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Part of the complexity and controversy surrounding the issue of bilingual education comes from the lack of consensus about its goals, philosophies, and even its definition. As a result, many different models are currently being implemented in the United States, with the only common thread being the recognition of the special educational needs of language minority students. Some of these programs have been designed as a reflection of current theories of second language acquisition, but often the decision as to what type of program is to be implemented in a community is based on political and economic factors (i.e. the type of funding a district is receiving). Behind this array of practical and educational considerations lies a collection of attitudes towards immigrants, minorities, and foreign languages which is deeply rooted in American society and linked to its political system. The nonlinguistic goals of assimilation and ethnic pluralism have been instrumental in shaping bilingual education policy, on both the national and community levels. Within a bilingual program, the opinions which individual teachers and administrators have concerning the relative importance of these goals, their attitudes towards the minority language and culture, and their own personal and educational backgrounds all play a major part in determining how the school's official policy is carried out. By examining some of the significant issues in bilingual education on a large scale, and then focusing on how theory is turned into practice in a particular school, one can see the ways in which a number of forces -- from a basic philosophical orientation to the structure of the school to the features of the surrounding community -- come together to shape the implementation of a program.
By taking into account the history of the attitudes towards language minorities in the United States, it is easier to understand how bilingual educational policy came to be in the state it is in today, and why the American public has such mixed feelings about it. In spite of relatively consistent legal tolerance for minority language groups, U.S. language policy throughout the years can basically be characterized as directed towards the assimilation of language minorities into mainstream society. In the 18th and early 19th centuries, English was only one (albeit the most prominent) of several widely-used languages of colonization. While many of the members of the politically dominant Anglo-Saxon majority had a strong sense of nationalism and felt themselves to be superior to other ethnic groups, there was no overall policy which mandated the use of English or required it as the language of the schools. Nevertheless, many members of ethnic minority groups became fluent in English and were in the process of rapid assimilation to mainstream American culture. Ferguson and Heath propose the theory that the practice of legal tolerance actually encouraged assimilation, because language minorities became caught up in the "consensual high value placed on ability to learn English" without ever having to feel the group solidarity and defensiveness which can come from having to fight for their rights to preserve their ethnicity and native language.

In the latter part of the 19th century, assimilationist sentiments became much more overt and widespread. The immigrants who were arriving in large numbers from Eastern and Southern Europe were poorer, less educated, and more obviously culturally distinct in their physical appearances and manner of dressing than earlier
arrivals had been, and as prejudices against the newcomers escalated, legislation was passed which restricted citizenship and voting rights based on lack of ability to speak English. By the early 1900s, both naturalization laws and laws requiring public school instruction in English were established in many states. This intolerance of cultural diversity became even stronger during the course of the 20th century, and ethnocentric attitudes were particularly evident during World War I and World War II, when laws concerning ethnic groups were especially restrictive. One of the harshest examples of this was the prohibition of the speaking of German "not just from many private and public schools but also from public meetings, telephone communications, and the streets" in several states during World War I.

Even when the law was not overtly discriminatory, there was very little attention given to the plight of the immigrant student who entered the public schools knowing little or no English. When the issue of bilingual education came to the forefront politically in the 1960s, it was largely as a result of the Civil Rights Movement. Minorities began to recognize that although the American tradition of legal tolerance protected their basic, personal civil rights, nothing was being done to address the inequality of educational outcome. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 represents the first official U.S. policy which recognized the academic difficulties of children whose first language is not English.

An important question to address is whether this law, and the later policies favoring bilingual education which were enacted as a result of the Lau vs. Nichols case in 1974, represent a major shift in the attitude of the American people towards a more pluralistic
acceptance of a diversity of linguistic and cultural groups, and away from the assimilationist viewpoint which prevailed for so many years. The educational goals which were embedded in the 1974 policy clearly support the ideals of an ethnically diverse, mutually accepting society. As summarized by Gonzalez, these goals of the policy were designed to assist limited-English children in the following ways:

-- To understand instruction and participate effectively in school activities through the use of their home language while English skills are being developed.

-- To "develop psychologically and socially in a climate which systematically reinforces their feelings of self-worth and the worth of their ethnolinguistic heritage."

-- To maintain the positive changes and momentum gained by the implementation of the first two goals.

The law explicitly promoted the idea of pluralism through the fourth goal, which called for programs

-- To assist native English speakers to develop greater linguistic, social, and interpersonal skills.

Yet at the same time, there was, and still is, a significant amount of public opinion which opposes this sort of pluralistically-oriented bilingual policy, which, according to Gonzalez, "raises dark xenophobic fears (Babelophobia?) in some sectors of society." The situation which has resulted is that the schools, which normally serve to stabilize and propagate the ideas and practices which are valued by the majority, are being forced to create programs which are supposed to promote linguistic and cultural diversity, principles which are not valued especially highly in the United States. This disparity between the directives of federal policy, the needs of minority communities, and the values which are embedded in the popularly-supported educational system has played a very large part in causing such a
wide range of bilingual programs and philosophies to coexist in this country today.

What all these models have in common is the recognition of the need for some sort of policy to deal with the educational difficulties particular to the situation of the language-minority child. The basic philosophical differences between the models are based in how, and to what extent, the students' first language is to be used to achieve this goal. The factors which make up the implementation of a model, from the basic design of the program, to the attitudes and extent of personal commitment of the teachers and administrative staff, to the specific situation of the surrounding community, all contribute to the outcomes of a bilingual program.

MODELS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

**Immersion**

The goal of an "immersion" bilingual education program is "additive bilingualism"; that is, acquisition of a second language with no negative effects on the development of abilities in the native language. In the most successful immersion programs (such as the one which was created in St. Lambert, a suburb of Montreal, in the 1960s), students begin attending classes taught completely in a second language (L2) at an early age, and while they are often permitted to respond in their native language (L1) for the first year or two, they are encouraged to use L2 whenever possible. According to Krashen, this method is effective because it provides a large amount of "comprehensible input" in L2 -- statements which can be understood through context, which build on simple words and concepts that the students already understand. Unlike traditional,
grammar-based foreign language classes, the focus is on what is being said, rather than how it is said, and natural speech is allowed to develop with little emphasis on correction of grammatical errors.\textsuperscript{10} Because all the children in a class are in the "same linguistic boat" (i.e. not fluent in the language being spoken) the environment is particularly comfortable and non-intimidating. Starting at about the third-grade level, instruction in the native language is gradually added, and although literacy in L1 is not achieved until a somewhat later age than would occur in a normal class, it was found that by the end of elementary school most children are reading and writing at grade level in L1 and at a "respectably good" level in L2 as well.\textsuperscript{11}

One of the most important aspects of this method of language teaching is that it is highly successful when members of the linguistic majority language are immersed in a minority language. In Canada, for example, the students who were immersed in French were members of the dominant English-speaking majority, and continued to have English reinforced at home (most likely by literate, educated parents) as well as by the society as a whole. In contrast, when language-minority students in the U.S. are immersed in English, their native language is not reinforced by mainstream American culture. This results in "subtractive bilingualism", a situation whereby L2 is gained at the expense of loss of complete proficiency in L1.

Because active bilingualism has never been promoted or even encouraged in this country, what is referred to as immersion often ends up being a form of "submersion." This "sink or swim" method is favored by many people who believe that it is the only way to force immigrants into becoming functional members of American
society, especially older immigrants or first generation Americans who feel that since they (or their parents) managed to succeed without bilingual education, today's immigrants should be capable of doing the same. The following examples, which are taken from telephone interviews with people who were giving their opinions of bilingual education, are good illustrations of this kind of thinking: 12

No one taught me in my own language. I had to learn the hard way and it took less than a year even though I spoke my own language at home. This is an English-speaking country; if the parents want their kids to speak Spanish, they should teach them at home like I taught my kids.

There's too many people coming here from other countries. My parents came from Italy -- they didn't get any help. These people, they want everything for nothing. I wish it would go back to the old time. It was beautiful.

They spend too much time being Spanish and not enough time being American.

In actuality, the situation of most of today's non-English speaking ethnic groups is vastly different from that of immigrants of 50 or 100 years ago, with respect to the social structure of minority communities, the nature of the skills and the cultural backgrounds of the members of these communities, and the opportunities which poor people have for socioeconomic advancement. Research has shown that on the whole, submersion of students in all-English classes with no native-language or remedial English support results in low achievement scores, high dropout rates, and an opinion of their native language as low in status, which then leads to a loss of self-esteem and self-confidence. 13

The immersion model has been adapted to meet the need of bilingual programs in the U.S. in several forms, some more successful than others. Some English as a Second Language (ESL)
programs "introduce content-area subjects to LEP [limited English proficiency] students at their level of proficiency in English", thereby providing comprehensible input at the same time as they teach the concepts that are necessary for students to keep up with their grade level in school. More often, however ESL programs merely include supplementary "pull-out" classes for students who are otherwise completely mainstreamed, which consist of 20-40 minutes per day of direct English-language instruction. Ovando and Collier note that while ESL is an important component of other models, it cannot itself be considered to be a sufficient form of bilingual instruction. However, in complicated situations where there are a number of language-minority students who speak a variety of languages, this type of program is often the only viable alternative.

