Bilingual Education in the United States: possible moral transition toward global citizenship

Anna Carolina Barbosa[I]

Abstract

This theoretical study investigates the importance of cross-cultural competencies, such as communicative skills, for the development of education that enables global citizenship. The study's hypothesis is the suggestion that arguments against bilingual education in the United States may represent evidence of a transition from a conservative approach to citizenship to a global citizenship. Thus, through critical analysis of the literature, a theoretical reflection is constructed about the moral aspects of arguments against bilingual education and for English-only education, including the implications for global citizenship. Arguments for English-only education and against bilingual education may reinforce the need for educational reform based on both Adela Cortina's theory of minimum ethics (2005), and Makoni and Pennycook's (2007) proposition of the disinvention and reconstitution of languages. In conclusion, the critical analysis of arguments against bilingual education and for English-only movements seems to reinforce the proposal that the United States may be experiencing a transitional period from moral monism to moral pluralism, at the same time that moral pluralism might be prerequisite for global citizenship.

Keywords

Bilingual education – English-only movements – Moral monism – Moral pluralism– Global citizenship.

I- The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), El Paso, Texas, U.S.A.
Contact: aayrespereirabarbosa@utep.edu

Educ. Pesqui., São Paulo, v. 39, n. 3, p. 673-688, jul./set. 2013..

673

Educação bilíngue nos Estados Unidos: *uma possível transição moral para a cidadania global*

Anna Carolina Barbosa[I]

Resumo

Este trabalho consiste em um estudo teórico que tem como objetivo investigar a importância de competências interculturais, tais como habilidades de comunicação, para o desenvolvimento de uma educação para a cidadania global. Tem como hipótese a sugestão de que os argumentos contra a educação bilíngue, nos Estados Unidos da América (EUA) podem representar indícios da existência de uma transição entre uma abordagem conservadora de cidadania e uma de cidadania global. Para este fim, uma reflexão teórica sobre os aspectos morais associados a argumentos contra a educação bilíngue e em favor de movimentos English-only *dentro do sistema educacional dos EUA, bem como sobre as suas implicações para a cidadania global, será construída por meio de uma análise crítica da literatura produzida na área. Demonstra-se que os argumentos a favor do uso exclusivo do inglês e contra a educação bilíngue parecem reforçar a necessidade de uma reforma educacional baseada tanto na teoria de Adela Cortina (2005) sobre ética mínima, quanto na proposição de Makoni e Pennycook (2007) a respeito da necessidade de uma* desinvenção *e* reconstituição das línguas. *Concluiu-se que uma análise crítica dos argumentos contra a educação bilíngue, e em favor movimentos educacionais* English-only, *parece reforçar a proposta de que os EUA podem estar enfrentando um período de transição entre uma condição de monismo moral para uma de pluralismo moral, ao mesmo tempo em que o pluralismo moral pode ser um pré-requisito para a cidadania global.*

Palavras-Chave

Educação bilíngue – Movimentos educacionais English-only *– Monismo moral – Pluralismo moral – Cidadania global.*

I- *The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), El Paso, Texas, E.U.A.*
Contato: aayrespereirabarbosa@utep.edu

In the article entitled *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures*, The New London Group developed the following statement:

> Effective citizenship and productive work now require that we interact effectively using multiple languages, multiple Englishes, and communication patterns that more frequently cross cultural, community, and national boundaries. (1996, p. 4)

These communicative skills constitute one aspect of what Banks terms *cross-cultural competency*, which includes "the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function in diverse cultural settings," and also represent the main goal for global and multicultural education (2006, p. 26). Therefore, for education to help individuals develop these competencies for global citizenship, it seems urgent that a field of knowledge concerned with development of communicative skills should also be concerned about transforming its pedagogical practices to fulfill this need and its agents' personal beliefs about its urgency.

In this regard, I argue that the current debate about the implementation of bilingual programs in American educational institutions might represent one aspect of a transitional period from a conservative, biased, and individualistic to a multicultural, humanistic, and global approach to civic education. Moreover, this study explores moral aspects associated with arguments against bilingual education and for English-only education and the implications of these arguments for global citizenship. Hence, this paper is structured as follows: 1. Introduction; 2. Rationale; 3. Literature Review; 4. Findings/Results; 5. Implications; 6. Conclusion.

