

education policy analysis archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 28 Number 18

January 27, 2020

ISSN 1068-2341

Dual Language Programs: Questions of Access in the State of Arizona

Laura M. Gomez

Los Angeles City College



Jesus Cisneros

University of Texas at El Paso

United States

Citation: Gomez, L. M., & Cisneros, J. (2020). Dual language programs: Questions of access in the state of Arizona. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 28(18). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.4680>

Abstract: Public schools across the country are increasingly working with children who enter schools speaking a language other than English. Using a case study methodology, the authors examined Dual Language Program (DLP) implementation in Arizona, which by law supports English-only education. Several benefits (bilingualism, bi-literacy, biculturalism, globalization) and challenges (curriculum, teachers, state policy, funding, and lack of access to DLPs for minority language students) are highlighted from stakeholder perspectives. Participants in this study described the paradox of excluding ELLs from dual language programs as inefficient, unnecessary, and wrong. Taking Interest Convergence as a theoretical framework to understand the Arizona context regarding English-only education, this study raises implications for research and practice.

Keywords: Dual Language Programs; English Language Learners; Interest Convergence; Case Study

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>

Facebook: /EPAAA

Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 5/6/2019

Revisions received: 6/10/2019

Accepted: 6/10/2019

Programas de lenguaje dual: Preguntas de acceso en el estado de Arizona

Resumen: Las escuelas públicas de todo el país trabajan cada vez más con niños que ingresan a escuelas que hablan un idioma que no es inglés. Utilizando una metodología de estudio de caso, los autores examinaron la implementación del Programa de Lenguaje Dual (DLP) en Arizona, que por ley apoya la educación solo en inglés. Desde la perspectiva de las partes interesadas, se destacan varios beneficios (bilingüismo, bi-alfabetización, biculturalismo, globalización) y desafíos (plan de estudios, maestros, política estatal, financiamiento y falta de acceso a DLP para estudiantes de idiomas minoritarios). Los participantes en este estudio describieron la paradoja de excluir a los ELL de los programas de lenguaje dual como ineficiente, innecesaria y errónea. Tomando la Convergencia de Intereses como un marco teórico para comprender el contexto de Arizona con respecto a la educación solo en inglés, este estudio plantea implicaciones para la investigación y la práctica.

Palabras-clave: Programas de lenguaje dual; estudiantes del inglés; Convergencia de intereses; Caso de estudio

Programas de idioma dupla: Questões de acesso no estado do Arizona

Resumo: As escolas públicas de todo o país estão trabalhando cada vez mais com crianças que ingressam em escolas que falam outro idioma que não o inglês. Usando uma metodologia de estudo de caso, os autores examinaram a implementação do Programas de Idioma Dupla (DLP) no Arizona, que por lei apóia a educação somente em inglês. Vários benefícios (bilinguismo, bi-alfabetização, biculturalismo, globalização) e desafios (currículo, professores, política estadual, financiamento e falta de acesso a DLPs para estudantes de línguas minoritárias) são destacados das perspectivas das partes interessadas. Os participantes deste estudo descreveram o paradoxo de excluir ELLs de programas de idioma dupla como ineficiente, desnecessário e errado. Tomando a convergência de interesses como uma estrutura teórica para entender o contexto do Arizona em relação à educação somente em inglês, este estudo levanta implicações para a pesquisa e a prática.

Keywords: Programas de idioma dupla; estudantes de inglês; Convergência de Juros; Estudo de caso

Introduction and Overview

After the founding of the United States, bilingual education was utilized for immigrant communities to establish themselves into American culture while also establishing and maintaining their cultural and linguistic heritage without being forced into assimilation (Ovando, 2003). However, throughout the years, the support for bilingual education has changed and fluctuated depending on the levels of immigration and the governmental relationships with countries from which immigrants originate (Gándara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). Depending on the political climate, the views of bilingual education have shifted from support of literacy and heritage languages to anti-bilingualism through education policy. Today, the availability of Dual Language Programs (DLPs) in the United States continues to increase as a way to prepare students to be competitive and thrive in a multicultural global economy (Howard & Christian, 2002). DLPs are a form of bilingual education that aims for additive bilingualism and are designed to serve two populations of students: those for whom the primary instructional language is a mother tongue, and those who are adding a language to their linguistic repertoire (Thomas & Collier, 2012).

There are approximately 40 million foreign-born immigrants living in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a). Furthermore, roughly 22 percent of all 5-18 public school-aged students speak a language other than English at home regardless of nativity (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011b). Hence, public schools across the country are increasingly working with children who enter school speaking a language other than English. States such as California and Massachusetts have lifted restrictions against bilingual education in order to give opportunity for the different educational needs of linguistically and ethnically diverse student populations. In contrast, states such as Arizona have implemented restrictive language policies, including Proposition 203 and HB 2064, which systematically deny English language learners (ELLs) access to DLPs. Proposition 203 requires all districts to implement a one size-fits-all Structured English Immersion model, whereby students are taught English by being taught in English during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed a year (Gándara & Orfield, 2010). Similarly, HB 2064 requires English learners to receive English language development services in an English-only immersion setting for a minimum of four hours per day for the first year in which they are classified as ELL, and in subsequent years until they achieve English proficiency (Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2013). Hence, in Arizona, where roughly 13 percent of the states' K-12 public school enrollments speak a language other than English at home (Arizona Department of Education, 2010), ELLs cannot participate in DLPs because they are not systematically deemed English proficient. Instead, they are submerged in English-only settings and segregated from their English-proficient peers for up to 80 percent of the school day (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2010; Garcia, Lawton, & Diniz de Figueiredo, 2013).