"Structured Immersion" is a variation of the immersion method, and also utilizes the principle of comprehensible input. LEP students are grouped together and taught all in English, but at a lower level than the regular classes, often with native language tutoring support available for the first year or two. Teachers in these classes are generally bilingual, and accept students' comments in their native language but will respond only in English. While this type of program shares many of the disadvantages of total submersion, such as potential alienation from one's native culture, it has the advantage of easing the transition to all-English instruction by enabling students to gain some confidence in their ability to function in English before being mainstreamed.
The transitional model of bilingual education is related to immersion theory in that it recognizes the need to make input comprehensible to students in order for any learning to occur. Unlike immersion, however, the basic concept of this method is that input should be in the form of the students' native language, which is to be used as an "interim medium of instruction" to ease the transition to mainstream classes while the students are acquiring English. This method, which is currently being implemented by many districts with bilingual education funding, is the subject of a great deal of controversy. It has been criticized by both pro- and anti-bilingual education factions, either for being too assimilation-oriented or for being an unnecessarily costly method of teaching English to minority children.

The fundamental principle behind transitional bilingual education is that children should be taught basic academic skills in L1 so that they do not become cognitively deficient and fall behind grade level while they are in the process of learning to speak English. Central to this model is the idea that knowledge and skills are transferable from one language to another. In other words, if students learn how to read in Spanish, they will retain the concept of associating the printed word with a sound and a meaning, and have a relatively easy time learning to read in English once they become orally proficient in the language.

At the same time as they are being taught all the academic subjects in their native language, students are given daily ESL classes which are intended to raise them to a functional level in English in order for them to be mainstreamed as early as possible. An example of the goals of a typical transitional program is
written in the guidelines of the Reading, Pennsylvania school district's bilingual program, which state that

The goal of the program is to successfully place all students in the district's regular programs as soon as possible to the ultimate advantage of the student.(19)

Mainstreaming generally takes place after no more than two years, with the decision to take a student out of the native-language class usually based on oral and written test scores and English reading level. In some programs, the mainstreamed student is closely monitored for a short period by a bilingual teacher to make sure that his/her placement was correct,20 while in other places the mainstreaming can be supplemented by a continuation of ESL classes which provide extra help with language-related difficulties.21

Transitionally-oriented programs vary in terms of how English is used in the classroom in addition to (or sometimes instead of) ESL instruction. Many fluent bilingual teachers tend to use the method of concurrent translation, which Krashen describes as a misuse of the first language in bilingual classrooms. He claims that unlike paraphrasing or using visual aids, merely repeating a statement in two languages does nothing to make the English more comprehensible. When this method is used, "students quite naturally listen to the message in their own language, and pay little attention to the English input."22 Besides not teaching students English, use of this method ends up wasting class time that could have been used to teach something else.23 Another way to use both languages which does not have this problem is what Garcia and Padilla call the "New Concurrent Approach" (NCA). With this method, teachers speak to students alternately in English and Spanish without ever actually translating the same idea from one
language to the other. This approach does provide students with a way to make L2 input more comprehensible, because statements which are made in L1 prior to code-switching give them a contextual background which helps them to understand what is being said in L2.24

Although transitional bilingual education represents a positive step toward addressing the needs of minority children whose lack of English proficiency prevents them from having equal educational opportunity, it has met with a great deal of criticism from educators, linguists, and minority communities for both practical and philosophical reasons. On a linguistic level, the policy of early mainstreaming promotes the misconception that two years is sufficient time for a child to become completely fluent in a second language.25 This belief is a product of what Paivio and Begg refer to as "one of the most popular pieces of folklore concerning second-language acquisition", the notion that "children up to a certain age are veritable linguistic sponges, capable of absorbing two or more languages quickly, efficiently, and painlessly."26 There is no way that a child whose only source of comprehensible input in English is a daily ESL class, and who goes home each day to an environment where only his/her native language is spoken, can be expected to achieve perfect fluency within a short period of time. While studies do suggest that children are much more capable than adults of picking up native-like pronunciation of a second language, in a way this can be a further disadvantage to second-language learning, in that a child who sounds like a native English speaker is often assumed to be at a higher level of proficiency than he/she really is.

The ability to communicate on a basic level in unaccented
English does not necessarily imply the ability to function successfully in an all-English classroom. In *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms*, Ovando and Collier describe the discrepancy between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills), which immigrant children can generally acquire within a year or two after arrival, and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency), the ability to learn concepts and discuss abstractions, which often does not develop for 5-7 years. Transitional programs can be highly functional for older children (fourth grade and up) who arrive in the United States with a decent educational background. Having already acquired CALP in their own language, these children would then have little trouble transferring these skills to English once BICS proficiency has been achieved. For young children, however, mainstreaming to all-English classes before these skills are achieved is often a permanent disadvantage, because without comprehensible input they may never gain the facility with high-level English which would enable them to be successful in an academic environment.

Rivera's criticism of the transitional model questions its validity on a basic, theoretical level. Because it calls for the replacement of L1 with L2, this model can be viewed as working under the implicit assumption of a "single-space" theory, which says that because the brain has room for only one language code, extended teaching in a foreign language detracts from the process of English acquisition. This belief, which for a long time was held to be a main reason for the lack of success of immigrant minorities, was disproven by a study done by Peal and Lambert in 1962, which concluded that fluent bilinguals were actually superior to monolinguals on a number of cognitive tasks of conceptualization.
and mental flexibility. Once again, it is significant to note that this study was done in Canada, where French and English are officially recognized as having equal status and bilingualism is considered essential to political power.

This situation is obviously quite different from that of the United States, where bilingual education is seen by most legislators and educators as a form of compensatory education, with its goal being to "correct the linguistic handicaps" of students who are not proficient in English. Fluency in a language other than English is viewed almost as a form of cultural deprivation, a negative characteristic of minority group members which limits their potential to break out of the "poverty cycle" and assimilate to middle-class American culture. Transitional programs in general make very little effort to build up students' skills in L1, because policy planners view the native language primarily as a tool to be used to facilitate the acquisition of English and is no longer of value once an adequate level of English has been reached. Likewise, many transitional programs recognize the utility of making use of some aspects of the "cultural dimension" of the ethnic backgrounds of LEP students as a "bridge", which takes students from their home environment and uses some familiar elements to carry them into the mainstream of American society.

While Rivera sees the lack of recognition of the positive effects of bilingualism as stemming from a general belief that home/school language mismatch leads to retardation of learning, it seems to me that this aspect of transitional bilingual education is based more in social attitudes than in linguistic theory. Educators who design transitional programs do not attempt to make use of the positive aspects of bilingualism because their ultimate
goals are assimilationist rather than pluralistic, and therefore do not include active bilingualism as a targeted end product. The compensatory emphasis of the transitional model has prevented bilingual education from appearing to be a desirable enrichment opportunity for native English speakers, and therefore has served to inhibit bilingual education "from promoting the broader ends of cultural and linguistic pluralism in a more sustained and consistent way." From the standpoint of non-English speakers who value their own culture and believe in the mutual respect and acceptance of people from a variety of ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, "transitional bilingual education is insulting, demanding, and hypocritical when it is seen as a statement of language policy." 

**Maintenance**

While a program which follows a maintenance model might appear, especially in the earlier grades, very much like a typical transitional program, the genuinely pluralistic philosophy behind the concept of maintenance makes it distinctly different. Rather than having a compensatory or remedial purpose, the implementors of maintenance programs view bilingualism as an advantage which is worth the effort of preservation, and they understand that a school's official attitude towards its students' ethnicities can make all the difference in terms of instilling in minority children a positive outlook on education and their own ethnic identities.

Maintenance programs differ in terms of their structure and means of implementation, but they do share a set of basic assumptions regarding the nature of language learning and the
effects which linguistic and cultural factors have on educational outcomes. They are all implicitly based on what Rivera calls the "Integrated Proficiency Model", the premise of which is that knowledge of one language enhances learning of another. This theory is supported by a study done by Escamilla and Cogburn-Escamilla to investigate the relationship between Spanish and English development in Mexican-American children. Half of the the students in the experimental group were placed in bilingual-bicultural programs, and the other half were put in ESL pullout programs. It was found that one program did not facilitate the development of English skills more than the other, and that the best overall predictor of English language gains appeared to be level of proficiency in Spanish. These results are affirmed by the work of Krashen, who states that

Programs that meet these requirements [comprehensible English input and subject matter teaching in L1] teach English at least as well, and usually better, than all-day English submersion programs...even when such programs include ESL. These results are, at first glance, astounding: Programs that appear to provide less exposure to English actually teach English as well or better. (39)

According to Ovando and Collier, the most important concern of schools which operate under this model "is that students receive a solid academic curriculum with support for reaching full English-language proficiency without negating their first language in the process." This is accomplished through a program which includes some of the methods of transitional education -- such as the gradual increasing of instruction in English -- but remains committed to the continuation of classes in the native language. The following chart is an example of a sample program, which ideally would go up through secondary school, although there is
very little funding for maintenance programs above the sixth-grade level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>First Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Art, Music, P.E.</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>All core subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Art, Music, P.E.</td>
<td>ESL, Math, Science</td>
<td>Language arts, Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Art, Music, P.E.,</td>
<td>Language Arts,</td>
<td>Enrichment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math, Science</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>All subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrichment program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The mainstream column indicates classes in which LEP students and English speakers are grouped together. "Sheltered" means classes are made up of all LEP children, and instruction is all in English at a lower, more comprehensible level)

The amount of time it normally takes for a child to reach the "mainstream" level varies, but in areas where little English is spoken outside of school, full mainstreaming may take 5-6 years. As opposed to many transitional programs, where students are pushed to enter mainstream classes as soon as possible, maintenance programs operate under the assumption that moving too quickly or skipping levels "only ensures incomprehensible input".

