

KANSAI GAIDAI UNIVERSITY

THE HISTORY AND PRESENT STATUS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: Kansai Gaidai University. Intercultural Research Institute 公開日: 2020-01-29 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): bilingual education, multicultural society, English language learners, dual language program, Bilingual Education Act 作成者: Suefuji, Mitsuko メールアドレス: 所属: Toyo Gakuen University
URL	https://doi.org/10.18956/00007887

THE HISTORY AND PRESENT STATUS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MITSUKO SUEFUJI

Toyo Gakuen University

This paper aims to examine possible solutions for bilingual education in the context of a multicultural society based on the experience in the US. The US was built by migrants. The earliest example of bilingual education is found in the mid-nineteenth century. In the second half of the twentieth century, the federal government tried to include bilingual education as part of their national policy. Therefore, I have traced the history of bilingual education in the US through the first half of the twentieth century. Next, I have analyzed the general trend in the US government's bilingual policy in the second half of the twentieth century. Finally, I have discussed the current situation in bilingual education in the US using the case in California as an example.

Keywords: bilingual education, multicultural society, English language learners, dual language program, Bilingual Education Act

1. Preface

Nowadays, new plans for multicultural and multilingual/bilingual education have been launched in many countries with the hope of achieving harmonious symbiosis between minority and majority pupils. For example, in Japan, the number of non-Japanese pupils is increasing every year, and these pupils need Japanese language education. It is necessary that Japanese authorities take steps to care for the pupils whose native language is not Japanese. This paper aims to examine possible solutions in bilingual education in the context of a multicultural society based on the experience in the United States of America. The US was built by migrants. The earliest example of bilingual education is found in the mid-nineteenth century. In the second half of the twentieth century, the federal government tried to include bilingual education as part of their national policy. Therefore, I would like to trace the history of bilingual education in the US and analyze its contemporary situation and problems. I would like to clarify the actual situation in bilingual education in the US through the first half of the twentieth century. Next, I would like to analyze the general trend in the US government's bilingual policy in the second half of the twentieth century. Finally, I would like to introduce the

current situation of bilingual education in the US using the case in California as an example.

First of all, I would like to clarify the meaning of two important keywords in this paper, i.e., “bilingual education” and “English language learners (ELLs).” “Bilingual education” is the method of language education in which pupils are able to acquire skills in both their native and second languages in the context of schooling. However, in the US, several different subtypes can be found; transitional bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, and dual language programs are popular. Among them, transitional bilingual education is the most popular method applied to language minority groups. In this method, two languages are used simultaneously in the classes, but eventually, the goal is to shift from the native language to English. At the early stage of this education, subject teaching is carried out in the native language, but gradually, more and more classes are carried out in English. Maintenance bilingual education is a bilingual education program that aims to maintain the pupils’ native language ability while having them acquire English as a second language. In this respect, it is different from transitional bilingual education as its goal is to simultaneously develop both their native language and English. In this type of education, we have a 90/10 model, a 50/50 model, and so on, depending on the proportion of native language to English. The dual language program targets both the language minority group and native speakers of English, aiming to make them bilingual speakers. Here, in order to acquire both the native and second languages, subject teaching is carried out in both languages. This type of education also utilizes a 90/10 model, a 50/50 model, and so on, depending on the proportion of native to second languages. For example, mathematics is taught in Spanish in kindergarten, second, and fourth grades, while it is taught in English in the first, third and fifth grades. In another program, the teaching languages are changed every week.

I would like to clarify the connotation of an “ELL.” In the US, pupils in language minority groups have been regarded as pupils whose native language is not English, and therefore, they have been labeled as “limited English proficient (LEP).” However, after No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was enacted in 2002, they were called “English language learners (ELLs).” In 2004, the number of ELLs in the public schools was 4,341,435, but this increased to 4,559,323 in 2014 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). The number of ELLs in fiscal year 2014 was as follows: 1,390,316 in California (the largest number in the US); 772,843 in Texas; 252,172 in Florida; 209,959 in Illinois; and 186,694 in New York (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). We can see that the State of California has the largest number of ELLs in the US. As for languages spoken by families in fiscal year 2014, the largest groups were Spanish-speaking people, numbering 3,770,816, which accounts for 76.5% of the total number of ELLs. This is followed by 109,170 Arabic speakers, accounting for 2.2%, and 107,825 Chinese speakers, accounting for 2.2% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Therefore, as the largest group of non-native English speakers, those whose native language is Spanish are the main target of bilingual education in the US.

2. Language Education in the US Through the First Half of the Twentieth Century

First, we have to keep one thing in mind: the US Constitution provides no clause concerning language. The federal government has no fixed policy regarding language in the US. Matters of language education in the context of schools and the medium of instruction at each school are entrusted to each state and school district, and they usually tend to reflect the wishes and views of the local residents. In terms of chronology, early American society used to be generous to non-English languages, but in the course of time, it evolved into a more rigid society in which non-English languages were rejected and discriminated against. Eventually, the federal government began to be involved in language policies. Let us take a chronological look at this trend.

2.1. Period of Generosity toward Non-English Languages

When we look at the national census between 1790 and 1950, we find that the largest number of non-English-speaking people in the US were German immigrants; approximately nine million German immigrants lived in the US in 1910.

They first came to Pennsylvania in 1683. Later, they spread into the German belt consisting of New York, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota, and the German triangle, consisting of Saint Paul, Minnesota, Saint Louis, Missouri, and Cincinnati, Ohio. They were proud of their German language and culture; they built churches and schools in each community. They tried to maintain their own language and culture.

Here, I would like to indicate some of the examples in which we can testify to the generosity of the American society toward the German language and culture. In the mid-nineteenth century, in such cities as Baltimore, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, and Saint Louis, bilingual education in English and German was carried out not only in the parochial schools but also in some of the public schools. In the 1870s, William Harris, the superintendent of education in Saint Louis, Missouri, succeeded in bringing more ethnic German children into the public schools by enacting bilingual education policies for English and German. However, in 1889, new state laws were enacted in Wisconsin and Illinois by which only English could be used as a means of teaching in both public and private schools. Ethnic Germans opposed this vehemently. State authorities were finally compelled to withdraw the laws. Thus, we see that German, a non-English language, was once treated generously in American schools and society (Suefuji, 2002: 25-29).

2.2. Period of Ungenerosity toward Non-English Languages

By the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century, American society began to lose its generosity toward non-English languages. I would like to explain the details of the

transition over time for new immigrants, German immigrants, and Hispanics (Suefuji, 2002: 29-38).

2.2.1. New immigrants.

By the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century, new immigrants began to come to the US in great numbers. In order to cope with the inflow of new immigrants, a national origin quota system and literacy test were introduced, and eventually, a restriction of immigrants was put into force by the Immigration Act of 1924. Meanwhile, those immigrants who were already in America were expected to assimilate into the existing American society as soon as possible. "Speaking good English" was regarded as a criterium for being a "good American." English education was carried out for adult immigrants through social education and for the immigrants' children in school education.

Ellwood Cubberley, one of the nation's foremost education historians, was alarmed by the large numbers of immigrants arriving from Southern and Eastern Europe; he remarked in 1909 that the immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe were "illiterate, docile, lacking in self-reliance and initiative, and not possessing the Anglo-Teutonic conceptions of law, order, and government; their coming has served to dilute tremendously our national stock and to corrupt our civic life" (Cubberley, 1909: 16-20). The role of the public schools, he said, was to break up these distinctive groups and amalgamate them into the general population. In his opinion, the role of a public school was to dismantle the original group and assimilate them into the general public. His idea represents the typical way of thinking in strong Anglo-conformity.

2.2.2. German immigrants.

In 1917, the US declared war against Germany and entered the First World War; anti-German sentiments were heightened in American society. The use of German language and its education was restricted. By the early 1920s, a law to stipulate English as the medium of instruction had been enacted in as many as 34 states.

