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A REAL-LIFE EXAMPLE

‘What country is this?’ ‘America!’ ‘What language do we speak here?’ ‘English!’ came the rallying cries from the standing-room only crowd at a school board meeting in the small community of Forest Lake, Minnesota. It was the winter of 2003. Two years earlier a new parent, Shannon Peterson, had approached school board officials about establishing an immersion programme. They asked her to identify 20 other families who would be willing to place their children in a pilot programme. She found 60 families. The school board organised a task force that included Shannon, parents representing the interested families, and local teachers and administrators. The task force worked tirelessly to inform the community of the benefits of immersion and was convinced the district would launch a programme. The 2003 meeting signalled a change. Fear, ignorance and anti-immigrant sentiments served as powerful forces against the proposal.

Shortly after that meeting the school board decided not to open an immersion programme, citing a lack of financial resources. The parent group pursued other options – a different nearby school district, a private or charter school. The group’s tenacity and stamina were major forces that functioned
as effective counterweights to the obstacles they faced. They eventually established a charter school once the Minnesota Department of Education agreed to authorise them.\(^3\) Lakes International Language Academy (LILA), an early total foreign language immersion programme (100% immersion in early grades) with an International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme curriculum, was launched in September of that same year. LILA opened its doors to 177 children with two Spanish immersion classes each in kindergarten, first and second grade (ages 5–7), as well as third- and fourth-grade classes that received enhanced Spanish-as-a-foreign-language instruction. The latter was phased out as the immersion programme grew. LILA’s new director Cam Hedlund had spent years in the community as a principal and was highly trusted and respected, and LILA benefited from his political capital.

Now, in 2014, the highly popular K–6 school serves over 700 students, offering both Spanish and Chinese immersion. The Chinese programme opened in 2011 and currently encompasses Grades K–3. A significant Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) federal grant for 2006–9 provided the stability needed in the Spanish programme to try out Chinese immersion. The Spanish immersion students also study Chinese as a foreign language, and Chinese immersion students have Spanish classes.

Ironically, the school district that opposed immersion in 2003 began losing students to LILA and dollars (since state per-pupil funding follows the student). They turned to LILA for assistance in establishing their own immersion programmes. In 2010 the district elected to offer partial immersion (50% in English, 50% in Spanish) at its two elementary schools. The board did not wish to compete with LILA’s total programme and wanted to allay parent concerns about English language development. Meanwhile, the district was instrumental in creating public, non-charter junior-high and high-school immersion continuation programmes for LILA graduates.

Important mechanisms support LILA. Initially, the Minnesota Advocates for Immersion Network (MAIN),\(^4\) a grassroots consortium of immersion educators and University of Minnesota researchers/teacher educators, as well as the Immersion Projects at the University’s Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA),\(^5\) were particularly valuable as LILA established roots. LILA responded to parental needs and concerns by offering a pupil before- and after-school care programme, parent language classes, student summer language camps and orientation camps for incoming kindergarteners. Another beneficial mechanism is the Amity Institute (www.amity.org), which provides interns from Spanish- and Chinese-speaking countries to serve as ‘language ambassadors’ at LILA.

LILA is thriving, yet remains challenged by issues faced by most US immersion programmes. There is a shortage of qualified (according to state
licensure standards), highly proficient teachers who are prepared for immersion settings. Per-pupil funding for charter schools is lower than in regular public schools, and there are few federal and state grants to support immersion. Despite these enduring challenges, LILA is an indisputable success and serves as a model for others. This example illustrates that it is the passion, commitment and sense of mission of some indefatigable individuals who know how to use existing mechanisms and create new ones that has been the driving force in the establishment of many US immersion programmes.

INTRODUCTION

In many ways, the US is a country of paradoxes, many of which are driven by conflicts between personal freedom and societal order – fierce independence and governmental supervision. This is also the case with bilingual education. For example, on the one hand, the US government has recognised the critical need for US citizens to speak languages other than English for well over 50 years (Jackson and Malone 2009); on the other hand, it consistently institutes policies that squander existing linguistic resources amongst heritage speakers/immigrant students. Another paradox is that despite persistent anti-immigrant sentiments and English-only agendas, the US is experiencing unprecedented growth in bilingual/immersion programmes (e.g. Eaton 2014; Maxwell 2012; Mellon 2014). Forces such as the belief in the importance of bilingualism and mechanisms such as state-level support for immersion programming serve as effective counterweights to anti-immigrant rhetoric and advocates of English-only policies.