Much research asserts that DLPs can be a benefit for students from ethnic and linguistically diverse backgrounds to achieve literacy and academic readiness regardless of English proficiency (Alanís & Rodriguez, 2008; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010). Gatekeeping policies, such as Proposition 203 and HB 2064, however, effectively deny language minority students of opportunities for bilingualism development. The purpose of this study is to highlight the context of DLPs and the perspectives of DLP stakeholders with regard to language policy in a state that systematically denies ELLs access to DLPs—Arizona. The following research question guided this study: What are stakeholders' perceptions of DLPs and the context in which DLPs operate in the state of Arizona?

We focus on stakeholders to interrogate whether there is alignment in ideology between policy and implementation. We focus specifically on stakeholders' perspectives to understand whether the state's language policy represents the demands and needs of local communities. The

following section describes the academic, cognitive, and sociocultural benefits of bilingualism, which contextualize the growth and support of DLPs even in “English-only” states such as Arizona.

Literature Review

Dual Language Programs can serve both as an alternative and transitional model to educate ELLs, and for English proficient students to reach proficiency in a second language. The benefits of utilizing DLPs are to maintain the primary language of the student, as well as acquire English proficiency instead of transitioning the student into English-only, which is the main goal of most transitional programs currently utilized (Morales & Aldana, 2010). The positive outcomes in student achievement and the development of cognitive abilities for both ELLs and English proficient students are incentives for the insertion and increase of DLPs nationwide.

Academic Benefits

Thomas and Collier (2012) have found consistent results that DLPs “lead to grade-level and above-grade-level achievement in second language, the only programs that fully close the gap” (Thomas & Collier, 2012, p. 11). In this sense, DLPs benefit both ELL and native English-speaking students in obtaining higher levels of academic achievement than their counterparts in mainstream classrooms. Thomas and Collier (2003), for example, document how ELL students in DLPs scored in the 51st percentile when taking the national Stanford 9 standardized test in the English-language section; whereas their peers in regular classrooms scored in the 34th percentile. Native English-speaking students also achieved higher scores than their regular classroom counterparts on the same test, scoring in the 63rd and 70th percentile in reading, as opposed to the 50th percentile for their regular classroom counterparts. Alanís and Rodríguez (2008) also support the fact that students perform well in DLPs. In their study, fifth grade native English language students demonstrated high test scores in the 80th and 100th percentile range on the English reading standardized section. Furthermore, ELLs also performed better on the same section in comparison to the state average, with 90% of the students receiving passing scores.

Social economic status (SES) is also an important variable to account for in the academic achievement of students that are in DLPs. Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010), for example, identified English proficient students from low SES in DLPs, with a focus on fourth and fifth graders. Their results demonstrated that both groups of students in comparison to their peers in regular classrooms performed at higher levels on the state assessment. Results highlighted the success of DLPs for all students regardless of English proficiency, SES, or race. Lindholm-Leary (2012) additionally highlighted how a language-majority and language-minority balance during content delivery can lead to academic proficiency in both languages.

de Jong (2002) similarly investigated how bilingualism is effective for language minority and language majority students’ academic achievement. de Jong (2002) looked at a Massachusetts’ two-way bilingual education program, which provides first language literacy development for all of its students during the first years of K-12 education. The program teaches the curriculum half of the time in the student’s primary language and the other half in student’s secondary language by third grade. de Jong (2002) highlights the fact that by fifth grade, native and non-native English speakers met the linguistic and academic achievement goals. Results highlight that strong native language literacy skills are strong predictors for proficiency in the primary language and the learning of a second language, which is known as additive bilingualism (Cummins, 1981). Moreover, according to Murphy (2016), two-way bilingual classes can be considered enrichment programs and, as a result, can be implemented in a variety of school settings and for a variety of students. Murphy points out

that these programs can be implemented in almost all schools and can potentially be beneficial for almost all students.

Cognitive benefits. The success of DLPs with students from different backgrounds can also be explained by the benefits of bilingual education for children's cognitive process. Bilingual education can influence much of learners' intellectual life and their ability to focus on utilizing language in a productive way (Bialystok, 2015; Nagy, Berninger, & Abbot, 2006). Bialystok (2010), for example, examined "how bilingualism influences the linguistic and cognitive development of children" (p. 6). Bialystok (2010) examined the developmental abilities (e.g., language acquisition, metalinguistic ability, literacy, and problem solving) of bilingual children in comparison to monolingual children, and highlighted how being bilingual has a substantial impact on children's ability to pick and choose relevant information. For this reason, according to Bialystok (2010), development of two languages during the early stages of life turns out to have a profound significance that ripples throughout the life of individuals. In this way, struggling learners benefit from DLP environments.

Sociocultural benefits. Consistent with previous studies, DLPs also help learners derive sociocultural benefits. Learners are able to learn about different cultures, and understand their own culture better. Similarly, they are able to develop friendships across cultures, and interact in culturally appropriate ways. Participating in DLPs results in more positive and confident attitudes toward education and the learning of two languages, with a lower likelihood of dropping out of school (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2012). Furthermore, students that are part of DLPs—which provide true and authentic ways of using and interacting with the language being learned—build peer relationships that lead to the building of linguistically integrated social networks (Kibler, Atteberry, Hardigree, & Salerno, 2015). These social networks are strengthened when administrators, teachers, and parents of bilingual and biliterate students understand and support the implementation of DLPs (Thomas & Collier, 2014).