The most distinctive feature of this and other maintenance programs is the idea of enrichment, which Krashen describes as "literature and social studies taught in the first language with the same seriousness as we teach these subjects in English." This part of the model is aimed at making the students complete bilinguals, not just orally fluent but also literate in both languages. Besides bringing with it the advantage of enhanced cognitive flexibility, enrichment serves to raise the prestige of the students' first culture, allowing students to recognize the value of their own ethnic and linguistic traditions. This is
considered by some theorists to be a desirable outcome in and of itself. Gonzales, for example, believes that two of the goals of bilingual education are, or should be, the promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity "for its own intrinsic value" and the enrichment of "the students' humanistic and aesthetic backgrounds."^{44}

In a model which represents all the factors contributing to educational outcome, Ramirez recognizes the importance of these social and cultural factors.^{45}

\[
\text{Community Background} \rightarrow \text{Student Input} \rightarrow \text{OUTCOMES} \\
\uparrow \\
\text{Factors} \\
\text{Educational Input} \rightarrow \text{Instructional Factors Treatments}
\]

This model stresses the point that educational outcomes cannot be seen simply as a direct result of what goes on in the classroom, but rather must be looked at in the context of a student's whole life. Students' native language, and the status of this language in the class, the school, the local community, and the society at large must be considered when one is examining the educational success or failure of minority children. A maintenance program is best suited to meet the needs of students in that it attempts to take all of these factors into account.

The theory behind a two-way maintenance program is that education should go a step further than respecting the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of minority students, to the point of encouraging active bilingualism in all students, regardless of their native language. Formulators of two-way maintenance policy believe that
if children are to coexist amicably and productively in society, and if they are to learn to accept and respect groups other than their own in the world outside of school, they could do no better than to begin by doing so in the classroom. (46)

Programs vary considerably as to how they go about implementing this philosophy. Ovando and Collier propose an "integrated model" in which "speakers of both languages are placed together in a bilingual classroom to learn each others' language and work academically in both languages." In this type of environment, the two groups are truly placed on an equal par with one another in an immersion-type situation, which enables English-speaking children to become more aware of and sensitive to the difficulties of the process of language acquisition which minorities living in the United States must face. One possible problem with this structure is that it seems that instruction would necessarily involve a good deal of concurrent translation, a method which has been shown to be unsuccessful and impractical.

One way to avoid this and other difficulties is to track classes according to students' ability levels in both L1 and L2. At the Coral Way School in Dade County, Florida, which was created in 1960 as one of the first two-way enrichment programs in the country, all children are required to spend half of each day in Spanish and the other half in English. Students are grouped according to their level of speaking in L2 and their level of reading in L1, and are placed in three categories: independent (able to communicate as or almost as well as native speakers), intermediate (able to comprehend English but in need of special attention), and non-independent ("seriously handicapped in their command of English"). In grades 1-3, the classes are basically segregated by native language, but the two groups are integrated in
subjects such as P.E., art, music, and during supervised play. At this level, subject matter is first taught in L1 and later reinforced in L2, a system which makes use of the principles of comprehensive input as a means of facilitating learning. In grades 4 and 5, duplication of material ceases, and both English and Spanish classes are mixed. Behind this type of structure lies the viewpoint that "such bilingual emphasis eradicates the stigma children from minority groups have traditionally experienced in American education".

The New Concurrent Approach is proposed as a "viable compromise between maintenance and transition" which also intends to dispel the view that minority languages are low in status, not only in the eyes of majority group members, but, more importantly, in the minds of the minority children themselves. NCA aims for an early transition to English as the primary medium of instruction, yet at the same time strives to maintain a positive attitude towards the home language through the acceptance and encouragement of students' bicultural identity. The theory behind NCA is that while English must be recognized as the primary language of schooling in this country, by creating a classroom environment which emphasizes the equal prestige of the two languages students will be more likely to maintain a high level of fluency in their native language and build up a positive self-concept.

Like all other kinds of bilingual education, the maintenance model has been subject to a great deal of criticism, from both practical and ideological standpoints. Because of the difficulty in evaluating the success of a program, many people are unclear as to how effective this model really is at producing students who are truly bilingual. Otheguy and Otto believe that the failure of many
of these programs to improve language-minority children's chances at high academic achievement stems in a large part from the "myth of static maintenance" which the programs support. They claim that maintenance schools create a fundamental confusion in the minds of students by presenting learning and development as the goal of education in general, but only giving enough LI instruction to provide social "recognition" of the language within the framework of the school. By merely aiming for "educational stasis", rather than growth and development of skills in LI, teachers are not exhibiting a genuine respect for the students' home language. They conclude with a rather extreme recommendation:

We suggest that to educate is to improve and that we should either embark on the development of our students' home language or acknowledge that we are abandoning it altogether. (55)

Much more prevalent are critics who doubt the ability of a maintenance program to effectively teach English. Admittedly, there are places where evidence shows that a maintenance program is not likely to be successful. In particular, language-minority communities which are both isolated and socioeconomically autonomous (such as Puerto Rico and certain rural areas in the U.S.) are not good places to implement this model, because people are just not exposed to enough English outside of the classroom for them to learn it without more concentrated instruction in school.

In the more typical urban environment, arguments have been made both for and against maintenance bilingual education based on evaluation of past and present programs. One of the only things which can be concluded with certainty is that a myriad of factors contribute to the outcomes of a bilingual program, and the type of program which has been chosen very often is not the most
significant of these factors. Thus it is nearly impossible to say that maintenance programs are able or unable to teach complete English proficiency. The structure of the individual program, the instructional approaches used in the school, the nature of the surrounding community, and the attitudes and personal philosophies of everyone involved (teachers, administrators, policy-makers, community activists, parents and children) all play a large part in determining how well a program will work.

It seems that much of the questioning of the effectiveness of the maintenance model is rooted in the assimilationist nature of American thought. The belief that children may not be learning English fast enough stems in part from the fear that it is somehow "un-American" to speak or be taught in a language other than English. There is a popular misconception that teaching students to be fluent in English is not one of the primary goals of bilingual education. A statement made by President Reagan in 1981 is a perfect illustration of this perspective:

It is absolutely wrong and against American concept to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market.(56)

Are Transitional and Maintenance Models Diametrically Opposed?

When trying to answer the question of whether or not these two models are really dichotomous, it is important to look at their philosophies separate from the methodologies being used to implement the two models. On a theoretical level, the two policies are fundamentally opposed in some very basic ways. Maintenance programs strive to achieve additive bilingualism, while the
structure of transitional programs leads to the phasing out of the first language and therefore most often results in subtractive bilingualism. The maintenance approach is based on an integrative model of language learning, through which teachers encourage the use of skills and knowledge in one language to support and enrich learning of the other. In contrast, transitional programs tend to take a more separate approach, in which the two languages are viewed as distinct entities, and L1 is only used as a means of facilitating the development of L2.57

It is crucial to understand, however, that whatever absolute distinctions exist in theory can very easily be muddled when they are translated into practice. "Regardless of program model, the personal philosophy of program implementors and educators ... often effects what occurs in the classroom."58 In addition to the role of teacher attitudes (which are discussed in detail in a later section of this paper) the disparity between bilingual educational theory and program implementation has come about as a result of policy ambiguity and inconsistency. The number of different programs described in this paper indicate that on a large scale, there is clearly a "lack of consensus about the philosophy, goals, and expectations for programs of bilingual bicultural education."59

The low opinion which many Americans have of bilingual education, and the shallow political and institutional support which it receives, makes it all the more difficult for educators and/or linguists to reach any kind of an agreement on desirable methods and outcomes. The lack of goal consistency and unfocused methodologies of individual programs can be seen as a reflection of the larger picture.

In reality, the tremendous differences among areas where
foreign languages are spoken cause a consistent policy to be not only impossible to achieve, but also very impractical. Because research on the subject is still inconclusive, the best way to deal with the current situation might just be to "live with the ambiguity" and utilize whatever aspects of a particular model are best suited to an individual community, school, or classroom.