This study's findings demonstrate that arguments for English-only programs and against bilingual education confirm the need for the disinvention and reconstitution of languages

(MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007). Furthermore, the study finds a need for dissociation between individuals' perception of diverse "projects for a happy life" and "minimum of justice" (CORTINA, 2005, p. 24), for the United States to transcend from a stage of moral monism (imposition of the moral values associated with one hegemonic group) to a stage of moral pluralism (sharing of common values of justice among different groups). In this sense, the stage of moral pluralism constitutes a prerequisite for implementing global citizenship.

Rationale

According to Banks (2006, p. 24),

> Literate citizens in a diverse democratic society should be reflective, moral, and active citizens in an interconnected global world. They should have the knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to act to change the world to make it more just and democratic. The world's greatest problems do not result from people being unable to read and write. They result from people in the world––from different cultures, races, religions, and nations–being unable to get along and to work together to solve the world's intractable problems such as global warming, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, poverty, racism, sexism, and war.

To put it another way, debate over the adequacies of various educational policies to train students in cross-cultural competency so they become active citizens seems to comprise more than language, culture, and power-related issues; it also manifests a stage of transition from moral monism to moral pluralism. Cortina (2005) posits that when a plural society is characterized by multiple worldviews that refer to diverse sources of happiness, there can be three possible scenarios: 1) moral polytheism; 2) moral monism; and 3) moral pluralism. In terms of definition, *moral polytheism* refers to

a social stage in which different societal groups have *no common moral values* and, therefore, cannot engage even in dialogue. Second, *moral monism* refers to a stage characterized by *the imposition of moral values* of one particular group on the other groups. Third, *moral pluralism* is a stage in which individuals from diverse groups can *engage in intercultural dialogue* because they share and agree upon common values of justice. Cortina (2005) further explains that moral pluralism can happen in a plural, multicultural society only if its members chose to adhere to certain moral principles of universal justice. Thus, to engage in moral pluralism, Cortina emphasizes, a fundamental requirement for individuals with different backgrounds (e.g., religion, gender, race, languages) is to develop a sense of belonging to the entire group. Such a sense of belonging would be necessary for individuals to develop the motivation to integrate and participate actively in the larger community.

Following this line of reasoning further, favoring English-only policies to the detriment of bilingual programs could be perceived as political, social, and academic resistance to a transitional period from moral monism to pluralism. Therefore, this study analyzes the following research questions:

1. What moral implications are associated with arguments for English-only policies and against bilingual education programs?

2. How can bilingual education represent a transitory mechanism toward moral pluralism?

Finally, this paper elucidates the debate concerning English-only policies versus bilingual education by developing the argument that educators and scholars should not limit their views on bilingual education to what it can do for individuals, but reflect upon what it can do for the global community. Overall, this study aims to develop moral arguments that justify implementation of bilingual education as a preliminary stage of multilingual education and, subsequently, as a prerequisite for moral pluralism and global citizenship.

Moral monism *versus* moral pluralism

In the book entitled *Ciudadanos del mundo:* hacia una teoria de la ciudadania (*Cidadãos do mundo:* para uma teoria da cidadania, 2005, Adela Cortina explains that the main task for political philosophy is to develop a distributive justice theory that can be integrated into all societal institutions; citizens would agree upon and adhere to this theory because it would reflect their values. Furthermore, Cortina identifies three steps in the development and effective implementation of this theory: 1) identification of what citizens consider fair; 2) a theory of justice based on the knowledge obtained in the first step; and, 3) integration of these values into society's institutions. However, Cortina also explains one factor that might jeopardize the implementation of a distributive justice theory in a plural, multicultural society: multiple worldviews that advocate for multiple and, sometimes contradictory, *projects for a happy life*, also described as *maximum of happiness* consisting of an individual's choice of religion, sexual orientation, gender, language, and so on. Cortina (2005) further observes that most conflicts among diverse social and cultural groups are related to misunderstandings regarding maximum of happiness (values chosen by each individual to achieve happiness) and minimum ethics (essential moral values of justice, common among diverse social and cultural groups and so prerequisite for intercultural dialogue).

