

アメリカにおける制限的言語政策の実証的研究

Empirical Research on Restrictive Language Policies in the United States

トレフソン, ジェームズ TOLLEFSON, James W.

● 国際基督教大学メディア・コミュニケーション・文化部門
Department of Media, Communication, and Culture, International Christian University



言語政策, 英語学習, 教育における言語, 学力

language policy, English language learning, language in education, educational achievement

ABSTRACT

本論文では、カリフォルニア州、アリゾナ州、マサチューセッツ州の学校において英語以外の言語を制限する言語政策がもたらす結果についての最近の研究を分析する。本論文は以下4つの主題からなる。1) 制限的な言語政策への異議、2) 研究方法とデータ、3) 主な研究結果、4) この研究結果が学校における言語政策に対して示唆すること。

This article analyzes recent empirical research on the consequences of language policies that restrict languages other than English in schools in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts. Four main topics are included: the opposition to restrictive language policies; research methodology and data; major findings; and the implications of these findings for language policies in schools.

1. Introduction: Restrictive Language Policies

In his analysis of the history of language policies in the United States, Wiley (2002) offers a typology of “policy orientations” distinguished by their implications for language in education. His typology includes the following: (a) promotion-oriented policies, characterized by official support for minority languages; (b) expediency-oriented policies, a subcategory of promotion-oriented policies, referring to policies that do not expand minority-language use, but nevertheless accommodate it; (c) tolerance-oriented policies, involving little or no state intervention in minority language use; (d) restrictive-oriented policies, involving state limitations or prohibitions on use of minority languages; (e) null policies, which refer to the lack of any state consideration of language policies; and (f) repression-oriented policies, involving explicit efforts to eliminate minority languages (Wiley, 2002, pp. 48-49). Since the early 1980s, language policies in the United States have become increasingly restrictive, culminating in the late 1990s and early 2000s in a series of state-level voter initiatives designed to make English the official language and to eliminate most bilingual education programs. Three initiatives in California (Proposition 227 in 1998), Arizona (Proposition 203 in 2000), and Massachusetts (Question 2 in 2002) have received the greatest attention among scholars of bilingualism and bilingual education. Although the details vary, these successful initiatives limited the educational options offered to English language learners, resulting in the end of most bilingual programs and the dominance of English-only programs of limited duration (normally no more than one year), usually called “structured English immersion.”

Opposition to these restrictive policies has been intense, led by scholars who argued during the political campaigns leading up to the vote on the

proposals that the policies were based on faulty data and inaccurate understanding of language in education (Crawford, 2000). Nevertheless, scholarly (and other forms of) opposition failed to stop imposition of these policies. Now, a decade after these policies were implemented, it is time to examine their consequences. This article examines recent research on the effects on education of restrictive language policies in the United States, with particular attention to California, Arizona, and Massachusetts. Four major topics are included: the opposition to restrictive language policies; research methodology and data of recent investigations of the consequences of the policies; major findings; and the main implications of these findings for language policies in schools.

2. Opposition to Restrictive Language Policies

Opposition to restrictive language policies such as those adopted in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts takes at least three forms. The first basis for opposing restrictive policies is pedagogical: the evidence that English language learning and educational achievement in school subjects is facilitated if schools use children’s native languages as media of instruction, at least until pupils become fluent in academic English. Although research clearly supports the use of learners’ native languages in many contexts, policymakers in the United States have largely ignored this research (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010).

A second critique of restrictive language policies involves linguistic human rights (LHR). The LHR critique of restrictive language policies is based on the larger concept of human rights; language is viewed as a protected category like gender, religion, or race, ethnicity, and nationality. The core idea of LHR is that all people have an inherent right to learn, use, and promote their languages, and that the state

has responsibility to ensure that language groups are able to exercise those rights (see May, 2008). Thus restrictive language policies, which limit use of students' native languages in schools, are viewed as violations of LHRs.