A Case Study: The Potter Thomas School

The Potter Thomas Bilingual-bicultural Magnet Elementary school in Philadelphia is designed to be a two-way maintenance program (Spanish and English). While there is no current printed statement of the school's philosophy, there is a definite sense of purpose which is understood and shared by the principal and most of the teachers, and expressed in the lines of the "Potter Thomas Hymn" which hangs on the walls of the classrooms and is sung by the children at assemblies (see Appendix). The theory behind maintenance bilingual education was clearly taken into account by the creators of this program, with the ultimate goals being additive bilingualism and ethnic pluralism. There are a great number of factors which determine whether or not a school such as this one actually achieves its initial goals. These include not only the bilingual program itself, but also the attitudes and abilities of the teachers and administrators and the characteristics of the community which it serves. While the Potter Thomas program is successful in some respects, the fact that the structure of the program does not take into account a number of very important points (such as the Spanish-dominant atmosphere of
the school and the need to facilitate interethnic student interaction) has led to its failure to achieve all of its desired outcomes.

Potter Thomas became a bilingual school in 1969 in response to the increasing number of Puerto Ricans coming to live in the community. Before that time, the neighborhood was made up of mostly poor whites (according to Mr. Z., a teacher who has been at the school for over 20 years). During 1970s, the population of the school shifted to what the same teacher termed an "ideal mixture" of ethnic groups: about 1/3 black, 1/3 white, and 1/3 Hispanic. By the mid-1980s, however, the area had become mostly Hispanic. In spite of an attempt in the early 1980s to make Potter Thomas a "magnet school" in order to attract children of all backgrounds with an interest in becoming bilingual, the vast majority of the small number of children from outside of the area who apply for a transfer to Potter Thomas are recent immigrants whose parents want them to be taught in Spanish. At this point the school's ethnic distribution is still basically a reflection of the surrounding community, which is roughly 80% Hispanic. When the school first opened, it was supported to a large extent by federal funding sources, but a new policy came into effect in 1978 which disqualified bilingual maintenance programs from receiving money from the U.S. government. According to the principal, since that time the school has become "institutionalized" (i.e. an official, established part of the Philadelphia school system) and as a result is now supported in full by the district.

The school is divided into two separate tracks, labelled "Anglo" and "Latino". The Latino classes (which consist of more than half of the school's population) are made up of children who
recently arrived from Puerto Rico and/or whose parents speak little or no English. The kindergarten, first grade, and second grade classes are taught almost entirely in Spanish, with 45 minutes of ESL instruction every day. The ESL teachers whom I have observed tend to emphasize communication over grammar, although the extent to which they are able to involve all the students varies from one individual to another. For example, the teacher of the more advanced first-grade English class was very good at getting the children to interact with each other, and was able to incorporate other skills into the English lesson, such as telling time. In third grade, which is described as a "transitional age" by the principal, a larger portion of the regular subjects are given in English, such as social studies and sometimes science. An equal amount of time each day is given to English and Spanish reading, and ESL pull-out classes are still available for students who have not reached a level of oral proficiency in English (primarily new arrivals). In fourth and fifth grades, almost all classroom instruction is in English, with the exception of a large block of time each day (about an hour and a half) which is devoted to Spanish language and culture.

The Anglo track is made up of children whose strongest language upon entering the school is English. Reflecting the racial composition of the neighborhood, about half of each class is black, with at most a few white children in each grade. The rest of the students are Latinos whose family moved from Puerto Rico one or more generations back, who have Spanish surnames but generally speak English at home. In accordance with the school's goal of teaching all students two languages, the children in the Anglo classes are given about 45 minutes per day of Spanish as a Second
Language, from kindergarten all the way through fifth grade. SSL instruction is basically communication-oriented for the first few years, with reading and writing added only after students reach a certain level of oral proficiency.

In some ways, the structure of Potter Thomas is similar to Ovando and Collier's model of an ideal maintenance program (see p.16). Students are given small amounts of L2 in the early grades with an emphasis on comprehensible input, and continue with instruction in L1 even after they have achieved proficiency in their second language. The major difference between the two programs is the column entitled "mainstream". While at Potter Thomas instruction in physical education and art is usually in English (because many of these teachers are not bilingual), students from the two tracks are not integrated for these classes. The two groups of students are not restricted from mixing with each other informally on the playground, but the only time when the structure of the program calls for an integration of the Anglos and Latinos is during fourth and fifth grade English reading classes. It is assumed that by this point the Latino-track children are already proficient in English, so rather than being tracked for native language, the entire grade is split into groups based on ability levels.

According to one teacher, Mr. R., this policy results in a division between the black children and the children with Latino backgrounds in both tracks, because the students in the latter group generally have more trouble with English and therefore end up being placed together in lower-level groups. In contrast with his opinion, I observed a group of fourth and fifth graders who were reading only at the third-grade level, and noticed that the class
was about evenly divided between blacks and Latinos. However, it was evident that the native English speakers dominated the class, and the teacher commented that in general they were at a higher level than the Latinos. I worked with a small group of Latino boys on a vocabulary lesson, and found that although they all could speak and understand English, they seemed to lack the richness of vocabulary and facility with the language which comes from being a fluent speaker.

These observations, although of course extremely limited, have caused me to wonder about the efficacy of a program in which Spanish-speaking children are exposed to so few native English speakers on a regular basis throughout the course of their schooling. Even when classes are given in English, the Latino teachers do not speak an unaccented, entirely grammatical version of English.* In addition, two of the teachers whom I interviewed (Mrs. L. and Mrs. D.) told me that although they know that they are supposed to be teaching certain subjects entirely in English, there are a number of students in both of their classes who arrived recently from Puerto Rico and speak only Spanish. In order to help these children keep up with the rest of the class, both of these teachers report that they frequently translate the lessons into Spanish, with or without repeating the information in English as well.

Although the possible lack of sufficient exposure of Spanish-speaking students to English is a very serious problem, whatever they do learn is at least somewhat reinforced by the fact that they are living in a predominantly English-speaking country.

*While of course nobody's speech is perfect, the kind of mistakes I have heard teachers make are obviously language-related, and not merely a result of personal habit.
where the knowledge of the language is generally required in order to "get ahead". For the Anglos, the lack of exposure to Spanish outside of the classroom works against the philosophy of a dual maintenance program, in that language ends up having very little significance to them. According to Mr. R., the majority of the non-Latino children have almost no interest in learning Spanish, and the negative attitudes of their parents, who see no reason why valuable school time should be wasted on teaching them a minority language, contribute to their apathy. Some of the students who have been in the program since they started school have not yet begun to learn to read or write in Spanish, and although "they've been taught to say 'manzana' since kindergarten" (Mr. Z.) they are still not even minimally orally proficient in the language. Because of their negative attitude towards the subject they end up being disciplinary problems, and disrupting class so often that it becomes difficult for the few motivated students to learn.

The children who seem to be benefitting most from the structure of the school are the Latinos who are in the Anglo classes. For them, the daily Spanish instruction is both a form of enrichment and a means of giving them a positive outlook on their families' language and culture. While some of these children speak little or no Spanish at home -- Mrs. L. told me that many of their parents cannot speak the language well enough to help them with their homework -- most of them are still a part of the larger Latino community, with Spanish-speaking relatives and neighbors, and have probably been to Puerto Rico to visit family members. Motivation to learn Spanish among these children is therefore quite high, and in general the program is strongly supported by their parents, especially since the Spanish maintenance curriculum does
not mean that they are receiving less instruction in English skills. It is interesting to note that in spite of their Hispanic background and the fact that they are encouraged to learn Spanish, English is clearly the dominant language in their daily interactions. I saw an example of this when I observed a group of about 8 fifth-grade boys in an Anglo class interacting casually while they were waiting for the rest of the class to arrive. Although only one of the children was non-Latino, the conversations I overheard were all entirely in English.

As with the English classes, all the SSL classes are tracked according to ability level, which basically results in a split between the (mostly black) non-Latinos and the Latino-heritage children in the Anglo classes. In this particular case, some kind of ability grouping really seems to be essential, because it would be very difficult to teach a class made up of students who were at such a diversity of levels within the framework of the strictly regulated curriculum of the school. It seems (from what I have seen) that the teachers of the second language classes have much more freedom to use innovative methods with the beginning classes, which are taught primarily on an oral level. Once the students are at a point where they can begin to read and write, teachers must follow a series of graded textbooks, which clearly limits the amount of creativity that can go into their lesson plans, and would cause it to be nearly impossible to run a class which had a very heterogeneous group of students.