In other words, according to Cortina (2005), the absence of common moral values of justice (minimum ethics) among individuals from diverse groups associated with misinterpretations of *the maximum of happiness as minimum ethics* can culminate only in three possible consequences: 1) moral polytheism (diverse groups share nothing in common); 2) moral monism (a hegemonic group imposes moral values on other groups); and 3) moral

pluralism (diverse social and cultural groups agree and adhere to common values of justice). As mentioned above, individuals need a sense of belonging to develop motivation to integrate actively into the community and, consequently, adhere to the community's moral principles of universal justice. However, the sense of belonging arises only if an individual feels protected and validated by the group. Therefore, for individuals to perceive themselves as global citizens, they must develop a sense of belonging to the global community.

Paradoxically, before achieving a sense of global citizenship, a sense of moral justice must be achieved on a local scale. In this regard, only when each pluralistic, multicultural nation can develop a sense of belonging in its citizens, based on common principles of justice, not on fanaticism and exclusivism, is it possible for individuals to engage in intercultural dialogues based on tolerance and respect (moral pluralism). Kohlberg indicates the importance of individuals comprehending the difference between *principles and rules*:

> Principles are to be distinguished from rules. Conventional morality is grounded on rules, primarily 'thou shalt nots' such as are represented by the Ten Commandments, prescriptions of kinds of actions. Principles are, rather, universal guides to making a moral decision. (2011, p. 155)

Even though theoretical motivation for belonging and moral justice are essential, they are not the only essential features for establishing intercultural dialogues. Individuals must obviously have the practical communicative skills to engage in intercultural dialogues and to transition among diverse cultural settings. The "knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function in diverse cultural settings" are what Banks aggregates into the term "cross-cultural competency" (2006, p. 26).

In the following section, I analyze some arguments in favor of English-only policies and against bilingual education through moral education lenses. I argue that English-only policies represent maintenance of moral monism in the American society, but bilingual education consists of particular educative actions that aim to develop the cross-cultural competencies necessary for individuals to shuttle among diverse linguistic, social, and cultural groups. Indeed, if the implementation of bilingual education can avoid becoming another form of *monolingual pluralization* (GARCIA, 2007, p. xii), it would constitute a transition from moral monism to moral pluralism, and, therefore, bring U.S. education a step closer to aiming for global citizenship.

Moral implications associated with arguments for English-only policies and against bilingual education

The main theoretical framework of my analysis is *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez, An Autobiography* (2005). Brought up in a middle-class background, Richard Rodriguez is a Mexican American writer who has academically achieved throughout his life in the predominantly English-oriented, educational context of the U.S. In his autobiography, Rodriguez correlates his academic trajectory with arguments against bilingual education and affirmative action. To stay focused on bilingual education versus English-only education, I limit my analysis to his arguments against bilingual education.

Rodriguez's arguments against bilingual education are based on the separation of private and public language. He states,

> What they [supporters of bilingual education] seem not to recognize is that, as a socially disadvantaged child, I considered Spanish to be a private language. What I needed to learn in school was that I had the right–and the obligation–to speak the public language of los gringos. (2005, pp. 17–18)

Educ. Pesqui., São Paulo, v. 39, n. 3, p. 673-688, jul./set. 2013..

677

Not only does Rodriguez position his argument on language, but he also correlates private and public language with the development of private and public identities. Rodriguez reflects about possible outcomes if he had been exposed to bilingual education as a child:

> Without question, it would have pleased me to hear my teachers address me in Spanish when I entered the classroom. I would have felt much less afraid. I would have trusted them and responded with ease. But I would have delayed–for how long postponed?–having to learn the language of public society. I would have evaded– and for how long could I have afforded to delay?–learning the great lesson of school, that I had a public identity. (p. 18)

In this text fragment, Rodriguez acknowledges that his teachers' use of Spanish in the classroom could have facilitated a much less problematic transition from home to school. However, he feels concern about lengthening the timeframe for his assimilating English and his developing a sense of belonging to public society. Krashen, on the other hand, explains,

> [...] successful bilingual programs do, in fact, result in faster acquisition of English than 'submersion' or 'sink or swim' programs, even when such programs are supplemented with English as a second language (E.S.L.). (1992, p. 355)

Therefore, discussion about the development of Rodriguez's identity cannot be dissociated from his sense of belonging to a group.