Given this extensive research backing in support DLPs, it is surprising to see states like Arizona opt for English-only approaches for educating ELL students. Moreover, it is concerning to witness language policy (Proposition 203 and HB 2064) effectively denying ELLs the opportunity to develop their native language via participation in DLPs. While native English-speakers are allowed to maintain their native language and add another language for enrichment via DLPs, ELLs are forced to abandon their native language under the English-only model (Jimenez-Castellanos, Cisneros, & Gomez, 2013; Jimenez-Silva, Gomez, & Cisneros, 2014). The following section describes the theoretical framework undergirding this study.

Interest Convergence

Interest Convergence draws from an interdisciplinary perspective to challenge dominant ideologies, including colorblindness, race neutrality, and equal opportunity in the eyes of the law that camouflage the self-interest and power of the dominant group (Bell, 1980; Delgado, 2006). Interest Convergence is specifically used to analyze the interaction of race with the law and how the interests of people of color and those of white elites coincide, even if for a short period of time, allowing minority progress (Bell, 1980). Bell (1980) coined the term Interest Convergence after utilizing it to explain the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision to desegregate schools. Bell argued that *Brown v. Board of Education* was approved at that time, not because the Supreme Court saw this decision as fair, just, or moral, but because approving desegregation was necessary to support the United States Cold War objectives. These objectives, according to Bell (1980), included sending a clear message to the world that the US was committed to supporting and advancing Blacks' interests and conditions

in the nation. Coincidentally, the message was also an attempt to gain support from countries around the world against communism. Interest convergence is the idea that racial equality for people of color will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites (Bell, 1980).

In the same sense, English-only education was promoted and passed in Arizona through Proposition 203 and HB 2064 because the interests of language minority students and the dominant group intersected. The mutual interest was advertised as providing specialized education and support for ELLs in the learning of English. The goal was to eliminate bilingual education by incorporating ELLs into general education as soon as possible. ELLs would receive specialized education in English for four hours a day for a period of one year and then be integrated into regular classrooms. The elimination of bilingual education via English-only mandates, however, stands in contrast with the proliferation of DLPs in Arizona, which require English-proficiency for admission. In this sense, Proposition 203 and HB 2064 propel erroneous beliefs of minority progress and camouflage the self-interest and power of the dominant group by supporting the interest of middle- and upper-class white Americans, while diminishing the self-interest of low-income language minority students. It can be argued that the current language policies in the state support second-language acquisition as an asset, but only for native-English speakers. Native-English speakers can reap the benefits of bilingualism in a global society. ELLs, on the other hand, are restricted to learning English via the regulations of Proposition 203 and HB 2064, and are denied the opportunity to develop their native language via DLPs. Their native language, in this sense, is viewed as a deficit. This double standard ultimately exploits the richness of ELLs' language and culture for the benefit of the dominant culture while further subjugating language minority groups (Jimenez-Castellanos et al., 2013; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2014). Taking Interest Convergence as a theoretical framework to understand the Arizona context regarding English-only education, the following section describes this study's methodology.

Methodology

According to Yin (1984), the case study research method is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (p. 24). In the context of this study, the case study method allowed for the gathering of original data in a natural setting and enabled the researchers to make direct observations (Bromley, 1986). We utilized case study research design to explore the phenomenon of the fast growing DLPs in the state of Arizona within a context of an “English-only” environment in education.

Data Collection

We conducted in-person interviews with nine DLP stakeholders as a means to provide a more focused in-depth view of DLPs in Arizona. Participants included current and former principals, world language coordinators, and language acquisition directors from different districts implementing DLPs in Arizona. Participants self-selected to participate. We invited a total of 24 DLP stakeholders from the 35 identified schools implementing DLPs in Arizona. Some stakeholders had responsibility over multiple schools, which is why only 24 DLP stakeholders were identified and recruited for participation. Interviews helped identify patterns behind participants' experiences across the state (Kvale, 1996; Sandelowski, 2000). We used semi-structured, open-ended interviews to understand participants' meaning making within the context of DLPs in Arizona, and how such context had influenced their experiences, views, and cognitive processes (Brenner, 2006). Specifically, we asked about participants' respective DLPs and how their schools navigated issues of

accessibility, finance, implementation, and policy that directly affected the setting, context, and environment of DLPs. We also inquired about the implementation of programs in an English-only state. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed, and ranged between 30-45 minutes.

Data Analysis

To analyze and interpret the data collected, we utilized descriptive coding (Miles, Huberman, & Sandaña, 2014; Sandelowski, 2000). We reviewed each interview transcript systematically with the research question in mind. Specifically, we assigned symbolic meaning to excerpts of data gathered from each interview and placed conceptual labels on responses that described events, experiences, and feelings that summarized the meaning derived (Saldaña, 2013). During second level coding, we collapsed the coding categories into broader themes by grouping invariant statements that depicted the essence of participants' experiences of DLPs. We edited and removed any preliminary codes that were not as salient within or across interview transcripts until a thematic narrative was developed (Meriam, 1998).

