

Course Title: Language Politics and Education
Course #: BEF 585, 3 credit hours

Instructor: John Petrovic

Office: 206 Wilson Hall

Phone: 348-0465

Email: jpetrovi@bamaed.ua.edu

Office Hours: Tuesday 10:00-12:00, Thursday 1:30-2:30, and by appointment

• ***Course Overview:***

The course covers the history and politics behind education programs for language minority students, especially programs using non-majority languages (bilingual education). We will consider how political movements to establish English-only legislation both societally (by specific legislation at the state and federal level) and educationally (e.g., Proposition 227 in California and Proposition 203 in Arizona) fit within approaches to (or philosophies of) language policy and planning. What drives these movements? What are the specific proposals? Are they defensible? The arguments for and against bilingual education and English-only will be examined and informed by international comparisons (How do other nations approach issues of language diversity and education?), second language acquisition theory (What variables and practices help/hinder second language acquisition and what happens to first languages in the process?), and effectiveness studies (Is it possible to draw conclusions about which programs—English only or bilingual—are more effective? What do we mean by effective?).

• ***Required Texts/Readings:***

Crawford, J. (2000). At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Soto, L. D. (1997). Language, culture, and power: Bilingual families and the struggle for quality education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

* Additional required readings can be found on reserve in McClure Education Library (♣) or can be accessed electronically (♦) by simply clicking on the title (on the electronic syllabus) of the appropriate reading. (You will find the reading list at the end of the syllabus.)

• **Course Requirements:**

1. This course will be run as a seminar, i.e., informed discussion will be our basic modus operandi. Therefore, you must keep up with the readings, which at times will be heavy. In such a small class, failure by just a few to do the readings will quickly bring us to stagnation.
2. Following from #1, you must participate in class. Note that you can't participate if you don't come. (My subtle way of saying attendance matters to your grade.)
3. Communicate electronically. I will create a class list-serv on which you should all try to participate. This list will serve a couple of purposes. First, it will allow me to communicate with you as a group, e.g., to send out discussion questions, assignment clarifications, etc. Second, it will serve as a means to continue discussions begun in class. I often think of things after class that I wish I had said in class and I'm sure you do to. Here is our chance to share those gems of thought!

Also, there are a couple of list-servs that you should subscribe to: AZBLE@asu.edu and BILING@asu.edu (Just the message "subscribe." If that doesn't work send a message to Dr. Jeff MacSwan (MacSwan@asu.edu) at Arizona State University and ask him to subscribe you to the lists. After you follow the discussions in those for a while, you may choose to drop one or the other. Many of the people whose work you will be reading participate on these sites. This is a forum for you to ask questions from people around the country and world about questions this course will raise for you.

4. Teach parts of the class and/or lead discussions. Each of you should be prepared to do a semi-formal presentation on the topic(s) of the day or parts thereof. You can do this alone or with a partner. Basically, you should try to dig a little deeper into that topic, present your findings to the class, and present some discussion questions based on the readings for the whole class and the additional research that you present.
5. Other requirements include 7 reading response papers (2 pp, 1.5 spaced, Times New Roman 12 point font), periodic in-class introduction of readings, 3 letters on language policy/bilingual education. The reading response papers might include a brief summary of key points, your reactions to the readings, critiques, points of (dis)agreement and explanation. Students will be expected to volunteer to introduce readings and provide some guidance for discussion. I cannot predict the number of times each of you will need to do this, but, as a class, we will endeavor to provide everyone with a similar number of opportunities. Your three letters should be a page to a page and a half, single spaced. Please submit copies to me (so that you can send the original if you wish) with a cover page (or two) explaining whom you have chosen to send your letters to and why. You should also explain what significant differences there are in each letter. In other words, you will need to do some research on the views of the people you are writing to and their political situation. For example, the views of Senator Dodd (D, CT) are very different from those of Senator

Lott (R, MS) on both English only legislation and bilingual education and their political situations are different (CT is generally more liberal than MS). Also, the demographic situations in their states—number of language minority students, for example--are very different.

• **General Policies**

Absences—High and chronic absenteeism also affects the dynamics of the class. Your attendance is required and absences will negatively affect your participation grade since you cannot participate if you do not attend. One absence will not affect your grade. Barring some sort of emergency or illness, all others will.

Extra credit—I am all in favor of you working harder and doing more. I will announce extra credit assignments periodically in class, as they come to mind. If I do not announce one soon enough for your taste, just ask. Also, feel free to make suggestions as to the extra credit assignment you would like to do.

Special needs—If any member of the class feels s/he has a disability and needs special accommodations as addressed by the ADA, please let me know during or immediately after the first or second class meeting. We will work together to provide you reasonable accommodation to ensure your fair opportunity to participate in the class.

Academic Misconduct—Academic misconduct, especially plagiarism, will not be tolerated and will result in failing this course and referral to the Associate Dean for further action. Please consult your student handbook and familiarize yourself with the UA and College of Education descriptions of misconduct and policies.

• **Grading:**

1. Attendance/Participation	25%
2. Semi-formal presentation	15%
3. Response papers/Reading Reflections	25%
4. Introduction of readings	10%
5. Letters	25%

100-95=A, 95-90=A-, 90-87=B+, 87-83=B, 83-80=B- and so on...

Your reading reflections will receive a $\sqrt{+}$, $\sqrt{}$, a $\sqrt{-}$, or an NC (no credit). To calculate your grade start at 2.4 and add .2 for every $\sqrt{+}$ and .1 for every $\sqrt{}$. Subtract .2 for every $\sqrt{-}$ and .3 for every NC. $\sqrt{+}$ papers provide an integrated and accurate summary of all of the readings as well as some personal reflection on and/or analysis of the reading. $\sqrt{}$ papers provide an accurate summary of all of the readings. $\sqrt{-}$ papers provide a mostly accurate summary of most of the readings. NC, will you really write a paper this bad in a graduate class??

• *Course Schedule*

<u>Week</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic(s)</u>	<u>Reading</u>
1	January 11	Introductions and syllabus negotiation	none
<p>In the first couple of weeks, we will try to situate ourselves within the current debates over language policy (mainly societal at this point, but the educational ramifications cannot be separated cleanly) in the United States. The U.S. approach to language policy and planning has always suffered (benefited?) from two approaches: <i>ad hoc</i> and benign neglect. In recent years, the benign neglect has turned to active abuse in the form of more ad hoc solutions. For the most part, the suggested solutions treat nonexistent problems.</p>			
2	January 18	Historical and Contemporary overview of the English-Only movement	Crawford (2000), pp. 1-51 Schlesinger (1992), pp. 23-43
3	January 25	Historical and Contemporary overview, cont.	Various readings from <u>Language Loyalties</u> Crawford, 1992; Schlesinger (1992), pp. 101-118
4	February 1	no class	
5	February 8	Language Policy and Language Planning Theory	Ruiz (1984) (1994); Magnet (1990)
6	February 15	Language Policy: International Perspectives	Petrovic (1999); Hornberger (1998)

Our lack of any reasoned or systematic approach to language policy in the United States has direct ramifications for education. If we are to be a monolingual society, what is the best way to educate children? If we respect families' rights to their own language and culture, need we supply the resources to promote them? If we want to respect private bilingualism but promote societal monolingualism, how should we educate language minority children? There seems to be a link and progression, albeit an often hazy one, between the political English-only movement and the educational English-only movement. As we saw, Crawford likes to lump both movements as reactions against a generic notion of "bilingualism." But, in fact, politicians go to great pains to try to separate these things in various rhetorical ways (read: often insincere ways). Most sponsors of English-only legislation, for example, do not mention or specifically except bilingual education. This is a pragmatic political maneuver since bilingual education has become a volatile issue and has historically been supported by groups being wooed by

those sponsoring the legislation. As we shall see, despite the growing body of research demonstrating the effectiveness of bilingual education, its political support continues to decline in this “age of anxiety.”

7	February 22	Bilingual Education: What is it?; The politics of bilingual education	Crawford (2000), pp. 84-103; Ovando and Collier (1998), pp. 4-5, 52-61; Bennett, Lyons (from Language Loyalties)
8	March 1	The politics of bilingual education, cont.	Soto (1997), pp. 1-99

The debates within the politics of bilingual education often become bogged down into the he said, she said world of “effectiveness research.” Generally, these debates rage between these those who are adamantly opposed to bilingual education (Linda Chavez, Christine Rossell, Ron Unz, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and a host of politicians) and those who support it. Indeed, the research is not crystal clear and so federal law requires only that schools service language minority students through programs or methods recognized as effective by some “expert.” With this rather open requirement, policy vis-à-vis language minority education easily digresses into ideological positioning. This is not to say that there are not debates among supporters of bilingual education; there are. But these are much more specific debates that do not concern the basic element of bilingual education: systematic and extensive use of a child’s first (i.e., non-English) language as a medium of instruction.

9	March 8		Cummins, chs. 1-2
10	March 15		Cummins, ch. 3; MacSwan (2000)
11	March 22		Cummins, chs. 4 & 7
12	April 5		Cummins, ch. 8
13	April 12		Cummins, chs. 9&10

Having teased out some of the empirical and philosophical questions surrounding the English-only question, we can now apply this background to language policy vis-à-vis specific language minority groups. We can also apply this knowledge to critical analyses of recent and on-going policy initiatives at both the state and federal levels.

14	April 19	Native American languages, Ebonics	Crawford (2000), pp. 52-83 Zepeda & Hill, (1991)
----	----------	------------------------------------	---

Delpit (1998, 1988),
Smith (1998)

15	April 26	Recent initiatives and their ramifications	Crawford (2000), pp. 104-127
16	May 3	Final Project Presentations	

• Additional Required Readings List and Sources:

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1993). An overview of European models of bilingual education. Language, culture and curriculum, 6(3), 197-208. ♣

Crawford, J. (1990, winter). Bilingual education: The effectiveness debate. Equity and choice, 37-45. ♣

Crawford, J. (1992). Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cummins, J. and Genzuk, M. (1991). [Analysis of final report longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children](#). CABE Newsletter, 13(5). ♦

Gersten, R., Baker, S., Otterstedt, J. (1998). Further analysis of: A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of bilingual education. Author: Unpublished. ♣

Greene, J. P. (1999/1997). [A Meta-Analysis of the Rossell and Baker Review of Bilingual Education Research](#). Bilingual Research Journal, 21(2&3), 103-122. ♦

Hornberger, N. (1997/1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 13(2), 1-22; Language in society, 27, 439-458. ('97 version available on line through [ERIC \(EBSCO\)](#))

Krashen, S. (1998). [A note on Greene's "A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of bilingual education"](#). Author: Unpublished. ♦

MacSwan, J. (2000). [The threshold hypothesis, semilingualism, and other contributions to a deficit view of linguistic minorities](#). Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 22(1), 3-45. ♦

Magnet, J. (1990). Language rights as collective rights. In K. L. Adams and D. T. Brink (Eds.), Perspectives on Official English: The Campaign for English as the Official Language of the USA, pp. 293-299. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. ♣

Petrovic, J. E. (1999/1997). [Balkanization, bilingualism, and comparisons of language situations at home and abroad](#). Bilingual Research Journal, 21(2&3), pp. 233-254. ♦

Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., and Ramey, D. R. (1991). [Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children](#). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education and Aguirre International. ♦

Rossell, C. H. and Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. Research in the teaching of English, 30(1), 7-74. ♣

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. NABE journal, 8(2), 15-34. ♣ *not yet available*

Ruiz, R. 1994. " Language Policy and Planning in the United States." Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 14: 111-125. ♣ *not yet available*

Schlesinger, A. (1992). The Disuniting of America. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. ♣

Zepeda, O. and Hill, J. (1991). The condition of Native American languages in the United States. Diogenes, 153, 45-65. ♣