On the whole, however, the general consensus among teachers is that the lack of continuity which results from the constant grouping and regrouping of students is one of the most negative aspects of the school. Several teachers remarked on the amount of
time which is wasted moving from one classroom to another (a total of about 45 minutes per week, according to an administrator) and then getting the attention of a new group of students. One of the third-grade Latino teachers mentioned that only a few of the children in her English reading class are actually in her homeroom, and expressed concern about the difficulties of monitoring the progress of individual students whom she only saw for one period per day. She believes that the children would get more out of school if they stayed in the same room with the same teacher for the entire day, and feels that she would be able to do a better job of teaching them if she could have them for all their subjects. Aside from the wide variations in ability levels, which most likely is what originally prompted the policy of homogeneous grouping, the biggest problem with this sort of arrangement is that many of the teachers are not equipped to teach in both English and Spanish. Mrs. Melendez (the principal) expressed this fact in a positive way, explaining that the program takes into account the language proficiency of the teachers as well as the students, thus enabling everyone to teach only in his or her strongest language.

The issue of lack of continuity of education for the students at Potter Thomas goes beyond the day-to-day inefficiencies of the tracking policy. Even more significant is the problem of student mobility. A bilingual program such as this one is designed sequentially, so that what is taught one year builds upon the foundation of what should have been learned the year before. It is intended that students enter the school in kindergarten and gradually acquire knowledge of their second language while strengthening skills in their native tongue. However, the rate of mobility for Latino students is extremely high. According to
Mr. Z., only about 25% of the children in the fifth grade have been there since kindergarten. Many of the students who arrived over the years came into the school directly from Puerto Rico, with a lower level of English proficiency than the children who had been taking English classes for several years. Another side to this problem is low or sporadic attendance, often due to frequent travel between here and Puerto Rico ("These kids go to the island the way you and I go to the shore!" exclaimed Mr. Z.). This situation would of course be a hinderance to education anywhere, but it is especially detrimental in a bilingual program, where the goal is to teach more than what is normally expected in elementary school in the same amount of time.

ATTITUDES: A PERVERSIVE UNDERLYING FORCE

Research Analysis

Regardless of which model of bilingual education is being implemented by a system, there is always a great deal more going on within a school than merely the realization of a language-oriented policy. Woven into the fabric of everyday life, along with the language classes, homework assignments and disciplinary practices which exist in all schools, are the threads of personal philosophies. These deeply-rooted attitudes of individual teachers and administrators intertwine with the strands of official policy, and have a significant impact on the educational outcomes of a bilingual program. The vague or blurred policy guidelines of these programs often give students a mixed message about the status of their native language, especially when a school has an official
philosophy of ethnic pluralism which contradicts the general societal view that the assimilation of minorities is a positive thing. Transitional programs sometimes support cultural enrichment while simultaneously implementing a policy of phasing out native-language instruction as early as possible; maintenance programs which espouse a philosophy of pluralism often end up being taught with a bias towards English. In these and other ambiguous situations, the implicit attitudes of teachers towards the minority language and their underlying assumptions about the purpose of bilingual education are transmitted to students through daily behavior and language use, and thus play an important role in shaping students' school experiences.

A doctoral dissertation by Jill Kerper addresses these attitudinal factors, and explores the variables which influence perception and use of language among teachers. Her study looks at the congruence between the official goals of the Texas State Plan for Bilingual Education and the personal philosophies of several teachers in the program, and then examines the extent to which the actions of these teachers are in accordance with their stated philosophies. This research points up the fact that regardless of the guidelines of the program, frequently it is the individual teacher's use of one language or another that determines the methodology which actually gets implemented. Kerper identifies five factors which contribute to the incongruences which often exist between words, actions, and official policy:

A. Proficiency in Spanish
B. Background in bilingual education
C. Attitude regarding language prestige
D. Teacher perception of administrative support
E. Teacher perception of the clarity of programmatic expectations

A study of the relationship between teachers' dominant
language and their success in Spanish-English bilingual classrooms found that:

the language dominance or relative language proficiency of the teacher affected the total amount of time each language was used, as well as the ways in which each was used in a single classroom with two different instructors observed at different points during the school year. The classroom of the English-dominant teacher had a distinctively English atmosphere [i.e. more English than Spanish spoken, bulletin boards in English, etc.], whereas the Spanish dominant teacher's classroom had a Spanish atmosphere. The functions and prestige of the two languages also varied according to the teachers' dominant language. Consequently, teacher language dominance had a pervasive effect on language use patterns. (63)

Although another study found that nativelike fluency in Spanish was not necessary for someone to be an "exemplary" teacher, it would be impossible for a teacher to be able to run a balanced bilingual classroom without having attained a certain level of conversational ability.

Teachers' attitudes towards the languages being taught can be related to a myriad of factors, including their own level of fluency, their experiences speaking foreign languages, and where their beliefs fall on the scale between assimilation and pluralism. The patterns of language use found in the speech of bilingual teachers are often inconsistent with the stated goals of the program. In some cases, the deviation is intentional, while at other times language alternation is unconscious and seemingly random. On an overt level, some teachers have a point of view concerning the "functional efficacy" of emphasizing one language over the other, and will use more English or Spanish (or another minority language) based on what they believe is most beneficial for the students. 64 Research done by Rodriguez indicates that "effective bilingual teachers know the philosophy behind bilingual
education and are familiar with and committed to particular principles," and sometimes choose not to conform to policies they view as inconsistent with the needs of the learner. Kerper refers to this as "positive risk-taking behavior", "stemming from their assessment of the relevance of particular theories and practices to their teaching situation."66

In spite of the fact that one of the fundamental principles of bilingual education is the strategic use of code-switching in order to best facilitate the learning of two languages, "the extent to which language switches are conscious and deliberate strategies utilized by the teacher to achieve certain learning outcomes with bilingual learners is questionable."67 Fluent bilinguals tend to code-switch a great deal, based on factors such as conversation content, the dominant language of others present, or the desire to use a particular expression. Restricting themselves to speaking one language at a time while teaching must take some amount of effort, especially since they know that many of the students in their classes can comprehend both Spanish and English. Without any background in sociolinguistics or in the techniques of bilingual education, the teacher "is often not aware of his/her own patterns of language use nor the implications of these patterns for student learning and motivation."68 Teachers who are trained in bilingual methods have an increased awareness of the implicit meanings that are transmitted to students simply on the basis of language choice, and thus are more likely to realize that the contexts in which English and Spanish are used can make a statement about the status of the two languages. Studies have shown that teachers who have been trained in bilingual education are more able to control their own language usage, and that those who have had some education in
Spanish give the language higher ratings for prestige than those who had not. 69

Research concerning the relationship of attitudinal factors to language prestige has shown in what ways code-switching can lead to perceptions of English as the higher-status language. In a study of the implementation of the objectives of a maintenance bilingual program, Phillips found that teachers often switched to English during Spanish lessons, thereby placing Spanish at a lower level and signaling to the students that "English is more effective for 'important' messages." 70 In a study of bilingual classrooms in San Antonio, Texas, Ramirez found that there was a greater tendency to use English words while teaching in Spanish than to use Spanish words during English lessons, and that ESL classes tended to use a more commanding, question/response format while SSL classes used more modeling and repetition. 71 Bruck and Shultz noted that the teachers whom they observed tended to use English for more formal classroom proceedings, for incidental comments, and for disciplinary or management purposes, while Spanish was mainly used for actual content instruction. This type of dichotomy might cause students to perceive that there is a distinction between the appropriate communicative functions of Spanish and English, and to view English as the voice of authority and order and Spanish as the language of vital communication. One cannot be certain that children actually pick up on all the status messages which are associated with the contexts of code-switching, especially since the teachers themselves are probably largely unaware of when they switch languages and why. If the students are indeed receiving these signals, then the speech patterns of the teacher are serving to prevent the two languages from having equal prestige within the
school, which can lead to the perpetuation of a linguistically stratified society.

Other studies of relative language status within bilingual programs further illustrate the common bias towards English which exists even in supposedly multicultural, pluralistically-oriented programs. The research findings of Ramirez indicate that in many programs, bilingual teachers often form negative first impressions from pupils' inability to speak standard English which lead to low expectations, and in fact place students in homogeneous groups within the first week of school based on these initial perceptions. Their negative responses to nonstandard, accented English and to the errors of struggling LEP students may end up creating a barrier which serves to hinder the process of English acquisition.

These findings prove that it is possible for a teacher to work within the basic framework of a particular bilingual methodology while at the same time creating an atmosphere which goes against the fundamental premises of the model being implemented. A dual maintenance program which intends to foster a climate of cultural pluralism and intergroup communication by teaching two languages to all students is effectively wasted if the teachers do not impart a basic understanding and appreciation of these goals through their actions. If the SSL classes are given little emphasis by the teachers, and taught largely through the medium of English, while Spanish-speaking pupils are made to feel that English should be the means of expressing all important information, then the goals of the program are not being met regardless of the structure of the school or the commitment of the administrative staff. Similarly, a transitional program such as the one in Texas (outlined by Kerper
on p.54) which apparently attempts to combine a commitment to linguistic diversity with a primary focus of helping LEP students become functional in English can end up being a mainstreaming factory if individual teachers have little regard for the concept of ethnic pluralism.

Kerper's study of the attitudes of bilingual teachers suggests that bilingual programs would benefit from teacher training focused on the affective objectives of bilingual education and clinical supervision to increase teachers' awareness of their language use patterns in the classroom. (74)

The results of Kerper's examination of the relationship between program philosophy and personal implementation of several bilingual teachers indicates that these teachers "appeared to be functioning in the classroom according to the dictates of their internalized model of bilingual education rather than performing in order to comply with an externally imposed model," a fact which further points up the need for teachers to be educated in the goals and practices of bilingual education. These particular teachers had all already been through at least a few years of background training in bilingual education, and as a result all demonstrated a high level of congruence between self-reported and observed behaviors.

It is clear that in the design and implementation of a policy of bilingual education, the model being used is only one factor in the shaping of the outcomes of the program. Many variables go into the creation of the educational climate of a school, which then helps to determine whether or not children leaving the school are truly bilingual, and the extent to which they have been exposed to a positive perspective of cultural pluralism.
Attitudes at Potter Thomas

Nowhere is the importance of these underlying factors more evident than at the Potter Thomas school. Unlike many of the maintenance programs described in the literature, where English is emphasized despite the programmatic goal of linguistic balance, at Potter Thomas Spanish is definitely the dominant language. While the principal is quick to defend the school in terms of the educational benefits received by both the native English- and Spanish-speaking children, the comments of many of the teachers and the overall atmosphere of the school indicate that the program is better designed to meet the needs of the Latino community than those of the Anglo population. Like most other bilingual programs, the success of Potter Thomas is very difficult to evaluate, and during the time I spent there I encountered a variety of opinions concerning both the effectiveness of the school and the value of bilingual education in general. To fully understand the ways in which attitudinal factors contribute to the incongruences between theory and practice at Potter Thomas, it helps to analyze the program in terms of Kerper's five-variable categorization (see p.32).

Since the school became bilingual in 1969, an effort has been made to hire teachers with proficiency in both languages. As the older monolingual teachers retired they were replaced by younger bilinguals, the majority of whom spoke Spanish as their native language. Most of the Hispanic teachers I encountered were fully bilingual, although the English they spoke was usually accented and often not grammatically perfect. Many of the conversations I overheard in the halls or the office were in Spanish, and while
eating lunch every week with a group of Latino teachers I noticed a
tremendous amount of code-switching, which was such a natural part
of the conversation that they did not even seem to be aware of it.
Most of these women (I did not meet a single male Latino teacher)
were born in Puerto Rico or another Spanish-speaking country, and
their common language and background seems to have created a bond
which has helped them to develop a close, supportive community.
They frequently bring in lunch for each other (and cooked an
incredible feast on my last day!) and often pop in and out of each
other's classrooms with a message or a piece of cake.

In contrast to this group of Hispanic women is a small number
of older, white, male teachers who have been in the school since
before it became bilingual. While at least on the surface they
seem to get along with the Latino teachers, and have made some
effort to pick up a few words of Spanish, they clearly perceive
themselves as separated from the rest of the school by a wide gulf
of linguistic and cultural differences. The split between the two
groups is made even greater by their feelings of bitterness towards
many aspects of the situation, which they were quick to talk to me
about "off the record" within a few minutes of our meeting. Both
Mr. R. and Mr. Z. expressed resentment towards the system's
affirmative action policies, which in the 1970s resulted in the
hiring of bilingual teachers who did not even hold bachelor's
degrees. They described the injustice of a system which gave
funding for the continuing education of Hispanic teachers, while
they had been forced to pay for graduate school on their own.

The difficulties inherent in the linguistic makeup of the
school are exacerbated by the fact that very few of the teachers
have had any sort of training in the field of bilingual education.
With the exception of a few ESL teachers, the faculty is made up of individuals who have no special awareness of the implicit messages which students receive through language use or the problems which relate specifically to a bilingual community. Mr. R. made the point that whenever the school is willing to pay for the education of teachers so that they can learn more about the practices of bilingual education, it is always the Latino teachers who are given funding, not the Anglo teachers who have even less of an idea about bilingualism since they are not experiencing it firsthand.

In terms of prestige of the two languages within the school, students receive a variety of messages from the teachers with whom they interact during their time at Potter Thomas. Within the Latino track, it seems to me that the program has been successful in fostering an atmosphere of equality and balance. While one of the Latino-track teachers mentioned that she believed that the program should be somewhat more transitionally-oriented, with children who were fully capable of functioning in English being moved into the Anglo track instead of continuing to be taught in Spanish for several more years, her behavior and language use remain within the bounds of school policy. Although her overall behavior indicated that the two languages were at the same status level, I noted that there were some instances when this teacher used English for classroom management and switched back to Spanish for content-based instruction. This could have been her way of compromising between her personal beliefs and the rule which told her to teach only in Spanish, or else she could have been using English simply as a means of setting her non-academic comments apart with added emphasis.

In general, I found that the goals of the school are clearly
expressed and well-enforced, and that teachers tend to stay within
the framework of what is expected of them. It is interesting to
note that the deviations from policy guidelines are mostly in the
direction of more Spanish rather than less, a finding which
contradicts much of the research discussed in the previous section.
An example of this is the use of Spanish by the Latino third and
fifth grade teachers to accommodate for new students who did not
understand English. (see p.27).

When I asked a fifth-grade Latino teacher about the use of
the two languages among students in her class and how this relates
to other aspects of their academic performance, she replied that
many of the cliques which have formed are based on language
ability, and that in general the students who speak better English
are also the ones who are more successful in their other subjects.
I did not spend enough time observing the children to be able to
tell the extent to which these groups are related to prestige, but
nevertheless it is interesting to note that despite an overall
Spanish emphasis in the school, the value of English in American
society still has a pervasive influence on the behavior and
achievement patterns of students within the program. This finding
is supported by a study done by Ramirez, who concluded that
"reversing the roles of Chicano and Anglo children in a
compensatory bilingual program may not be sufficient to reverse the
status of a group and its language."76

The children in the Anglo classes at Potter Thomas receive a
mixed message in terms of the importance of learning a second
language and the positions of English and Spanish in the school and
in the larger society. Although the school is intended to be a
two-way maintenance program, with the ultimate goal being
bilingualism for everyone, the Spanish classes which they take do not stress the communicative, vital aspects of language learning. They are given just 45 minutes of Spanish per day, and while they do not only learn grammar and verb conjugations, the emphasis is on moving from the oral to the written phase as quickly as possible without focusing on fluency as the objective. In spite of the line in the hymn (Spanish version) about being "brothers united by the light of an ideal," the structure of the school gives little opportunity for the Anglo students to use the Spanish they learn in shared activities with the Latino classes (see the next section). In a sense, then, the Anglo children are presented with contradictory information. The school is dominated by Spanish-speaking staff and students, and Anglos as well as Latinos are obliged to study Spanish. Yet the SSL classes themselves have many of the same negative aspects, such as an abundance of translation, as language classes in bilingual programs which have a clear bias towards English.

The disparity in beliefs of the teachers probably contributes further to their confusion. In general, I found that the Latino teachers have a very positive conception of the program, and interspersed our conversations with stories about the abilities or progress of particular students as evidence of its success. Teachers in the younger grades praised the program most highly, while the third and fifth grade teachers with whom I spoke occasionally expressed some reservations.

In contrast to this are the ideas of Mr. R., also a fifth grade teacher. While he does not do anything to actively undermine the program, Mr. R. believes so strongly in his opinions that it is hard to imagine them not coming out somehow in his teaching. He
believes that bilingualism is a good thing ("I'm bilingual too--I speak Lithuanian.") and that pride in one's native culture is important, but he said to me without hesitation that since English is the language of the United States, schools should make sure that LEP students learn to function in it. He is in favor of a transitional program, which he thinks would serve this purpose much better than maintenance.

When Mr. Z. and Mr. R. talked about the Anglo children who get the worst deal out of the program, they were referring primarily to the blacks, not to the Latino-surnamed children, who have the advantages of taking their regular subjects in English while at the same time learning and retaining the Spanish of their heritage. Mr. R. commented that in a sense, black students at Potter Thomas are doubly disadvantaged. Within American society they are members of a minority group with a long history of oppression, and as native English speakers within the school they are a minority group as well, discriminated against (according to him) by a program which forces them to learn a second language when the time could be much better spent reinforcing the first.

Mr. R. and Mr. Z. see themselves on the fringes of Potter Thomas' teaching community. Their negative attitudes must certainly be reinforced by the fact that administrative support for the program is strong, and expectations are so clear-cut that there is no room for critical input. Teachers such as these are thus placed in a powerless position, forced by school policy to implement a program which they do not believe in. The two men both feel that if it were up to the principal and bilingual staff, there would be no blacks in the school at all. Right or wrong, their perception -- that the ideal environment according to most people
at Potter Thomas would be a school made up entirely of Latinos -- leaves them feeling bitter and cynical towards the school where they have invested more than 20 years of their lives. At this point, they think of themselves as members of an unwanted and insignificant minority group, slated to be replaced by highly valued bilingual teachers as soon as they decide to retire.

