

MANAGING LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE THROUGH DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA

Lydia Nyati-Saleshando¹

Abstract

Formulation of language policy is one of the tools for managing linguistic diversity in education and society in multilingual contexts. California is resident to 213 of the 325 languages spoken in the United States of America (USA), and yet had enforced assimilationist, English only policies until recently. This paper is a review of research on bilingual education policy and practice in the USA. The aim of the paper was to discover the types of bilingual education in operation. Which types were perceived to be successful in providing literacy skills for academic purposes? What success factors and challenges are faced in implementing the program, and what lessons other multilingual and assimilationist policy countries like Botswana may learn from the California experience? The Dual Language Program (DLP) was the most popular and preferred program. In order to gain practical insights on this program, classroom observations were undertaken in two schools in Northridge. Lessons were videotaped and analysed to find out how the program operated, the skills that were being instilled, the teaching methods, and the assessment standards used by teachers. Interviews were conducted with teachers, school administrators, an official and two parents. The paper concludes that while California had English only policies, litigation on language use in schools provided space for bilingual education programs. The DLP promotes biliteracy, bilingualism, and multiculturalism. It also enhances academic performance and fosters an appreciation for cultural diversity, which is necessary for nation building. There are a few lessons for Botswana as a multilingual country with achievement gaps between linguistic groups.

Keywords: diversity, bilingual education, Botswana, dual language, illiteracy.

1. Introduction

In most multicultural societies, linguistic and cultural diversity is managed through policies that recognize or lack thereof different groups represented within a nation (Kashoki, 2003). The policies reflect either a value for assimilation or pluralism as a management strategy for linguistic diversity (Hornberger, 2000; McCarty, 2012; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1999; Roberts, 1995). Policy formulation is a political process and it entails a consideration of political interests, historical facts, economic and cultural factors (Lo Bianco, 1990; Odugu, 2011; Ouedraogon, 2000). In terms of political influence, policy makers normally tend to satisfy the interests of dominant groups at the expense of lesser ones (August, Goldenberg & Rueda, 2010; Simich-Dudgeon & Boals, 1996). Language in education policies would then determine what language is to be used for instruction, or just as subjects or play no role at all. Such decisions depend on how the political formation views diversity, as a resource

¹ *University of Botswana, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, P/Bag 00702, Gaborone, Botswana. Telephone: +267 355 5577, Fax: +267 391 9241, Email: ramaholn@ub.ac.bw

or as a problem (Ruiz, 1984, 2010). If it is viewed as a problem, then the goal of the language in education policy would be to assimilate and rid of other languages and cultures, and create monolingualism (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2002). In this case, the language of instruction would be the dominant language and children from other linguistic groups would have to be immersed or submerged into that language during the learning process. In most cases, this would negatively affect student academic achievement.

Education programs that use more than one language as medium of instruction, inclusive of the child's home language are referred to as bilingual education (BE) programs (NABE, www.nabe.org/bilingual-education). Strategies to facilitate the learning of English through English instruction only are not viewed as BE programs (Hornberger, 1990). The most common types of bilingual education programs are transitional, maintenance (or additive/developmental) and enrichment programs (McCarty, 2012; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1999; Roberts, 1995; Kim, et al., 2013). Transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs are those in which students from non-dominant linguistic groups begin instruction in their native language (L1) and take the second language (L2) as a subject and once they develop adequate proficiency in L2, then they are taught content subjects in L2 (Hornberger, 1990; Roberts, 1995). Maintenance bilingual education programs (MBE) are those that add L2 as a medium of instruction, having started with L1 (Kim, et al., 2013; McCarty, 2012). Instead of a switch, both languages are used as medium of instruction in certain designated subjects. The goal is to continue to develop L1 and L2 skills throughout the school system.

Included under enrichment programs are one-way and two-way BE programs (Whiting, 2017). In a one way, one language group learns in their language and in L2. In a two-way, children in both groups learn in each other's language. Two-way bilingual education programs are also commonly known as dual language programs (DLPs), dual instruction or dual immersion or dual language education (Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Kim *et al.*, 2013; McCarty, 2012; Roberts, 1995). *As a type of the enrichment model, the goal of DLPs is to promote bilingualism and biliteracy. The most common models of DLP are the 90:10 and the 50:50. In the former, all students study in a minority language up to grade three 90% of the time and 10% in English. In the latter, all students study in a minority language half of the time and in English half of the time (Kim et al., (2013).*

2. Language policies and education

2.1 Bilingual education policy

The challenge for the California school system, and indeed for the USA, is how to close the achievement gap between learners with limited English proficiency (LEP)

or English learners (ELs) or English Language Learners (ELLs) as they are referred to in the latest studies (Valentino & Reardon, 2015; Whiting, 2017), and those whose first language is English, the medium of learning. Education has been the mandate of each state and language policy is determined at the state level (Simich-Dudgeon & Boals, 1996). There are 325 languages spoken in the USA and 213 of them are in California (U.S English, 2016-www.us-english.org). By 2006, 30 of the 51 states had adopted the English only policy (De Ross, 2006) and currently they are 31 states with English language policy (U.S. English, 2016-www.us-english.org).

The Federal government, however, is obliged to observe court rulings, which impose mandatory provision of education in other languages if the parents so wish (Maldonaldo, 2016; Olsen, 2015; Sanchez, 2016). As a result, under federal law, states are equally obliged to implement such court decisions (Cheung & Drabkin, 1999; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez & Hopkins, 2010; Maldonaldo, 2016; Manzanares, 1988). One of the most famous rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1974 was the *Lau vs. Nichols* in which Chinese students who could not speak English took the San Francisco, California School District to court claiming that they were “not provided with equal educational opportunities” (Beyond Brown—www.tc.pbs.org/beyond; Ovando, 2003; Wiese & Garcia, 1998, 2001; Kim et al., 2013). The court observed that the provision of facilities, books, teachers and the curriculum did not amount to equal opportunity, if the students’ language is not part of the learning process (author emphasis).

Manzanares (1988) and Wiese & Garcia (1998) provide the most comprehensive evolution of legislation on bilingual education (BE) in the United States. Before the enactment of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968, the language policy was English only, and most programs were the swim or sink into English instruction. Since its inception, the BEA has been reviewed and reauthorized five times: in 1974, 1978, 1984, 1988 and 1994, reflecting the changing needs of students with LEP. The Equal Opportunity Act of 1974, further stated that “language barriers were to be overcome by instructional programs” (Manzanares, 1988, p. 3) and the Native American Languages Act (NALA) of 1990, reviewed in 1992 called for the preservation and use of Native American Languages (NAL) in education (Hornberger, 2000; Klug, 2012).

The major emphasis of the BEA reviews were to define more clearly what BE was; providing guidance on achieving the *Lau* remedies, eligibility to transitional bilingual education (TBE) program (which was in operation at the time), and prescription of the appropriate teaching approach as well as the provision of greater ‘local flexibility, creativity and innovation’.

In the early 1990s came the English Only Movement which pushed for the passage of proposition 227 in California in 1998 (Cheung & Drabkin, 1999; Gandara

et al., 2010). This policy called for a mandatory use of English only as medium of instruction in all public schools in California. Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) were to be taught in special classes in English for not more than a year, after which they had to join regular classes.

In November 2016, proposition 58 was voted for in California, essentially repealing proposition 227 and allowing languages other than English to be used in public schools (Sanchez, 2016). The new aspect of the law was that parents will no longer have to sign a waiver to have their children enrolled in a BE program. The dual language program which became popular despite restrictions imposed by proposition 227 is likely to be most preferred by parents under proposition 58.

2.2 *Assimilationist and pluralist ideologies*

Hornberger (1990, p. 173) observed that “ideological tensions between assimilationist and pluralist discourses about linguistic and cultural diversity are long-standing and persistent.” On the one hand, assimilationists believe that it is best to provide good quality monolingual English education with well trained teachers and good provision of educational materials, and focus less on language of instruction (Chin, 2015; Valdes, 1997). On the other, pluralists argue that bilingual education does add value to the education of children with LEP and to English speakers learning another language (Krashen, 1999; Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Marian, Shook, Schroeder, 2013; Myers, 2014, www.news.stanford; Thomas & Collier, 2002, 2003). Some scholars argue that DLPs are expensive, have complex scheduling, need highly trained and dedicated teachers and need a lot of parental support and involvement (Fortune, 2012; Roberts, 1995). It is worth noting that these requirements are inherent within the nature of education itself if success is expected and not unique to DLPs. Thomas and Collier (2003) maintain that DLPs educate both English learners and native English speakers without incurring extra costs.

2.3 *Bilingual education program effectiveness*

Proposition 227 had resulted in a decline in BE programs in California and more research began to show that TBE programs in particular were not really assisting children to acquire the necessary linguistic skills they needed for their studies (Cheung & Drabkin, 1999; Valdes, 1997), especially if the transition was in less than five years (Fuller, 2011). The new set of results could have been influenced by reduction in resources and teacher moral in response to proposition 227 (Cheung & Drabkin, 1999). Gandara and Contreras (2009) concluded that neither English only nor BE were the answer—both depend on well trained BE teachers, good curriculum and programs that address poverty and marginalization. Kim et al., (2013) also observed that students with LEP lived in poverty and most of their parents have low education, and they perform poorly in math and reading compared to their English-

speaking counterparts.

While BE programs went on a decline after the passage of proposition 227 (Cheung & Drabkin, 1999), the battle for it continued (Benson, 2014; Mongeau, 2016) and dual language programs (DLP) became popular and on high demand (Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Lindholm-Leary, 2005, 2013; Ramos, 2007). More middle class American parents wanted their children to learn another language and be competitive in a globalized world (Fortune, 2012; Schwartz, Koh, Chen, Sinke & Geva (2016). Research indicated that DLPs have greater benefits and are more effective (Lindholm-Leary, 2012; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Valentino & Reardon, 2015; Yazejian, Braynt, Freel & Burchinal, 2015).

Federal government, through the American Institute for Research (AIR) conducted a study in 1978 (Gandara & Contreras, 2009) on the value of BE. AIR concluded that TBE had no impact on educational outcomes. The study was heavily criticized on its methodology and many other factors (Gandara & Contreras (2009). Another study followed in 1991 and concluded that TBE provided superior reading outcomes in earlier years of school than those in the English immersion programs. On the standard deviation, those in TBE were about .4 better than those in English only classes (Gandara & Contreras, 2009).

The study by Thomas and Collier (2003a, p. 65) which covered 15 states, 23 school districts and over 2 million students concluded that “dual language programs can close the achievement gap for English learners and provide a superior education for native English speakers”. The debate and tension on BE seems to move towards DLP as the answer to closing the academic gap between LEP and native English-speaking students.

Valentino and Reardon (2015) studied the effectiveness of four instructional programs meant to assist English learners and found that DLP was the best, followed by TBE and English immersion was last. They further found that students in dual language programs not only catch up with their peers but actually surpass them both linguistically and academically (Myers, 2014, www.news.stanford; Valentino & Reardon, 2015). More studies seem to point to the greater success in early childhood education in dual language (Ford & Palacios, 2015; Fortune, 2012; Yazejian et al., (2015).

In 2014, the United States Department of Education (USDOE) commissioned AIR to conduct a study to examine current state policies and practices with regard specifically to DLPs. There were 46 states implementing a dual language program, and 39 were receiving Federal funding (USDOE, 2015). One of the conclusions of the study was that while TBE provided partial gap closure between English speaking children and those with limited English proficiency (LEP), DLP provided full gap

closure among other advantages already outlined above. The US Department (USDOE, 2015, p. 9) states that “dual language program holds the promise of giving students access to key 21st century skills”. Another important finding was that states vary with regards to program structure, implementation processes, operational practices and policies, and assessment standards for partner languages. However, they shared the common goal to provide high level bilingual and biliteracy skills, and develop these skills through the teaching of content subject in the target languages for high levels of academic achievement (USDOE, 2015, p. VIII) In conclusion, the DLP is the most preferred since “more schools are adopting this model” (USDOE, 2015, p. VIII). This program offers more benefits in enhancing academic achievement, literacy and linguistic skills, “foster awareness for cultural and linguistic pluralism, develop cognitive, social and emotional identity” (Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education, 2013, p. 1).

3. Data collection methodology

This article is essentially a review of literature carried out at the University of Pennsylvania library from January to June 2016. The goal was to review research in its broad sense and analyse the major findings in relation to the research questions below. The following sources were utilized for the search: University of Pennsylvania library (hard and soft sources), ERIC, Google and Google Scholar. The search produced 102 pieces of work including those from Botswana. Using the abstracts, 58 pieces of research work were selected: 31 Journal articles, 2 books, 4 book chapters, 17 reports, one dissertation, one thesis, and 2 news reports. The search words were those indicated in the abstract. The goal was to trace bilingual education policy in the USA since the inception of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968 to date.

In order to bring the literature to life, classroom observations were carried out in two schools implementing the DLP, over a three-week period in March 2016. This aspect of the paper is informed by qualitative methodology borrowing some ethnographic elements, namely participant observation and case study as opposed to quantitative approaches. The former focuses on in-depth observations and inquiries, hence sacrificing breadth for depth (Nyati-Ramahobo, 1999). It derives its significance not from statistical evidence, but rather from how the participants construct meaning from their experiences. Interviews were conducted with four teachers whose classes were observed, and with the school principals, an official in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and two parents (a Korean and a Spanish). Interviews focused on finding out the interlocutors’ perception of the program, curriculum, assessment, the success factors, challenges and activities associated with the programs in terms of the teaching and acquisition of language and literacy skills for learning. The schools were selected by the Los Angeles Unified School District Office because of their proximity to where the author lived and the willingness of the

school leadership to work with the author.

One school was running a DLP in Korean and English (School A) and another in Spanish and English (School B). Each class had 50% native speakers of English and 50% speakers of the other language (Spanish or Korean). Both schools run the 50% model from kindergarten to grade 6. The goal of the program in each school was to promote the development of literacy in both languages and “acknowledge the value of biliteracy in our society, affirm the value for diversity and honour the cultures of our community” (School B brochure, no page number). “The goals include bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence. Students are also expected to develop grade level academic proficiency” (Principal for school A, Interview, March 8th, 2016).

The paper aims to answer the following questions.

1. What BE programs are in operation in the United States and California?
2. What types of BE are perceived to be most successful in providing academic skills to learners in California?
3. What are the success factors and challenges BE programs are facing in California?
4. What lessons can be drawn from this experience for countries such as Botswana?

While visitations were made to classes from kindergarten to grade 6, data utilised for this paper was from two one-hour long grade three lessons observed and video-taped in School A and two grade five lessons in School B. These four lessons were selected based on clarity of the video. In most classes, there was active learning with a lot of movement, and that affected the sound on video. All other lessons provided valuable insights based on detailed notes.

3.1 Data coding and analysis

Data from the literature was categorized according to the research question the article or document was addressing. Some articles addressed more than one question. Each article was coded with numbers 1 to 4 corresponding to the questions. Data from classroom observations was reviewed to note the skills being taught, the strategies used, and classroom assessment techniques. Data from interviews was also modelled along the research questions. The questionnaire covered issues under research question number 2 to include assessment, curriculum content, teacher training and student success and reclassification. As a result, the interviews focused on these matters as well as clarifying some of the issues observed in class and in the literature. Follow up questions were emailed and responses were received from the school principals. Content analysis was the main strategy to analyse data from the different

sources. This process entailed searching for themes related to the four research questions.

3.2 *Limitations of the study*

The limiting factor was the researcher's lack of competence in Spanish and Korean. While she could understand when students with LEP spoke in English and discern their level of competence, she could not understand native English speakers when they spoke in Spanish or Korean. As a result, she depended on the actions in classroom interactions which helped to work out the focus of the lesson. The teacher would also explain before the class what activities will take place and what they intended to achieve. This proved helpful in following the lessons.

4. Findings on the BE programs in operation

There is tension in ideology on whether bilingual education is the answer to closing the achievement gap between children with limited English proficiency (LEP), and those who speak English at home. Assimilationists believe English immersion is the answer, while pluralists are convinced that BE is the answer (Hornberger, 1990). This ideological tension has however, resulted in having to find ways to educate the diverse populations represented in the country (McHugh & Sugarman, 2015) hence the persistence of BE in the US despite the resistance. The second point of tension is, if BE has some value, which program type is most beneficial for LEP students? Research has been providing conflicting results as shown above. While there is evidence that TBE does make a difference, the latest research (US Department of Education (USDOE, 2015), indicates that the two-way DLP closes the achievement gap and is currently the most preferred program in the United States.

The second finding is that scholars note that while BE and, DLP in particular, may be the solution to closing the achievement gap, the issue is more complex than that (Gandara & Contreras, 2009). There is need to address the socio-economic aspect of these children with regards to poverty, discrimination, class, attitudes, etc., which impact on their academic achievement. The third finding is that, there is growing pressure from middle class English speaking American families who find the need for their children to learn another language (Ramos, 2007; Kim et al., 2013). Jackson and Malone (2009) state that:

There is a critical national requirement for skilled speakers of languages other than English As a result of 21st Century economic globalization and international tourism, it has never been more urgent to develop American citizens who fully understand and can communicate effectively with people of other cultures (Jackson & Malone, (2009), cited in Massachusetts Association for Bilingual

Education, 2013, p. 4).

There is also pressure from many linguistic groups especially Spanish, Korean and Chinese parents who would like their children to learn their native language and heritage. “My parents are now elderly, and they are the only ones who speak Korean, so I thought it is good for my children to learn Korean and English at the same time” (Participant, Interview, March 7, 2016). These pressures provide an opportunity for BE, especially DLP, to flourish for years to come.

4.1 *Most successful program*

The Two-way dual language program (DLP) was effective in the schools I visited, corroborating research (Thomas & Collier, 2002, 2003; US Department of Education, 2015; Valentino & Reardon, 2015; Lindholm-Leary, 2012). One of the teachers in school B said “These kids are great, they are more sociable, they communicate well and they do well in their content areas”. (Participant, Interview, March 7, 2016). The Principal for school A said “Research clearly shows that students in dual language programs develop academic skills on par with, or superior to, the skills of comparison groups of their peers educated in general education classes, and we have witnessed this” (Principal, Interview, March 8, 2016). DLP is seen to provide students with language skills for literacy as well as for academic purposes where it is well implemented and well resourced. The principal of School A said, “We are having a showcase to celebrate all that our students have learned as well as the cultural achievements of the program” (Principal, Interview, March 8, 2016). Teachers, school principals and parents in both schools had confidence in the success of the two- way dual language program they were running.

4.2 *Success factors*

The effectiveness of the program was due to the following success factors: Well trained teachers in the bilingual education methodology and of course the subject matter, good curriculum, clear assessment tools to ensure that the skills are achieved at the relevant grade level in both languages. The program must be well-resourced, have a value for cultural diversity, at least 50% instruction time in the target languages, and a minimum of five years on the program. Other success factors from both interviews and the literature include community engagement, strong school leadership and administrative support, continuous staff development on methodology, cultural diversity, and parental involvement.

A striking feature of most classes was the active and dynamic classroom settings in both schools. There was lots of writing in the target languages all over the classroom walls to foster comprehension and memory. There was an integrated approach to teaching all four language skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening)

within the subject content. Students would write, read sometimes to each other, sometimes to the class, and talk to each other and then talk to the class. The class was full of movement, changing tasks, working in pairs, in groups and as individuals, in one lesson. I noted that reading what the friend had written, and sharing it with the class created purposeful reading, and it communicated the writers' purpose, making him or her not only part of the learning process but contributing to it. The skills were taught for communication and not just descriptive reasoning. The communication demonstrated the understanding of the content being imparted. The teacher in school A said "we are doing great academically, our students do very well in the tests before they are reclassified" (Teacher, Interview, March 8, 2016).

While BE is implemented in different contexts, states are required by Title 111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to use the English language proficiency standards and assessments to monitor student progress (USDOE, 2015). However, for the partner language (any other language being taught other than English), states have a choice to use the same standard, or develop different assessment tests (USDOE, 2015). In addition to their normal competencies and qualification, teachers are expected to acquire "high level of proficiency in the languages in which they teach, an understanding of sheltered instruction and second language development, and skill in supporting second language learners in content areas (mathematics, science, social studies)" (USDOE, 2015, p. xv). The principals of both schools indicated that their teachers were well trained in BE, and this is one of their strong success factors.

4.3 Challenges

Interviews with teachers, school principals and the officer revealed that there are challenges associated with DLP program. They corroborate those that are described in the literature. Provision of resources to the schools was echoed by all. As noted earlier, the review of the BEA resulted in the reduction in funding for BE programs, with a preference to alternative programs which would help the students to transfer to English medium as quickly as possible, irrespective of whether or not they were ready to receive instruction in English. "The program is great, the problem is, we are under resourced, but we do our best" (Teacher in school B, Interview, March 7, 2016). The second challenge is having all the staff and students embrace the philosophy of DLP or BE in general. "It depends on the school management, I mean, I have done my best and we are doing great, other schools—not so well" said the principal for school A. There are therefore mixed reactions to what makes DLP successful. The third challenge is to get all parents involved in helping with homework, creating a home environment that nurtures the language the child is learning, and participating in school activities, volunteering for cultural events and even lessons. This problem

is also dependent on the school leadership to mobilise and make connections with parents. The principal for school B concurred that her role is to bring everyone to the show. “Our gate way is the arts, music, theatre, dance, these attract both students and parents to the program. Throughout the year students perform and share their talents with the community” she said. Making arts and culture as an important part of the program creates the spirit of unity in supporting the program for the greater benefit of the students and the community. Maldonado (2016) said:

Our diversity will not go away, we just have to know how best to manage it and provide every learner with the best opportunity they can have. (Maldonado, Interview, March 4, 2016).

Parental support is critical to ensuring that the target language the child is learning in school is encouraged and supported at home. The schools which are able to bring the parents and the school together reap more benefits.

The fourth challenge is shortage of qualified teachers to teach in DLP programs, since most teachers left California after the passage of Proposition 227. Teachers need to have the additional competencies required for the dual language program to be employed, said the Principal in school B. (Interview, March 4, 2016). The two schools seem to have overcome these challenges, hence the success they have experienced.

4.4 *Lessons learned*

While it is the goal of the paper to see if there are lessons Botswana could learn from California in relation to bilingual education, it is important to acknowledge that the contexts are different. It is beyond the scope of this paper to compare and contrast Botswana and USA contexts. Suffice to state the fact that bilingual education is good for education (Fishman, 1976) and for minority children. If BE is good for learning in a multilingual and multi-cultural society like California, there must be lessons for a multi-cultural country such as Botswana. The majority of Botswana citizen children are learners with limited English proficiency. They learn in the national language for one year and then transit into English immersion throughout the education system. Botswana is therefore, wrestling with the same issues facing the US, including: long history of under-performance in marginalized areas, acceptance of unity in diversity, mother tongue education, and tribal discrimination. Unique to Botswana are declining standards in education, and lack of literacy skills at all educational levels. The other difference is that the US has been making effort to provide literacy skills for learning to close the achievement gap while Botswana has not. Now the question is, are there lessons which Botswana can learn from California since they are dealing with similar issues?

The ability to read with comprehension, analyse text and apply its meaning

determines one's academic achievement in other subjects. Therefore, these skills are indispensable to education as they form the foundation for learning (Ntereke & Ramoroka, 2015; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1999). The first lesson is that DLP may be useful in providing reading and literacy skills in Botswana Primary Schools and beyond. Studies on reading and literacy in Botswana have indicated serious problems with regards to students' inability to communicate effectively in writing (Ketsitlile & Commeyras, 2014; Komarek & Keatimilwe, 1988; Masalila, 2008; Ntereke & Ramoroka, 2015; Botswana Examination Council (BEC), 2015; Spaul, 2011). The curriculum at all grade levels needs assessment tools to ensure that students acquire the necessary skills for academic performance (Ketsitlile & Commeyras, 2014).

The second lesson is the need for a new policy direction from English only to multilingualism. English being a foreign language in Botswana, there is need for policy that would enable the use of the child's first language for at least five years before moving into English only instruction. It has also been found that while teachers are expected to teach in English only, they use other languages to aid learning (Ketsitlile & Commeyras, 2014; Spaul, 2011). The unofficial and unplanned use of other languages in the classrooms (Ketsitlile & Commeyras (2014), Komarek & Keatimilwe, 1988); Spaul, 2011) seems to support the need to review the language policy to align it with the realities on the ground for the development of the country. There has been an achievement gap between rural and urban schools in Botswana, it is time to raise consciousness and close this gap through some form of BE program.

Program model or type is the third lesson for Botswana, with either an extended TBE (to rectify its shortfalls and provide beyond one year) or DLP depending on the linguistic composition of the school. The diversification of the education system through program types operating as opposed to the current standardization (Hornberger, 2000), would address the needs of the learners in each locality and provide better education results.

Research in Botswana has found that the education system is deteriorating in standard (Boko, 2015; BEC, 2015; Mphale & Mhlauli, 2015) and there is under performance in content subjects especially those that are Science based (Botswana Examination Council (BEC), 2015). DLP seems to have the good things Botswana needs, such as high literacy skills development for academic performance, well trained and certificated teachers in reading and literacy, language arts methodology and BE theory and practice, standardized grade level assessment tools, good curriculum for teacher training and parental participation. Developing national language resources and making students to be aware of linguistic and cultural diversity is an important value for nation building. It fosters intercultural education which results in learning to live together peacefully.

The fourth lesson is in teacher education (curriculum, methodology and

assessment standards). The development of grade level materials for teaching English as a foreign language is important if students are to acquire skills for academic performance at each level. Assessment tools for both teacher and student competencies for DLP can prove useful for grade level competency development. The English language proficiency assessment standards in California are detailed and have been used for years hence they are predictable. While there may be need for modification, the core principles of developing such standards can be learned.

5. Conclusions

Bilingual education programs in the US and California are a result of court decisions calling for the use of other languages in education. The enactment of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968 moved practice from the swim and sink approach to transitional bilingual education, to a host of other models, and provided a window of opportunity to implement the Lau remedies. The 2016 vote in favour of proposition 58 opened a greater opportunity for the expansion of the dual language program which has become the most preferred program in the US to date. Its success rate in a multicultural society like California has made it popular in providing both LEP and English speaking American students with academic skills, and addresses the achievement gap. There is evidence that the two schools in California are running successful bilingual education programs, which foster biliteracy, multicultural ethos, and cultivate academic proficiency skills. There is parental involvement, and teachers are well trained in methodology and assessment. There is space to celebrate and highlight the different cultures represented in the school. This results in cultivating the spirit of unity in diversity for nation building.

Like California, Botswana has to find ways to educate the diverse ethnic groups within its borders. A new phase of national development, focusing on quality education calls for excellence in teaching literacy and numeracy skills. These skills are not to be taught for their own sake but for learning other subjects, developing critical thinking and analytical skills (Ketsitlile & Commeyras, 2014; Nyati-Saleshando, 2011) and economic development of the country. The declining overall education standards at all levels, may well be the litigation that should compel Botswana to move in the same direction as the US to close the rural-urban achievement gap.

Immersion without the student language takes away their voice (Hornberger, 2006). They become rote learners and disable student centred methodologies (Nyati-Ramahobo, 1999). The management of linguistic diversity needs a paradigm shift from assimilation to pluralism, leading to diverse ways of providing education to specific communities, and DLP is worth exploring in this regard.

Works Cited

- August, D., Goldenberg, C., & Rueda, R. (2010). Restrictive state language policies: Are they scientifically based? In P. Gandara, & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*, (pp. 139-158). New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Benson, J. (2014). The fight for bilingual education programs in the U.S. VOXX1. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/04/12/bilingual-education-programs_n_513892.html.
- Boko, D. (2015, March 22). Botswana's education system has become a tragedy. *Sunday Standard*. Retrieved June 7, 2018, from www.sundaystandard.info/Botswana
- Botswana Examination Council (BEC) (2015). PSLE results 2015. Retrieved from www.bec.co.bw
- Chin, A. (2015). Impact of bilingual education on student achievement. *IZA World Labor*. 131 -141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15185/izawol.131>
- Cheung, C. & Drabkin, D. (1999). Bilingual education in California: Poverty and prejudice: Our schools, our children. *Ethics in Development in Global Environment (EDGE)*. Retrieved from www.stanford.edu/class/e297/poverty_prejudice
- De Ross, V. (2006). The English Only Movement In the United States. *IPERSTORIA*. <http://iperstoria.it/vecchiosito/httpdocs>.
- Fishman, J. A. (1976). Bilingual education is good for education. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Bilingual education: An international sociological perspective*, pp.23-31. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ford, K., & Palacios, R. (2015). Early literacy instruction in Spanish: Teaching the beginning reader. Retrieved from www.colorincolorado.org.
- Fortune, T. W. (2012). What research says about immersion? In Asian Society. *Chinese language learning in the early grades: A handbook of resources, best practice for mandarin immersion*, pp.9-13. Retrieved from <http://asiansociety.org>.
- Fuller, J. M. (2011). Bilingual education: What it is, and why and how it works (or doesn't). Retrieved from www.popularlinguisticsonline.org/2012/bilingual-education.
- Gandara, P. & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gandara, P., Losen, D., August, D., Uriarte, M., Gomez, M. C., & Hopkins, M. (2010). Brief history of U.S. language policy. In P. Gandara & M. Hopkins

- (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*, pp.20-32. New York: Teachers' College: Columbia University Press
- Hornberger, N. H. (1990). The continua of biliteracy and bilingual educator: Educational linguistics in practice. *Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7 (2&3), 155-171.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2000). Bilingual education policy and practice in the Andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 173-201. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2000.31.2.173>
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006) Voice and biliteracy in indigenous language revitalization: Contentious educational practices in Quechua, Guarani, and Maori contexts. *Language, Identity and Education*, 5 (4), 277-292. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0504_2
- Jackson, F.H. & Malone, M.E. (2009). Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework, CAL. In K.Michell. *Synthesis of Research for Advocacy*. SIG,MATSOL,2009.
- Kashoki, M. E. (2003). Language policy formulation in multilingual Southern Africa, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24 (3), 184-194. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434630308666497>
- Ketsitlile, L. E & Commeyras, M. (2014). Reviewing published information on reading in Botswana secondary schools. *Reading and Writing*, 5 (1). Article no. 35. Retrieved from www.rw.org.za/index.php/rw/article/view/35/125
- Kim, Y. K., Hutchison, L., & Winsler, A. (2013). Bilingual education in the United States: A historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Education Review*, 67 (2): 236-252. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.865593>.
- Klug, K. (2012). Native American languages act: Twenty years later, has it made a difference. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, retrieved from www.culturalsurvival.org.
- Komarek, K., & Keatimilwe, E. (1988). *Language competence and educational achievement in primary schools in Botswana*: Part 11, Allgemeine Bildung Wissenschaft Sport.
- Krashen, S. (1999). *Condemned without trial: Bogus arguments about bilingual education*. Portsmouth, N.H: Heinemann.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2005). The rich promise of two-way immersion. *Educational Leadership*. (Fall) 62, 56-59.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education.

- Theory into Practice*, 51 (4), 256-262. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726053>
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Education: Dual language instruction in the U.S. *American Quarterly, Update on Policy*, 7, 97-98.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1990). Making Language Policy: Australia's experience, In R. B. Bauldauf, jr., & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australia and South Pacific*, pp. 47-79. Philadelphia: Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.
- Manzanares, G.S. (1988). Bilingual Education Act: Twenty years later. *National Clearinghouse for bilingual education*. Occasional paper no.6. Fall 1988.
- Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion programs benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 167-186. Retrieved from www.comm.soc.northeastern.edu/bilingual-psychology/files <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.818075>
- Masalila, T. (2008). *Towards a systematic framework for examining the congruence among reading objectives, tasks and competencies in Botswana Primary schools*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. International Institute for Educational Planning. Gaborone. Botswana.
- Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education (2013). www.massmabe.org.
- McHugh, M. & Sugarman, J. (2015). *Transatlantic symposium report: Improving instruction for immigrant and refugee students in secondary school*. Washington, D.C: Migration Policy Institute's National Centre on Immigrant Integration Policy.
- McCarty, S. (2012). Understanding bilingual education 2: Analyzing types of bilingual education. www.childresearch.net/papers/language/2012.
- Maldonado, Hilda. Interview. March 4, 2016. Mongeau, L. (2016). Battle for bilingual education once again is brewing in California. The Hechinger Report. Retrieved from www.pbs.org/-assets/spi/pdfs/Bilingual_Immersion
- Mphale, L. M. & Mhlauli, M. (2014). An investigation on students' academic performance for junior secondary schools in Botswana. *Journal of European Research*, 3 (3), 111-127.
- Myers, A. (March 25, 2014). Student's learning English benefit more in two-language instructional programmes than english immersion, Stanford research finds, www.news.stanford
- Ntereke, B. B. & Ramoroka, B. (2015, September). *Reading competency of first year undergraduate students at the University of Botswana*. Paper presented at the 9th Pan-Literacy Africa: Literacy for All. Cape Town. Retrieved from www.ubrisa.ub.bw/bitstream.

- Nyati-Ramahobo, L. (1999). *The national language - a resource or problem: The implementation of the language policy in Botswana*. Gaborone: Pula Press
- Nyati-Ramahobo, L. 2002. The long road to multilingual schools in Botswana. In O. Garcia, T. Skutnabb-Kangas & M. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Language in education*, pp. 285-303. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Nyati-Saleshando, L. (2011). An advocacy project for multicultural education: The case of Shiye language in Botswana. *International Review of Education*, 57, 567-582. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11159-011-9254-4>
- Odugu, D.I. (2011). *Education language policy process in multilingual societies: Global visions and local agendas in India, Nigeria and UNESCO*. (Dissertation). Paper number 166. Loyola University, Chicago. Retrieved from http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/166
- Olsen, L. (2015). Bilingualism and education in California and the United States: A time line. Retrieved from www.laurieolsen.com/uploads/2/5/4/9/25499564/timeline.
- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27 (1):1-24. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589>
- Ouedraogon, R.M. (2000). Language planning and language policies in selected West African countries. UNESCO. Retrieved from www.unesdoc.unesco.org.
- Ramos, F. (2007). What do parents think of two-way bilingual education? An analysis of responses. *Journal of Latino and Education*, 6 (2), 139-150. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348430701304807>
- Roberts, C. A. (1995). Bilingual education program model: A framework for understanding. *The Bilingual Education Research Journal*, 19 (3&4), 369-378. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1995.10162679>
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations to language planning. *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal of Research and Practice*, 8 (2) 15-34.
- Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting language as a resource. In J. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education policy and practice and controversy*, 155-172. Charlotte: Info Age.
- Sanchez, C. (2016). *Bilingual education returns to California: Now what?* Retrieved from www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016.
- Schwartz, M., Koh, P. W., Chen, B. X., Sinke, M., & Geva, E. (2016). Through the lens of teachers in two bilingual programmes: a look at early bilingual education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 29 (2), 141-168. Retrieved

- from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1103250>
- Simich-Dudgeon, C. & Boals, T. (1996). Language and education policy in the state of Indiana: Implications for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3), 537-555. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587697>
- Spaull, N. (2011). Primary school performance in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa. SACMEQ Working Paper 8. Retrieved from www.sacmeq.org/sites/default/files/sacmeq/publication/08-comparisons_final_18oct2011.pdf.
- Thomas, W. P. & Collier, V. (2003). Reforming education policies for English learners: Research evidence from U.S. schools. *Multilingual Educator*, 4 (1), 16-19.
- Thomas, W. P. & Collier, V. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. *Centre for Research on Education, Diversity (CREDE) and Excellence*. University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved from www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.Html.
- US Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition (USDOE), (2015). Dual language programs: Current state policies and practices. Washington, D.C. <http://www2.ed.gov/about/office/list/oela/resources.html>.
- U.S. English, (2016). www.us-english.org
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Education Review*, 67 (3), 391-430. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948>.
- Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of four instructional programs designed to serve English language learners: Variation by ethnicity and initial English proficiency. *American Educational Research Association*. 37 (4), 612-736.
- Wiese, A. M., and Garcia, E.E. (1998). The bilingual education act: Language minority students and equal educational opportunity. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22 (1), 1-18. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1998.10668670>
- Wiese, A. M., & Garcia, E.E. (2001). Bilingual education act: Language minority students and US Federal education policy. *International Journal of Bilingual education and bilingualism*, 4 (4), 229-248). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050108667730>
- Whiting, J. (2017). Caught between the push and pull: ELL teachers' perceptions

of mainstreaming and ESOL classroom teaching. *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal of Research and Practice*, 8 (1), 9-27.

Yazejian, N., Braynt, D., Freel, K., Burchinal, M., & the Educare Learning Network (ELN) (2015). High-quality early education: Age of entry and time in care differences in student outcomes for English-only and dual language learners. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 32, 23-39. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.02.002>