In Nebraska, it had been stipulated since 1919 by state law that only English could be used as the means of education. However, it was pointed out in 1923 that this state law violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution from the viewpoints of the right of education for both teachers and parents. This judgment, known as the Meyer Decision, indicated that education in native languages should not be prohibited for those whose native languages were not English. However, this decision indicated the superiority of English as well. After the Meyer Decision, extreme state laws to stipulate only English education disappeared from American society, but more and more states began to stipulate English as the official medium of instruction in education.

2.2.3. Hispanic immigrants.

Hispanic people who speak Spanish include Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban immigrants. Mexican immigrants began to come to the US as a result of the Texas Annexation in 1845 and the Mexican-American War. In 1848, some parts of former Mexican territories were annexed into the US by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, so immigrants came into the US legally as well as illegally. They settled in southern states such as California, New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, and Colorado. Puerto Rican immigrants began to come to the US as their homeland became part of America after the Spanish-American War in 1898. The majority of them came to settle in New York City to look for better jobs. Cuban immigrants began to come to the US as political refugees after the Cuban Revolution in 1959, and many of them settled in Florida.

Let us look at the Mexican immigrants as they form the majority among Hispanics. In California and Texas, state laws were enacted in 1855 and 1919, respectively, by which all schools were to use only English as a means of education, and all subjects had to be taught in English. Spanish-speaking people were expected to abandon their native language as soon as possible. In the southwestern regions, school segregation had been in practice since the end of the nineteenth century. The legal basis for school segregation was the idea of “separate but equal,” a result of the Supreme Court judgment in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896. Here, the Anglo-conformity mentality had permeated local people’s minds. By 1920, 85% of the schools in southwestern regions were either Mexican schools or had Mexican classes.

3. Language Education Policy of the Federal Government

3.1. Before Bilingual Education Policy

The Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s accelerated policy-making to protect human rights for minority groups. As a result, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were enacted. However, in reality, “equal by law” but “unequal in terms of economic and social status” still existed in American society. Eventually, cultural pluralism became popular; it advocated due respect to the various different languages and culture.

Meanwhile, President Lyndon Johnson entered the scene and began to advocate building the Great Society as his political platform. He enacted the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 by which he launched the Head Start Program to support early childhood education for poor families. He enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to further improve education for poor families. In spite of these policies directed toward poor families on the part of the federal government, the Coleman Report in 1966 showed that the problem of inequality had not been solved in American society. It pointed out that children of minority groups showed poorer academic achievement than their majority counterparts, and the academic gap between the two groups became

wider as they reached higher grades. The Coleman Report indicated how difficult it is to achieve equality in education. The Johnson administration further put forward such compensatory education policies as the Head Start Program and the Follow Through Program. While various methods were put into practice with the hope of improving academic achievement among minority group children, the federal government began to be aware of the effectiveness of bilingual education.

In 1963, the success of Coral Way Elementary School in Florida brought the federal government's attention to the effectiveness of bilingual education. After the Cuban Revolution in 1959, many Cuban refugees began to flow into Florida, and in 1963, Coral Way Elementary School launched a bilingual education program in English and Spanish. It received financial support from the federal government and was a dual-language program that targeted both English-speaking and Spanish-speaking children. An almost equal number of English-speaking teachers and Spanish-speaking teachers were deployed. Depending on their language background, children were divided into two groups; in the morning classes, native-language instruction and subject teaching in the native language were carried out, and in the afternoon classes, second-language instruction and subject teaching in the second language were carried out. At lunch time, all students ate lunch and studied music, arts, and physical exercise together. This practice at Coral Way Elementary School proved that bilingual education is feasible, and pupils' academic achievement can be promoted through bilingual education (Suefuji, 2002: 40-43).

At the same time, teachers' unions began to voice the need for bilingual education. State laws to ban the use of Spanish and insist on English-only education had been enacted in southwestern states such as California and Texas at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. As a result, the number of pupils who could not catch up with classes in English and had dropped out of school had increased dramatically. Facing this difficult situation, the National Education Association (NEA) began to take steps to promote the quality of education among children in the southwestern regions whose native language was Spanish. The NEA held a symposium, published a report, and promoted a campaign to push bilingual education. As a result of this campaign, the bill known as S.428 was introduced to Congress to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, aiming to help establish and put into practice bilingual education programs in each school district (Suefuji, 2002: 43-49).