To ensure the trustworthiness of interpretations, we approached this study with awareness of our own positionalities as Mexican-American first-generation immigrants and former ELL students. Both of us participated in bilingual education programs through much of our K-12 education in states adjacent to Arizona. However, language rights and culture were significant components of our educational formation, as we were not restricted to English-only instruction. Acknowledging our subjectivities, we reflected on how our personal experiences informed our engagement with participants and the interpretation of data (Collins, 1991; Guba, 1981; Ruby, 1980). As non-native Arizonans, we remained attuned to how participants described their meaning making and how our own experiences could be influencing the interpretation of data.

Results

The following describes participants' perceptions of DLPs and the context in which DLPs operate. Three minority languages were represented across DLPs: Spanish, Mandarin, and Navajo. Specifically, participants alluded to several benefits (bilingualism, bi-literacy, biculturalism, globalization) and challenges (curriculum, teachers, state policy, funding, and lack of access to DLPs for minority language students) with regard to the implementation of DLPs within the context of Arizona. Participants in this study described the paradox of excluding ELLs from dual language programs as inefficient, unnecessary, and wrong.

Benefits of DLPs

All nine participants stood behind the implementation of DLPs in their schools and the benefits for their students in achieving bilingualism, bi-literacy, biculturalism, and academic achievement. The benefits that the nine participants identified varied from positive cognitive development, to being able to communicate with people in more than one language. However, the commonality among all nine participants was the collective understanding that there is a plethora of research supporting dual language education. For example, as one participant stated:

I feel like the brain research shows that it increases academic performance and the example programs that I have reviewed show a lot of progression from elementary through high school of proficiency in foreign language and that is a skill that is going to be a lifelong skill so I do think that it is effective.

Participants made it clear that the implementation of their programs was based on legitimate research that supported academic achievement, bilingualism, and bi-literacy. Yet, because of their

responsibility over multiple schools in their districts, some participants also relied on actual performance measures on state standardized exams to describe the benefits of DLPs for their students. As another participant stated,

Well, obviously you have your cognitive strengths, we always track students on their AIMS scores and their benchmarks as well just to make sure that they are on track because they do their math here in Spanish, but the testing is done in English. I am in a lucky situation because I'm able to compare the dual language immersion kids with the non-dual language immersion kids in the district because we are very homogeneous so I can do that. So the graph starts with immersion and non-immersion at the same level, but as the years go by, the [dual language] immersion students just...the line just starts to go up a little bit. You have obviously social cultural benefits, the kids are so much more open-minded, they are much more accepting of things, they are risk takers, they have higher self-esteem.

For most participants, the benefits of DLPs were self-evident, not just in test scores but also in students' interactions with each other. One participant stated:

Also, there is the other aspect of the social and cultural awareness that the students are truly not just bilingual but also bicultural. They have created an environment where learning is very conducive because they have established a culture within each classroom and within the program, and I found out that that is very conducive to learning and truly makes a difference when it comes to building community amongst them and just having a complete education.

The biculturalism component of DLPs varied in two ways. One way was via supporting individuals' cultures through heritage language education so students could be bicultural as well as bilingual. The second way was via identifying bilingualism as being culturally aware; however, the focus and goal for students remained to be bilingual, not necessarily bicultural. Seven of the participants recognized the importance of language and culture during their interview. One participant, for example, shared the following: "making sure that they appreciate another language and that they communicate in that language and have a context in that culture helps to build confidence and self-motivation." Participants recognized the demand to implement a true bilingual program where students not only learned the curriculum in two languages, but also learned about the cultures of the people that speak those languages. Learning about the culture of the language students were learning was done in several ways. In some cases, it was accomplished by interacting with students of the same age in a Spanish-speaking country through Skype; in other instances, it was done by celebrating Chinese- or Spanish-speaking countries' cultural events and connecting curriculum to learning the cultural components of the language the students were learning.

In describing the benefits of DLPs within the context of Arizona, participants also heavily relied on market logics that accentuated living in a globalized society. Participants generally placed emphasis on the development of job-related skills and contributing to the economy. As one participant exemplified,

Anything that is two languages in this day and age will put us on the same playing field as the majority of the other industrialized nations that are out there. They say that 21 out of the 25 top industrialized nations require early introduction of other languages and we don't, so we need to get on the same playing field...

For most participants, the global economic argument justified the benefits of and approaches to DLPs. They described globalization and international competition as drivers of the need for DLPs,

given how many other countries have more than just one official language. In this way, all nine of the participants described DLPs as enrichment programs that added substantially to students' education either by enhancing their educational outcomes or providing a life skill with both personal and societal benefits. As one mentioned, "I think expanding student's horizons, making sure that they appreciate another language and that they [can] communicate in that language." The community demand to implement DLPs in a way that meets the demands of global capitalism is a growing response in language policy (Piller & Cho, 2013; Relaño Pastor & Fernández Barrera, 2018). All nine participants understood that there is a growing demand for DLPs regardless of the reasons why. Yet, they also all agreed that DLPs face challenges resultant from their implementation in an English-only state.

Challenges for Implementing DLPs

The challenges that the schools implementing DLPs faced were different depending on the needs of the community in which the school was located. However, most prominent across the challenges described was finding curriculum and materials in the partner language, as well as qualified teachers. As one participant expressed:

Finding the curriculum, finding the resources in the partner language, that is a challenge. Those are the types of challenges that are hard and we want to know what is good, we do not know what is effective. Another challenge is when they get older, trying to figure out what kind of proficiency level they are at. Trying to find out what assessment is accurate, what is good, that is another challenge.