Further, along in the same chapter, Rodriguez explains what might have acted as an initial barrier for his immersion in English as a second language:

> But I couldn't believe that the English language was mine to use. (In part, I did not want to believe it.) I continued to mumble. I resisted the teacher's demand. (Did I somehow suspect that once I learned public language my pleasing family life would be changed?). Silent, waiting for the bell to sound, I remained dazed, diffident, afraid. (p. 18–19)

Again, the absence of Spanish in the classroom contributed to the author's disengagement from the school environment and, consequently, public society. Interestingly, however, Rodriguez describes a request from nuns at school to his parents, which alters his relationship with both English and Spanish for the rest of his life. The nuns requested that Rodriguez's parents stop speaking Spanish and speak only English to immerse their children fully into English both at home and at school. As his parents began to engage in English-only conversation with the children, Rodriguez, who had associated Spanish with belonging to his familiar community, perceived himself as isolated from both groups (Spanish-speaking family/community and English-speaking school/public society):

> Those gringo sounds they uttered startled me. Pushed me away. In that moment of trivial misunderstanding and profound insight, I felt my throat twisted by unsounded grief. I turned quickly and left the room. But I had no place to escape to with Spanish. (The spell was broken). (p. 21)

Hence, Rodriguez's inner conflict regarding community belonging demonstrates that the feeling or sense of community is directly associated with linguistic unity. Edwards identifies this same concept:

> Speaking a particular language means belonging to a particular speech community and this implies that part of the social context in which one's individual personality is embedded, the context which supplies the raw materials for that personality, will be linguistic. (2006, p. 23)

According to Canagarajah (2007), scholars and educators are still very much attached to the notion of community as associated with *linguistic or cultural terms*. However, only when these professionals can deconstruct this limiting, colonized perspective might it be possible for bilingual education to be formulated and implemented without committing the fallacy of *monolingual pluralization* (GARCIA, 2007, p. xii).

In *Hunger of Memory*, Rodriguez further complements the previous analysis by explaining how the immersion in English helped him develop "the calming assurance that I belonged in public ..." (p. 21). Again, the Mexican American child's association of protection and security with belonging to a group, and its interruption gradually gave place to the possibility of belonging to another group, in this case, the broader public society. Interestingly, Rodriguez's narrative highlights the separation between different social and cultural groups, us (Spanish/family/community) and the other (*gringos*/school/public society), as well as the non-existence of dialogue between the groups. This narrative also illustrates the isolation of diverse groups, along with the predominance of one group's language and values, as an example of moral monism in the American society. Furthermore, Rodriguez's immersion into English and detachment from Spanish culminated in his development and assimilation of identity as an "American citizen" (2005, p. 22). Similarly, Ullman (2010) presents data that demonstrates how Mexican immigrants hope to obtain symbolic American citizenship by purchasing the English-language program Ingles sin Barreras. Ullman expands her analysis by articulating Mexican immigrants' attempt to master English as a form of obtaining, often illusionary, citizenship.

Yet, one perceives that identity as an American citizen could directly correspond to linguistic identity as an English-speaking citizen, of course, suggesting community as attached to linguistic terms (SNOW; HAKUTA,

1988; NUNBERG, 1992; CANAGARAJAH, 2007). Nunberg, for example, argues, "For it is not language as such that becomes a bond of national unity but a language as the emblem of a particular conception of community" (1992, p. 484). Nunberg also argues,

> To make English language "official," however, is not merely to acknowledge it as the language commonly used in commerce, mass communications, and public affairs. Rather, it is to invest English with a symbolic role in national life and to endorse a cultural conception of American identity as the basis for political unity (p. 484–485).

In this sense, American citizenship does not reflect moral pluralism, but moral monism that reaffirms the separation of diverse groups. In the same way, this social and moral context associated with an individual's need to develop identity in association with a sense of belonging culminates in the logical assumption,

> If my language barrier does not allow me to belong to the mainstream 'English-only,' 'public' society, my only option is to associate my identity with the 'Spanish-speaking', familiar, private social group, and vice-versa. (NUNBERG, 1992)

Snow and Hakuta elucidate this situation, stating (1988, p. 386),

> The adult who learns a second language so well that he can 'pass' as a native speaker is, in a sense, in a very risky situation. He is in danger of losing the identity that is well established in the first language, because he is being treated as a native of the second culture.

