



Western Washington University  
Western CEDAR

---

WWU Honors Program Senior Projects

WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship

---

Fall 2000

## State School Systems and Language Rights

Laura Mariko Cheifetz  
*Western Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwu\\_honors](https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwu_honors)



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Cheifetz, Laura Mariko, "State School Systems and Language Rights" (2000). *WWU Honors Program Senior Projects*. 198.

[https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwu\\_honors/198](https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwu_honors/198)

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in WWU Honors Program Senior Projects by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact [westerncedar@wwu.edu](mailto:westerncedar@wwu.edu).



## ***HONORS THESIS***

In presenting this honors paper in partial requirements for a bachelor's degree at Western Washington University, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes. It is understood that any publication of this thesis for commercial purposes or for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

*[Handwritten signature]*

Date

10-30-00  
*[initials]*

## **State School Systems and Language Rights**

**Laura Mariko Cheifetz**

**Department of Sociology  
Western Washington University  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
[lcheifetz@hotmail.com](mailto:lcheifetz@hotmail.com)**

**(An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association in San Diego, March 2000.)**

### **Abstract**

This paper discusses the issue of language rights, examining the struggle for power between state school systems and parents over children's education, specifically language rights. An examination of state statutes regarding bilingual education, and state department of education web pages for the lower 48 states revealed that all states provide bilingual education for limited-English proficient students, or LEP students. The indicator of language rights the paper uses is parental approval, the extent of the authority that parents have over their child's presence in bilingual education classes as stated in state statutes. Using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), we attempt to explain the absence of parent approval in particular states.

## Introduction

In an examination of state statutes regarding bilingual education, and state department of education web pages for the lower 48 states reveals that all forty-eight states provide bilingual education for limited-English proficient students, or LEP students. That all states are similar in this way is an indication of what DiMaggio and Powell (1991) call institutional isomorphism. Institutions and organizations mimic one another, so at certain levels, state educational systems are increasingly similar to one another. There is no variation: just as every state school system has a superintendent, every state has bilingual education. The impetus for this isomorphism regarding bilingual education was the application of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and *Lau v. Nichols* (1973), a federal court case that stated language-minority students had the right to equal opportunity in education and special programs.

That variation does not occur in terms of whether or not states have bilingual education does not necessarily mean that state school systems are similar in practice, specifically in the extent to which parents can exercise authority over language rights. Because language rights are more than simply providing education for LEP students, an examination of other indicators of language rights would be prudent.

This paper examines one measure of language rights, the degree of approval extended to parents over the enrollment of their children in bilingual education classes. A review of state statutes reveals that parents are accorded this right in fourteen states.

First we review the history of language diversity in American schools and what kinds of language rights issues were prevalent from 1840 to 1920, and during the 1960s

and 1970s. Briefly, we examine the Common School Era, the era of backlash that led to increased standardization, and increased language diversity in the 1960s and 1970s. Then we explain the theoretical framework used to evaluate differences in the rights parents have to approve their child's presence in bilingual education course. A brief explanation of the measures and data follows. The method we use to determine causes of the presence or absence of parental approval, Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), is discussed, followed by a discussion of the analysis and results.

## **Language Diversity and Educational Access:**

### **An Historical Overview**

American “common schooling” has long included groups whose native language is not English. Language instruction in schools and school instruction conducted in languages other than English parallels strains of immigration. A local immigrant group with enough political power could include their native language in school curriculum, either as an instructional language used in classes such as mathematics or as a distinct subject (Casanova and Arias 1993, p. 6). Some such groups included Italians, Polish, Czech people, French, Dutch, and Germans.

#### **Common School Era and Language Groups: 1840-1890**

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, several Midwestern cities had bilingual schools that utilized and taught in both English and German (Baron 1991, p. 11; Casanova and Arias 1993, p. 6). In Cincinnati in 1840, German citizens first ensured German would be taught in elementary schools statewide. Classes became bilingual; by 1899, teaching time was split evenly between instruction in English and German in grades one through four (Tyack 1974, pp. 106-107). In St. Louis, German tended to be taught as a separate subject, and non-German students also enrolled in German classes in 1871-1872 (Tyack 1974, p. 107). As Germans and German-speakers assimilated into English-speaking mainstream society, “they shifted their demands from bilingual schools... to a justification of German as an elective and separate subject for the upper elementary grades and the high schools” (Tyack 1974, p. 108).