**Student Interaction**

The importance of having a positive attitude toward the goals of a bilingual program extends beyond the realm of teacher behavior to the issue of student interaction. Just as the implicit beliefs and unconscious language uses of a teacher can cause students to pick up signals as to the prestige of a language and the value of being a bilingual speaker, the way in which a school is structured serves to promote or to discourage interethnic communication and the active usage of the students' second language as more than an academic subject. As well as shaping specifically what children learn, the program's method of implementation can be crucial to the development of their motivation for acquiring a second language or gaining an understanding of a different culture. In spite of the two-way maintenance goals which are in effect at Potter Thomas, the structure of the program acts as more of a barrier than a facilitator to the achievement of the pluralistic outcomes of bilingual-bicultural education.

A large body of research supports the claim that a positive attitude toward the other ethnolinguistic group is crucial to the success of a bilingual program. Lambert identifies the two major factors which influence second-language acquisition as aptitude and
attitude, and claims that a positive "attitudinal orientation" can outweigh deficiencies in intellectual capacity and enable a student to succeed in learning a second language. He discusses motivation to learn a second language as being integrative (propelled by a desire to become part of a community or broaden one's experiences through contact with another culture) or instrumental (taking a utilitarian approach to language learning as a means of getting on the inside of a community in order to manipulate or control, with personal ends in mind). He believes that learners with integrative goals are much more likely to become fluent in a second language, and states that

the successful learner of a second language also has to identify with members of another linguistic-cultural group and be willing to take on very subtle aspects of their behavior, including their distinctive style of speech and their language. (78)

While it would be unrealistic to expect English-speaking black children to acquire the characteristics of their Hispanic neighbors, or to insist that Hispanic children fit themselves into Anglo culture in order to learn English successfully, these findings point out the importance of close personal contact with members of the other ethnic group. This belief is reinforced by Arias and Gray, who discuss the importance of "cultural democracy" in bilingual classrooms, and express that the ideal goal of bilingual education should be "bicultural identity." An educational atmosphere which encourages children to learn from each other, and in particular open classrooms which allow for extensive peer interaction, enable students to have maximal amounts of "language practice in meaningful situation." According to Kerper, the variables of social interaction and language learning are interrelated, in that
students who perceived the native speakers of the second language as supportive of their efforts to learn the language also indicated more willingness to affiliate with that group and become actively involved in oral language activities. (81)

The organization of Potter Thomas does very little to promote this type of meaningful interaction. Integration is very successful on a certain level and in certain situations, for example the Anglo-track classes, where blacks, the few whites, and English-speaking Latinos are together for most classroom activities and interact casually on the playground and in the cafeteria. Among these students who speak English as their primary language, I observed very little racially-based separation. However, the structure of the school, especially the continuation of distinct Latino and Anglo tracks through fifth grade, is definitely not conducive to the promotion of informal interactions between linguistic groups, and thus works against the achievement of the objectives of the school.

When I questioned Mrs. Melendez (the principal) about the issue of student mixing, she answered a bit defensively, assuring me that of course the groups have ample opportunity to interact. They live side-by-side in the surrounding neighborhood, and integration is worked into the school's organization in the form of the mixed English reading classes. Although the fifth grade reading class I observed did contain a mixture of Latino and Anglo students, the regulated, textbook-centered format of the class did not encourage students to work together in groups. It is significant that the only officially designated opportunity they are given to spend time with students from the other track occurs within the framework of an English class. Students who are studying Spanish as a second language get no chance to attempt to
use the Spanish they are learning for real communicative purposes. Thus even though many of them appear to acquire a reasonably good comprehension of Spanish by the time they leave the school, they have little motivation to cultivate their speaking skills. This situation became more apparent to me when I observed a fifth grade SSL class for children on a low level of reading and writing. Although the students seemed to understand virtually everything the teacher said to them, they often responded to her questions in English, and she had to remind them to speak only in Spanish.

This view of the failure of the school to achieve successful integration is strongly supported by Mr. R. and Mr. Z., both of whom hold very negative opinions about the ability of the school to promote intercultural communication. Mr. R. claimed that in all of his years of teaching at the school, he has never seen a black student approach a Latino in Spanish in an effort to improve his/her Spanish skills. He and Mr. Z. talked about the self-segregation of students during periods of casual interaction, a perspective which contradicts the views of several other teachers. At least in the cafeteria, the separation of the groups is not initiated by the students themselves, but rather by the school administration, which enforces a policy of seating by class.

The Latino teachers' points of view were far less unified than those of the white teachers. The teachers of younger grades with whom I spoke all felt that there was a great deal of opportunity for casual interaction and friendships to develop among children in the different groups. The fact that their opinions are so much more positive could have to do with the differences in social awareness between children of different ages: the older a child gets, the more likely he/she is to adopt the prejudices of the
community and of society, while categories of race and linguistic group are probably much less fixed in the minds of younger children. In contrast, a third grade teacher told me that she felt that very little mixing takes place, and in fact she knew of incidents where fights broke out on the playground between members of the two groups. A fifth grade Latino teacher began answering my question about interaction with a statement similar to that of Mrs. Melendez about the students living together and interacting within the community. Then she hesitated a moment, and added that in spite of this, conflicts between the blacks and Hispanics are actually very common.

A study of the dynamics of interaction in bilingual classrooms supports the conclusion that if a school intends to foster true bilingualism, then more has to be done to encourage communication between linguistic groups than merely placing children in a class together for less than an hour per day. Observation of discourse patterns indicated that, partly as a result of grouping strategies which isolated English- and Spanish-dominant students throughout much of the day, students rarely use their weaker language during the course of natural classroom interactions. Unless the design of a program forces children to use their non-dominant language for active communication, they may not ever become completely comfortable in that language.

In addition to promoting bilingualism, maintenance programs are created with the purpose of encouraging a positive view of other ethnic groups. According to Lambert, "bilingual children have markedly more favorable attitudes towards both language communities than do the monolingual children." A study by Politzer and Ramirez in 1973 found that Mexican-American children
enrolled in a bilingual-bicultural program came out with more positive feelings about bilingual people than children with the same ethnic and linguistic backgrounds who were educated in a monolingual school. What would the results of this type of attitude analysis be at Potter Thomas? It seems to me that the children for whom the program has been relatively successful (i.e. the Latino-track students and the children in the Anglo classes from Latino families) would tend to have very positive feelings towards bilingualism, and a strong sense of connection to their own cultural background, although the children in the Anglo classes would be much more likely to acquire a sense of bicultural identity.

Whether or not this actually means that these students are getting the best possible education in English skills is another question. In a sense, what it comes down to is a matter of priorities, and the dissatisfaction with the program expressed by teachers such as Mr. R. and Mr. Z. is largely a product of a difference in opinion about the primary purpose of education in the United States. Naturally, educators want to give children the greatest opportunity for all kinds of learning, but in a program like this one which strives to do more than the average American elementary school, something has to suffer. This is especially true in an urban community such as the one which surrounds Potter Thomas, which has more than its share of the problems such as poverty and crime which plague other urban schools. The administration at Potter Thomas has apparently chosen to give the school's bilingual program the position of primary importance. Judging from the overall positive atmosphere of the school and the dedication of its teachers, this decision has enabled the school to
become a brighter spot than most urban elementary schools on the public education map.

The question which remains is that of the attitudes towards bilingualism and towards the school in general of the minority population, the native English speakers. The evidence which I have gathered leads me to believe that it is doubtful that most of these students leave the school with an especially positive view of bilingual education. Much like the white, monolingual teachers, the Anglo children probably get the impression that they are of little importance to the overall functioning of the school, and perhaps they feel slighted by a system which seems to regard their education as one of its lowest priorities.

Although Potter Thomas' situation appears to be unique to a bilingual school functioning in a specific community, in a sense it is a reflection of a larger, even more significant educational problem: that of providing good schooling to the majority at the expense of minorities. The reason that Potter Thomas is so unusual is that the typical roles are reversed, and the needs of students who speak the same language as the majority of Americans are not given as much attention as those of Spanish speaking children, who make up the dominant group in the community.
Corny as it may be, this first stanza of the "Potter Thomas Hymm" is an expression of the noble and ambitious vision which the creators of the Potter Thomas bilingual-bicultural program must have had in mind when the school opened. Potter Thomas was not conceived of as a compensatory, remedially-oriented program designed to give special assistance to Hispanic students whose low level of English proficiency prevented them from being properly educated in the Philadelphia public schools. Rather, it was intended to be a school with a commitment to interethnic communication, expressed in a policy of "two languages for everyone" and rooted in the implicit belief that no culture is inherently superior to another. Nearly twenty years later, aspects of this underlying philosophy can still be detected in the words of the principal and in the unique multicultural atmosphere of the school. However, many factors have interfered since the time of its inception that have prevented Potter Thomas from becoming the genuinely bilingual-bicultural institution that its creators (or at least the writers of the Hymm) hoped that it would be.

The failure of the program to achieve its goals of full bilingualism and mutual understanding for all students can at least partly be attributed to the choices that were made in terms of its implementation. According to Mr. Z., it was originally hoped that Potter Thomas could be organized very much like the Coral Way school in Florida, with half a day devoted to each language. This
plan had to be altered in order to insure that all students were being taught the basics, and also because the Anglo students were just not capable of functioning in Spanish for their regular academic subjects. The sacrifice of the school's original language-oriented goals for the sake of satisfying more general academic requirements is something which both Mr. Z. and Mr. R. regard as necessary. On separate occasions, each one expressed the belief that black/Anglo students who are not reading at grade level in English should not be studying Spanish at all. They both think that bilingualism is a good thing, but clearly view it as something extra, and they agree that Spanish should only be available for those students who want to take it and are capable of handling an additional subject. Besides firmly believing that remedial help in English should take priority over instruction in Spanish, these teachers imply through their comments that children who do not do well in their other subjects are not intelligent enough to begin studying a foreign language. They clearly weigh the variable of "aptitude" much more heavily than "attitude" when predicting the potential success of Anglo students at learning a second language.

In line with Lambert's findings, which state that a positive attitude towards learning a second language can outweigh a lack in some sort of nebulous innate ability, my response to a situation such as this would be to cultivate a more integrative disposition towards the Latino community among the English-speaking students. Rather than taking the children's failure to become fluent in Spanish to mean a deficiency on their part, and using it as a rationale for moving even further away from the initial goal of two-way maintenance, I believe that the current situation signifies the failure of the school's administration to design a program
which motivates the Anglo children to learn Spanish. If the
rigidity of the curriculum will not allow for an increase in the
overall amount of Spanish that the English-dominant students are
given, perhaps the program can be restructured to facilitate
greater interaction among the Anglo and Latino groups. It seems
that many decisions concerning organizational structure and school
rules, for example the cafeteria seating regulations, were made
without taking into account the special needs of a bilingual
program.

Yet perhaps there is more to the disparity between theory and
practice which cannot be attributed to poor planning. It is
possible that because of the ethnic imbalance of the school and the
strong concentration of Latinos in the surrounding neighborhood,
two-way maintenance bilingual education is just not an appropriate
option for the community. This is certainly the opinion of Mr. Z.
and Mr. R., who kept harking back to the days when the school was
evenly divided between whites, blacks, and Latinos as if that was
the only the time the program had any chance for success. While
this might not be true, there are several ways in which the
demographic makeup of Potter Thomas acts as a barrier to the
success of the maintenance model. The English-speaking black
population is significantly smaller than the "critical mass" of 30%
which desegregationists set as a minimum level to achieve
successful integration; without this percentage, a minority group
often does not have the power to make their ethnicity an important
part of the school, and instead frequently ends up feeling
threatened by the majority. This is especially true at Potter
Thomas, where nearly everyone in the school and the surrounding
community speaks Spanish. Although the Latino-track children are
learning to speak English, my observations and the comments of teachers have caused me to wonder if all of them achieve as high a level of fluency as they would have if they had had more contact with native English speakers. This is particularly true for the children who arrive from Puerto Rico later on in elementary school, and spend their first few years in the U.S. in an environment where everyone, including their teachers, speaks Spanish.

One possible alternative to two-way maintenance is the New Concurrent Approach. Besides being a way to reinforce a positive view of Hispanic culture while increasing the amount of English used in class, this model has the added advantage of reflecting the language patterns which exist in the community. By permitting a certain amount of natural code-switching, children in both groups could learn to understand both languages, and hopefully would feel comfortable speaking either. Of course, using only this approach without making an effort in some classes to stay in one language could be detrimental. Code-switching would probably have to be avoided in English and Spanish classes in order to insure that students become literate in each language and are able to keep them apart when necessary. The question of whether or not language mixing causes confusion and, ultimately, a lack of mastery of either language, is still open to debate, although Hakuta states that "The commonly held fear that early simultaneous bilingualism causes retardation in language finds little support in data."\(^7\)

Through creating a comfortable, supportive bilingual atmosphere, an NCA program intends to "maximiz[e] the learning efforts of bilingual children at school" through "focusing... on educational rather than societal goals."\(^8\) I believe that this emphasis on quality of education is crucial to the success of any
bilingual program, regardless of the model being implemented. Classrooms with an unstructured rather than traditional format and schedules which allow time for open discussions of the issues of ethnic pluralism and bilingualism would seem to be especially important to making a school an environment which is conducive to good learning.

Unfortunately, the rigidity of the curriculum at Potter Thomas is one of the biggest hinderances to the bilingual program. In an attempt to insure that basic material is not neglected in favor of innovations which only address the bilingual issue, all teachers are required to use a certain set of textbooks in several subjects which are organized around specific lessons and regular, standardized tests. Mrs. L. commented that this uniform curriculum (which is actually a citywide, mandated policy) acts as a major limitation to what she can do with her students. The lack of flexibility and the regulated quantity of material which she has to cover takes away most opportunities for creativity in her lesson plans, and she constantly feels rushed by the frequent movement of students and teachers from class to class which occurs as a means of placing students who are on the same level together for individual subjects while keeping the homerooms heterogeneous.

Despite the many negative points which I have discovered during my semester at Potter Thomas, I cannot help but come away with a somewhat positive outlook on the school and especially its teachers. The criticisms of the program expressed by Mrs. L. were evidence of the commitment that she and teachers like her have to the pluralistic philosophy of the school and to the ultimate goal of quality education. The fact that everyone is working within an innovative program which has a philosophy aimed at providing the
best possible education for minority students seems to give the school a special kind of energy and focus. Of course I do not have many other experiences at inner-city urban schools with which to compare this, but after having been prepared for the worst I was often pleasantly surprised by the quality of the teaching, and, more than that, by the genuinely caring and enthusiastic attitudes of so many of the teachers. The school is obviously not achieving all of its goals as a two-way maintenance program, and many of the teachers clearly recognize this, but by providing urban minority children with the chance for a positive school experience, Potter Thomas is succeeding on another, perhaps even more important level.
Descriptions of teachers and administrators:

Mrs. Melendez, principal: A Latino woman, probably in her 40s. She speaks English well but with a strong Spanish accent.

Mr. Z.: a white, monolingual man, probably in his 50s, who worked in the area when there were actually two smaller schools -- Potter and Thomas -- situated a few blocks apart. He transferred to the Potter Thomas building when it opened, and worked there for a few years before it became bilingual. His position at the school now is as an English reading specialist. He used to teach a number of remedial classes, but now his job is primarily to test students and keep records of their scores and reading levels.

Mr. R. ("Call me Joe Smith"): A white monolingual man, probably about 60, who has been teaching at Potter Thomas since before it became bilingual. Now he has a 5th grade Anglo homeroom, and in addition teaches math to some of the other 5th grade classes (Latino and Anglo).

Mrs. L.: A Latino woman of Cuban origin who is in her 50s. She came to the United States about 30 years ago, and speaks English very well. Her homeroom is a 5th grade Latino class, and she also teaches some SSL sections.

Mrs. D.: A Latino woman in her 40s who speaks English well. Her homeroom is a 3rd grade Latino class.

Mrs. P.: A Latino woman of about 50, who also speaks English well. She teaches a Latino 1st grade class and also a 2nd grade beginning SSL class.

Mrs. N.: A woman of about 30, probably Latino in origin, who taught for several years in South America. She seems to be completely bilingual, although she speaks English more often than Spanish. She teaches a 2nd grade Anglo class.
Potter Thomas Hymn

Come brother I'll teach you my language
and you teach me yours.
If we work together our knowledge
will open the doors.

Our pledge will unite us
and let love join us, too.
The barriers will be broken,
understanding will shine through.

Potter Thomas is a symbol
of progress, strength, and unity.
Our school is the banner
of our community.

We'll shape our understanding
as brothers side by side --
We'll march along together
with knowledge as our standard
and God our final guide.

Note: I have edited the punctuation and rearranged the stanzas a bit in attempt to make the "Hymn" read better. I have never heard it recited or sung, though, so I may be a little bit off. I had to do this because the only place I saw it written in English was in one second grade classroom, where it looked like this:

(First page)

Come brother I'll teach
you my language and
you teach me yours

If we work together
our knowledge will
open the doors

Our pledge will unite
us and let love join us
too the barriers will
be broken understanding
will shine through.

Potter Thomas is a symbol of progress, strength and unity this school is the banner of our community.

We'll shape our understanding as brothers side by side --
We'll march along together with knowledge as our standard and God our final guide.

* * * * *

Potter Thomas Himno

Estudiemos hermanos unidos por la luz de un ideal. Hablemos dos lenguas y comprendamos más. Que nos una el empeño, que nos una el amor. Rompamos la barrera de la incomprensión.

Potter Thomas simboliza una era de progreso y unidad. Esta escuela es la bandera de la comunidad.

La ciencia es nuestra meta, las armas nuestros libros, la guía nuestros maestros, comprensión el emblema, Dios la inspiración.
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