Significantly, therefore, misunderstanding of the social, historical, and moral context, as

Educ. Pesqui., São Paulo, v. 39, n. 3, p. 673-688, jul./set. 2013..

679

described by Rodriguez, often culminates in an individual's incorrect assumption that he/she cannot belong simultaneously to both groups or that private identity cannot engage in dialogue with public identity, since the two share nothing in common.

The association of American citizenship with English-speaking citizenship demonstrates negative effects mentioned by other scholars involved in the debate over English-only policies and bilingual education. For one thing, the arguments that Edwards develops about arrogant attitudes usually attributed to Anglophones regarding learning a second language "reveal more about social dominance and convention than they do about aptitude" (2006, p.11). Edwards also discusses Anglophones' negative attitude toward bilingualism as a manifestation of a deeper societal and political resistance to the significant influx of immigrants to the U.S.— a direct effect of globalization and increased migratory processes. In addition, Makoni and Pennycook (2007) argue that the construction of language serves as a colonizing mechanism to resist linguistic plurality and promote the notion of linguistic group homogeny as the only accepted norm. Therefore, the correlation between American citizenship and English-speaking citizenship seems to demonstrate a new form of postmodern colonization toward linguistic-minority immigrants.

In his autobiography, Rodriguez (2005, p. 26) criticizes bilingual education advocates:

> They do not seem to realize that there are two ways a person is individualized. So they do not realize that while one suffers a diminished sense of *private* individuality by becoming assimilated into public society, such assimilation makes possible the achievement of public individuality.

And, "The bilingualists insist that a student should be reminded of his difference from others in mass society, his heritage" (p. 26). Both text fragments relate to the lack of dialogue

between private and public individuality and between different social and cultural groups. Unfortunately, lack of dialogue may represent an individual's inability to develop a sense of belonging to more than one group.

Finally, I agree with Krashen (1992), who states, "empirical evidence supports the probability that Rodriguez may have succeeded quite well without giving up Spanish at home" (p. 357). In fact, as Cummins (1984, p. 33) indicates,

> Thus, whether English or a minority language is used in the home is, in itself, relatively unimportant for students' academic development. [...] What is important for future academic success is the quality of interaction children experience with adults. Viewed from this perspective, encouraging minority parents to communicate in English with their children in the home can have very detrimental consequences. If parents are not comfortable in English, the quality of their interaction with their children in English is likely to be less than in LI.

Now that I have demonstrated some of the moral implications associated with arguments for English-only and against bilingual education (moral monism), the second part of this paper emphasizes possible mechanisms through which bilingual education might represent a step closer to moral pluralism.

Bilingual education: A possible transitory stage toward moral pluralism

As previously demonstrated, the correlation between speaking English-speaking and "American citizenship" seems to reinforce the notion of community as a linguistic unity separate from other linguistic unities. In addition, this correlation agrees with Pennycook's (2007) argument, "... rather than offering opportunity for all, English operates as a deeply exclusionary language" (p. 103). In fact, Nunberg (1992, p. 484) concludes,

It is undeniable that racism and xenophobia have played an important role in the electoral successes of the Official English movement or that some of the movement's organizers have espoused explicitly anti-Hispanic and anti-Catholics views.

Moreover, English-only advocates seem to utilize the notion of English as an international language to argue for U.S. education that prioritizes English over all other languages (PENNYCOOK, 2007).

However, the implementation of bilingual education programs would not alone solve the linguistic and societal conflicts in plural nations, such as the United States. In fact, authors such as Snow and Hakuta (1988, p. 391), argue,

> The bilingual initiatives that were taken in the 1960s have certainly made the transition easier for students. But the bottom line of all of these programs has been an almost single-minded interest in the extent and the efficiency of English proficiency development.

Therefore, for the implementation of bilingual education programs to help increase the potential for intercultural dialogues, scholars and educators should consider that,

> [...] most political scientists who have studied the relationship between language and politics seem to agree that language is rarely the *causal* agent of such conflicts. Although language differences may serve as the focal point of the controversies, they usually just mirror the tensions already existent. (SNOW; HAKUTA, 1988, p. 390)

Thus, if language is not the cause, then bilingual education programs cannot be the solution.