3.2. Approval of the Bilingual Education Act

In January 1968, the Bilingual Education Act was approved as the Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 under President Lyndon Johnson. The purpose of this Act was mentioned as follows. "In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to

develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs” (U.S. Congress, 1968). This Bilingual Education Act did not require each school district to launch a new bilingual education program but provided necessary financial support for the school districts that had already launched such programs (Suefuji, 2002: 55-58).

However, in the 1970s, judicial authorities indicated that each school district was obligated to assure the rights of pupils with low English proficiency to receive an education. In 1970, ethnic Chinese pupils attending public schools in San Francisco, California, complained that an equal educational opportunity was not assured for them as they did not understand the classes carried out in English. This is known as the case of *Lau v. Nichols*. It was rejected at the first and second trials, but the Supreme Court issued the *Lau Decision*, in which each school district was required to provide the necessary measures for the pupils with low English proficiency, based on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Memorandum of Understanding between the Office for Civil Rights and the US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Later, in 1974, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 was approved and is regarded as the law that embodies the *Lau Decision*. With this act, each school district was required to assure an equal educational opportunity for pupils irrespective of their ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Here, the concept of a bilingual education was finally confirmed as a right (Suefuji, 2002: 62-74).

The Bilingual Education Act has been amended several times. Let us look at the changes to the Bilingual Education Act, which parallel the trends in American education.

3.3. Bilingual Education Act in the 1970s

Charles Silberman published *Crisis in the Classroom* in 1970 in which he described the real situation of American education. He pointed out that, in spite of various efforts to bring about equality in education since the latter half of 1960s, no sufficient results had yet been achieved. He further argued that education must be aimed at nurturing the pupils' humanity.

The Bilingual Education Act was amended in 1974 and 1978 and promotes maintenance bilingual education in which pupils with a poor English background are given training as well as subject teaching in their native language. The federal government's subsidy accounted for \$7,500,000 in fiscal year 1969, but this increased to as much as \$166,900,000 in fiscal year 1980 (Suefuji, 2002: 80-84).

3.4. Bilingual Education Act in the 1980s

The federal government's report entitled, *A Nation at Risk*, was published in 1983. It examined the risk that American students are falling in competence in the international society and gave strong warnings regarding the dwindling high school education in the US.

As a result, the trend to pursue both equality and excellence in education was accelerated all the more. In fact, equality and excellence have been the two major targets of education throughout ages, but it is difficult to achieve both of them simultaneously.

Many people argued about how much should be taught in education. They argued about the content of literacy. They also argued about what cultural literacy Americans should share in common.

While the federal government's subsidy for bilingual education regularly increased, the efficiency of performance was strictly examined. One study revealed that pupils' English proficiency and the academic achievement of those who were in a transitional bilingual education program and those who were in an English-only program proved to be almost equal. At this stage, bilingual education became a political issue in American society (Suefuji, 2002: 85-87).

As a symbolic phenomenon of this period, the Official English Movement became popular in American society with the hope of amending the Constitution and stipulating English as the official language of the US. This campaign was promoted mainly by a political lobbying organization called U. S. English, represented by Senator S. I. Hayakawa. Although the campaign to stipulate English as the official language of the US was rejected at the federal level, it was promoted further at the state level. In 1990, there were 17 states that had declared English as the official language (Crawford, 1999: 78), but this number increased to 23 states by 2004 (Crawford, 2004: 153), and 32 states by 2016 (U.S. English, 2016).

The Bilingual Education Act was amended in 1984 and 1988; it rather promoted transitional bilingual education from native language to English, and English-only programs. Therefore, bilingual education policy has proved to be more budget-minded and a type of quick remedy rather than a long-term perspective. The federal government's subsidy was cut by as much as 47% between fiscal years 1980 and 1988 (Suefuji, 2002: 87-90).

3.5. Bilingual Education Act in the 1990s

In the 1990s, American education began to move in yet new direction. President George H. W. Bush called all of the state governors to an Education Summit in 1989. He then published *America 2000: An Education Strategy* in 1991.

Through the series of the above-mentioned policies, a standards-based reform was launched throughout the US; each state would stipulate the standard of public education that each pupil should acquire at school.

In 1994, President Bill Clinton enacted the Goals 2000: Educate America Act by which the federal government would help each state to stipulate their standard of education. He also enacted the Improving America's Schools Act by which the federal government would give financial support for improvements in each state. Under this circumstance, the 1994 amendment of the Bilingual

Education Act still advocated multi-lingual proficiency, but in reality, it had been strongly influenced by the social trend of standards-based reform and put more emphasis on promoting English proficiency and a higher quality of academic achievement (Suefuji, 2002: 90-94).

In this period, bilingual education again became a political issue in American society. In 1996, the school board in Oakland, California, regarded African-American English as different from standard English, and they tried to apply for a bilingual education subsidy. Known as the Ebonics Debate, this, however, received sharp criticism, and eventually the school board was compelled to abandon its plan. An anti-bilingual education initiative asking for the abolition of bilingual education at public schools was passed in California in 1998, in Arizona in 2000, and in Massachusetts in 2002.

3.6. Bilingual Education Act in the 2000s

In the 2000s, the federal government began to regard American education as an important national strategy to promote higher academic achievement for every child, establish standards, and ask for accountability. Educational reform was pushed forward. The results of state-level standardized tests were reflected in subsidy allocations, teacher evaluations, and parents' choice of schools. As a result, the stakes for standardized tests dramatically increased, involving high interests for both children and their parents. Competitive accountability became dominant throughout the US.

In 2002, the NCLB Act was approved as the revised version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Its Title III was the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act. With this revision, the Bilingual Education Act, approved as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was finally abolished. After this revision, those students with low English proficiency were called ELLs, and the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act aimed for such students to acquire proficient English (Suefuji, 2018: 115).

In December 2015, the NCLB Act was further revised and the new law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was approved and put into effect in September 2017 (U.S. Department of Education, 2018). As a result, the ESSA eliminated the authority of the federal government. However, the new act still requires children to take standard tests; each state government should give guidance to those high schools where the dropout ratio is high or the academic level is dwindling. Title III covers language education for ELLs and immigrants' children, and Title I covers general education for ELLs and immigrants' children. Title I is the most important item of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, accounting for the most financial support from the federal government. With this act, education based on standards and achievement tests exclusively for ELLs was made obligatory.

4. Language Education Policy in the State of California

4.1. From the Exemplary State of Bilingual Education to the State of Anti-bilingual Education

The State of California has the most ELLs in the US. The state government stipulated the California Bilingual Education Act in 1972 and the California Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act in 1976 and have thereby put into practice a number of progressive bilingual education programs. Therefore, California is known as the state where ELLs' right to education is most protected in the US. However, as the campaign to make English the official language spread throughout the country, in California, Proposition 63, aiming to declare English as the official language, was approved by referendum in 1986. In the same year, the California Bilingual and Bicultural Education Act, which was a temporary legislation for eleven years, expired and faded into history. People's attitudes about English and other languages have changed gradually over time. In 1994, Proposition 187 was approved, by which education and medical services for illegal immigrants was abolished. In 1996, Proposition 209 was approved, by which the affirmative action was also abolished. Thus, the environment for minority groups in California has become increasingly unfriendly every year.

Under this circumstance, Proposition 227 was introduced to abolish bilingual education in public schools. It was proposed by Ron Unz, a businessman in Silicon Valley, who spent huge amount of his own private money for the campaign. He finally succeeded in passing Proposition 227 by a vote of 61 to 39. Ron Unz asserted following five points (Crawford, 1999: 301-304);

1. English is an official language of the US and the State of California.
2. Parents of immigrants would like their children to learn English.
3. The state government of California and its public schools have an obligation to ensure that all children in California acquire necessary skills, including the ability to make use of English in order to make them able members of the society.
4. Public schools in California have failed to educate immigrants' children by spending a lot of tax money on language programs.
5. If immigrants' children are put in an English-only environment at an early stage, they can more easily acquire English proficiency.

In California, the demographic structure changed in the 1990s; Caucasians were replaced by Hispanics as the majority group, and Hispanics proved to be the largest ethnic group in public schools. This change in demographic structure was regarded as a menace for Caucasians. As part of his tactics, Ron Unz drew a clear line between his campaign and conventional campaigns in making English the official language, which was rejected by immigrants. However, he took some successful immigrants into his campaign, asserting that he was on their side. This is the main reason for the

success of his campaign (Suefuji, 2002: 111-125).

4.2. Approval of Proposition 227

With the approval of Proposition 227, it is determined whether students with low English proficiency are able to join the mainstream classes after a probation of 30 days. If they are judged as not having sufficient English proficiency, they are to take Structured English Immersion (Sheltered English Immersion) courses for one year, after which they will be moved to the mainstream classes. Proposition 227 has several waivers. The waivers include, first, cases in which, by the parents' request, the students are considered to be proficient according to a standard English test; second are cases in which the students are over ten years old and bilingual education will be more suitable to acquire English proficiency; third are cases in which special support is necessary, and education in the native language is more appropriate (Suefuji, 2002: 118-120).

After the approval of Proposition 227, in principle, bilingual education was prohibited in California public schools. Among students whose English proficiency is not sufficient, the number of students who prefer bilingual education has diminished. For example, whereas 29.1% of students took bilingual education in 1997, the number had dropped to 11.9% in 1998 and 4.9% in 2008. In contrast, the number of students who take English-only education has increased drastically. While 21.8% of the students took English-only education in 1997, by 2009, the number had increased to as much as 58.9% (Takizawa, 2015: 159). This indicates that the preference for monolingual education has become more popular in society. The exceptional cases for bilingual education include waivers of Proposition 227, alternative schools, and charter schools.

4.3. Spread of Dual Language Programs

Dual language programs continued in some alternative schools and charter schools even after the approval of Proposition 227. In fact, as many as 95 schools in 1998, 119 schools in 2000 (Ushida, 2002: 117), and 201 schools in 2013 (Takizawa, 2015: 163) continued to carry out dual language programs.

Here, a dual language program means that students from the majority language group and the minority language group are integrated into one unified class for education based on the two languages. Several different patterns can be found, depending on the ratio of the majority language to the minority language. For example, in the 90/10 model, the ratio of minority language to English would be 90% vs. 10% in kindergarten and first grade. It becomes 80% vs. 20% in the second and third grades, and then becomes 50% vs. 50% in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. In 50/50 models, the ratio of the minority language to English is 50% vs. 50% throughout elementary school.

The most common model is the Spanish and English program; as many as 108 out of 119 schools preferred the Spanish and English program in 2000 (Ushida, 2002: 118). As for 90/10 models

between Spanish and English, cases such as César Chávez Elementary School (the alternative school in Davis Joint Unified School District) (Ushida, 2002: 119-123) and the Language Academy of Sacramento (the charter school in Sacramento City Unified School District) (Takizawa, 2015: 171-189) have been studied by researchers. An example of a 50/50 model between Chinese and English is a public school in Los Angeles Unified School District (Kusuyama, 2015: 53-59).

4.4. From Proposition 227 to Proposition 58

The campaign against Proposition 227 has become more and more active. In 2014, California State Senator Ricardo Lara proposed a new bill entitled “California Education for a Global Economy Initiative” (Senate Bill 1174) to the California State Legislature. This bill proposed to scrap Proposition 227, and the state government would provide ELLs with more variety in English education. Lara explained his reasons for proposing this bill in this way: firstly, California has variety, secondly, the local residents had begun to evaluate the immersion program and multilingual education program, and thirdly, more appropriate programs were necessary for all workers in order to promote further development of the state. The California Education for a Global Economy Initiative (Senate Bill 1174) was approved both in the Senate and Assembly, and it was put to referendum as Proposition 58 in November 2016, along with the presidential election. Proposition 58 was approved with 73.5% support (Suefuji, 2018: 117-118).

Proposition 58 includes the following items (Taylor & Udang, 2016);

1. Whereas Proposition 227 had limited the method of teaching English, Proposition 58 will support the pupils in acquiring English proficiency as soon as possible.
2. Whereas Proposition 227 had prevented the pupils whose native language is English from joining a dual language program, Proposition 58 will support such students in acquiring second languages.
3. If the pupils whose native language is not English acquire high-level English proficiency, they will be able to perform actively in the context of the global market economy. In this respect, Proposition 58 will promote the nurturing of such pupils.
4. Whereas Proposition 227 had limited the school district’s choice, Proposition 58 will lift such barriers and allow each pupil to choose the best possible method to promote their language ability.

Thus, Proposition 58 was put into effect as the California Multilingual Education Act of 2016 in July 2017. The California Multilingual Education Act of 2016 guarantees all pupils living in California the chance to learn English as well as other languages. In other words, this act aims to provide pupils with both English backgrounds and non-English backgrounds with the opportunity to

learn various languages. In fact, under Proposition 227, pupils with non-English backgrounds had been exempted from learning English through English, but under the California Multilingual Education Act of 2016, such an exemption was lifted. As a result, public schools in California are now able to freely choose teaching English through English, bilingual education, or other language education programs, depending on the local conditions of each school.

4.5. Significance and Problems for the California Multilingual Education Act of 2016

The shift from Proposition 227 to Proposition 58 was an epoch-making event. Some mass media used the expression of “revival of bilingual education” (Mitchell, 2016) (Moreno, 2016), but people’s expectations for bilingual education has changed drastically over the last two decades. Proposition 58 aims to have all pupils in California acquire bilingual ability. In addition, when all pupils in California acquire multilingual ability, it will surely bring more affluence to California, apart from the individual pupils’ merit.

The pupils will have more variety of choice in their future vocation if they acquire multilingual ability while they are young. Thereby, they can hope for a more affluent life in the future. On the other hand, for California, such pupils will become competent human resources in the context of the global economy and will bring more affluence to the state. In other words, a multilingual ability is regarded as an indispensable resource both for the individual pupils and the State of California. In this respect, the California Multilingual Education Act of 2016 clearly regards language ability as a useful resource.

Some problems have been pointed out in enacting the California Multilingual Education Act of 2016. Among others, the biggest issue is the lack of certified teachers in bilingual education because, under Proposition 227, bilingual education had been limited. For example, in 2009, California had 1,273 certified bilingual teachers. In 2012, the number had dropped to 834 (State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2015). In 2017, a budget of as much as \$10 million was appropriated for a program to nurture bilingual teachers (Rubio, 2017). Here, the pressing problem is how to nurture certified teachers for bilingual education and how to place them in the respective schools.

5. Epilogue

Richard Ruíz analyzed the positioning of English and other languages in terms of the development of language education policy in the US. He pointed out that Americans see three different aspects with regard to language: 1. language as a problem, 2. language as a right, and 3. language as a resource (Ruíz, 1988: 3-25).

The “language-as-problem” aspect implies that all people in the US should acquire English

proficiency at the expense of their native language because non-English languages cause difficult problems for both individuals and the society. In this respect, acquisition of English is regarded as the primary purpose of education. This view was conspicuous in dealing with new immigrants' children in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century and with Mexican-American children in the Southwestern states by the middle of the twentieth century.

The "language-as-right" aspect means that language is a basic human right. It reflects the result of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s and aims to guarantee language rights for the speakers of minority languages to ensure their equality and equity in the society. This means that, by abolishing discrimination based on the differences in languages, we must admit the right to use and learn our own native language. This issue has been brought to the courts from time to time.

The "language-as-resource" aspect means that language ability can be regarded as a useful resource for both individuals and the society. This aspect is based on the theory proposed by Pierre Bourdieu in which the ability to use a non-English language is regarded as a valuable resource not only for individuals as a superior talent but also for society in order to promote international relations in terms of politics, economy, and culture. However, so far, this aspect has not necessarily been realized effectively in American society. Therefore, it is hoped that this aspect will be realized more effectively in the context of language education policy.

The California Multilingual Education Act of 2016 is meant to realize the idea of "language as a resource," proposed by Richard Ruíz. For the moment, it is hoped to overcome possible difficulties and realize its purpose. Other states in the US have also turned their eyes to the future prospects for this act.

References

- California Department of Education (2018) "Definitions of Language Instruction Programs," <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/ip/langedprogdefs.asp>, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- Crawford, J. (1999) *Bilingual Education: History Politics Theory and Practice*, Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc. (Fourth Edition).
- Crawford, J. (2004) *Educating English Learners: Language Diversity in the Classroom*, Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.
- Cubberley, E. (1909) *Changing Conceptions of Education*, New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kusuyama, K. (2015) "Bilingual Education in California: Focus on cooperation with the authorities and interaction with the communities after implementing the No Child Left Behind Act," *Bulletin of Education, Nagasaki University*, Vol. 1.
- Mitchell, C. (2016) "Bilingual Education Poised for a Comeback in California Schools: State's voters may end era of 'English-only' instruction," *Education Week*, October 11, 2016,

- <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/10/12/bilingual-education-poised-for-a-comeback-in.html>, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- Moreno, W. (2016) "California voters bring back bilingual education in a big win for students," *Education Votes*, December 10, 2016, <http://educationvotes.nea.org/2016/12/10/california-voters-bring-back-bilingual-education-big-win-students/>, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- National Center for Education Statistics (2016) "Number and percentage of public school students participating in English language learner (ELL) programs, by state: Selected years, fall 2004 through fall 2014," *Digest of Education Statistics*, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_204.20.asp, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- National Center for Education Statistics (2017) "English Language Learners in Public Schools (March 2017)," *The Condition of Education*, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- Rubio, B. (2017) "The multiple benefits of learning two languages," *EdSource*, June 14, 2017, <https://edsources.org/2017/benefits-of-learning-in-two-languages-increasingly-clear/583374>, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- Ruíz, R. (1988) "Orientations in Language Planning," in *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?*, ed. Sandra Lee McKay & Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (2015) "Bilingual Teachers Prepared in California by Language: 2009-10 to 2012-13," *Bilingual Authorizations*, https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/statistics/2015-01-stat.pdf?sfvrsn=d41fc812_0, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- Suefuji, M. (2002) *Bilingual Education in the United States: For the Construction of the New Society*, Tokyo: Toshindo.
- Suefuji, M. (2018) "The Revival of Bilingual Education in California," *BULLETIN OF TOYO GAKUEN UNIVERSITY*, No.26-2.
- Takizawa, J. (2015) *A Study on Educational Policies of Language Minorities in California: Educational Control and Guarantee of Alternative Educational Ideas in Multilingual Society*, Doctoral Dissertation (Hiroshima University Graduate School of Education).
- Taylor, J. & Udang, L. (2016) *Proposition 58: English Proficiency. Multilingual Education. "California Education for a Global Economy Initiative,"* http://www.mcgeorge.edu/Documents/Publications/prop58_CIR2016.pdf#search=%27Jamie+Taylor+%26+Lilliana+Udang+%282016%29+Proposition+58%3A+English+Proficiency.+Multilingual+Education.+%E2%80%9CCalifornia+Education+for+a+Global+Economy+Initiative%E2%80%9D%27, (accessed 15 April 2018).
- U.S. Congress (1968) *Bilingual Education Act*, P.L. 90-247-Jan 2, 1968, 81 Stat.816,

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-81/pdf/STATUTE-81-Pg783.pdf#search=%27Bilingual+Education+Act+P.L.90247%27>, (accessed 19 November 2019).

U.S. Department of Education (2010) *No Child Left Behind Act*,

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>, (accessed 15 April 2018).

U.S. Department of Education (2018) *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*,

<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html>, (accessed 15 April 2018).

U.S. English (2016) "About U.S. English," *Making English the Official Language*,

<https://www.usenglish.org/history/>, (accessed 15 April 2018).

Ushida, C. (2002) "New Directions for Bilingual Education in California: The Effectiveness of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs," *Comparative Education* (Bulletin of the Japan Comparative Education Society), No.28.