The remainder of this chapter first discusses terminology associated with US immersion programmes. It then describes bilingual education for majority-language learners, minority-language learners and Indigenous minorities by briefly summarising their unique historical contexts and identifying current programme types. Throughout these discussions, the forces, mechanisms and counterweights that have influenced bilingual programming are examined. The chapter concludes with a call for a new paradigm that brings together advocates for all types of bilingual education in the quest to promote bi/multilingualism for all.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The use of the term ‘bilingual education’ as an umbrella term for programmes that use at least two languages as media of school-based instruction has
become highly politicised in the US. Historically, ‘bilingual education’ in the US was used to refer only to programmes developed for minority-language students. As anti-bilingual education initiatives took hold in some states in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the label ‘dual-language education’ emerged as an alternative and more inclusive term to refer to a range of bilingual programmes serving minority- and/or majority-language students. At the same time, it is also a more restrictive term in that it refers only to additive (strong) bilingual programmes, while the term ‘bilingual education’, as used internationally, encompasses both weak and strong forms (Baker and Jones 1998). Additive (strong) bilingual programmes are designed to allow students to acquire a new language at no expense to their first, native language, whereas subtractive (weak) bilingual programmes do not provide for continued development and maintenance of students’ first languages (Lambert 1984).

In the US, dual-language programmes aim to develop additive bilingualism and biliteracy in at least two languages, grade-level academic achievement, and inter-, cross- or multicultural competence (Christian 2011). They are subject-matter driven programmes in which a foreign, second, heritage or Indigenous language is used as the vehicle to teach academic content for 50% or more of instructional time during the Pre-K–5/6 school years and, ideally, into secondary education. They also provide for the continued development of the majority language, English.

These programmes may serve student populations that are linguistically homogeneous (e.g. students who speak English as a home language), or linguistically heterogeneous (e.g. a combination of English speakers and Spanish speakers). Howard, Olague and Rogers (2003) included four distinct additive bilingual programme models under the ‘dual-language umbrella’: ‘developmental bilingual education’ (DBE) – serving minority-language students; ‘one-way’ foreign language immersion (OWI) – targeting majority-language speakers; ‘two-way’ immersion (TWI) – enrolling a linguistically heterogeneous student population; and ‘heritage’ or Indigenous Language Immersion (ILI) – which seeks to revitalise endangered Indigenous languages and cultures, and typically serves children with Indigenous ancestry. ILI programmes may be one-way or two-way, depending upon their student composition (with most being one-way). They have a set of challenges that differs from programmes focused on modern languages and thus should be in a category of their own (Fortune and Tedick 2008).

A challenge with terminology in the US is that often ‘dual-language education’ is used as a synonym for TWI education. Despite concerted efforts to promote ‘dual-language education’ as an inclusive, umbrella term, its use as
an equivalent for TWI persists. Complicating matters further, ‘dual immersion’ is used to describe ‘two-way’ programmes, and ‘one-way dual-language’ to describe DBE (Thomas and Collier 2012). Moreover, in its state-level initiative, Utah chose ‘dual-language immersion’ as an umbrella term to represent both OWI and TWI (Leite and Cook, this volume). This terminological challenge inevitably causes confusion, particularly among the American public and often the media.

Because this chapter describes some weak (subtractive) forms of bilingual education and because of the confusion that surrounds ‘dual-language education’ as an umbrella term, the term ‘bilingual education’ will be utilised throughout the chapter to refer to programmes that use a minimum of two languages as media of school-based instruction for at least some of K–12 education. The different programme models described in this chapter are summarised in Table 1 (see below).

Table 1: US Bilingual programme models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Student population</th>
<th>Goals and description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive (weak)</td>
<td>Structured English Immersion (SEI)</td>
<td>Minority-language students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE)</td>
<td>Minority-language students</td>
<td>English language acquisition and academic achievement – they use the minority language for instruction as a temporary bridge while students learn English so that they can be mainstreamed into regular English-medium education as quickly as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive (strong)</td>
<td>Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE)</td>
<td>Minority-language students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Way Foreign Language Immersion (OWI)</td>
<td>Majority-language students (primarily)</td>
<td>Bilingualism, academic achievement and cross-cultural competence – they teach students through the medium of a foreign language and English until at least Grade 5 or 6 (ages 11–12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Immersion (TWI)</td>
<td>Minority-language and majority-language students</td>
<td>Bilingualism, academic achievement and intercultural competence – they integrate 2 learner groups and provide instruction through the medium of both the minority language and English until at least Grade 5 or 6 (ages 11–12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Language Immersion (ILI)</td>
<td>Majority-language students with Native American/Indigenous ancestry (primarily)</td>
<td>Revitalisation of endangered Indigenous languages and cultures and academic achievement – they use the Indigenous language and English for subject-matter instruction, but programmes vary in terms of the instructional time devoted to both languages. They also emphasise Indigenous cultural values and traditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BILINGUAL/IMMERSION EDUCATION FOR MAJORITY-LANGUAGE STUDENTS

Historical context:

In the late 1960s, Professor Russ Campbell of the University of California Los Angeles was disillusioned by the abysmal results of traditional foreign language instruction in the US. He became intrigued by the Canadian French immersion experiment in St. Lambert (see Genesee, this volume), and during visits to St. Lambert he consulted extensively with students, parents, teachers, their McGill University partners and school officials (Campbell 1984). He later convinced Culver City Unified School District in California to adopt the Canadian model and launch in 1971 the first US foreign-language (Spanish) immersion programme for majority-language students (Campbell 1984). Thus, Canada’s St. Lambert programme served as a powerful example or mechanism facilitating the establishment of OWI in the US.