During the Common School Movement of the 1840s, educational policies became codified as regulation at higher levels increased (Kaestle 1983, pp. 104-135). Public

schools were perceived to be the most important institutions in the socialization of the influx of immigrant children from southern and eastern Europe. Using English as the language of instruction in the schools became vitally important (Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 29). The resurgence of nativism at this time “marked the beginning of a gradual decline for bilingual education” (Crawford 1989, p. 21). Again in the 1880s, there was a move to eliminate instruction of foreign languages in elementary schools (Tyack 1974, p. 109). Many cities ceased teaching German in schools, often justifying their actions by relying on rhetoric about economics or the need for Americanization.

### **The Standardization of Language Diversity: 1890-1920**

The backlash after 1900 to the numbers of poor, mainly Catholic immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, was manifested in an Americanization movement (Crawford 1989, p. 22). The U.S. Bureau of Education joined the effort, publishing Americanization propaganda. The goal of education was to assimilate immigrants linguistically and culturally, under the assumption that this would ensure loyalty to the United States (Crawford 1989, p. 22).

After World War I, anti-German sentiment was such that all non-English language schools were shut down. Many states banned teaching languages other than English. In 1903 fourteen states required English-only instruction and 34 states had such regulations by 1923 (Estrada 1979, p. 104; Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 29). Nearly 25% of students studied German in school in 1915. By 1922, that percentage had dwindled to 0.6% (Baron 1991, p. 7). Nebraska passed a law in 1919 prohibiting teaching a foreign language to children below eighth grade (Baron 1991, p. 6; Minow 1985, p. 165). Under this law, a teacher (Robert Meyer) was fined for allegedly teaching



German to a ten-year old boy (Baron 1991, p. 6). Meyer sued the state and his challenge prompted the Supreme Court to declare the legislation unconstitutional (see Meyer v. Nebraska 1923; also Minow 1985, p. 165). The decision stated:

The desire of the legislature to foster a homogeneous people with American ideals prepared readily to understand current discussions of civic matters is easy to appreciate...But the means adopted, we think, exceed the limitations upon the power of the State and conflict with rights assured...in time of peace...The protection of the Constitution extends to all, to those who speak other languages as well as to those born with English on the tongue (cited in Crawford 1989, p. 24).

Between the end of World War I and the early 1960s, those students who were NEP or LEP were submerged into classrooms, for the most part left to sink or swim (Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 30).

#### **The Legalization of Language Rights: The Legacy of *Lau v. Nichols***

It wasn't until the 1960s that the issue of bilingual education was held in the national spotlight again. At this time, accelerated immigration of Spanish speakers required programs to teach the English language. In 1963, Dade County in Florida began a successful test bilingual program to meet the needs of the large numbers of Cuban immigrants coming to that area (Casanova and Arias 1993, pp. 7-8; Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 30). Many other cities were emulating Dade County by the late 1960s (Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 30).

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) which lent legitimacy at the federal level for bilingual education programs, has been the cause of much contention due to its ambiguity. Signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, this piece of legislation was not meant to restrict schools but to encourage the development of assorted creative programs (Crawford 1989,

p. 32; Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 32). Funds would be distributed based on the potential of each pilot program to test the effectiveness of different curricula. The Act also provided funding for the development of instructional materials (Matute-Bianchi 1979, p. 19). Beyond this, the legislation does not define bilingual education, nor does it clearly state the goals of bilingual education sponsored at the federal level. The original Act does not explicitly state that schools must use languages other than English to be eligible for funding (Crawford 1989, p. 32).

Some proponents of Title VII believed the goal was to maximize English-language proficiency. Others believed it encouraged proficiency in both English and the child's native language, while recognizing and validating the child's native culture (Moran 1987, p. 327). Three central goals have emerged from the Bilingual Education Act:

1. the development of a more effective, more just one-way bridge to English by building upon content instruction first in the mother tongue (transitional bilingual instruction)
2. the development of more effective education for limited-English-speaking children, in addition to the long-term development and maintenance of both English and the mother tongue (maintenance bilingual education)
3. the provision of a source of jobs in education and of preferential treatment for members of the ethnic groups involved (Matute-Bianchi 1979, p. 20)

Each of these goals conflicts with the others. The first is concerned only with proficiency in the English language. The child's native language is seen only as a tool to be used in gaining English-language proficiency. The second goal encourages proficiency in both the dominant language and the child's native language, which would result in true bilingualism. The third goal accuses bilingual education of being counter-productive; rather than education as the focus, a sort of affirmative action is encouraged.