Although the LHR critique of restrictive language policies is a powerful one with many supporters (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), the approach often has only limited impact in contexts where LHRs are not widely supported, such as the United States. Indeed, LHR supporters have lamented the limited effect of their arguments in many settings. Skutnabb-Kangas, for example, reaches the "sad conclusion" that "a HRs [human rights] approach to language planning and policy has not been effective in promoting educational equity for diverse students populations" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002, p. 179).

A closely related critique of restrictive language policies invokes an ecology of language, in which it is argued that linguistic diversity (like biological diversity) is essential to the health of human culture and civilization. In Nettle and Romaine's view (2000), for example, "people are actors in a complex field whose boundaries are set by physical geography and natural resources, by their own knowledge and opportunities, and by the behavior of others around them" (p. 79). Because languages are "enmeshed in a social and geographical matrix" (p. 79), language loss is a result of social, economic, and environmental forces. Within this framework, language loss is seen as a prime indicator of "less visible stresses" (p. 79) that threaten social systems. This view underlies the focus on language loss, language revival, and language maintenance.

The ecology of language perspective places a fundamental value on linguistic diversity and on the relationship between languages and the social identities of their speakers. Although there is a growing body of important research on the powerful connections between language and social identity, the ecology of language often has only

limited impact on language policies. On the one hand, while a healthy ecology of language requires linguistic diversity, it may be difficult to demonstrate that a particular language must be preserved in a particular context (just as preservation of a single species may be difficult to achieve in efforts to maintain biological diversity). On the other hand, opponents of the ecology of language argue that linguistic diversity has dangerous social and political consequences, such as threatening the sociopolitical unity of multilingual states. This argument is made in many contexts, including France, England, and the United States (Tollefson, 2002).

At the policy level, the argument that linguistic diversity is a threat to social cohesion is often more persuasive than the case for language rights or for a healthy ecology of language in which multilingualism is supported. Evidence suggests that the ballot measures restricting bilingual education in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts were supported in part by voters who feared what they believed to be the dangers of widespread bilingualism/multilingualism, including the dominance of Spanish over English and social conflict resulting from language diversity (Crawford, 2000). Other factors contributing to popular support for restrictive language policies have included concerns about the quality of public education (Maxwell, 2009), belief that Spanish speakers do not want to learn English (despite clear evidence to the contrary, see Rumbaut, Massey, & Bean, 2006), nativist sentiments and fear of Latino immigrants (e.g., crime, see Rumbaut & Ewing, 2007), and latent racism (see Crawford, 2000). Faced with such opposition to the use of languages other than English, supporters of bilingual education and other promotion-oriented policies have had enormous difficulty making their case, not only in public debates about statewide voter initiatives, but also in local policymaking forums (e.g., local school boards).

It has been approximately a decade since the restrictions on bilingual education and on students' native languages were imposed in schools in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts. Enough time has passed for the accumulation of carefully designed empirical research studies about how those restrictions have affected students and teachers in schools in those states. The findings of those studies have important implications for language policies in American schools.

3. Research Methodology and Data

Scholars seeking to investigate the impact of restrictive language policies on students' language learning, language use, and educational achievement face well known methodological problems. Large-scale longitudinal studies are rarely possible, as students move from one district or state to another and new immigrants constantly enter school systems. Common data sets that would permit comparative studies between, for example, learners in schools with monolingual policies and those in schools with bilingual policies, are difficult to gather. Even when comparable groups in different settings or programs are found, researchers may not be able to compare learners because tests given to students vary from one district to another (though this factor is changing, as discussed below). The broad range of variables affecting language learning, language use, and educational achievement also makes it difficult to isolate language policy as an independent variable. At the same time, small-scale research involving relatively small numbers of learners may not permit generalization to other contexts, and thus policy recommendations based on empirical research, particularly at the state or national level, have been rare.

Fortunately, under the federal education law No Child Left Behind (NCLB), a standard set of assessments is gradually being developed (though the

law has many serious shortcomings [see Crawford, 2007]). In California, researchers have used three standardized tests: the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), the California Achievement Test (CAT), and the California Standards Test (CST). (The most recent edition of the SAT is the ninth and of the CAT the sixth; hence SAT-9 and CAT-6.) The SAT-9 is a national test that includes important information about students, including primary language and whether the student was enrolled in an English language program.

In Arizona, the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), which assesses learners' performance to curricular standards, has been administered annually since 2005 to grades 3-8 and 10. Before 2005, only grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 were tested. In Massachusetts, the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) assesses English proficiency in order to meet NCLB requirements. Progress in other academic areas is assessed under the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), which tests students in reading, language arts, math, and science. Passing the grade 10 math and English language arts exams has been a requirement for high school graduation in Massachusetts since 2003. In addition to such tests of student achievement, additional quantitative data available to researchers in all three states includes rates of attendance, suspensions, retention, and dropouts.

In addition to quantitative studies that rely on such data, qualitative studies have also proved to be useful. Menken and Kleyn (2010), for example, conducted interviews with long-term English language learners (seven years or more in US schools), as well as school administrators and teachers in New York City public schools. Similarly, interviews with teachers in Massachusetts have helped to clarify the impact of restrictive language policies on teachers and their teaching practices (de Jong, Arias, & Sánchez, 2010).

4. Major Findings

The most important empirical research on the educational consequences of restrictive language policies in the United States is collected in the important volume edited by Gándara and Hopkins (2010). The impact of Proposition 227 in California is examined by Wentworth, Pellegrin, Thompson and Hakuta (2010), building on research by Parrish, Pérez, Merickel, and Linquanti (2006). The effect of Proposition 203 in Arizona is examined by Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, and García (2010). The impact of Question 2 in Massachusetts on the Boston Public Schools is investigated by Uriarte, Tung, Lavan, and Diez (2010). (Inadequate data are available for the state of Massachusetts as a whole.) Major findings are listed below.

4.1 California

Using SAT-9 and CST scores from 359 of the state's 1,131 school districts, Wentworth, Pellegrin, Thompson and Hakuta (2010) examined test score trend lines across time, looking for evidence of changes in the gap between test scores of English learners and fluent English speakers. Their findings are as follows.

(1) On average, students' scores (including those of English learners) have gone up since the passage of Proposition 227, but the gap between the scores of English learners and those of other students has remained "consistent and substantial" (Wentworth, Pellegrin, Thompson & Hakuta, 2010, p. 45), with the gap slightly narrowing in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, and widening in grades 2, 4, and 8.

(2) The gap between English learners and other students does not seem to be explained by the instructional model (bilingual education versus structured English immersion). Instead, quality of instruction, leadership, connections between home and school, and other factors may better explain the continuing achievement gap.

(3) Implementation of Proposition 227 created enormous uncertainty and confusion, with students experiencing major programmatic changes and educators adjusting to the new law. The result was a negative impact on the achievement of English learners that may explain the widening achievement gap among students who were in early elementary grades when Proposition 227 was brought into effect.

4.2 Arizona

Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, and García (2010) used two data sets to examine the achievement gap in Arizona. One was four years of SAT-9 scores across time from two groups (those who attended Arizona public schools from 1997–2000 and those who attended from 2001–2004). Each group was divided into three sub-groups: students whose primary language is English; students who had been coded as English learners for the first year of the data set; and students who had been coded as English learners for the first two years of the data set. The researchers also used AIMS tests scores for grades 3, 5, and 8 from 2002–2006 to determine whether Arizona students are meeting the standards of learning established after Proposition 203. Using very large data sets (e.g., 18,985 students for 1997–2000 and 25,147 students for 2001–2004), Mahoney, MacSwan, Haladyna, and García reached the following conclusions.

(1) Students' gains across grades in reading and math were the same before and after Proposition 203. Thus the change from bilingual education to English-only instruction did not result in improved academic achievement in reading and math.

(2) The achievement scores in reading and math among English learners who were certified as English proficient (i.e., they had successfully completed structured English immersion classes) declined after Proposition 203. That is, the shift from bilingual education to English-only instruction is associated with lower performance on tests of

academic achievement in reading and math.

4.3 Boston

Uriarte, Tung, Lavan and Diez (2010) examined student engagement in the Boston public schools during the four years (2003–2007) immediately following the implementation of Question 2. They compared English learners with other students on rates of attendance, out-of-school suspensions, retention (repeating a grade), and dropping out. They also examined four-year trends in the achievement gap in math and English language arts in grades 4, 8, and 10, using the MCAS. They reached four important conclusions.

(1) English learners had significantly better attendance and lower rates of out-of-school suspensions than other students. However, while the retention rate remained stable for other students, English learners' retention rate increased significantly after Question 2, indicating that teachers were holding back an increasing number of English learners.

(2) Although the dropout rate among English learners was significantly lower than the rate for other students in the year prior to Question 2, over the next four years the dropout rate for English learners almost doubled, becoming the highest of any group in the schools.

(3) For most grades, MCAS pass rates for English learners declined after Question 2, while the pass rates for other students increased. For grades in which pass rates among English learners increased, the increase was significantly smaller than the increase in pass rates among other students.

(4) Overall, the achievement gap between English learners and other students widened in the four years immediately following the implementation of Question 2, especially in math.

4.4 Other

In addition to the impact of restrictive policies on

students, some research has examined the impact on teachers and programs. These findings may be summarized as follows:

(1) In Boston, the percentage of teachers receiving the training that (according to the school district and the state Department of Education) was required for being qualified to teach English learners has declined, with only about 20% receiving such training (Uriarte, Tung, Lavan, & Diez, 2010).

(2) In Arizona since Proposition 203, the training for teachers with English learners in their classes is significantly less than the training that was provided prior to Proposition 203 (90 hours versus 360-405 hours) (de Jong, Arias, & Sánchez, 2010).

(3) In California and Arizona, the percentage of English learners assigned to special education has significantly increased since the adoption of restrictive language policies (Artiles, Klingner, Sullivan, & Fierros, 2010).

(4) Qualitative research by Menken and Kleyn (2010) documents learners' oral bilingualism (English and their native language), but many students lack ability in academic English, even after several years in school, due to programs that do not distinguish basic communication skills from academic English. Menken and Kleyn call this "subtractive schooling" (p. 399).

5. Implications for Language Policies in Education

The three voter initiatives to end most bilingual education were proposed and supported on the basis of the claim that bilingual education had failed to teach English. In California, for example, Proposition 227 supporters repeatedly asserted that bilingual education had failed:

Immigrant education is a complete failure in California. Some 1.3 million California public school children – 23% of the total – are now classified as not proficient in English. Over the

past decade, the number of these mostly Latino immigrant children has more than doubled... Yet each year only about 5% of school children not proficient in English are found to have gained proficiency in English. Thus, the current system of language education has an annual failure rate of 95% (English for the Children, 1997).

Although the claimed “failure rate” of 95% was a bogus one (Yamagami, 2008), a plurality of voters were convinced by such statements that English-only (“structured English immersion”) would more effectively teach English and would also narrow the gap between English learners and other students in subject area achievement.

Yet the shift to English-only schooling brought about by Proposition 227, as well as similar measures in other states, has not improved English learning, nor has it narrowed the gap in subject area achievement between English learners and other students. As Rumberger and Tran (2010) found, states with restrictive language policies “tended to have larger achievement gaps than those without such policies, especially at grade 4” (p. 98). Indeed, in their review of research, August, Goldenberg, and Rueda (2010) conclude that there is “no legitimate scientific basis for proscribing instruction in the [students’] home language” (pp. 151-2). Thus the continued (and in some instances widening) achievement gap between English learners and other students in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts clearly suggests that the English-only approach has failed to achieve its stated goals, and therefore should be reconsidered.

6. Conclusion

Under the federal education law called No Child Left Behind, educational policies are required to be based on “scientifically based research” (see Crawford, 2007, p. 33). Despite this requirement, policy-by-initiative has led instead to laws against

bilingual education that are not supported by scientific research. In addition, such a system for deciding language policies inevitably risks overwhelming research with political discourse. Donahue (2002) shows, for example, that adoption of Proposition 106 declaring English the official language in Arizona in 1988 was the result of an almost complete disregard of research data or rational analysis in newspaper coverage leading up to the vote. Similarly, Cummins (1999) argues that opponents of bilingual education in the United States often make their case by aggressively disregarding research and constructing arguments with “blatant internal contradictions” (p. 13).

As high quality research about the impact of restrictive language policies accumulates, the issue for policymakers is whether this new research will be the basis for policies, as required by law. If so, we can anticipate significant changes in language policies in California, Arizona, Massachusetts, and elsewhere. If research is ignored, however, we can expect a continuation of policies having the unfortunate consequences for learners that researchers have documented.

References

- Artiles, A. J., Klingner, J. K., Sullivan, A., & Fierros, E. G. (2010). Shifting landscapes of professional practices: English learner special education placement in English-only states. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 102-117). New York: Teachers College Press.
- August, D., Goldenberg, C., & Rueda, R. (2010). Restrictive state language policies: Are they scientifically based? In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 139-158). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crawford, J. (2007). The decline of bilingual education: How to reverse a troubling trend? *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1 (1), 33-37.
- Crawford, J. (2000). Proposition 227: A new phase of the English only movement. In R. D. González (Ed.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the*

- Official English Movement, vol. 1* (pp. 28-61). New York: Routledge.
- Cummins, J. (1999). The ethics of doublethink: Language rights and the bilingual education debates. *TESOL Journal*, 8 (3), 13-17.
- de Jong, E. J., Arias, M. B., & Sánchez, M. T. (2010). Undermining teacher competencies: Another look at the impact of restrictive language policies. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 118-136). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Donahue, T. S. (2002). Language planning and the perils of ideological solipsism. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 137-162). New York: Routledge.
- English for the Children. (1997). *The 1998 California "English for the Children" Initiative*. Retrieved August 16, 2007, from English for the Children Website: <http://www.onenation.org/facts.html>.
- Gándara, P. & Hopkins, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mahoney, K., MacSwan, J., Haladyna, T., & García, D. (2010). Castañeda's third prong: Evaluating the achievement of Arizona's English learners under restrictive language policy. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 50-64). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Maxwell, L. A. (2009, January 8). Immigration transforms communities. *Education Week*, 28 (17), p. 1.
- May, S. (2008). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Menken, K. & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13 (4), 399-417.
- Nettle, D. & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parrish, T., Pérez, M., Merickel, A., & Linqanti, R. (2006). *Effects of the implementation of Proposition 227 on the education of English learners, K-12: Findings from a five-year evaluation*. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.
- Rumbaut, R. G. & Ewing, W. A. (2007). *The myth of immigrant criminality and the paradox of assimilation: Incarceration rates among native and foreign born men*. Washington: American Immigration Law Foundation. Retrieved June 15, 2008 from http://borderbattles.ssrc.org/Rumbault_Ewing/printable.html.
- Rumbaut, R. G., Massey, D. S., & Bean, F. D. (2006). Linguistic life expectancies: Immigrant language retention in Southern California. *Population and Development Review*, 32 (3), 447-460.
- Rumberger, R. W. & Tran, L. (2010). State language policies, school language practices, and the English learner achievement gap. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 86-101). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights?* New York: Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002). Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1 (3), 179-205.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2002). Conclusion: Looking outward. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 327-337). New York: Routledge.
- Uriarte, M., Tung, R., Lavan, N., & Diez, V. (2010). In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 65-85). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wentworth, L., Pellegrin, N., Thompson, K., & Hakuta, K. (2010). Proposition 227 in California: A long-term appraisal of its impact on English learner student achievement. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 37-49). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wiley, T. G. (2002). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the U.S. context. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 39-64). New York: Routledge.
- Yamagami, M. (2008). *Talking English-only: A discourse analysis of Ron Unz's Proposition 227 campaign in California*. Unpublished master's thesis, International Christian University, Tokyo.