In fact, even though studies have demonstrated the positive impacts of bilingual education programs on students' cognitive development and language proficiency (BIALYSTOCK, 2009; GORT, 2006; MOLL ; DWORIN, 1996), these findings do not provide sufficient evidence for English-only advocates to alter their perceptions. A refusal to consider evidence seems especially short-sighted in a society focused on youth and increasing life expectancy because studies show that bilingualism protects individuals from cognitive decline as they age and provides "a delay in the onset of symptoms of dementia" (BIALYSTOCK, CRAIK; LUK, 2012).

Some studies for bilingual education might actually reinforce the notions of linguistic communities and linguistic minority rights without altering the modern paradigm that perceives language as a natural and rigid construct. In other words, as Garcia (2007, p. xii) indicates,

> [...] if language is an invention, then there is no reason to separate students into ESL classes or to advocate for bilingual education that simply is 'monolingual pluralization'.

In fact, with the idea of disinventing language in mind, Garcia tries to promote critical reflection about some of the linguistic features that constitute the main objects of research related to bilingual education:

> And so the notion of 'Spanglish' which has been so controversial in the United States, is as invented as is the notion of Spanish and English. And the question that we should be asking is not whether code-switching is an appropriate responsible pedagogy, or whether 'translanguaging' is valuable in itself or whether 'Spanglish' should be accepted in the classroom. If language is an invention, then we must observe closely the way in which people use language and base our pedagogical practices on that use, and not on what the school system says as valuable practices. (2007, p. xiii).

With the idea of disinventing languages in mind, Canagarajah (2007) proposes that scholars and educators should reflect upon new forms for reconstituting languages and rethinking the concept of communities. In addition, Canagarajah highlights the importance of scholars differentiating the concept of community in precolonial/premodern multicultural communities from our contemporary definition of it. As Canagarajah (2007; p. 234) observes,

> [...] 'community' for local people was based not on unitary languages, but a shared space where many languages live together. In other words, community was conceived in spatial terms, not in linguistic or cultural terms.

Changing the meaning of community is one possible form of reconstituting "language"; this would reflect what Canagarajah (2007) calls language practices that are "based on negotiation rather than on fidelity to unitary constructs" (p. 234).

To take this a step further, in bilingual education, focusing on providing individuals from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds the abilities and skills to move between communities (instead of focusing on the assimilation of a set of linguistic assets and proficiency) might contribute to the demands of globalization and migratory processes. As a matter of fact,

> Though all this, we are helping students shuttle *between* communities, and not to think of only joining a community. The latter was the focus in all language teaching. We created the expectation that by learning another language the students would ideally become insiders to a community. We now know that communities don't work that way. There are no permanent insiders or outsiders anymore. All of us are engaged with each other for specific objectives and then disband

and form new communities for other needs. (CANAGARAJAH, 2007, p. 238)

In conclusion, if advocates for bilingual education keep in mind the differences between what is universally fair (minimum ethics) and what might interest a particular group (maximum happiness), they may succeed in developing cross-cultural competencies, based on minimum ethics, that take U.S. society a step closer to intercultural dialogues based on justice and, consequently, to moral pluralism.

Findings/Results

This study's findings aimed to respond to the following research questions: 1) What are the moral implications associated with the arguments for English-only policies and against bilingual education programs? 2) How can bilingual education represent a transitory mechanism toward moral pluralism?

In response to the first question, I have tried to articulate the following concepts as a theoretical framework: 1) moral monism versus moral pluralism; 2) a sense of belonging as a necessary condition for motivation to participate actively in a pluralistic society and adhere to universal principles of justice (CORTINA, 2005); and, 3) deconstructing linguistic communities to reconstitute languages (Canagarajah, 2007). I used this theoretical framework as a filter to interpret Rodriguez's arguments against bilingual education and for the English-only movement. In so doing, I utilized Rodriguez's arguments to characterize linguistic community as associated with American citizenship. Such association has been demonstrated as responsible for the development of a linguistic criteria of exclusion (to belong to the American community, an individual should be English proficient) and, consequently, imposition of values from one dominant group onto others (moral monism).