As positive research results from programme evaluation studies emerged in California (e.g. Campbell 1984), paralleling those reported in Canada, interest in the programme grew. By 1977, 12 US schools offered OWI and, two years later, that number nearly doubled, according to a directory maintained by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). By 1999, the number of schools offering OWI gradually increased to 280. In the 1980s, federal desegregation monies for public schools served as a mechanism to support OWI programmes. These programmes could attract students from across school districts and in that way were seen as contributing to the desegregation of highly segregated neighbourhood schools. Parents like Shannon Peterson, who believed in the power of bilingualism and its importance for their children, were another important mechanism that served to promote these programmes. Parents lobbied school district officials to offer OWI, and some moved to districts that offered this programme choice.

During the early to mid-2000s, CAL reported a nationwide drop in the number of programmes offering foreign language immersion (see n. 6). At the same time, a large-scale study also reported a significant drop in the number of US elementary schools offering foreign-language instruction from 1997 to 2008 (Pufahl and Rhodes 2011); lack of funding and teachers were two of several reasons cited for this drop. However, by the end of that decade, the tide turned.

The immersion landscape changed dramatically in 2009 when Utah passed unprecedented legislation and provided funding for immersion (see Mehisto, Introduction, and Leite and Cook, Chapter 5). This marked a shift in how
programmes were established in some parts of the country – from their grassroots origins to top-down, state-level mandates. States such as Arizona, Delaware, Georgia and Wyoming have since followed Utah’s lead, implementing immersion programmes with state level support (G. Roberts, personal communication, 19 March 2014). A powerful networking mechanism that has led several states to follow Utah’s example is the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NCSSFL; www.ncssfl.org).

State-based initiatives like Utah’s have received considerable positive media attention. This attention has been a strong mechanism spurring the development of immersion elsewhere and its continued growth in areas with a long history of successful immersion programming (e.g. Minnesota, Oregon). Although the actual number is quite likely much higher, the 2014 CAL Directory (see n. 6), which is based on school districts self-reporting, includes nearly 600 foreign-language immersion programmes.

**Types of immersion programmes for majority-language students:**

The US offers immersion programmes in multiple modern languages (see CAL Directories). Spanish remains the most prevalent for OWI and TWI programmes, but French and Mandarin Chinese are also prominent. Chinese in particular has grown in popularity, not only because of China’s expanded role in the global economy, but also because US federal funding for ‘critical languages’ (like Mandarin, Korean, Arabic) and monies from the Chinese government have served as strong mechanisms to support programme development.

Two main bilingual education programme types – OWI and TWI – are offered for majority-language students; the latter combines majority-language with minority-language students in the same classrooms and offers instruction in English and the minority partner language (e.g. Spanish). Each of these models has variations. The US only offers programmes of the ‘early’ variety – those that begin in pre-school, kindergarten, or Grade 1 – unlike Canada and other countries that also offer ‘delayed’ (Grade 4 start), and ‘late’ immersion (Grade 7 start).

*One-way ‘partial’ immersion education:* Partial immersion programmes offer 50% of subject-matter instruction in the second or new language (L2) and 50% in the majority language, English, from the beginning and throughout the duration of the elementary school years. Utah adopted this model (see Leite and Cook this volume) and called it ‘50:50’ rather than ‘partial’ immersion because it was believed that the term ‘partial’ would not be interpreted favourably by parents and legislators. Since Utah’s adoption of the ‘50:50’
descriptor, it has become increasingly common to see these programmes described as ‘50:50’ rather than partial, although ‘50:50’ was initially used exclusively to describe a TWI variety.

One-way ‘total’ immersion education: Total OWI programmes begin with 100% of subject-matter instruction in the L2 for the first few years. Then, about 30–45 minutes of English (L1) language arts instruction is formally introduced into the curriculum as early as Grade 2 and as late as Grade 4. More instructional time in English is gradually added each year so that by the end of elementary school (Grade 5 or 6, ages 11–12), students have about 50% of instructional time in each language.

Two-way immersion education: There are two main varieties of TWI programmes: the 50:50 and 90:10 model. The 50:50 model is parallel to partial OWI. In 90:10 programmes, 90% of instruction occurs in the minority language and 10% in English for the first years of the programme, with a gradual increase in English and decrease in the minority language as students advance in grade, until a balance is reached by upper elementary. There are also other variations such as 80:20 or 70:30. The Alicia Chacón International School in El Paso, Texas, is considered an 80:10:10 model, because all students study a third language (Chinese, German, Japanese or Russian) for 10% of the time throughout the programme; it transitions to 45:45:10 for Grades 5–8 (Calderón and Minaya-Rowe 2003). CAL lists in its self-reported TWI directory approximately 450 TWI programmes although, again, the actual number is likely much higher. The TWI model is discussed in more detail in the next section.

