



**Comments on Sandra Lee McKay and Sarah Warshauer Freedman's "Language Minority Education in Great Britain: A Challenge to Current U.S. Policy".
Response to Hoye: Decision Making for Minority Education: Setting Priorities**

Sandra Lee McKay; Sarah Warshauer Freedman

TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 4. (Winter, 1991), pp. 758-759.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-8322%28199124%2925%3A4%3C758%3ACOSLMA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

TESOL Quarterly is currently published by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/tesol.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Response to Hoye . . .

Decision Making for Minority Education: Setting Priorities

SANDRA LEE McKAY

San Francisco State University

SARAH WARSHAUER FREEDMAN

University of California, Berkeley

In her commentary, Marjorie Hoye raises two major concerns with our article, “Minority Education in Great Britain: A Challenge to Current U.S. Policy”—that we suggest “that there are only two approaches to teaching LM/LEP students” and that we fail “to raise a key issue” by not asking “teachers to clarify their views on academic achievement in a second language.” We would like to consider each of Hoye’s concerns in turn.

In the introduction to our article, we point out that “U.S. policies promote separate educational programs such as ESL pull-out programs, sheltered English, or bilingual education” (386). We grouped these programs because they all potentially separate LM/LEP students. Hoye suggests that we admit to only “two approaches,” that we “conflate” a number of programs, and that we “categorize” programs. Given her use of terms, we’re not sure exactly where her disagreement lies. We have recognized that there are numerous approaches, like sheltered English, ESL pull-out, mainstreaming, and bilingual education. We agree with Hoye that we have categorized these approaches along two dimensions, but not that we in any way have conflated them. We created our two categories for the purpose of examining one key variable in LM/LEP programs, namely, the racial composition of classrooms. We did this in order to encourage a discussion of the social and linguistic effects of this dimension of classroom life on student learning. As suggested in our conclusion, we as a profession need to ask the question, “What are our views on social segregation in educational programs?” (p. 402). This is a difficult question, one that we did not attempt to answer, but rather one that we felt needed to be raised.

As for Hoye’s second concern, we agree that the academic achievement of nonnative speakers must be a central consideration in program design. In fact, in our article we acknowledge the need for attention to academic achievement. Our third and final question focuses directly on content learning, suggesting our shared concern with Hoye on this matter.

Hoye contends that we are arguing for mainstreaming. We are not. We are rather raising three central questions for the profession to address, consider, and debate. No syllogisms of the sort Hoye puts forth underlie our article. Although social equality may well contribute to language learning, we are not so naive as to think that mainstreaming, in and of itself, will result in social equality. Social equality will be achieved only when all individuals share equal political and economic access. The school, along with other social institutions, plays a role in either supporting or undermining social equality. When social equality is attained, individuals and social groups will be able to select the language programs that best meet their needs.

We envision our article being used in the following manner. A community would set the priorities they believe important based on the questions we raised and others. If a community were to decide that its priorities included native language development, academic achievement, and social integration, then program development would proceed with these priorities in mind. Setting priorities would encourage planners to design innovative programs responsive to community needs, rather than automatically selecting a preexisting model. Our article advocated no approach. We argued rather for a careful weighing of priorities before designing or accepting any approach to minority education.

Research Issues

The *TESOL Quarterly* publishes brief commentaries on aspects of qualitative and quantitative research. For this issue, we asked two researchers to address the following question: What is the importance of power and effect size for second language research?

Edited by **GRAHAM CROOKES**
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Power, Effect Size, and Second Language Research

A Researcher Comments . . .

ANNE LAZARATON
The Pennsylvania State University

When we engage in testing hypotheses in our research, we hope we will be able to reject our null hypotheses (e.g., that there is no difference