Indeed, once we understand the mechanisms through which this linguistic paradigm is manifested in the American society

(as a mechanism of postcolonial control toward minority groups), it is easier to understand Rodriguez's conflict over choosing between a private and a public identity. Furthermore, Rodriguez's identity conflict, resulting from his "loss" of Spanish, exemplifies two important issues: 1) feelings of alienation upon becoming immersed in English (English as a barrier to his family); 2) the lack of common principles of justice empowering intercultural dialogue (the incorrect assumption that an individual can belong to only one group).

In addition, the identification of arguments for the English-only movement as manifestation of moral monism might facilitate understanding that the child Rodriguez, as depicted in *Hunger of Memory*, could not readily conceptualize a project for a happy life (maximum happiness), nor conceptualize overall moral fairness (minimum ethics). This is easily perceived since Rodriguez conflates his immersion in English with belonging to a public, or mainstream, society that, in the event, did result in his choice for maximum happiness. In other words, writing in English became his project for a happy life. Rodriguez's need to belong persuaded him to correlate this need with a personal choice for happiness; thus, his arguments for English only-policies and against bilingual education lose credible generalizability because they are based on personal lived experience rather than on a carefully researched approach to the issues (CUMMINS, 1984; KRASHEN, 1992).

The second part of this study aimed to respond to the following research question: How can bilingual education programs represent a transitory mechanism toward moral pluralism? First, it seems necessary to recognize that bilingual education programs might not constitute the only possible way for an individual to achieve fluency in two languages. In fact, as Krashen observes,

> Bilingual education is especially useful for children who do not live in English-speaking neighborhoods, who cannot get comprehensible input outside of the classroom. But it would have been helpful even for a "success story" like Rodriguez. It could have meant faster, more comfortable acquisition of English, better communication with his family, and even a richer career as a literature scholar, with two great literary traditions to learn from instead of only one. (1992, p. 357).

Second, bilingual education programs based on common principles of justice and the deconstruction of language and linguistic communities should be regarded as an attempt to manifest a more humanistic society – a step closer to promoting intercultural, democratic dialogue among its diverse groups. In other words, implementation of bilingual education programs would both represent and actually be the dissolution of us against the other. Then, perhaps, an individual would cease to lose the first identity as they gain another or cease to develop discrete multiple identities that seem necessary for belonging to a plural society. Meanwhile, identifying diverse groups' common moral values of justice (CORTINA, 2005) and development of cross-cultural competencies among individuals (BANKS, 2006) could help implement intercultural dialogues and, consequently, moral pluralism. In fact, individuals who limit themselves to their own groups "are denied important parts of the human experience and are culturally and ethnically encapsulated" (BANKS, 2006, p. 52). Even so, bilingual education programs should not be perceived as the answer to a social and moral problem, but as a path toward a more humanistic, democratic concept of American citizenship.

In addition, from the reflections in this study emerge some questions for future researchers:

1. What common values of justice exist among diverse cultures, in this case, between English- and Spanish-speaking cultures?

2. How can bilingual education help individuals develop a democratic sense of belonging to more than one social and cultural group, without succumbing to cultural assimilation and moral monism?

3. How can bilingual education programs be designed to align with the goal of global citizenship?

Implications

The effects of globalization and migratory influxes seem to require that plural societies face the challenge of redefining "communities." Plural societies should also provide cross-cultural competencies that enable individuals to shuttle among diverse communities and, simultaneously, maintain a sense of belonging to their communities of origin. In the light of the previously developed reflections in this literature review, it seems easier to understand why arguments for English-only policies and "American citizenship" based on English-speaking proficiency might constitute a desperate attempt to hold to moral monism. However, because the effects of globalization are not currently retroceding, it seems that the fall of moral monism might be as inevitable as the fall of any former social empire. On the other hand, if scholars and educators cannot develop postmodern educational practices based on common principles of justice and associated with the teaching of cross-cultural competencies, when the future becomes the present and Latinos become the uncontested U.S majority, new migratory movements could instigate another form of moral monism–from the formerly oppressed as they become the oppressor.

Therefore, some implications of this study relate to the need for educators and scholars in teacher preparation programs with bilingual and monolingual students to 1) broaden the scope of multicultural education; 2) perceive not only bilingual but also multilingual competencies part of the cross-cultural competencies essential for individuals to establish intercultural dialogues; and 3) comprehend the need for global citizenship's discussion to be mediated by universal principles of justice. No less important, this study intends to instigate scholars in bilingual or English-only education to consider the moral aspects of linguistic education. Advocates both for and against bilingual education should remember that education itself has a greater charge: to help students, regardless of their linguistic group of origin, understand that all human beings should be validated and protected by their nations, and, consequently, by all its constituents groups (in this case, both English- and Spanish-speaking communities). This study aimed to help educators involved with bilingual education programs transform their personal beliefs and pedagogical practices to understand and teach that all individuals are free to choose different projects for a happy life (in this case, language) as long as they do not impose their choices on others (moral monism). Finally, I hope that future research on bilingual education considers this study to avoid monolingual pluralization nd moral monism.

References

BANKS, James A. **Cultural diversity and education:** foundations, curriculum, and teaching. Boston: Ally and Bacon, 2006.

BIALYSTOCK, Ellen. The extent of the bilingual mind. In: BIALYSTOCK, Ellen. **Bilingualism in development:** language, literacy, and cognition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. p. 219-248.

_____; CRAIK, Fergus I.M.; LUK, Gigi. Bilingualism: consequences for mind and brain. **Trends in Cognitive Sciences**, v. 16, n. 4, p. 240-250, 2012.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. After disinvention: possibilities for communication, community and competence. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair (Orgs.). **Disinventing and reconstituting languages**. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2007. p. 233-239.

CORTINA, Adela. **Cidadãos do mundo:** para uma teoria da cidadania. São Paulo: Loyola, 2005.

CUMMINS, James. The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In: LEYBA, Charles F. (Org.). **Schooling and language minority students:** a theoretical framework. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center: California State University, 1984. p. 3-50.

EDWARDS, John. The foundations of bilingualism. In: BHATIA, Tej K.; RITCHIE, William C. (Orgs.). **The handbook of bilingualism**. Malden; Oxford; Victoria: Blackwell, 2006. p. 7-31.

GARCIA, Ofelia. Foreword. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair (Orgs.). **Disinventing and reconstituting languages**. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2007. p. xi-xv.

GORT, M. Strategic codeswiching, interliteracy, and other phenomena of emergent bilingual writing: lessons for first grade dual language classrooms. **Journal of Early Childhood Literacy**, v. 6, p. 323-354, 2006.

KOHLBERG, Lawrence. The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. In: ORNSTEIN, Allan C.; PAJAK, Edward F.; ORNSTEIN, Stacey B. (Orgs.). **Contemporary issues in curriculum**. New Jersey: Pearson, 2011. p.150-163.

KRASHEN, Stephen D. Sink-or-swim "success stories" and bilingual education. In: CRAWFORD, James (Org.). **Language loyalties:** a source book on the official english controversy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. p. 354-357.

MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair (Orgs.). **Disinventing and reconstituting languages.** Ontario: Multilingual Matters, 2007.

MOLL, Luis; DWORIN, Joel. Biliteracy development in classrooms: social dynamic and cultural possibilities. In: HICKS, Deborah (Org.). **Discourse, learning, and schooling.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. p. 221-246.

NEW LONDON GROUP. A pedagogy of multiliteracies: designing social futures. **Harvard Educational Review**, v. 66, n. 1, p. 59-92, 1996.

NUNBERG, Geoffrey. Afterword. The official english movement: reimagining America. In: CRAWFORD, James (Org.). **Language loyalties:** a source book on the official English controversy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. p. 479-494.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. The myth of english as an international language. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair (Orgs.). **Disinventing and reconstituting languages**. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2007. p. 90-115.

RODRIGUEZ, Richard. **Hunger of memory:** the education of Richard Rodriguez: an autobiography. New York: Dial, 2005.

SNOW, Catherine E.; HAKUTA, Kenji. The costs of monolingualism. In: CRAWFORD, James (Org.). **Language loyalties:** a source book on the official English controversy Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988. p. 384-394.

ULLMAN, Char. Consuming English: how mexican transmigrants form identities and construct symbolic citizenship through the English-language program ingles sin barreras [English without barriers]. **Linguistics and Education**, v. 21, p. 1-13, 2010.

Anna Carolina Barbosa is a Ph.D. student at the Teaching, Learning, and Culture Program at The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP).