Sources and Suggested Reading

This book relies in part on journalistic sources – that is, interviews, press briefings, public records, legislative hearings, oral statements at conferences, school visits, and reporting of events during and after the author’s tenure at Education Week (1985–87). Bibliographic sources, along with recommendations for further reading, are provided below. Many of the “public domain” documents listed are included on the CD-ROM companion to this book, along with numerous Internet links to copyrighted materials. For a full listing, see the Online Resource Guide.

Introduction


Chapter 1. Bilingualism, American Style

Studies by the Urban Institute are unparalleled sources of statistical information about immigrants and demographic change. Especially useful are two presentations by Michael E. Fix and Jeffrey S. Passel:

- “U.S. Immigration at the Turn of the 21st Century,” testimony before the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, Aug. 2, 2001; and


For a broad sociological overview, see Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut, Immigrant America: A Portrait, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

Naturally, the U.S. Census Bureau offers enormous amounts of raw data through its Web site. Gateway to Census 2000 is a good starting point: http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html. It also publishes numerous useful publications (many included on the companion CD to this volume). See in particular:

- Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000; and

See also the annual Yearbook of Immigration Statistics published by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.


The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey is described in two articles by Alejandro Portes and Lingxin Hao:


Stephen Krashen’s comments about today’s levels of diversity are from *Under Attack: The Case against Bilingual Education* (Culver City, Calif.: Language Education Associates, 1996).

Lucy Tse’s study of successful biliterates is reported in “*Why Don’t They Learn English?*” *Separating Fact from Fallacy in the U.S. Language Debate* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001).

The New York City exit rates for English learners come from Shelley Rappaport’s study for the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, *Beyond Bilingual Education: Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners in the New York City Public Schools* (Nov. 2002). The San Francisco study on long-term outcomes is *Performance of Redesignated Fluent-English-Proficient Students* (Feb. 1998), by J. David Ramirez.


**Chapter 2. Options for English Learners**


The study on native-language usage in bilingual programs is Paul Hopstock et al.,


Results of California’s annual Language Census since 1980–81 are available at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/.


ESL/EFL Teaching: Principles for Success (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heineman, 1998), by Yvonne S. Freeman and David E. Freeman, offers an especially helpful overview of all-English approaches.

The views of José Cárdenas on transitional and maintenance bilingual education are detailed in James Crawford, Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of “English Only” (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1992).


Chapter 3. Language Policies in the USA


For the latest information about Executive Order 13166, see the U.S. Justice Department web site: http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm.

Various historical documents in the Online Resource Guide are useful in understanding national myths that influenced American attitudes toward language:

- James Madison, The Federalist, No. 51 (1788);
- Alexis de Tocqueville, “Unlimited Power of the Majority in the United States, and Its Consequences” (from Democracy in America, 1835); and


John Hawgood describes German parents’ efforts at language maintenance in *The Tragedy of German-America* (New York: Putnam, 1940). The two works by Horace Kallen are “Democracy versus the Melting Pot,” *Nation*, Feb. 25, 1915; and *Culture and Democracy in the United States* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1924).

The critical importance of language resources in a time of terrorism is highlighted by the National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland – http://www.nflc.org/security/background.htm.


**Chapter 4. A Forgotten Legacy**


Probably the most prolific writer on language restrictionism in the United States has been Arnold H. Leibowitz. Three important works are “Language as a Means of Social Control: The United States Experience,” paper presented at the 8th World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, Aug. 1974; “English Literacy: Legal Sanction for Discrimination,” *Notre Dame Lawyer* 45, no. 7 (Fall 1969): 7–67; and *The Bilingual Education Act: A Legislative Analysis* (Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1980).

Repression of the German language during and after World War I is well documented in Carl Wittke, *German-Americans and the World War: With Special Emphasis on Ohio’s German-Language Press* (Columbus: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1936), pp. 163–79. See also Hawgood, *The Tragedy of German-America*.


Chapter 5. The Evolution of Federal Policy


Key documents from this era, included in the Online Resource Guide, include:

- *Lau v. Nichols* (Supreme Court, 1974);
- *Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools* (10th Circuit Court of Appeals, 1974); and


Congressional hearings on Title VII, its periodic reauthorizations, and related issues are a treasure trove of information about federal policy and about the condition of bilingual education over the past three decades. The more significant of these include:
Chapter 6. English Only or English Plus?


Events leading to the resignations of Chávez, Walter Cronkite, and John Tanton as officers of U.S. English are detailed in Crawford, Hold Your Tongue.


Linguists from several countries attack the notion of an official language for the United States in International Journal of the Sociology of Language 60 (1986), a special issue devoted to “The Question of an Official Language: Language Rights and the English Language Amendment.” The lead article is by David F. Marshall, with responses by Tom McArthur, Eric Maldoff, Michael Clyne, Shirley Brice Heath and Lawrence Krasner, Heinz Kloss, Kathryn A. Woolard, and James E. Alatis.


Several Congressional hearings have been held on the Official English question, including:

• Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, 104th Cong., 1st & 2nd Sess., hearings on S 356, Dec. 6, 1995, and Mar. 7, 1996.


Criticisms of Bennett’s position may be found in James J. Lyons, “Education Secretary Bennett on Bilingual Education: Mixed Up or Malicious?” NABE News 9, no. 1 (Fall 1985): 1, 14; José’ A. Cárdenas, “Education Secretary Bennett and the Big Lie,” Intercultural Development Research Association Newsletter, Oct. 1985, pp. 7–8; and “A Forked Tongue,” Miami Herald, Sept. 29, 1985, p. 2E.


Lyons’s letter on the 1988 House-Senate conference deliberations on reauthorizing Title VII is reprinted in NABE News 11, no. 6 (Apr. 1988). Relevant Congressional hearings include:


Chapter 7. The Effectiveness Debate


There are two versions of the Baker–de Kanter report. The earlier one – Keith A.


### Chapter 8. Basic Research on Language Acquisition

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages reports statistics on Americans’ limited linguistic abilities in *ACTFL Public Awareness Network Newsletter* 6, no. 3 (May 1987).


Rossell and Baker attack the so-called “facilitation hypothesis” in “The Educational Effectiveness of Bilingual Education.”

Chapter 9. Considering Program Alternatives


Keith Baker and Adriana de Kanter’s arguments for the time-on-task hypothesis can be found in *Bilingual Education*. See also Christine H. Rossell and J. Michael Ross, “The Social Science Evidence on Bilingual Education,” *Journal of Law and Education* 15 (1986) 385–418; and Rosalie Porter, *Forked Tongue*.

Philadelphia’s ESOL Plus Immersion program and the controversy surrounding it are described in Martha Woodall, “As Refugees’ Grades Sink, English Immersion Faulted,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Mar. 30, 1986, pp. 1B, 8B.

Baker and Willig’s differences over program definitions may be found in their exchange in the *Review of Educational Research*, Fall 1987.


Stephen Krashen outlines his theory of de facto bilingual education in *Under Attack*.


Rudolph Troike’s comments about late-exit programs appear in “Synthesis of Research on Bilingual Education.”


The controlled study in Dade County, Florida, is D. Kimbrough Oller and Rebecca E. Eilers, eds., *Language and Literacy in Bilingual Children* (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2002).
Chapter 10. The Case Studies Project


Implications of basic research for curriculum design are developed in California Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, *Basic Principles for the Education of Language-Minority Students: An Overview* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1983).


Chapter 11. Indian Language Education


For more perspective on these issues from the author, see James Crawford, “Endangered Native American Languages: What Is To Be Done, and Why?” and “Seven Hypotheses on Language Loss,” in *At War with Diversity*.


Steve Chesarek’s research on the influence of native language development on later
school achievement is summarized in “Cognitive Consequences of Home or School
Education in a Limited Second Language: A Case Study in the Crow Indian Bilingual
Community,” paper presented at the Language Proficiency Assessment Symposium, Airlie,

For a detailed description of the Crow Agency bilingual program (although the dis-
trict is not identified by name), see “A Well-Organized Indian Project,” in ESEA Title VII

A wealth of information about Navajo bilingual programs may be found in a special
issue of the Bilingual Research Journal 19, no. 1 (Winter 1995), including Sally Begay et al.,
“Change from the Inside Out: A Story of the Transformation in a Navajo Community
School,” pp. 121–39; Agnes and Wayne Holm, “Navajo Education: Retrospect and
Prospects,” pp. 141–67; and Daniel McLaughlin, “Strategies for Enabling Bilingual

For detailed, first-person accounts of bilingual education at Rock Point, see the
Holms’ “Rock Point, A Navajo Way to Go to School,” Annals of the American Association of
Political & Social Science 508 (1990): 170–84; and McLaughlin’s When Literacy Empowers:

Teresa L. McCarty relates the complex and compelling story of Rough Rock in
“School as Community: The Rough Rock Demonstration,” Harvard Educational Review 59,
no. 4 (Nov. 1989): 484–503. See also McCarty, A Place To Be Navajo: Rough Rock and the
Struggle for Self-Determination (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002); Galena
Sells Dick and Teresa L. McCarty, “Reclaiming Navajo: Language Renewal in an American
Indian Community School,” in Nancy H. Hornberger, ed., Indigenous Literacies in the
Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997); and John
Collier, Jr., “Survival at Rough Rock: A Historical Overview of Rough Rock Demonstra-

For an overview of Indian bilingual education policy, see McCarty, “Federal
Language Policy and American Indian Education,” Bilingual Research Journal 17, nos. 1 & 2
(Spring 1993): 13–34. See also Jon Reyhner, ed., Teaching American Indian Students (Norman:

Joshua Fishman provides a worldwide perspective on the problem of language loss
and efforts to solve it in Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of
Assistance to Threatened Languages (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 1991). See also
Fishman’s edited volume, Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited:

Details of the Pūnana Leo immersion program may be found in Larry Lindsey
Kimura, “The Hawaiian Language and Its Revitalization,” in Freda Ahenakew and Shirley
Fredeen, eds., Our Languages: Our Survival, Proceedings of the 7th Annual Native American
Languages Issues Institute (Saskatoon: Saskatchewan Indian Languages Institute, 1987). Robert
Bunge, “Language: The Psyche of a People,” appeared in the same volume. See also
William G. Demmert, Jr., “Language, Learning, and National Goals: A Native American
View,” in Center for Applied Linguistics, The National Education Goals: The Issues of Language
Chapter 12. Two-Way Bilingualism


Campbell, who helped design the Culver City Spanish immersion program in the early 1970s, outlines its history and effects in “The Immersion Approach to Foreign Language Teaching,” in California Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, *Studies on Immersion Education*, pp. 114–43. Also in that volume, Merrill Swain voices theoretical objections to teaching literacy simultaneously in two languages in “A Review of Immersion Education in Canada: Research and Evaluation Studies,” pp. 87–112.


Fred Genesee analyzes San Diego’s experiment in two-way total immersion in “Considering Two-Way Bilingual Programs,” Equity and Choice 3, no. 3 (Spring 1987): 3–7. The program’s effects on student achievement are reported in Krashen and Biber, On Course.

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary provides the most comprehensive overview of two-way programs to date in Dual Language Education (Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2001).


The evaluation of the Key School partial dual immersion program appears in Donna Christian, Christopher L. Montone, Kathryn J. Lindholm, and Isolda Carranza, Profiles in Two-Way Immersion Education (McHenry, Ill.: Delta Systems, 1997).

The Thomas-Collier data in Houston are reported in A National Study of School Effectiveness.


**Chapter 13. Disaster at the Polls**


For more on the changing face of the English-only movement, see Crawford, “Boom to Bust: Official English in the 1990s” and “The Proposition 227 Campaign: A Post Mortem,” in At War with Diversity.


Stephen Krashen’s campaign experience is detailed in “The Two Goals of Bilingual


Chapter 14. No Child Left Untested

The *Sacramento Bee* article is Janine DeFao, “Choice Looms: Fix or End Bilingual Education System,” Oct. 5, 1997.


The *ESL Standards for Pre-K–12 Students* were developed by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Alexandria, Va.: TESOL, 1997). The *English-Language Development Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* were adopted by the California State Board of Education in 1999.


Chapter 15. Advocating for English Learners

Statements on NCLB by Raul Yzaguirre and Delia Pompa were made in press releases dated Dec. 14, 2001, and Nov. 30, 2001, respectively.


For advocates of progressive causes, the best all-round guide to understanding and working with news media is Charlotte Ryan, Prime Time Activism: Media Strategies for Grassroots Organizing (Boston: South End Press, 1991).


Results of the Linguistic Minority Research Institute studies of Proposition 227 are reported in a special issue of the *Bilingual Research Journal* 24, nos. 1–2 (Winter 2000). See especially Patricia Gándara, “In the Aftermath of the Storm: English Learners in the Post-227 Era,” and Tom Stritikus and Eugene E. García, “Education of Limited English Proficient Students in California Schools: An Assessment of the Influence of Proposition 227 on Selected Teachers and Classrooms.”

Wayne Wright’s case study is reported in “The Effects of High Stakes Testing.”