications for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 537-555.

Thomas, W., and Collier, C. (1998). *Language minority student achievement and program effectiveness.* Washington DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. [on-line]. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu.

Mid-Western Educational Researcher

Call for Special Editors

The Mid-Western Educational Researcher is a scholarly journal that publishes research-based articles addressing a full range of educational issues. The journal also publishes literature reviews, theoretical and methodological discussions that make an original contribution to the research literature, book reviews, and feature columns. There are four issues of the journal published annually. The Summer issue is the program for the Annual Meeting.

Recently, the editorial advisory board recommended that the Autumn issue each year should be devoted to a special topic. Specifically, all articles in the Autumn issue should explore a topic of general interest in education and research, each focusing on a different aspect of the topic.

The journal is now seeking individuals interested in serving as special editors for Autumn issues for 2000–2002. In order to be considered as a special editor, please provide the following information in a 1–2 page proposal.

1) The special topic you wish to explore, and different viewpoints or perspectives which contributed articles may take. Include an explanation for why this is an important topic for the journal to explore and why it would appeal to the readership.

2) How you plan to solicit manuscripts for the issue. If you expect to invite manuscripts, from whom will the manuscripts be solicited? Do you expect to run a call for manuscripts in an issue of the journal?

3) Your background experience in authoring educational research and in editing, reviewing, and publishing journal manuscripts.

Each special issue should contain 40 typeset pages of copy, or about 6-8 manuscripts depending on length. Final manuscripts should be submitted to the editorial team in hard copy and on disk no later than July 15 of the year of publication for processing and printing.

The editorial team, in conjunction with the incoming editors, will make final decisions on the appointment of special editors. Questions regarding the journal or the roles of the special editor should be directed to the current editors.

Mary K. Bendixen-Noe (740) 366-9469
e-mail: Bendixen-Noe.1@osu.edu

Kim Metcalf (812) 855-4438
e-mail: kmetcalf@indiana.edu