This challenge, specifically, highlighted the lack of education programs that yield qualified bilingual teachers in the state—a challenge directly related to education policy requiring English-only education. Participants described how the number of teachers who have an English as a second language or bilingual education endorsement has steadily decreased since the passage of Proposition 203. The deficit of bilingual education endorsements resulted in a lack of resources and personnel for DLP programs and created a burden for the few qualified teachers that programs had, as teachers did not receive additional compensation for translating curriculum and materials not available in the partner language.

Additionally, DLP stakeholders described having a difficult time not only finding qualified teachers, but also retaining them because they did not have the resources or the support to incentivize bilingual educators to continue in DLPs. As one participant described:

Yes, challenges include staffing, that's probably the number one challenge finding teachers that are able to teach; funding, we are the number one struggling in the district—it's hard to pay for textbooks in English and in Spanish. We also have a very difficult set up that is not really attractive to a whole lot of teachers due to our budget restraints...there are other school districts that are more competitive when it comes to salaries so we are often not the first choice...It just adds an increased amount of responsibility on those dual language teachers and there's no stipend or anything that they get, it's just a pat on the back.

DLPs that had biculturalism as one of their main goals were having particular difficulties finding teachers to provide the students with the cultural component of the language they were learning. The lack of qualified teachers was associated with state policies and laws that negatively affected teacher training and certification. For example, Proposition 203 severely restricted the number of bilingual programs approved under waivers for ELLs (Jiménez-Silva & Grijalva, 2012). Hence,

because the state's bilingual teacher certification programs are extremely weak or non-existent, participants felt that they had no other choice but to import teachers from outside of the state or country in order to fulfill their goal.

Other participants focused more on the context of implementing DLPs in a state that strictly focuses on English-only education. They described the challenges of having to deal with the English language development restrictions and the segregation of students for four hours per day. One participant, for example, shared the difficulty in keeping their DLP a true 50/50 model because they did not have the "perfect marriage" between 50% English speakers, and 50% Spanish speakers; however, they still called themselves a 50/50 model because they had Spanish and English teachers. In a community with a high number of Latinx and ELL students, the DLP was not able to follow a more authentic 50/50 model as result of Proposition 203.

Other participants described the lack of information people have about DLPs as a challenge. The lack of information was often related to the politics surrounding English-only education within the state of Arizona. One participant, for example, described the challenge of educating individuals who are not personally or professionally familiar with DLPs or with minority cultures and languages.

A lot of the perception is, you know, "why are we teaching kids two languages?" For example, when it comes to ELLs, the question is "why are they being taught in Spanish when they need to learn English?" Or I've had comments from community members on board meetings when I present on dual language, "why are all of your dual language programs on the west side where all the Hispanics are? They already know Spanish," so I think the educational part of what really is dual language is a challenge, and I think the perception is that we are just translating for ELLs because they do not know English when in fact you are really developing two languages so I think to have English-only politics does not help any.

Participants described the ways language policy in the state made it difficult for DLP administrators to advocate for their programs and the inclusion of ELLs in their programs for the purpose of program fidelity. Three of the nine participants additionally identified racial tension as a major challenge in advocating for DLP programs. As another participant stated:

I think there should be plenty of education—and not just with words but actual statistics—in terms of what dual language does and how it impacts students and once you put it in that sort of context of what the results are and what it is, then I think that if people still vote in favor of it just because of other reasons, you know, then there is something that can be done legally to stop them.

For some participants, the pushback of DLPs had more to do with racial tension; specifically, resentment towards Spanish speakers and the association that if an individual spoke Spanish they must be an immigrant. As stated by one participant:

There is that little piece sometimes where you have to teach people who aren't totally opposed because those that hate it, even if they would understand it, they would not be okay with it because of their bias and what they think it means.

This resentment was tied to the context of immigration in the state and the laws that have been enacted to criminalize undocumented immigrants. Because of the context in which DLPs were implemented, some participants, especially those with high numbers of Latinos and ELL students in their schools, did not feel the support from their schools and districts in the implementation of their DLPs. As one participant described, "a good portion of my white Caucasian community-based

families didn't want necessarily poor Hispanic kids coming to the school." This participant's experience highlights the racist nativist context in which DLPs operate, and how the access to DLPs is connected to ethnicity, race, culture, and class.

Most participants directly and indirectly alluded to how state law and policy affected the implementation of their programs. Some described how they would like to see language policy reform to be able to include a broader spectrum of students in their programs. One participant, for example, described the lack of funding for DLPs because of the elimination of bilingual programs since the passage of Proposition 203. "Because of the law, we are not able to access specific funding for dual language. There's nothing supporting dual language." Another participant talked about the systematic exclusion of language minority students within their programs:

It was difficult to continue the program because one of the first obstacles that we had is that we could not have ELLs in the program anymore. So one of our obstacles became that our program became of children who spoke English, monolingual students who were learning Spanish, and those few bilingual kids who passed the [Arizona English Language Learner Assessment] test.

Participants associated language policy with their inability to include language minority students in their programs. ELL students cannot participate in DLPs until they are deemed English proficient by the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA). Though waivers were available for parents who wanted their kids to participate in DLPs, access to the waivers was not simple nor readily accessible for parents. Furthermore, the waiver could potentially result in the parent having to renounce ELL services for their children. Consequently, participants described how few parents knew about or requested waivers.

Yet, participants in schools that did not have a significant presence of language minority students did not view language policy as a problem. They were uncertain of the implementation and reform of Proposition 203 and bilingual education because their communities "were not affected by it." Two participants, for example, stated that Proposition 203 did not affect the implementation of their program and they did not care to see language policy reform. Two others stated that they would like to see language policy reform to be able to include a broader spectrum of students, but it currently did not affect the implementation of their DLP. Most of the participants were aware of the negative connotations attached to bilingual education because of political reasons associated with the passing of Proposition 203. Implementing DLPs in an English-only state with rigid language laws ultimately limited the choices that communities had in implementing language learning programs that catered to the needs of their students. Seven participants, for example, recognized the importance of having a choice in program offerings. They identified the importance of being able to select a DLP model that was good for their specific communities as well as having the choice to implement DLPs. As one participant stated:

I would say that Prop 203 creates a major obstacle for those parents and this is the way I see it...Parents of English language children do not have the choice of choosing the appropriate program for their children, so that's what it does, it denies parents' choice. Even if they withdraw them from the [structured English Immersion program] they are still subjected to taking the [AZELLA].

However, the English-only regulations did not allow for much choice when implementing DLPs and trying to cater to the specific community needs. Instead, schools implementing DLPs were required to exclude ELLs from DLPs as a result of Proposition 203 and HB 2064.

Discussion

The systematic exclusion of minority language students from DLPs demonstrates the failures of operating under an attempted interest convergence. English-only language policy was advertised, supported, and implemented under the guise that it would be beneficial for linguistic minority communities as well as linguistic majority communities. As a result, it was passed under the assumption of interest convergence—although the convergence was not the result of the implementation. The growth of DLPs and the exclusion of ELLs from participation signals an interest by the dominant culture in ensuring the development of bilingualism for native English speakers, affording them further academic, social, and economic progress, while at the same time foreclosing this opportunity for language minority, non-native ELLs. Participants in this study described the paradox of excluding ELLs from dual language programs as inefficient, unnecessary, and wrong. Yet, participants were forced to abide by restrictive language policies in Arizona, including Proposition 203 and HB 2064, which posed challenges for the fidelity of DLP implementation.

Eighty percent of public school DLPs in Arizona have Spanish as the partner language (Gomez, 2016). However, the significant number of Spanish-speaking students in the state who are considered ELLs cannot be part of the same DLPs that teach the curriculum in their own native language. Instead, they are pulled out of the classroom for four hours, which represents about 80% of the school day, to learn English in English. In this way, education policies such as Proposition 203 and HB 2064 target and marginalize immigrants in general and the ELL population in particular. Most participants in this study wanted to see policy reform with regard to the treatment of ELLs, additional support for bilingual education, and improved education for immigrants and minority language students. Yet, the current practice of excluding students based on English proficiency reflected a racist nativist ideology, whereby English was viewed as the superior language and white Americans were perceived as inherently “native” to the US. This mentality is what allowed minority languages and ELLs to be treated as culturally subordinate to the “official” language and the native English speakers, respectively.

Several participants often utilized a global economic argument to justify the benefits of and approaches to DLPs. The focus on the globalization ideal, however, commodified language and bilingual education as exchangeable for material goods. The idea of globalization and the commodification of language was exclusionary for language minority students because Arizona law systematically excludes ELLs from accessing DLPs and, therefore, also from accessing economic opportunities. For several participants, the implementation of DLPs was not necessarily about heritage language rights, but rather about neoliberalism and the globalization of education for native English foreign language learners. This neoliberal perspective detached the issue of providing education equity for all students, including ELLs, and instead focused on providing a higher quality of education for those students who are already socially and economically advantaged (native English-speakers). When language is exchangeable for money, language rights linked to identity, self-esteem, and belonging are compromised, creating an even more hostile environment for language minority students. Being able to communicate in one’s heritage language is linked to identity, as language is connected to culture. For this reason, participants who were able to articulate the importance of biculturalism in DLPs for their heritage language students best understood the importance of adding biculturalism to the goal of DLPs.

Most participants in this study were knowledgeable about the implementation of dual language models, thought that ELLs should not be excluded from participating in DLPs, and described how ELLs would enhance the quality of their program. However, because they were

obligated to abide by the law, most felt forced to make English proficiency a requirement for program admission, which systematically excluded ELLs from participation. The DLPs most affected by such laws were those in communities with high numbers of ELLs. Yet, the consequences of Arizona Proposition 203 and HB 2064 were also evidenced state wide in the inability to find local qualified teachers for dual language instruction and translation of materials, which posed challenges for the implementation of DLPs.

Arizona is in the privileged position of having a high number of native Spanish-speaking students that could potentially be a resource for implementing 50/50 model DLPs to meet the globalization demand of fluency in multiple world languages. However, the stigma attached to particular languages will reflect the power of hierarchies in a society. The context for Arizona language policies is a reflection of those power hierarchies because the state's dominant class continues to support English-only educational policies regardless of the make-up and needs of individual communities. Our hope is that policymakers in Arizona and other states with English-only mandates will advocate for more inclusive policy that responds to the benefits of including ELLs in DLPs.

Implications for Research

All studies have parameters and, therefore, limitations. The focus of this study was DLPs implemented in public schools, therefore, this study does not include all programs in the state. Further research should investigate DLPs in private and for-profit settings in order to explore approaches to bilingual education outside of the influence of public policy.

Similarly, we utilized a macro view when identifying the implementations of DLPs; hence, only DLP administrators were interviewed. As a result, this study does not account for the characteristics and implementation of DLPs at a micro level; for example, in the classrooms from the perspective of teachers or students. Further research should solicit such perspectives in an effort to contextualize the implementation of DLPs from a more holistic lens. An ethnographic study, for example, might give a view into the "black box" that this study does not. A micro level analysis would highlight what is really happening with the implementation of DLPs in the classroom.

Lastly, given that participant interviews were conducted in 2014, the number of DLPs and stakeholders across the state may have shifted. The data presented in this study, hence, may not be representative of all public DLPs in the state. Additional research is needed to understand the presence of DLPs across the state of Arizona, as policy changes and new leadership take place.

Implications for Policy

In order to respond to the needs of DLPs, funding allocation for resources such as the development and dissemination of translated curricular materials needs to be prioritized. State funding allocation for districts with DLPs needs to be strategic and intentional. Because the state currently functions under an 'English-only' mandate, it may be difficult for schools to find the funding they need without state support. For this reason, language policy reform is needed.

Language policy reform responsive to the needs of language minority students would better support the districts implementing DLPs, as well as the certification of bilingual teachers and availability of translated curricula and materials. Changes to language policy may also alleviate the shortage of qualified bilingual teachers in the state and increase existing bilingual teachers' capacity for working with their students. Language policy reform may also increase the number of programs available for families to choose from for their children's English language acquisition.

Yet, policy reform comes as a consequence of a consortium of people coming together to meet a demand that has not been met. For this reason, states should build consortiums of DLP stakeholders who believe in bilingual education, biliteracy, and biculturalism in order to enact change

in policy. These consortiums of DLP stakeholders should include parents, dual language teachers, school administrators, and policy makers for a wholesome stakeholder representation. Organizations such as the Arizona Language Association provide an existing framework for effectuating such work.

As a society, it is our social responsibility to provide equitable education for all students. As educational leaders, we must reject policies and laws that further marginalize those who are already living on the margins. Students who speak a language other than English at home should not be treated as deficient. On the contrary, these students should be viewed as assets for the true implementation of two-way 50/50 bilingual programs. Collier and Thomas (2004) state that at least 30% of a given student population needs to be speakers of the minority language as the minimum balance required to have enough peers in a class to stimulate the natural second language acquisition process. Furthermore, DLPs in which practitioners adjust programs to meet students' needs in the development of biliteracy provide opportunities for most of its emergent bilinguals to develop high levels of biliteracy (Babino, 2017). Taking into consideration the disparate opportunities available to ELLs as a result of state language policy, educational stakeholders must consider more appropriate alternatives that cater to DLP implementation and the English language acquisition needs of language minority populations.

References

- Alanís, I., & Rodríguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(4), 305-319.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802143378>
- Arizona Department of Education. (2010). Home language survey. Retrieved from <http://www.ade.state.az.us/oelas/ELLForms-StudentFiles/HomeLanguageSurvey.pdf>.
- August, D., Goldenberg, C., & Rueda, R. (2010). Restrictive state language policies: Are they scientifically based? In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden languages: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Babino, A. (2017). Same program, distinctive development: Exploring the biliteracy trajectories of two dual language schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(2), 169-186.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1307290>
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518-533. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1340546>
- Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. I. M. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(1), 19-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721409358571>
- Bialystok, E. (2015). Bilingualism and the development of executive function: The role of attention. *Child Development Perspectives*, 9(2), 117-121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12116>
- Brenner, M. E., (2006). Interviewing in educational research (p. 357-370). In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, G. & P. B. Elmore (Eds.). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*. Washington, D.C: Routledge.
- Bromley, D. B. (1986). *The case-study method in psychology and related disciplines*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, 63(1), 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748116300104>
- de Jong, E. (2002). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2002.10668699>
- Delgado, R. (2006). Rodrigo's roundelay: *Hernandez v. Texas* and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 41(1), 23.
- Gándara, P., Losen, D., August, D., Uriarte, M., Gomez, C., & Hopkins, M. (2010). Forbidden language: A brief history of U.S. language policy (pp. 20-36). In P. C. Gandara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gándara, P., & Orfield, G. (2010). *Segregating Arizona's English learners: A return to the "Mexican Room"?* Civil Rights Project.
- García, E., Lawton, K., & Diniz de Figueiredo, E. (2013). The education of English language learners in Arizona: A history of underachievement. *Teachers College Record*, 114(9), 1-18.
- Gomez, L. M. (2016). *Dual language programs (DLPs): Questions of access to DLPs in the state of Arizona*. (Doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University.
- Guba, E. G. (1981). ERIC/ECTJ annual review paper: Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology*, 29(2), 75-91.
- Howard, E. R., & Christian D. (2002). *Two-way immersion 101: Designing and implementing a two-way immersion education program at the elementary level*. Santa Cruz: Center for Research and Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Jimenez-Castellanos, O., Cisneros, J., & Gomez, L. (2013). Applying racist nativism theory to K-12 education policy in Arizona, 2000-2010. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 38(2), 175-190.
- Jiménez-Silva, M., Gómez, L. M., & Cisneros, J. (2014). Examining Arizona's policy response post *Flores v. Arizona* in educating K-12 English language learners. *Journal of Latinos in Education*, 13(3), 181-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2013.849600>
- Kibler, A.K., Atteberry, A., Hardigree, C. N., & Salerno, A.S. (2015). Languages across borders: Social network development in an adolescent two-way dual-language program. *Teachers College Record*, 117(8), 1-48.
- Kvale, S. (1996). InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing. In S. Kvale (Ed.), *Ethical issues in interview inquiries* (pp. 109-123). London: Sage.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902777546>
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2012). Successes and challenges in dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, 51(4), 256-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726053>
- Meriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Morales, P. Z., & Aldana, U. S. (2010). Learning in two languages: Programs with political promise. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden languages: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Murphy, A. (2016). Implementing and maintaining a dual language program: The nuts and bolts of a pathway to academic excellence. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 82(4), 45-53.

- Nagy, W., Berninger, V. W., & Abbott, R. D. (2006). Contributions of morphology beyond phonology to literacy outcomes of upper elementary and middle-school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), 134-147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.134>
- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589>
- Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism and language policy. *Language in Society, 42*(1), 23-44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404512000887>
- Relaño Pastor, A. M., & Fernández Barrera, A. (2018). Competing bilingual schools in La Mancha City: Teachers' responses to neoliberal language policy and CLIL practices. *Foro De Educación, 16*(25), 283-309. <https://doi.org/10.14516/fde.624>
- Ruby, J. (1980). Exposing yourself: reflexivity, anthropology, and film. *Semiotica, 30*(1-2), 153-180. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1980.30.1-2.153>
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: Sage.
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Focus on research methods: Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health, 23*(4), 334-340. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X\(200008\)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G)
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2014). *Creating dual language schools for a transformed world: Administrators speak*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2003). *The multiple benefits of dual language*. Alexandria, VA: Assoc Supervision Curriculum Development.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011a). Selected characteristics of the foreign-born populations by region of birth: Latin America. 2011 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_11_1YR_S0506&prodType=table
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011b). Language spoken at home. 2011 American Community Survey 1-year estimates. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_11_1YR_S1601&prodType=table
- Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

About the Authors

Laura M. Gomez

Los Angeles City College

gomezlm@lacitycollege.edu

Laura Gomez investigates education policy from an equity lens. Her research focuses specifically on language policy and its impact on English language learners.

Jesus Cisneros

University of Texas at El Paso

jcisneros7@utep.edu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7269-4078>

Jesus Cisneros takes a critical interdisciplinary approach to education policy and practice, providing a nuanced and complex understanding of identity, power, resistance, and oppression. His research moves gender, sexuality, and immigration status, and their conceptual margins, to the center of analysis in an effort to explore and understand the way politics and identity interact with various axes of inequality.

education policy analysis archives

Volume 28 Number 18

January 27, 2020

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, distribute, and adapt this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, the changes are identified, and the same license applies to the derivative work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank, SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultant: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Molly Ott, Iveta Silova** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro

San Diego State University

Gary Anderson

New York University

Michael W. Apple

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale

University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner

Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb

University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig

San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond

Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray

University of Georgia

David E. DeMatthews

University of Texas at Austin

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center

for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo

Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn

Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas

University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla

University of Colorado, Boulder

Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion

University of the Negev

Melissa Lynn Freeman

Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel

University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University
of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass

Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of

California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross

University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California
State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University

of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester

Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of

Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana

University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana

University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis

University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses

University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss

Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols

University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons

University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton

University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson

Bristol University

Gloria M. Rodriguez

University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle

University of Houston

A. G. Rud

Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of

University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of

California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider University of

Massachusetts Lowell

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist

University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine

University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera

Virginia Commonwealth University

A. Chris Torres

Michigan State University

Tina Trujillo

University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller

University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol

University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of

Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner

University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley

Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth

University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro

Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Felicitas Acosta** (Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento), **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Ignacio Barrenechea**, **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendia**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Alejandra Falabella** (Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile), **Veronica Gottau** (Universidad Torcuato Di Tella), **Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela** (Universidade de Chile), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **Tiburcio Moreno** (Autonomous Metropolitan University-Cuajimalpa Unit), **José Luis Ramírez**, (Universidad de Sonora), **Axel Rivas** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Maria Veronica Santelices** (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile),

Claudio Almonacid
Universidad Metropolitana de
Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega
Universidad Autónoma de la
Ciudad de México

Xavier Besalú Costa
Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad
Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia
Universidad de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad
Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez
Instituto Nacional para la
Evaluación de la Educación,
México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes
Universidad Iberoamericana,
México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,
México

Pedro Flores Crespo Universidad
Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli
Centro de Estudios de Estado y
Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET,
Argentina

Juan Carlos González Faraco
Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé
Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez
Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la
Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,
Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de
Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional
de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves
Instituto para la Investigación
Educativa y el Desarrollo
Pedagógico (IDEP)

José Ignacio Rivas Flores
Universidad de Málaga, España

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas
Universidad Autónoma de
Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez
Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de
Investigaciones sobre la Universidad
y la Educación, UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto
Universidad de Oviedo,
España

Jurjo Torres Santomé, Universidad
de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya
Universidad Iberoamericana,
México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón
Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal
Universidad Diego Portales
Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells
Universidad Autónoma de
Barcelona, España

Catalina Wainerman
Universidad de San Andrés,
Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco
Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editoras Associadas: **Andréa Barbosa Gouveia** (Universidade Federal do Paraná), **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV), **Sheizi Calheira de Freitas** (Federal University of Bahia), **Maria Margarida Machado**, (Federal University of Goiás / Universidade Federal de Goiás), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch**, **Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Geovana Mendonça Lunardi

Mendes Universidade do Estado de
Santa Catarina

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil