

## **Dispelling the Myths on Bilingualism: Effective Bilingual Education Models**

**Lucia Buttarò, PhD**

Adelphi University

United States

### **Abstract**

*Spanish-speaking children take their ethnolinguistic and sociocultural heritage to school. School culture requires socialization and learning solely in English. Spanish-speaking students' success depends on their ability to learn English and process subject matter in English effectively. Doing so means that students are grade-level proficient in English. But Spanish-speaking students are not developing English literacy accordingly. The English-only approach in educating Spanish-speaking students is ineffective (Garcia, 2001) and accounts primarily for the dropout rates of these children in the five Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas (Nieto, 1999, 2000, 2001). Bilingual education, many witnesses feel, would enable Spanish-speaking children to use the home language and culture to adapt positively to the culture of the school and learn content area material, thus developing literacy-related proficiency in the language they know best. Building a solid schooling foundation in the home language and through the use of culturally relevant instruction is seen as essential in developing classroom proficiency in English (Ogbu, 1987, Portes, 2006), hence the pathway for potential bilingual development. Bilingual education not only enables students to learn English through the use of the home language, but likewise process school curriculum accordingly.*

**Keywords:** bilingual education, native language literacy, language minority students, language diversity

### ***Key Heritage for Today's Bilingual Education Classroom***

In early 1967, Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas and six others co-sponsored Senate Bill 428, a bill that eventually became the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. More than 100 witnesses testified in favor of Senate Bill 428 during the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education Hearings, and several major arguments in support of bilingual schooling for Spanish-speaking students were advanced (Sanchez, 1940, Valenzuela, 1989). Four arguments follow: (1) to prevent the scholastic retardation which resulted from providing English-only instruction to children dysfunctional in English language skills (though they arrived at school with at least an array of conversational abilities in Spanish), (2) to stem the psychological oppression experienced by Spanish-speaking students in all-English classrooms, (3) to prevent the loss of Spanish-speaking students' potential; bilingual development, and (4) to promote effective home-school collaboration (Sanchez, 1940, Valenzuela, 1989).

### ***Preventing Scholastic Retardation***

Spanish-speaking children, especially Mexican American children in the American Southwest, had experienced decades of English only instruction in public schools. The expectation was that these children would integrate successfully into the unilingual educational system. However, data regarding dropout rates in several Southwestern states revealed differently. In his testimony to the Senate, Senator Yarborough stated the following:

The problems of Spanish-speaking children are highlighted by a survey that has been made of the median number of years completed by all people of Spanish surnames in the Southwest. The 1960 census showed of all people of Spanish surnames, those in Arizona had completed an average of 7 years of schooling; in California, 8.6 years of schooling; in Colorado, 8.1 years of schooling; in New Mexico, 7.7 years of schooling; but in Texas, only 4.7 years of schooling (Baker & Jones, 1998, p. 267).

Senator Yarborough also noted that, in these states, Anglo students 14 years of age and over had completed an average of 12 years of schooling (Baker & Jones, 1998). Clearly, Spanish-speaking children were not benefiting scholastically from all-English instruction. Bilingual education, it was argued, would not only enable these children to learn English through the use of the home language, but likewise process school curriculum accordingly.

At the time, information regarding the implementation of a successful bilingual education program (Coral Way Elementary School) in Dade County, Florida was available (Anyon, 1981, Bigler, 1999), and promising experimental bilingual education programs had been launched in Texas, New Mexico, California, Arizona, New Jersey and St. Croix, Virgin Islands as well (Corson, 1993, Donato, 1997).

### ***Stemming Psychological Oppression***

The onset of the First World War in 1917 “fostered sentiments of nationalism and isolationism in United States society, and existing concepts of cultural pluralism shifted toward the idea of cultural assimilation of all ethnic groups into a common monolingual, monocultural, English-speaking society” (Dorfman, 1998, p. 5), and these sentiments continued until the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Minority ethno linguistic groups “were expected to learn English, forget their native language, and adopt the American way of life” (Dorfman, 1998, p. 5), particularly through English-only schooling.

Throughout the aforementioned period, Mexican American students were punished if they spoke Spanish in school. The “No Spanish Rule” was an educational policy that “emanated from the belief that Mexican American culture was inferior and damaging. i.e., that it interfered with intellectual and emotional development” (Delpit, 1988, p. 107). This practice was adopted by many school systems in Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and California to discourage Mexican American students from speaking Spanish. A San Antonio Mexican American student gives a verbal account of the “No Spanish Rule” and its effect on his self-concept:

If they caught you talking Spanish, they would send you to the office and give you a warning. They would give you a long lecture about, if you wanted to be an American, you have got to speak English. And you were not a very good American ... I mean; they are telling you that your language is bad. You hear it at home. Your mother and father speak a bad language, and you speak a bad language (Erickson, 1990, p. 189-190).

During the Bilingual Education Hearings, expert witnesses commented “on the psychological damage which such practices rendered unto millions of children” (Fairclough, 1989, p.1), especially Spanish-speaking children in the five Southwestern states. Bilingual education, it was argued, would enable Spanish-speaking children to develop a positive self-concept via curriculum and pedagogy that validated their native language and culture while they internalized English and school culture, thus benefiting from a culturally pluralistic learning environment. The National Education Association of the United States (1966) reported that “Spanish properly used could be a bridge to the learning of English instead of an obstacle and the Mexican American students could become truly bilingual and bicultural” (p. IV). This publication was “an important part of the Senate hearing record” (Fine, 1991, p. 2).

### ***Promoting Effective Home-School Collaboration***

Mexican American parents were affected by the all-English functioning school as well. While they were predominantly Spanish-speaking, matters associated with school events, including their children’s school behavior, academic achievement or underachievement, and extracurricular activities were conducted solely in English. This dual communication dysfunction produced disconnectedness between the home and school. Thus, Spanish-speaking children were the avenues of contact and information sharing between both entities. A witness stated the following during the Bilingual Education Hearings:

The only contact the school has with the parents is the children and the only contact the parents have with the school are the children. But the child is neither bringing from home to share at school, nor does he take home to share with his parents (Heath, 1983, p. 308).

The witness further added:

When the little ones go home and their mothers ask, “Que aprendiste hoy?” [“What did you learn today?”] The answer usually sounds like this, “Quien sabe! No le entiendo a la maestra,” [“Who knows! I don’t understand the teacher,”] or if he has learned a few words, a few sentences in English, he’ll repeat them to his mother and she’ll answer, “!Quien sabe que diras! Yo no entiendo ingles, dime en espanol.” [“Who knows what you’re saying! I don’t know English, tell me in Spanish.”] After a few days or weeks she stops asking and he stops sharing (Heath, 1983, p. 308).

The above exemplified the disconnectedness between the Spanish-speaking home and the English-only functioning school.

Bilingual education, many witnesses argued, would establish effective collaboration between the home and school via teachers, counselors, administrators and other school personnel proficient in English and Spanish bilingualism and biculturalism. Liaison between the school and the Spanish-speaking family was seen as another important component to students' success (Heath, 1983).

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education Hearings concluded on July 21, 1967. After much congressional deliberation, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the *Bilingual Education Act* on January 2, 1968, "making bilingual education a federal policy for the first time in the history of the United States" (Kohl, 1994, p. 29). While Senate Bill 428 was originally intended for Spanish-speaking students, especially students of Mexican American descent, the *Bilingual Education Act* "adopted the broader approach" (San Miguel, 2001, p. 17) and authorized the utilization of federal monies for the education of non-English speaking students (Shor, 1992).

### ***Effective Programs in Bilingual Education***

The long road of creating equitable opportunities for English language learners continues to this day in most parts of the country. In order to better serve the English language learner population in Texas, the Successful School Study was conducted as a result of a recommendation made in a report to the 75<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature from the Texas Education Agency and as part of the Commissioner's Educational Research Initiative for 2011-2012. The study started in March of 2011. The principal investigator for the study was the Program Evaluation Unit in the Office for the Education of Special Populations at Texas Education Agency. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi provided the research support for the study. The purpose of the study was to profile the programs, policies and instructional practices of successful schools for Limited English Proficient students. The Texas Education Agency and the Charles A. Dana Center at the University of Texas in Austin, Texas identified seven school sites during a study of twenty six high achieving, high poverty schools in Texas. These schools also had over a forty percent Limited English Proficient Population. The seven schools were selected from a group of 26 Title I recognized schools in Texas, and also had zero LEP exemptions on the state assessment (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) and a rating of the "Recognized" or "Exemplary" on the Texas accountability system in May of 2011. The seven successful schools selected for the study were Bowie Elementary and Clover Elementary in the Pharr, San Juan, Alamo ISD; Campestre Elementary in Socorro ISD; Castaneda Elementary in Brownsville ISD; Kelly Elementary in Hidalgo ISD; La Encantada in San Benito ISD, and Scott Elementary in the Roma ISD (Texas Successful Schools Study, 2011).

This study was to examine the significant features of successful programs for Limited English Proficient students as evidenced by the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011 results of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), the state of Texas accountability measure for grades 3-8 and 10. The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) was a criterion referenced test administered for grades 3-8 and 10 (exit level) in reading, mathematics, and writing (English) in the spring of each school year. The subject areas of TAAS used in granting the ratings are:

Reading	(given across grades 3-8, 10)
Mathematics	(given across grades 3-8, 10)
Writing	(given only in grades 4, 8 and 10)

For a campus or district rating of **Exemplary**, at least ninety percent of the total students in each subgroup must pass each section of the TAAS. For a campus or district of **Recognized**, at least eighty percent of the total students in each subgroup must pass each section of the TAAS. For a rating of **Academically Acceptable** a campus or the district, at least forty percent of total students and students in each subgroup must pass each section of the TAAS. Those district (or campuses) not meeting the standard for **Academically Acceptable (or Acceptable)** or higher and not achieving **Required Improvement** in the low performing areas will be rated **Academically Unacceptable (or Low-Performing)**. Subgroups that are included in the comparisons for the ratings are free and reduced lunch vs. non-free and reduced lunch, male and female, and the ethnic subgroups, Hispanic, White, and African American. The tests were administered and taken in English (Texas Successful School Study, 2010).

The focus of the study, at first, was to look at the 2009-2010 school year and to examine what were the characteristics of the different groups that may have contributed to the success of Limited English Proficient Students.

Later, the researchers and the Texas Education Agency personnel decided to examine data over three year period. In all cases, the schools either sustained the same accountability rating, or improved. Most recently, the accountability ratings related to the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), the new Texas state assessment, were also examined.

The Texas Commissioner of Education and the Texas Education Agency Division of Special Populations were interested in the characteristics of the schools, the administrations, faculties, programs, and the parents of the LEP students that had demonstrated success with Limited English Proficient populations on the TAAS.

### ***Research Design and Methodology***

In researching the characteristics of these seven successful schools, the methodology used in this study is of a descriptive nature. Descriptive research is used in the literal sense of describing situations or events. It is the accumulation of a data base that is solely descriptive, and it does not necessarily seek or explain relationships, test hypothesis, make predictions, or get at meanings and implications, although research aimed at these more powerful purposes may incorporate descriptive methods (Suarez-Orozco, 2001).

The methodology is an operational framework within which the data collected are placed so that their meaning may be seen more clearly. Two major approaches are used for collecting and analyzing data: quantitative and qualitative. This study uses both the qualitative and quantitative approach. The qualitative approach is typically used to answer questions about the nature of the phenomena with the purpose of describing and understanding the phenomena from the participant's point of view (Stein, 1971). Qualitative researchers regard their research task as "coming to understand and interpret how the various participants in a social setting construct the world around them" (Trueba, 1989, p.6). Although qualitative research may not explicitly address the issue of generalizability, the concept of transferability is similar (Stein, 1971).

Quantitative research seeks to explain and make predictions that will generalize to other persons and places. The intent is to establish, conform, or validate relationships and to develop generalizations that contribute to theory. Quantitative research has been used in some parts of the study.

The research questions addressed were:

- (1) What are the district leadership practices that facilitate academic and linguistic growth/success for language minority students?
- (2) What are the campus leadership practices that facilitate academic and linguistic growth/success for language minority students?
- (3) What are the characteristics of the teaching staff that facilitate academic and linguistic growth/success for language minority students?
- (4) What are effective teaching practices that facilitate academic and linguistic growth/success for language minority students?
- (5) What are the characteristics of parents and parental involvement on the seven campuses?
- (6) What are the characteristics of program(s) serving language minority students?

### ***Data Collection***

The study data gathering included a teacher questionnaire and interviews, interview with the district administrator responsible for the district bilingual education program, campus administrator questionnaire and interviews, parent interviews, and on-site school classroom visitations by the research team. The teacher and principal questionnaires were designed and field tested by the Texas Education Agency Special Populations Division in the fall of 2010. Subsequently, the number of questions on the teacher questionnaire was expanded by the Texas A & M Research Team. The questionnaire included multiple choice, yes-no, open ended, and likert type questions. The teacher questionnaires were subsequently mailed to all seven schools for distribution to the bilingual teachers that taught at the school during the years designated to the study. Teacher questionnaires were filled out before hand and brought to the on-site interviews. Principal questionnaires were filled out during the on site interviews.

The on site visits consisted of a two day visit to five of the schools and a one day visit to two of the schools during the spring semester of 2010. During the school visits, the research team members had interviews with the district administrator (bilingual coordinator/director), the campus principal, teachers and parents. Classroom visits were conducted at each school site to observe the bilingual classroom for effective bilingual education classroom practices that were consistent with the current research.

The research team visited and observed in each classroom for about 30-45 minutes. Non-bilingual education classrooms were also observed to see what effective teaching practices were also present throughout the school. Researchers noted anecdotal records and took notes during observations in the classrooms.

Collected data were then analyzed. Triangulation, used in all types of qualitative research, is the process of using multiple data collection methods, data sources, analysts, or theories to check the validity of the findings. If similar themes are noted in data collection from the different sources, the credibility of the interpretations is enhanced. The data was collected from the district level perspective, the campus administration, teacher, and the parent in an attempt to validate the findings of the study.

### ***Analysis of the Data***

The study findings supported the research questions. The research findings of the data were divided according to the data collection procedures used, specifically teacher questionnaire responses, teacher interviews, campus administrator interviews, district bilingual director interviews and parent interviews.

### ***District Leadership***

There are several district leadership practices that facilitate academic and linguistic growth/success for language minority students in this district. In their recent study on effective practices for improved student performance, the Texas Center for Educational Research (2010), points to essential resources for schools. District support for teacher and administration professional training includes regular training practices. Throughout Texas schools, the rate of principal training practices occurs over 54% of the time while teacher training occurs 63% of the time. According to Baker, 1998, p. 77:

“...the call for teachers as public and critically engaged intellectuals and cultural workers places teacher work at the forefront of pedagogical politics that raises questions, subjectivist knowledge with which they labor, and pushes classrooms toward a democratizing notion concerning schooling.”

### ***Campus Leadership***

The principals of the successful schools had extensive training in bilingual and ESL education with a Master's Degree in Bilingual Education. They had also been a bilingual or a migrant teacher thus having knowledge of bilingual education philosophy and theory.

“Certification can prove to be essential in the process of a program ... several organizations have developed guidelines and certification standards for teachers who work in English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual programs. These standards build on basic program standards and also include proficiency in written and oral forms of two languages, as well as skills in developing students' language abilities,” (Corson, 1993, Cummins, 2000).

The principal was an instructional leader monitoring and visiting classrooms frequently during the week, focusing the teachers on instruction through vertical and horizontal planning on a weekly basis, and empowering teachers to make instructional decisions in their classrooms. Teachers expressed that they felt that the principal was collaborative in their leadership with high expectations of the staff and the students. Such practices are reflected in the professional literature,

“...specific characteristics crucial to the development of effectiveness and thus to a positive school social climate in bilingual schools include: a safe and orderly school environment, common agreement on a strong academic orientation with clearly stated academic goals, objectives and plans, well organized classrooms, and well functioning methods to monitor school inputs and students' outputs” (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006). One of the focuses of the principal was in providing staff development to the teachers in the area of literacy development on a yearly basis. Updating teacher knowledge makes the difference for students daily through dynamic learning. The principal also keeps informed on student test scores through open communication with her faculty. An awareness of the quality of testing can make a difference. The principal is also aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the staff through daily classroom visits. The principal is very familiar with the community, and the parents commented that they felt welcomed at the school. In addition, the social climate is often determined by the principal and her attitude toward the community, “...a well functioning total system producing a school social climate that promotes positive student outcomes is one characteristic of an effective bilingual school,” (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006).

Altogether, the characteristics of the principal lay the groundwork for success in the total school program,

“...the following attributes are identified as being associated with effective schools and classrooms: a supportive school-wide climate, school leadership, a customized learning environment, articulation and coordination within and between schools, some use of the native language and culture in the instruction of language minority students, a balanced curriculum that incorporates both basic and higher order skills, explicit skills instruction opportunities for student-directed activities, use of instructional strategies that enhance understanding, opportunities for practice, systematic student assessment, staff development, and home and parent involvement,” (Corson, 1993, Cummins, 2000).

### ***Teaching Staff***

All the teachers on the successful school campuses are bilingual or ESL certified, which is essential to long term success in the program, (Dorfman, 1998). Most of the staff taught at the school for more than ten years, and they attribute this longevity and stability as contributing to the success of the students. There are teachers from Mexico on the staffs of some of the schools that know the finite points of the Spanish language and are able to teach the Spanish Language Arts with a high degree of proficiency.

Teachers believe all students can learn and have high expectations. They described themselves as caring, but structured in their approach to the delivery of the curriculum. Second language learners' success is often predetermined by teacher expectation, (Erickson, 1990).

Teachers meet on a weekly basis for either vertical or grade level planning. During the planning, the teachers develop six weeks' plans to address the needs of the students. Ensuring internal support through regular planning periods creates a successful school climate in the school, research indicates that the successful

“...climate includes the following components: high staff expectations for children and the program, strong demand for academic performance, high staff morale. High staff morale includes the following: strong internal support, consensus building, job satisfaction, sense of personal efficacy, sense that the system works, sense of ownership, well defined roles and responsibilities, belief and practice that resources are best expended on people rather than on educational soft and hardware” (Valenzuela, 1999).

The development of teacher made materials and teacher designed thematic units enrich the curriculum. They are also able to discuss the progress of students during the planning meetings, and thus able to closely monitor the progress of each student through open communication. Teachers have a limited use of dittos, and they focus on direct, large group instruction, small group activities, and cooperative learning.

### ***Teaching Practices***

There are many practices that facilitate the academic and linguistic growth/success for language minority students. The use of both Spanish and English for direct instruction was evident in all classrooms. This is necessary for success with second language learners and does not impede progress in English (San Miguel, 2001, p. 375). Instruction delivered in the primary language can have a profound effect on the development of academic English. First, the primary language can be used to teach subject matter. If children know subject matter, they will understand much more of what goes on in the classroom in English, resulting in more acquiring of language as well as knowledge. Secondly, the primary language can be used to develop literacy, which transfers to the second language. There is strong evidence that programs that utilize the first language in this manner are effective in promoting academic English language development (Baker, Jones, 1998). Anyon (1981) and Garcia (2001) addressed the extensive comparative literature on instructional practices that contribute to the literacy development of bilingual populations. Almost all of these studies included Mexican-American students (Donato, 1997) used meta analysis to combine academic achievement scores from a large set of statistically unrelated studies. This meta analysis indicated that bilingual education programs significantly enhanced academic achievement, in comparison to English instructional programs. Dorfman (1998) conducted a more traditional review of related independent studies and they reached the same conclusions. Teachers acknowledge equal prestige to both the English and Spanish languages during instruction, and when eliciting student responses, an essential characteristic of success, (Garcia, 2001, Trueba, 1989). Most recently the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth (Shor, 1992, p. 245) concluded, “In summary, there is no indication that bilingual education impedes academic achievement in either the native language or English ...” The classroom environment is rich in both English and Spanish materials.

Suarez-Orozco (2001) noted that children who made greater use of books in the first language provided by the school had “a greater feeling of security in their cultural background.” Teacher made materials in both English and Spanish were also readily available in the student centers, one of the components of successful bilingual programs (Valenzuela, 1999).

### ***Teachers and Schools can learn to Foster native Language Literacy***

The responsibility to create excellent learning environments for language minority students should not rest with individual teachers alone, however. Entire schools can develop such environments. Suarez-Orozco (2001) analyzed eight exemplary school reform efforts for language minority students and found that all of the school shared the following common characteristics, among others:

- They had a school wide vision of excellence that incorporated students of limited English proficiency.
- They created a community of learners engaged in active discovery.
- They created programs to develop both the English and native-language skills of language minority students.
- They made a conscious effort to recruit and hire bilingual staff members.
- They honored the multicultural quality of the student population.

Bilingual programs also have secondary salutary effects, such as motivating students to remain in school rather than dropping out, making school more meaningful, and in general making the school experience more enjoyable. A related phenomenon is that bilingual education may reinforce close relationships among children and their family members, promoting more communication than would be the case if they were instructed solely in English and lost their native language. This is what the researcher found through interviews with immigrant parents when their preschool children were placed in English only settings. Not only did the children lose their first language, but more significantly, they lost the ability to communicate with their parents and families. In the process, they also lost the academic advantage that fluency and literacy in a language would give them when they begin school.

In her own research with academically successful students, Nieto (2000) found that maintaining language and culture were essential in supporting and sustaining academic achievement. In a series of in depth interviews with linguistically and culturally diverse students, one of the salient features that accounted for school success was a strong willed determination to hold on to their culture and language. Although their pride in culture and language was not without conflict, the steadfastness with which they maintained their culture and language in spite of widespread negative messages about them was surprising.

### ***Conclusion***

Language is one of the fundamental signs of our humanity. It is the “palette from which people color their lives and culture (Allman, 1990). Although linguistic diversity is a fact of life in American schools and society, many languages are not accorded the respect and visibility they deserve. But given recent trends in immigration, the shrinking of our world, and the subsequent necessity to learn to communicate with larger numbers of people, a reconceptualization of the roles of language so ther than English in our schools and society is in order. Given this kind of reconceptualization, current school policies and practices ned to be reexamined. Those that build on students’ diversity need to be strengthened, while those that focus on differences and deficits must be eliminated. This means, at the very least, that bilingual and multicultural programs for all students have to be comprehensively defined, adequately funded, and strongly supported.

The issue of what to do about language minority students goes much deeper than simple language diversity. Above all, it is an issue of educational equity. Whether bilingual education, ESL, or other approaches and support services are offered, they ned to be developed with an eye toward promoting, rather than limiting, educational opportunities for all students. Given the increasing number of students who enter schools speaking a language other than English, it is clear that attending to the unique condition of language minority students is the responsibility of all educators. For students with limited English proficiency, suitable approaches geared to their particular situation are not frills, but basic education. For English monolingual students, too, learning to appreciate and communicate in other languages is a gift to be cherished. When we approach language diversity as a resource that is respected and fostered, all students benefit.

## References

- Allman, W. F. (1990, November 5). The mother tongue. U.S. News and World Report.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 3-41.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bigler, E. (1999). *American Conversations: Puerto Ricans, White ethnics, and multicultural education*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Corson, D. (1993). *Language, minority education and gender: Linking social justice and power*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280-298.
- Donato, R. (1997). *The other struggle for equal schools: Mexican Americans during the civil rights movement*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dorfman, A. (1998). *Heading south, looking north: A bilingual journey*. New York: Penguin.
- Erickson, F. (1990). Culture, politics, and educational practice. *Educational Foundations*, 4(2), 21-45.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.
- Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban high school*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Garcia, E. E. (2001). *Hispanic education in the United States: raices y alas*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kohl, H. (1994). "I won't learn from you" and other thoughts on creative maladjustment. New York: The New York Press.
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3<sup>rd</sup>. ed.). New York: Longman.
- Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 312-334.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G. (2006). *Immigrant America: A portrait*, 3<sup>rd</sup>. ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sanchez, G. I. (1940) *Forgotten people. A study of New Mexicans*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- San Miguel, G., Jr. (2001). *Brown, not White: School integration and the Chicano movement in Houston*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stein, A. (1971). Strategies for failure. *Harvard Educational Review*, 41, 133-179.
- Trueba, H. T. (1989). *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. New York: State University of New York Press.