As in Canada, studies in the US have shown that majority-language students in OWI and TWI perform at or above grade-level norms on standardized tests of academic achievement administered in English (e.g., Downs-Reid 2000; Essama 2007; Lindholm-Leary 2001). Overall, majority-language students in immersion programmes display fluency and confidence when using the L2, are skilled at using communication strategies and develop high levels of comprehension in the L2 (see Genesee 2004, and Genesee and Lindholm-Leary 2013, for reviews). However, when it comes to production skills, immersion students’ language lacks complexity, sociolinguistic appropriateness, grammatical accuracy and lexical precision (see Lyster 2007, for a review).
BILINGUAL/IMMERSION EDUCATION FOR MINORITY-LANGUAGE STUDENTS

Historical context:

The historical context of bilingual education for minority-language students is much more complicated than that for majority-language students, and space limitations do not allow comprehensive coverage of it within this chapter. In a brief history of US bilingual education, Baker and Jones (1998) identify four overlapping periods—permissive, restrictive, opportunistic and dismissive. The ‘permissive period’ took place during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as European immigrants arrived. At this time, linguistic diversity was widely accepted in the US, and many bilingual and even some monolingual German, Dutch and Norwegian schools existed. This permissive attitude toward languages, a force in and of itself, was shaped by other forces, such as competition for students between private and public schools during the second half of the nineteenth century, ethnic homogeneity in many areas and desires to learn English (and by extension to belong to the majority group), while simultaneously maintaining and continuing to develop mother tongues. Despite the overall positive attitudes toward languages besides English that characterised this era, Ovando (2003) stresses that this period did not actively foster bilingualism; ‘rather, a policy of linguistic assimilation without coercion seemed to prevail’.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the permissive period evolved into the ‘restrictive period’ as attitudes toward bilingualism and bilingual education shifted dramatically. The restrictive period continued through to the 1960s and, arguably, many of its underlying forces persist today. An influx of immigrants at the turn of the century contributed to fear of foreigners and ‘the call for integration, harmonization and assimilation of immigrants, whose lack of English language and English literacy was seen as a source of social, political and economic concern’ (Baker and Jones 1998). ‘Americanisation’ emerged as a force. This was reflected in the Nationality Act of 1906, a mechanism that made English a prerequisite to naturalised citizenship. US participation in World War I led to anti-German sentiment, and the English language was perceived as a unifying force, with other languages seen as threats to Americanisation.

The launch of Sputnik by Russia in 1957 sparked concern about the quality of US education and foreign-language instruction. Such concerns were rooted in forces such as the fear of falling behind Russia and the desire for the US to be the lead nation globally. The National Defense Education Act (1958)
led to increased foreign language learning for majority-language students in K–12 settings and universities and, in turn, promoted a somewhat more tolerant attitude toward languages other than English (Baker and Jones 1998). Ovando (2003) notes, however, that while

the country was encouraging the study of foreign languages for English monolinguals, at great cost and with great inefficiency, … it was destroying through monolingual English instruction the linguistic gifts that children from non-English-language backgrounds bring to our schools.

The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, colour or creed, symbolised the start of a shift to less negative attitudes toward ethnic groups and more positive attitudes toward linguistic diversity. These mechanisms and forces heralded in a ‘period of opportunity’ that lasted for two decades. The Coral Way Elementary School established by Cuban exiles in Miami-Dade County, Florida, in 1963 is often associated with the resurgence of bilingual education during this period. Assuming that their stay in the US was temporary, these parents wanted school support in developing their children’s native Spanish, but also in acquiring English. The school brought together Spanish-speaking learners of English and English-speaking learners of Spanish, and is credited with being the nation’s first TWI programme, though it was not labelled as such (Christian 2011; Fortune and Tedick 2008).

The ‘period of opportunity’ was marked by significant legislation and a number of lawsuits. These mechanisms were used to further develop bilingual programming. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 authorised the use of languages other than English in education, but still only allocated funds to support native-language instruction for minority-language students temporarily, with the aim of transitioning them to English rather than supporting ongoing development of their mother tongues. A landmark 1974 US Supreme Court decision known as ‘Lau v. Nichols’ prohibited English ‘submersion’ programmes for minority-language children and led to ‘Lau remedies’, designed to eliminate past educational practices that had been ruled unlawful under Lau v. Nichols. Lau remedies included English as a Second Language (ESL) programmes, English tutoring and some forms of bilingual education. The emphasis remained on transitional use of students’ first language (L1) for instruction rather than long-term L1 development. Nevertheless, the Lau v. Nichols decision ‘... had an enormous impact on the development of bilingual education in the [US]’ (Ovando 2003).

The 1980s marked the beginning of the ‘dismissive period’. This period gave rise to the ‘English Only’ movement, which has since been sponsored by
various organisations, such as US English, a powerful, conservative, multi-
million dollar organisation that strives to make English the official language
of the nation. It has successfully lobbied for passage of English-as-an-official-
language legislation in many states. May (2012) identifies a number of
negative features that characterise the ‘English Only’ movement, including
historical inaccuracy, an over-emphasis on English proficiency as a barom-
eter of educational success, a misrepresentation of bilingual education, and
two additional factors, namely:

... the inherent nativism of much English Only rhetoric; language is used, in
effect, as a convenient proxy for maintaining racialized distinctions in the USA
[and] ... the assumption that speaking English is a unifying force, while multilin-
gualism is by definition destructive of national unity. (May 2012)

A counterweight to the ‘English Only’ movement is ‘English Plus’, a group
that promotes cultural, linguistic and democratic pluralism.

The dismissive period has included additional legislative changes and ini-
tiatives, all mechanisms that work primarily against bilingual education.
For example, in 1978, the US Congress re-authorised Transitional Bilingual
Education legislation, which established that federal funds could not be used
for DBE programmes. Later amendments provided for an increase in funds
for programmes that did not allow use of students’ native languages, al-
though at the same time there was some funding for the development of TWI
programmes. State-level legislation outlawing bilingual education has also
been prevalent during this period. Proposition 227 (passed in California in
1998) was initiated by millionaire Ron Unz, who claimed that bilingual pro-
grammes were failing to teach children English (Ovando 2003). Unz’s claims
were based in part on some studies showing that bilingual programmes
were ineffective (e.g. Gersten 1985; Rossell and Baker 1996); however, such
studies have been criticised as methodologically flawed (e.g. Krashen 2000).
Proposition 227 requires that minority-language learners be taught pri-
marily in English through sheltered or ‘structured English immersion’ (SEI)
programmes before being transferred to mainstream English-medium class-
rooms. Two other states soon followed California’s lead, passing similar le-
sislation in 2000 (Arizona) and 2002 (Massachusetts), although attempts
in Oregon and Colorado failed. The SEI programme label represents a mis-
appropriation of the term ‘immersion’, since immersion programmes are
intended to be additive in nature. California’s SEI programmes are clearly
subtractive in their intent: ‘to place [minority-language] children in an ini-
tially all-English instructional program [is] to misapply the immersion pro-
cess in a harmful, subtractive way’ (Lambert 1984).
As Baker and Jones (1998) aptly point out, the history of bilingual education in the US ‘shows that there is constant change, a constant movement in ideas, ideology and impetus. There is action and reaction, movement and contra-movement, assertion and response.’ Underlying and driving this constant change are the many forces, mechanisms and counterweights that intersect and come into play. Convincing the American public and policymakers that bilingual education is effective for minority-language learners and that bilingualism for all (regardless of language background) would be an asset for the nation continue to be challenges, yet they must be overcome if the US is to progress beyond this dismissive era (Ovando 2003).

Bilingual/immersion programmes for minority-language students

The nation offers both ‘weak’ and ‘strong’ forms of bilingual education for minority-language students (Baker and Jones 1998). The description of programmes presented here is restricted to those that employ the use of two languages for instruction for at least some minimum period of time. Unfortunately, most minority-language students are schooled in English-only programmes in the US.

**Transitional Bilingual Education:** As a weak form of bilingual education, TBE programmes are designed for linguistically homogeneous groups of minority-language students (typically Spanish speakers). Their primary goal is not for students to become bilingual and biliterate, but rather for students to function in mainstream, English-medium classes; thus they utilise students’ L1 only as a temporary bridge to classes taught in English only. These subtractive programmes persist despite the wealth of research evidence that demonstrates the superiority of additive models when it comes to overall academic achievement in English in the long term (e.g. Lindholm-Leary 2001; Lindholm-Leary and Genesee 2010; Thomas and Collier 2012; Valentino and Reardon 2014). Forces influencing the persistence of TBE are unfounded beliefs that bilingual education is ineffective in teaching English and that programmes fostering additive bilingualism will slow linguistic assimilation as they maintain student loyalty to minority languages (Crawford 2004).

**Developmental Bilingual Education:** DBE programmes represent a strong form of bilingual education serving minority-language learners (typically Spanish speakers) that strives to produce bilingual, biliterate and bicultural students. At least 50% of instruction is provided in the minority language, along with English, through at least the elementary school years; stronger DBE programmes continue through the secondary grades. Research on DBE
programme outcomes has generally shown that minority-language learners in DBE academically do as well as or better than peers schooled only in English in the long term (see Genesee and Lindholm-Leary 2013, for a review).

**Two-Way Immersion Education (TWI):** TWI programmes represent an amalgam of DBE and OWI programmes in that they serve both minority-language and majority-language students, ideally 50% from each language group. They also represent a strong and additive form of bilingual education.

A considerable body of research indicates that the TWI model is highly effective for minority-language learners (Lindholm-Leary 2001; Lindholm-Leary and Genesee 2010; Thomas and Collier 2012; Valentino and Reardon 2014). Studies have consistently shown that both minority-language and majority-language learners in these programmes do as well as or better than peers schooled only in English on standardised tests of achievement including in English (Lindholm-Leary 2001; see Genesee and Lindholm-Leary 2013, Thomas and Collier 2012, for reviews). Interestingly, however, research on the academic outcomes of minority-language learners, or English learners (ELs), in TWI, TBE and DBE programmes in comparison to structured English immersion (SEI) programmes has been rather inconclusive, in part because of the measures used, the short-term nature of studies and challenges with data sets provided by states such as California (American Institutes for Research 2006). Even meta-analyses have yielded different conclusions because of the different study inclusion criteria they adopt. However, a very recent study provides a quasi-experimental analysis of the relationship between instructional programme type and EL students’ longitudinal academic outcomes in English Language Arts and Maths in California. Valentino and Reardon (2014) found that at the Grade 2 level, TWI ELs score significantly lower than their EL counterparts attending TBE, DBE and SEI programmes; however, in the long-term (by Grade 7), they score ‘substantially above their peers in other programmes’ in English Language Arts and Maths (Valentino and Reardon 2014). Valentino and Reardon (2014) conclude that:

… provided our longer-term findings, these short-term results highlight the potential problems with relying on short-term outcomes (as much of the existing research does) to determine program effectiveness. (Valentino and Reardon 2014)

Lindholm-Leary and Genesee (2010) have reported similar results. When it comes to language proficiency, minority-language students have been found to achieve much higher levels of bilingualism than majority-language students in TWI programmes, who tend to develop ‘functional’ proficiency in
the minority language that can be characterised as grammatically inaccurate and lexically limited (e.g. Lindholm-Leary 2001; Potowski 2007). At the same time, even heritage minority-language learners often develop grammatical inaccuracies in the minority language (Potowski 2007; Tedick and Young 2014), and students at secondary levels report that they do not have sufficient opportunity in school or support to develop higher levels of language proficiency (de Jong and Bearse 2011).

A number of forces and mechanisms foster the continued growth of the TWI model. These programmes are driven by the belief that bilingualism for all is positive and will benefit the country. They are also influenced by beliefs that peer models of the languages will lead to better language learning and more positive intergroup relationships between the two linguistic groups (de Jong and Howard 2009). They also serve to allay frequent criticisms about the segregation of minority-language students in other forms of bilingual education (Christian 2011). A myriad of mechanisms support the establishment and implementation of TWI programmes, such as significant and robust research findings, as well as state and national organisations like CAL (www.cal.org/twi/index.htm), Dual Language of New Mexico (www.dlenm.org), the Association of Two-Way and Dual Language Education (www.atdle.org), the CARLA Immersion Projects (www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/index.html), and the National Dual Language Consortium (www.dual-language.org). Like TBE and DBE, TWI programmes also benefit from federal funding mechanisms.

BILINGUAL/IMMERSION EDUCATION FOR INDIGENOUS-LANGUAGE STUDENTS

Historical context:

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the discriminatory policies and practices that US Indigenous communities have faced over the centuries. Of the possibly more than 2000 native languages spoken historically in what is today North America, approximately 139 remain in use and all are endangered. Among US states, Hawaii was the first to establish state-level Indigenous language and culture revitalisation efforts.

In the late 1970s, William (‘Pila’) Wilson and his wife Kauanoe Kamanā had been hired at the University of Hawaii-Hilo to establish a Bachelor of Arts degree in Hawaiian Studies. They sought to create a programme that would be delivered, in part, through the medium of Hawaiian. Upon the birth of
their first child in 1981, they also decided to become a ‘Hawaiian-medium family’ (Wilson and Kamanā 2001). Wilson’s and Kamanā’s personal investment in the future of the Hawaiian language and their fear that Hawaiian would be lost were potent forces that propelled them to work with others to build a strong future for Hawaiian-medium education in Hawaii.

In 1983, following the lead of New Zealand’s Kōhanga Reo (‘language nest’ in Māori), Wilson and colleagues established the ‘Aha Pūnana Leo (‘language nest gathering’), a pre-school focused on developing Hawaiian native speakers, which was populated initially by children being raised in Hawaiian by L2 speakers, namely those leading the movement. In this case, as would later be repeated in other cases, parental commitment was such a powerful force that parents themselves, rather than educators or school systems, began offering pre-school programmes. Later in 1983 the parents received approval from Hawaii’s Board of Education to allow Hawaiian-medium education on Ni’ihau, an isolated, privately owned island where a small number (100+) of Hawaiian native speakers resided. A three-year battle was required to repeal a ban in place since the early 1900s on teaching through the medium of Hawaiian. New legislation was a mechanism for furthering the movement – the ‘Aha Pūnana Leo was legal and plans ensued to open more sites. Yet the needs of their children for continued Hawaiian-medium education after pre-school were initially ignored. Wilson and colleagues then established a ‘boycott kindergarten’, which they called Ke Kula Kaiapuni Hawai’i (‘The Hawaiian Surrounding Environment School’), so that their children could attend Hawaiian-medium primary education. Wilson and Kamanā (2001, 150) wrote: ‘We were prepared to be arrested for our children’s non-attendance at a public or private school if public Hawaiian-medium education was not provided for our children.’ In the summer of 1987, the Board of Education approved their action and named the programme the Hawaiian Language Immersion Programme. Other sites were soon established.

Today, Hawaii boasts 20 immersion programmes serving Grades K–12, six of which are charter schools (Hawaiian Department of Education 2014). As a counterweight to the status and ubiquitous nature of English in the community, in one school, Ke Kula ‘O Nāwahīokalani’ōpū‘u (Nāwahi), the entire K–12 programme is offered through Hawaiian, with the exception of English language classes beginning in Grade 5. Nāwahi’s student population is considered to be ‘at-risk’ with 70% receiving free or reduced price lunches. Nevertheless, since 1999, the school has maintained 100% graduation and 80% college attendance rates (Wilson and Kamanā 2011), much higher than those reported for Native Hawaiians in public schools.
Hawaiian-medium education also continues at the post-secondary level, with, for example, a bachelor’s degree in Hawaiian Studies, a post-baccalaureate certificate in Indigenous teacher education, and a PhD in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalisation at the University of Hawaii-Hilo. In just 31 years, what Wilson, Kamanā and colleagues have accomplished is nothing short of remarkable. Additional legislation has established Hawaiian (along with English) as an official state language; Hawaiian television and radio stations have been developed; and, most importantly, many more families are using Hawaiian for daily communication within their families, schools and communities. Hawaiian remains endangered, but significant strides have been made in its revitalisation.

**Bilingual/immersion programmes for Indigenous minorities**

Hawaiian revitalisation efforts have prompted other Indigenous-language communities in the US to use immersion education as a vehicle to revive their native languages. The exact number of Indigenous-language immersion (ILI) programmes nationwide and the exact number of Indigenous languages being revitalised through immersion are unknown. In addition to Hawaiian, CAL’s directory for OWI programmes reports ILI programmes in seven other Indigenous languages – Diné (Navajo), Chinook, Dakota, Inupiaq, Ojibwe, Salish and Yup’ik. But, based as it is on self-reports, the directory is incomplete; programmes also exist in Cherokee, for example. Currently Navajo is the only language for which TWI programmes are officially offered – two exist in the state of Arizona.

ILI programmes differ from immersion programmes in modern languages in a number of significant ways. Because their priority is language and culture survival, they are strictly Indigenous-language medium and often withhold the introduction of English in the curriculum until later (Grades 3–5). They emphasise traditional cultural values and practices within the curriculum. They also experience tensions not experienced by programmes focused on modern languages. For example, there is tension between the requirement that ILI programmes administer standardised achievement tests in English and the Indigenous perspective that assessment should represent the Indigenous language and traditional cultural values and practises that permeate the ILI curriculum (Wilson and Kamanā 2011). To date, in comparison to Hawaiian, no other Indigenous-language community in the US has built such an extensive programme covering all levels of the education system; in fact some ILI programmes do not continue beyond pre-school or the primary grades.
CONCLUSION AND CALL FOR A NEW PARADIGM

This chapter began with the story of LILA, which illustrated many of the forces, mechanisms and counterweights underlying bilingual education initiatives that have been further examined throughout this chapter. The complete list is summarised in the table at the end of the chapter. Key here are a number of paradoxes arising from diametrically opposed forces that have a major impact on bilingual education in the US. In particular, in this era of globalisation, a belief in the value of bilingualism is leading to unparalleled growth in immersion programmes for all students – majority-language, minority-language, and Indigenous-language – in some states and communities, while the persistence of a monolingual view of American identity and fear of immigration are contributing to anti-bilingual education agendas in other states. The growth in immersion programmes, the positive media attention surrounding them (e.g. Eaton 2014; Maxwell 2012; Mellon 2014), and recent discussions regarding the repeal of anti-bilingual legislation (e.g. Morrison 2014), perhaps signal that there is hope on the horizon and that the nation may be, broadly speaking, on the verge of a shift towards embracing bi/multilingualism for all.

To give impetus to such a shift, a new paradigm is needed. It is imperative that scholars and educators channel their beliefs and aspirations regarding bilingual education in a united and systematic manner through jointly created mechanisms to advocate for bilingualism for all. All too often forces (e.g. passions and commitments) arise distinctly and therefore align separately with each group – minority-language students, majority-language students and Indigenous-language students. These different ‘camps’ reflect the fact that bilingual/immersion education programmes have emerged in very different ways and for very different reasons for the three groups, as evidenced in the historical account presented earlier. The divide among these three ‘camps’ is reinforced by federal funding streams that serve each community separately, and by other distinct mechanisms that support immersion education for the three student groups, such as different professional organisations and conferences, and legislative initiatives (both pro- and anti-bilingual education).