Even while this legislation is confusing and has been interpreted in numerous ways, it brought the issue to the federal level, positively changing policy toward those whose native language is not English. It also undermined English-only laws at the state level. Vitaly important, "it suggested that equal education was not the same as identical education, even when there was no difference in location or teacher" (Malakoff and Hakuta 1990, p. 32).

In the landmark case of *Lau v. Nichols* (1973), the Supreme Court ruled that language-minority students had the right to equal opportunity in education and special programs (Casanova and Arias 1993, p. 9). Under Title VII, as the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) interpreted it, school districts had to be proactive when students were excluded from learning by language barriers (Moran 1987, p. 328). It has generally been interpreted to mean an affirmative order for schools to develop programs which integrate use of the native languages of the students (Mitchell, Destino, Karam, and Colon-Muniz 1999, p. 91). While this vague ruling was meant to allow schools maximum flexibility, it has been the cause of much contention.

The OCR drafted a series of guidelines called the Lau remedies. These "remedies" specifically promoted bilingual education (Rossell and Ross 1983, p. 42). Announced in August of 1975, the guidelines stated that districts were required to provide Limited-English Proficient (LEP) or Non-English Proficient) NEP students with bilingual education when they were found to have dishonored the rights of these children. School districts were told how to recognize which children were LEP/NEP and were provided with suggestions regarding appropriate instruction; guidelines were included on determining when children could be placed in regular classes (Crawford 1989, p. 37).

While never officially adopted, the remedies were used to draw up plans with offenders of civil rights by investigators from the Office of Civil Rights (Crawford 1989, p. 37).

## **An Empirical Analysis of Language Rights:**

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Parental Authority vs. School Authority**

When initially observing the presence of bilingual education in the different states, we found that all states had bilingual education regardless of the region, proportion of students enrolled in bilingual education, and other factors that would theoretically have a bearing on the presence of bilingual education. This phenomenon is termed “institutional isomorphism.” DiMaggio and Powell maintain that organizations become increasingly similar because of escalating bureaucratization. They state that “bureaucratization and other forms of organizational change occur as the result of processes that make organizations more similar without necessarily making them more efficient” (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, p. 147).

DiMaggio and Powell state that the “existence of a common legal environment affects many aspects of an organization’s behavior and structure” (1983, p. 150). *Lau v. Nichols* and the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 created a particular environment that led to decreased variation across states in terms of the provision of bilingual education. Because the presence does not vary, we examine differences in practice of parental authority.

In this analysis, language rights are operationalized using a measure of parental authority versus school authority over a child’s education. Parental approval of a child’s presence in bilingual education classes here is an indication of the balance of power in

this aspect of language rights. The presence or absence of parental approval says something about the state education system itself, that is, the amount of power the state school system exercises over the extension of provisions designed to fulfill mandates for language rights. The presence or absence of parental approval is the outcome of some combination of factors, and we seek to explain why particular states would formalize in statute language the right for parents to influence or determine school provisions over bilingual education. What is it about the structure of state school systems that may explain the relative balance of power between parents and state school systems?

### **Data and Measures**

The analysis focuses on Parental Approval within public education for levels K-12. Parental Approval is the extent of the authority that parents have over their child's presence in bilingual education classes as stated in state statutes. The presence or absence of parental approval was determined by examining state statutes on state government websites and at the University of Washington Law Library for the contiguous 48 states. Washington, D.C. and US territories and associated areas were excluded from this analysis, as were Hawaii and Alaska.

To examine parental approval (the indicator of language rights on which we chose to focus), we looked at several variables, or factors (see Table 1 – factor list). The first factor is the proportion of LEP (limited-English proficient) students in the state as of the 1996-97 school year (LEP). Because these are the students that bilingual education classes seek to serve, it makes theoretical sense that the proportion LEP would have some bearing on how the state approaches bilingual education. It is difficult to hypothesize what kind of impact this would have on parental approval. It would seem that a high

percentage, or presence, of LEP students would increase the likelihood that parental roles would be mentioned in state statutes. Depending on other factors such as the degree of centralization (see discussion of centralization below), a high proportion, or presence, of LEP students (for the purpose of this research it is defined as 7.0% or greater) could either increase the likelihood that the statutes will contain a provision for parental approval or decrease the likelihood of that happening. This information was obtained by searching various websites pertaining to bilingual education in public schools.

The second factor we explore is the degree of centralization of the school system (CENTRAL). This measure is taken from a scale by Wirt (1977) that helps to indicate the distribution of authority over schools between the state level and the local level. The more the balance of power between the state and local education authorities is tipped toward the state, the greater the degree of centralization. As school organization becomes increasingly centralized, that is, more authority is held at the state level than at the local level, it makes theoretical sense that the balance of power shifts from parents to the state school system. Therefore, the more centralized state school systems become, the less likely parents will be able to exercise their authority over the presence of their children in bilingual education classes. Frederick Wirt's scale of centralization of state school systems is an important measure and concept for this research. The concept of centralization is based on the level of authority the state holds compared to individual teachers, schools, or parents.\*

The degrees of centralization for the states range on a theoretical scale of 0 to 6, 0 being the most decentralized (Absence of State Authority), and 6 being the most centralized (Total State Assumption). This scale was calculated during 1972-1973 using

a content analysis of laws in thirty-six areas of educational policy in all fifty states (Wirt 1977, p. 171). Each state received a score based on the degree of state authority over the school system in that state. Alabama was determined to have the most centralized school system, with a score of 4.67. Wyoming was found to have the least centralized school system, with a score of 1.86.

For this research, states with values of 3.65 and above were coded as highly centralized, and those with values below 3.65 were coded as having a low degree of centralization. We hypothesize that if a state school system were highly centralized, the more likely it is to override parental authority.

The third factor is whether or not the state requires all high school seniors to pass an exit exam in order to graduate (EXAM). The exit exam factor indicates the extent to which the state has imposed standards on individual school districts, rather than allowing school districts greater autonomy to set their own graduation requirements. The presence of a statewide exit exam would make parental approval less likely to occur. The exit exam variable is a correlate of centralization. This information was gathered by culling state department of education websites, calling assessment offices, and emailing assessment personnel during April and May, 2000.

### **Methods**

To examine the factors that lead to the mention of parental approval in state statutes, we use Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). Rather than being variable-oriented, this analytic technique focuses on cases (Ragin 1987). It is possible to examine configurations of factors that produce particular outcomes (Ragin, Mayer, and Drass 1984; Ragin 1987; Ragin 1995, p. 177). QCA provides “analytic tools for conducting

holistic comparisons of cases as configurations and for elucidating their patterned similarities and differences” (Ragin 1998, p. 107).

This technique uses Boolean algebra to reduce or minimize complex configurations; combinations that are unnecessary for the “presence of the outcome in one or more cases are trimmed from its solution” (Griffin, Caplinger, Lively, Malcom, McDaniel and Nelsen 1997, p. 18). Several combinations of factors remain that can’t be reduced further; these are the causes of the outcome being examined. There are usually several different causal combinations. One is not more “correct” than another. There is more than one explanation as to how the positive outcomes came about, for “they all provide different representations based on different goals and different assumptions” (Ragin 1995, p. 189). QCA is not deterministic, but rather helps the researcher better understand what factors lead to a particular outcome, in this case, Parental Approval (Griffin et.al. 1997, p. 18).

What is extremely valuable is that QCA allows the researcher to see general patterns as well as more complex interactions that cause particular outcomes. The researcher retains the ability to examine specific cases in light of the general patterns providing “a basis for interpreting cases, reconstructing them as types, and evaluating their different trajectories” (Ragin 1998, p. 122). Sometimes there are negative cases, cases that fall under the minimized configurations but have a negative outcome. This is not an error, but can help researchers explain patterns, as “deviations are identified and addressed on a case-by-case basis” (Ragin 1995, p. 179).

QCA requires that all of the variables or factors be binary, or presence-absence dichotomies. In this research, the factors of proportion LEP and centralization were



coded high (1) – low (0), and the exit exam variable and parental approval were coded yes (1) – no (0). With three independent variables, there are eight logically possible combinations, which is the structure of the Truth Table.

### **Analysis and Results**

QCA was performed using the factors of percentage of LEP students, degree of centralization of the state school system, and state-wide exit exam requirements as interacting in some way to produce the outcome of the absence of Parental Approval. The QCA analysis of the truth table was performed using the program developed by Drass and Ragin (1989). The initial analysis of the three variables yielded no clear, evident patterns. Upon examination of the states that have parental approval, it appeared that there was something about the size of the state population that correlated with parental approval, so state population was included as a variable (POP).

The analysis was performed again using the four variables. State population was coded as high/low (7 million and greater/less than 7 million). State population size, as of July 1999, was obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau website. With four factors, there are 16 logically possible combinations.

The final minimized configurations are no exit exam and a low population, or a low proportion of LEP students and a high degree of centralization, or a low proportion of LEP students and a state-wide exit exam requirement, or a high degree of centralization and the presence of a state-wide exit exam requirement (see Table 2). Thus, the absence of Parental Approval in particular states may be explained by four different combinations of factors.

There are nineteen cases that fall under the configuration of no exit exam and small state population and have the absence of Parental Approval (see Table 3). In addition, two cases fit this configuration but had the presence of Parental Approval. These cases are called “negative cases.” Fifteen cases fall under the configuration of low proportion of LEP students and high degree of centralization, and there are also three negative cases (see Table 4). Eleven cases fall under the configuration of low proportion of LEP students and the presence of an exit exam requirement for high school graduation with the absence of Parental Approval, and there are an additional five cases that are negative (see Table 5). There are nine cases that fall under the configuration of a high degree of centralization and the presence of an exit exam requirement (see Table 6). Also, three negative cases fall under this configuration.

There is some overlap among cases. Some states fit more than one configuration, which is an example of how complex causal explanations can be.

### **Discussion**

Parental Approval theoretically implies parental access to be able to exert authority on school-related policy. Minimizing on the absence of this helps us understand what combinations of factors lead states not to extend such authority to parents in their statutes. Four configurations of factors help explain why parents are not given the power in state statutes to determine whether or not their child should be enrolled in bilingual education courses.

The first configuration, no state-wide exit exam requirement and low population, implies that the state school system is not as highly centralized, since the absence of a state-wide exit exam requirement is correlated with a lower degree of centralization of

the state school system (This is not a perfect correlation; states may be less centralized than some but still be centralized enough so that they were coded as having a high degree of centralization.). Also, because the state has a low population, there are fewer students and fewer parents to interact with school agents. It may be that interactions tend to be less formal because of this, and therefore the parental role did not have to be formalized in state statutes.

The second configuration, a low percentage of LEP students and a high degree of centralization of the state school system, implies that because the system is highly centralized, parents can't exert as much authority over child's presence in bilingual education classes. Regardless of the proportion of students who would be enrolled in bilingual education classes, the state has claimed the authority to place students in such classes at its discretion.

A low percentage of LEP students and the presence of a statewide exit exam requirement, the third configuration, indicate much the same situation as the second configuration. Because the presence of the exit exam requirement implies that the state school system is highly centralized, it does not matter how many LEP students there are in the state who will be availed of bilingual education classes; the state makes no provisions for parental authority in this matter. It is the state who makes such a decision. It is the same for the fourth configuration, which is a high degree of centralization and the presence of a statewide exit exam requirement.

### **Conclusions**

This research opens the door to a fascinating way to evaluate causes of the variation in practice of language rights between states. Using Qualitative Comparative

Analysis to evaluate the sets of factors leading to the absence of Parental Approval helps the researcher explore complex causes of the outcome. Oftentimes, cases conform to more than one configuration; this is further evidence that there can be more than one way to explain a particular outcome. Because this research is not deterministic, there is no “correct” explanation for the outcome. The researcher can not draw “conclusions,” per se, but can explore “causal complexity and case specificity while examining general patterns” (Ragin 1998, p. 122). Different combinations of such factors as the proportion of LEP students in a state, the degree of centralization of the state school system, the presence or absence of a state-wide exit exam requirement, and the size of the state population, help us understand why a state would or would not specify, in state statutes, that parents have the right to approve their child’s presence in bilingual classes.

Unfortunately, time constraints do not allow for an in-depth analysis of each negative case; further research is recommended. Further research on other indicators of language rights is also recommended.

### Endnote

---

\* States have become increasingly involved in local schooling. After World War I, school districts were consolidated, a trend that accelerated after World War II. As states reduced the number of school districts, they also worked "to improve the quality of instruction and administration" (Wirt 1977, p. 165). States began to regulate finances, graduation requirements, teacher qualifications, and curricula (Wirt 1977, p. 166). Specifically, Wirt examined the distribution of power between state control and local education authority (LEA), measuring the extent to which authority over educational policy is centralized within states (Wirt 1977, pp. 169-170).

## References

- Baron, Dennis. Spring 1991. "English in a Multicultural America." *Social Policy* 21: 5-14.
- Casanova, Ursula and M. Beatriz Arias. 1993. "Contextualizing Bilingual Education." In *Bilingual Education: Politics, Practice, and Research*, edited by M. Beatriz Arias and Ursula Casanova, 1 - 35. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, James. 1989. *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice*. New Jersey: Crane Publishing Company, Inc.
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991.
- Drass, Kriss A., and Charles C. Ragin. *Qualitative Comparative Analysis. QCA 3.0*. Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1989.
- Estrada, Lawrence J. 1979. "A Chronicle of the Political, Legislative and Judicial Advances for Bilingual Education in California and the American Southwest." In *Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research, Volume 1: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States*, edited by Raymond V. Padilla, 97 - 108. Michigan: Bilingual Bicultural Education Programs, Eastern Michigan University.
- Griffin, Larry J., Christopher Botsko, Ana-Maria Wahl, and Larry W. Isaac. "Theoretical

Generality, Case Particularity: Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Trade Union Growth and Decline.” In *Issues and Alternatives in Comparative Social Research*, edited by Charles Ragin. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Griffin, Larry J., Christopher Caplinger, Kathryn J. Lively, Nancy L. Malcom, Darren McDaniel and Candice Nelsen. 1997. “Comparative-Historical Analysis and Scientific Inference.” In *Historical Methods* 30 (1): 13-27.

Kaestle, Carl F. 1983. *Pillars of the Republic*. New York: Hill and Wang.

*Lau v. Nichols*, 472 F. 2d 909 (9<sup>th</sup> Civ. 1973).

Malakoff, Marguerite and Kenji Hakuta. 1990. “History of Language Minority Education in the United States.” In *Bilingual Education: Issues and Strategies*, edited by Amado M. Padilla, Halford H. Fairchild, and Concepcion M. Valadez. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Matute-Bianchi, Maria Eugenia. 1979. “The Federal Mandate for Bilingual Education.” In *Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research, Volume 1: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States*, edited by Raymond V. Padilla, 18 - 38. Michigan: Bilingual Bicultural Education Programs, Eastern Michigan University.

Minow, Martha. 1985. “Learning to Live with the Dilemma of Difference: Bilingual and Special Education.” *Law and Contemporary Problems* 48(2): 157-211.

Mitchell, Douglas E., Tom Destino, Rita T. Karam, and Anaida Colon-Muniz. 1999. “The Politics of Bilingual Education.” *Educational Policy* 13(1): 86-103.

Moran, Rachel F. 1987. “Bilingual Education as a Status Conflict.” *California Law Review* 75 (pt. 1): 321-362.

- Ragin, Charles C. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1987.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1995. "Using Qualitative Comparative Analysis to Study Configurations." In *Computer-Aided Qualitative Data-Analysis: Theory, Methods and Practice*, edited by Udo Kelle, 177-192. London: Sage Press.
- Ragin, Charles C., Susan E. Mayer, and Kriss A. Drass. "Assessing Discrimination: A Boolean Approach." *American Sociological Review*, 49 (1984): 221-234.
- Rossell, Christine H. and J. Michael Ross. 1986. "The Social Science Evidence on Bilingual Education." *Journal of Law and Education* 15(4): 385-419.
- Tyack, David B. 1974. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wirt, Frederick M. 1977. "School Policy Culture and State Decentralization." In *The Politics of Education: The Seventy-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, edited by Jay D. Scribner, 164-187. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.



<b>Table 1</b>		
<b>Factors</b>		
<b>Factor Name</b>	<b>Absence=0</b>	<b>Presence=1</b>
<b>LEP</b> Proportion of LEP students in state school system	0 – 6.9%	7.0% and greater
<b>CENTRAL</b> Degree of centralization of state school system	0 – 3.64	3.65 and greater
<b>EXAM</b> Statewide exit exam administered as a prerequisite for high school graduation	No	Yes
<b>POP</b> Size of state population	Less than 7 million	7 million and greater

<b>Table 2</b>	
<b>Minimized Configurations - absence of Parental Approval</b>	
<b>Cd</b>	No exit exam and low population
	Or
<b>AB</b>	Low proportion LEP and high degree of centralization
	Or
<b>AC</b>	Low proportion LEP and presence of exit exam
	Or
<b>BC</b>	High degree of centralization and presence of exit exam

**Table 3****States matching configuration "cd" (no exit exam requirement and small state population) with the absence of Parental Approval**

Arkansas  
Colorado  
Connecticut  
Iowa  
Kansas  
Kentucky  
Maine  
Maryland  
Massachusetts  
Montana  
Nebraska  
North Dakota  
Oregon  
South Dakota  
Vermont  
Virginia  
Washington  
West Virginia

**States matching configuration but with presence of Parental Approval**

Missouri  
Rhode Island

**Table 4****States matching configuration “aB” (low proportion LEP population and high degree of centralization) with the absence of Parental Approval**

Arkansas  
Colorado  
Connecticut  
Iowa  
Kansas  
Kentucky  
Maine  
Maryland  
Massachusetts  
Montana  
Nebraska  
North Dakota  
Oregon  
South Dakota  
Vermont  
Virginia  
Washington  
West Virginia

**States matching configuration but with presence of Parental Approval**

Indiana  
Minnesota  
New Jersey

**Table 5**

**States matching configuration “aC” (low proportion of LEP students and presence of statewide exit exam requirement) with the absence of Parental Approval**

Alabama  
 Georgia  
 Idaho  
 Louisiana  
 Michigan  
 Mississippi  
 North Carolina  
 Ohio  
 Oklahoma  
 South Carolina  
 Wyoming

**States matching configuration but with presence of Parental Approval**

Indiana  
 Minnesota  
 New Jersey  
 Tennessee  
 Wisconsin

**Table 6**

**States matching configuration “BC” (high degree of centralization and presence of statewide exit exam requirement) with the absence of Parental Approval**

Alabama  
 Florida  
 Michigan  
 Mississippi  
 New Mexico  
 North Carolina  
 Ohio  
 Oklahoma  
 South Carolina

**States matching configuration but with presence of Parental Approval**

Indiana  
 Minnesota

New Jersey

## APPENDIX

## CONDITIONS

STATE	LEP	Central	Exam	State Pop.	PARENTAL
Alabama	0	1	1	0	0
Arizona	1	0	1	0	1
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0
California	1	1	0	1	1
Colorado	1	1	0	0	0
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	1	1	1	1	0
Georgia	0	0	1	1	0
Idaho	0	0	1	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	1	1
Indiana	0	1	1	0	1
Iowa	0	1	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	0	1	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	1	0	0
Maine	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	1
Michigan	0	1	1	1	0
Minnesota	0	1	1	0	1
Mississippi	0	1	1	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0	1
Montana	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	1	0	0	0
Nevada	1	0	1	0	1
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	1	1	1	1
New Mexico	1	1	1	0	0
New York	1	0	1	1	1
North Carolina	0	1	1	1	0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	0	1	1	1	0
Oklahoma	0	1	1	0	0
Oregon	0	1	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	1	0	1	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	1
South Carolina	0	1	1	0	0
South Dakota	1	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	1	0	1
Texas	1	0	0	1	1
Utah	1	0	1	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	1	0	0	0
Washington	0	1	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	1	0	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0	1	0	1
Wyoming	0	0	1	0	0

**CENTRAL:** 3.65 = 1  
**LEP:** 7 or >= 1  
**EXAM:** yes = 1  
**STATE:** 7 million or >= 1

---

**PARENTAL:** approval = 1