Yet, as the US continues to diversify linguistically and culturally, the distinctions among the three groups and the programmes that serve them are becoming less clear. Spanish-speaking children are enrolling in Spanish OWI programmes designed for native English speakers; children without Hawaiian ancestry are attending Hawaiian immersion schools; a greater number of ‘third language’ students (whose home language is neither English
nor the minority language of the programme) are populating immersion programmes; some TWI programmes are having difficulty enrolling at least one-third English speakers (the recommended minimum guideline for TWI being at least one-third of each linguistic group); and all programme types are serving more ‘at-risk’ youth – socioeconomically disadvantaged, ethnic minority and special needs students (Fortune and Tedick 2008). Given the range of linguistically and culturally diverse students enrolled in many immersion programmes, there are benefits to joining together as professional colleagues. Ultimately, there is much to be gained from coming together with a unified voice in support of bilingual and immersion education, as opposed to just working in separate ‘camps’ and pursuing isolated advocacy efforts.

There are also benefits from joining forces to tackle the persistent challenges that are common across all types of immersion programmes in the US. This could be accomplished by jointly building some of the following mechanisms: (1) effective immersion teacher preparation and professional development programmes; (2) incentives to draw more highly qualified people into immersion teaching; (3) strong secondary programmes and higher education bilingual continuation programme options; (4) pedagogical guidelines to support teachers in helping students develop strong enough levels of proficiency to handle the literacy and other cognitive demands in higher grades (especially with the proliferation of 50:50 models); (5) valid and reliable assessment instruments that can be used to communicate language development targets to students and teachers, track language development, compare programme models and establish grade-level benchmarks to guide programme development; (6) well-developed curricula and classroom-based assessments that integrate language, subject matter and culture, and that make visible specific targets, including assessment criteria, and provide students and teachers with strategies for achieving those targets; (7) well-funded research efforts to address the myriad questions facing the field, and (8) centralised support at the federal level to foster the expansion of immersion and other bilingual programming into the future.

As the number of US immersion programmes grows, as research continues to demonstrate the positive impact of bilingual schooling for all learners, and as the need for language skills increases in an ever-more complicated and integrated world, the US just may be on the threshold of significant change regarding bilingual education. Synergy created through the concerted and co-ordinated efforts of scholars, educators, parents, community representatives and other stakeholders could be a force for change. Our challenge is to find ways of uniting to build that synergy, and to find the right mechanisms to allow us together to tap into the forces and other resources that will help deliver on the promise of bi/multilingual education.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks to Peeter Mehisto, Donna Christian, Fred Genesee and an anonymous Cambridge reviewer for helpful suggestions and insightful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

NOTES

1 Shannon Peterson is assistant director of Lakes International Language Academy (LILA). I am indebted to her for telling the LILA story and for her meticulous review thereof.
2 Charter schools operate independently while receiving public funding. There are over 5,000 such schools across the US (www.charterschoolcenter.org).
3 The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) sponsored approximately 10 schools within a one or two-year period. In 2011, however, they gave each of the schools they authorised one year to find new sponsors.
4 MAIN (www.mnimmersion.org) is now a non-profit member-supported organisation that advocates for immersion programmes in the state, provides annual professional development for immersion teachers, maintains a list of the state’s 90+ immersion programmes and posts job openings.
5 CARLA (www.carla.umn.edu) is one of 15 National Language Resource Centers that are funded by US Department of Education Title VI.
6 The link to CAL’s Directory of Foreign Language Immersion programmes is: webapp. cal.org/Immersion/.
7 The link to CAL’s Directory of TWI programmes is: www.cal.org/twi/directory/.
8 Readers are encouraged to review the Fall 2014 special issue of the Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, an international compilation of articles titled ‘Language Immersion Education: A Research Agenda for 2015 and Beyond’.
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## United States Of America: Summary of Forces, Mechanisms And Counterweights

### FORCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key values in human relations</th>
<th>MECHANISMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Committed parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>Networks (e.g. MAIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local expertise/expert consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to a vision that guides programme development</td>
<td>CARLA Immersion Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americanisation</td>
<td>CAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-language revitalisation</td>
<td>NCSSFL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs and attitudes</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in immersion/bilingual education</td>
<td>Laws and lawsuits (selected examples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in the power of bilingualism and its importance for children</td>
<td>The Nationality Act (1906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Chinese in global economy</td>
<td>The National Defense Education Act (1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive attitude towards languages</td>
<td>The Civil Rights Act (1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to belong to majority group</td>
<td>Anti-bilingual education legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobia (ethnolinguistic minorities seen as 'foreigners')</td>
<td>Multiple legislative initiatives in Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that bilingual education is ineffective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>Grassroots initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions between western standards and Indigenous-language revitalisation efforts</td>
<td>Charter schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Ethnic homogeneity (19th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-immigrant sentiments</td>
<td>Competition for students between public and private schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-German sentiments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear that endangered Indigenous languages would be lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERWEIGHTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Information and public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative forces, obstacles</td>
<td>Tenacity, stamina of parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-only movement</td>
<td>English Plus movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-immigrant sentiments</td>
<td>Belief in importance of bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of English in Hawaii</td>
<td>Establishment of pre-K-12 programme almost entirely in Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>