Krashen, S. 2003. Three roles for reading for language-minority students. In G. Garcia (Ed.) English Learners: Reaching the Highest Level of English Proficiency. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association. Pp. 55-70.

CHAPTER 3

Three Roles for Reading for Minority-Language Children

Stephen Krashen

I will argue here that reading can play three major roles in language development for minority-language children:

1. In early stages of English-language development, developing literacy in the primary language is a shortcut to English literacy.
2. Once some proficiency in English is achieved, free voluntary reading in English is a clear route to English literacy and the development of academic English.
3. There is no reason to stop reading in the primary language once English is acquired. Continued reading is an important means of developing advanced proficiency in the heritage language.

Early Stages: First-Language Reading and Second-Language Literacy

There is very good reason to believe that learning to read in the primary language facilitates learning to read in a second language. The argument in favor of this proposition has three steps:

1. We learn to read by reading, by understanding what is on the page. (This is the Smith-Goodman hypothesis, considered to be the foundation of the whole language approach. Despite recent attacks on this hypothesis, there is, in my view, still overwhelming evidence supporting it, as well as good reason to doubt the correctness of the attacks [Krashen, 1999; McQuillan, 1998a].)

2. It is easier to understand text in a language you already know.
3. Once you can read, you can read; reading ability transfers across languages.

Correlational Studies

Support for step 3 comes from several sources (for a review, see Krashen, 1996), and includes studies showing a clear correlation between reading in primary and second languages: Those who read better in their primary language also tend to read better in English. In Table 3.1, I review some of these studies.

Inspection of the fourth column, "*r* with L1 RC" (correlation of scores on tests of reading comprehension in first and second languages), shows that although most correlations are positive, there is some variation.

TABLE 3.1 Relation between first- and second-language literacy

Study	L1	Grade	*r* with L1 RC	*r* with oral L2
Escamilla (1987)	Spanish	4	0.48	0.19
Saville-Troike (1984)	various	2–6		0.26
Tregar & Wong (1984)	Spanish	elementary school (3–5)	0.95	0.1
Tregar & Wong (1984)	Chinese	elementary school	0.4	-0.17
Cummins et al. (1984)	Japanese	2–6	0.23	
Hacquebord (in Bosser, 1991)	Turkish	age 13.9	0.4	
Gonzales (1989)	Spanish	6	0.48	0.44
Garcia-Vazquez et al. (1997)	Spanish	8	0.24	0.74
Hacquebord (in Bosser, 1991)	Turkish	age 15.9	0.09	
Tregar & Wong (1984)	Spanish	middle school (6–8)	0.26	0.42
Tregar & Wong (1984)	Chinese	middle school	-0.14	-0.59
Cummins et al. (1984)	Vietnamese	age 13.2 *	.41, .51	
Oketani (1997)	Japanese	age 20	0.21	
Nguyen et al. (2000)	Vietnamese	5–8	0.06	
Cobo-Lewis et al. (2002)	Spanish	2 and 5	0.55	
Okamura-Bichard (1985)	Japanese	6	0.09	

* *low length of residence (LOR) (5–22 months)*

Some of this variation is due to age; the correlation between age and the relation of L1 to L2 reading ability is -.32 (correlation between average grade level, at times estimated from age, and L1–L2 reading comprehension correlations; based on 14 studies). In other words, correlations between reading ability across languages are higher for younger children. For those studies using only Spanish speakers, the relation was strong (r = -.801, n = 6 studies). This result suggests that reading ability in the primary language has its strongest effect in the early stages of second-language literacy development. An especially clear case of this is Hacquebord (cited in Bosser, 1991), who tested the same subjects at age 13.9 and again at 15.9. The correlation between their ability to read in their first language (Turkish) and their second (Dutch) declined from .4 at age 13.9 to .09 at age 15.9.

In the early stages of second-language literacy acquisition, the influence of fluency in the primary language appears to be stronger than the influence of spoken second-language competence (Escamilla, 1987; Tregar & Wong, 1984). This is, of course, the essence of Cummins's important distinction between conversational and academic language and his hypothesis of a strong relation between academic language proficiency in first and second languages (Cummins, 1981; see also Cummins, chapter 1 in this volume).

Saville-Troike's (1984) study of 19 children, grades 2–6, deserves special mention. She reported low correlations between English reading ability and measures of oral fluency (r = .26), and even lower correlations between English reading ability and the amount of interaction children had with other children or adults in English (r = -.057 and .131, respectively). Because of the variety of first languages involved, no measure of L1 literacy was available, but Saville-Troike notes that

> in almost all cases bilingual instructors' judgments of students' relative competence in native language studies coincided with the same students' relative achievement in English...[a] Japanese girl who scored highest in reading English, for instance, was reported to read several years above grade level in Japanese, and her Japanese vocabulary and grammar were considered "exceptional" for a child her age. (p. 214)

(There were, however, two exceptions—two students who read very well in their first language but made little progress in English reading that year.)

August, Calderon, and Carlo (2001) examined the relation between reading ability in the first language at the end of second grade and reading ability in English at the end of third grade, a design that makes a great deal of sense: One would expect the impact of first-language literacy to have a greater impact

on subsequent second-language literacy than on current second-language literacy. Controlling for oral ability and general intelligence, the authors reported that performance on a test of word identification at grade 2 in Spanish predicted word identification competence in English one year later, but only for those who received early instruction in Spanish.

Cobo-Lewis, Eilers, Pearson, and Umbel (2002) reported that for second- and fifth-grade acquirers of English as a second language who spoke Spanish as a first language, performance on tests involving reading and writing (Word Attack, Letter-Word, Passage Comprehension, Proofing and Diction) were highly intercorrelated, regardless of the language of the test. Performance on tests involving oral language (verbal analogies, oral vocabulary), however, intercorrelated only with other oral tests given in the same language. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that literacy transfers across languages.

These correlational studies are consistent with other areas of research: Comparisons of bilingual and all-English alternatives for limited-English-proficient (LEP) children consistently show that those in bilingual education programs that are set up correctly, that include reading in the primary language as well as subject matter taught in English, read in English as well as or better than those in all-English programs (Krashen, 1996; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Oller & Eilers, 2002).

Reports From Teachers

In addition, reports from teachers confirm that transfer of reading ability from the first to the second language occurs. In Krashen (1996), I published a case history showing that children who learned to read in Spanish found it easy to transfer this knowledge to English (pp. 28–29). Here is a synopsis:

Lorraine Ruiz taught a second-grade class of Spanish speakers, all LEP or non-English speakers. The children had aural comprehensible input in English, but much of the curriculum was in Spanish and reading was taught in Spanish done with whole language teaching "with a little dab of phonics." Ms. Ruiz had a classroom library with books in both English and Spanish. At the beginning of the year the children could not read the English books, but by the end of the year they could. The children themselves were amazed. One child asked Ms. Ruiz, "When did you teach us to read in English?" My conclusion was that Ms. Ruiz helped them learn to read in Spanish—and once you can read, you can read. I also claimed that this experience was not an isolated one.

In a personal communication by e-mail, a reporter for the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, then in the process of preparing a series of articles on bilingual education, questioned the generality of this phenomenon. She said that this case study was "interesting," but "perhaps it is the exception to the rule." To see if this case was an exception I posted a request on several listservs, asking whether Ruiz's case was indeed an exception, or whether according to educators' experience it really was true that once children read very well in their first language, and have some aural competence in English, they pick up English reading quickly.

Lorraine Ruiz herself was among those who responded, and she confirmed that the event was not an isolated one: "The same thing happened in other classes that I have taught as well. As research indicates, once you can read you can read. It is just a matter of transferring the skills to another language." Here are some of the other testimonials I received:

"Transition was 'a piece of cake'" (sent by Yolanda Garcia, Redwood City, California):

I was an assistant in a 1st grade Bilingual class at Selby Lane School...about 11 years ago. I taught the Spanish speakers reading, writing, and arithmetic and the teacher taught the English speakers (30 students per class). Two of the three groups were on or near grade level. After that year I left assisting and went to graduate school for my teaching credential. As part of an independent study I returned to track that group of students (and had them perform a play that I converted from one of their literature books). Then in third grade, their teacher told me that their transition had been a piece of cake. They were reading with the fluency of their English-only counterparts, had the comprehension, and their test scores were high! They were also in a strong ESL program. Then a few years later, while taking a CLAD [Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development certificate] preparation course, I met a teacher who taught Junior High. She was raving about a group of students that she had and their high level of English fluency and excellent test scores. To my surprise she was talking about my same group of students!

I do not believe they were the exceptions to the rule. We had a good program with continuity and a positive transition program.... I have been an employee in the bilingual program with the Redwood City School District for 25 years. I have seen it roller coaster, both functioning and faltering. At one point the program was unstable due to lack of parent education, or support. There were also many changes in staff and an administration causing discontinuity. When these factors became stable, students gained a strong development of their native language. This ability to dominate their native language enabled them to dominate English (and other Romance Languages). Our students end up prepared to live in a global world with the advantage of speaking/knowing multiple languages, and more importantly, having a strong sense of self.

"They transition themselves" (sent by Ginny Kalish, selected as teacher of the year by the Arizona Educational Foundation):

I teach a bilingual second grade. My best readers in Spanish who have had a great deal of exposure to oral English just pick up English books and start reading. I have one girl who is writing in her journal in English (her choice) everyday. The monolingual English teachers say her entries rival their top students' entries. When their skills are strong in their first language, and they have had lots of exposure listening to English it seems that they transition themselves. I have had students pick up English books and read them fluently the first time they saw them. I do no "formal" English reading or writing instruction.

"The top five readers in English were also the top five readers in Spanish" (sent by Fay Shin, California State University, Long Beach):

I have done many observations and student teacher supervisions—some in bilingual classes or transitioning bilingual classes. I observed one class in Montebello Unified School District. They were fourth graders who were transitioned from a K–3 Spanish bilingual program to fourth-grade English instruction. The top five readers in English were also the top five readers in Spanish (from third grade). I particularly observed a fourth-grade girl who was reading very well in English (she was at the top of her class), and I was told by her teacher that she was also an excellent reader in Spanish.

Also, I observed Korean bilingual students in a third-grade class in LAUSD [Los Angeles Unified School District], Wilton Elementary. The students were actually reading and writing in Korean very well, and I was amazed at how well they read in English also. Of course it is easy to argue that they would have done well in an English-only class, but I was very impressed at how well they did in language arts in both English and Korean.

"The rule, not the exception" (sent by Francisco Ramos, LAUSD [now at Florida International University, Miami]):

In my experience (eight years in elementary school) [transfer of literacy from the first language] has been the rule, not the exception. In addition I have constantly been asking friends and teachers at my school and they all agree: good skills in the first language almost for sure guarantee no problems in English. In my class at (Cal State) Fullerton (teaching middle school and high school teachers) even people who don't support bilingual education also agree.

More: In my own experience learning English as a Foreign Language, I was never taught the English phonetic system. I learned to read in English by reading simple words and simple sentences first, and proceeding to more complicated sentences later. My wife...came from Cuba at 11, very literate in Spanish. She was translating for her family six months later. She holds an MA in Speech and Language, she reads in both languages, writes in both languages, and never lost her Spanish.

"The more proficient the Spanish reading, the more easily English reading is achieved" (sent by Kerry Anne Dees, Redwood City, California):

As second and third grade aged students grow from beginning to more fluent readers I see this change occur annually. In the beginning of the year they don't themselves believe that they can read in English and I have never forced the issue. But having a library such as the one named above [Ruiz's classroom library], the students eventually find the courage and take on the challenge to read out of those English books. They share with their peers and attack the text with all of the reading strategies they have learned: decoding, contextual clues, pictures, etc. They have at this point, NEVER been instructed to read in English. And it is true, the more proficient the Spanish reading, the more easily English reading is achieved.

"Students who have a good background in L1 reading generally teach themselves to read in English" (sent by Pam Isaacs, San Diego Unified School District):

I frequently have the opportunity to notice this very phenomenon. I have been a bilingual teacher for the last 16 of my 30 years of teaching. I currently provide literacy support for students in the general education population. Therefore, I see and work with a large number of students, many of them English language learners, many of them in bilingual education. Students who have a good background in L1 reading generally teach themselves to read in English. They are guided by the teacher, but most of it occurs very quickly. Of course, direct instruction in English phonics, spelling and further oral vocabulary development helps the process along. Since I know some students well over a period of years (second through fifth grade), I have been able to make many observations. First, the specific skills or lack of skills that a student has carries directly over into second language reading. For instance, a student who was taught only to decode in Spanish will carry this imbalance into English language, and not use meaning as a cue, a severe handicap in English reading. Students who have learned to monitor themselves and self-correct often in Spanish, will carry this skill into English reading.... Students who learn to think carefully about what they read, the story line and abstract concepts, will carry this comprehension skill into their second language reading.... I have absolutely no question that primary language instruction assists in the acquisition of English literacy.

(For additional reports, see Krashen, 2002).

Taken alone, these reports provide, at best, suggestive evidence; a critic could claim that they were reported by dedicated supporters of bilingual education and may not represent what occurs in all cases. They are, however, consistent with the research and confirm that Ruiz's case is not a rare exception.

I sent these and other reports to the *Sentinel* reporter, as well as a copy of my book *Under Attack* (Krashen, 1996), which includes a review of some of the published research. Here is what appeared in the *Sentinel* on February 6, 2000:

> Some experts such as Stephen Krashen, a professor of education at the University of Southern California, say that students who can speak English and read Spanish should be able to read in English without much formal instruction. But practice doesn't always reflect theory. Educators agree that in Santa Cruz County, as in other areas, some immigrant students have been hampered by untrained teachers and a watered-down curriculum. Taught to read in Spanish, they seemed to do well. When they started reading in English, however, they fell behind. At most schools, less than 10 percent became fluent in English by fifth or sixth grade. Often they gave up in frustration.

The reporter clearly ignored the case histories I sent, as well as the empirical data in *Under Attack*. She also provides no additional details about the students who apparently failed to transfer their reading knowledge to English. We do not know how many cases there were like this, and how many cases there were in which transfer was successful. We also do not know what the "untrained teachers" did wrong, what "fluent in English" means, the level of reading achieved in the first language, or the availability of print in either language.

As noted earlier, the evidence suggests that the transfer effect from the first language appears to decline as children get older. The most obvious reasons for this decline include the loss in first-language literacy competence that typically occurs as children get older, owing to lack of access to print (see discussion that follows). A second is that other factors become stronger, especially one that is rarely considered in studies of this kind: reading in English.

Reading in the Second Language

There is overwhelming evidence that reading in a second language, especially free voluntary reading or pleasure reading, makes a powerful contribution to the development of academic proficiency in a second language. The evidence comes from several sources: correlational studies, studies of in-school free reading, and case histories.

In-School Free Reading

I focus here on one of these sources of evidence, in-school free reading. In-school free reading studies include evaluations of several kinds of programs; in the most common, Sustained Silent Reading (SSR), students read whatever they please (within reason) for a short time each day and there is no accountability required (see Cummins, chapter 1, and Freeman & Freeman, chapter 2, in this volume).

I have reviewed the available research on in-school free reading in several places (Krashen, 1993, 2001b). In my most recent summary (Krashen, 2001b), I found that students who participated in these programs did as well as or better than comparison students in traditional language arts or second-language programs on tests of reading comprehension in 51 of 54 comparisons. The results were even more impressive when one considers only studies lasting one academic year or longer: In 8 of 10 cases, participants in in-school reading programs outperformed comparisons, and in two cases there was no difference.

The National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000), supported by the U.S. government, also reviewed studies of in-school reading—and reached the startling conclusion that there is no clear evidence supporting this practice. They were, however, able to find only 14 comparisons, all lasting less than one academic year, between students in in-school free reading programs and comparison children, and devoted only 6 pages of their report to this topic (as compared to approximately 120 pages devoted to research on phonemic awareness and phonics).

Interestingly, in-school reading did not fare badly even in the limited analysis done by the panel, with in-school readers doing better in four cases and never doing worse. Note that even a finding of "no difference" suggests that free reading is just as good as traditional instruction, an important theoretical and practical point. Because free reading is so much more pleasant than regular instruction, and because it provides readers with valuable information, a finding of no difference provides strong evidence in favor of free reading in classrooms.

I have also argued (Krashen, 2001b) that the National Reading Panel not only missed many studies, they also misinterpreted some of the ones they included. I present here a discussion of some recent studies that have particular relevance to second-language acquisition in children.

In Elley and Mangubhai (1983), fourth- and fifth-grade students of English as a foreign language were divided into three groups for their 30-minute daily English class. One group had traditional audiolingual method instruction, a second did only free reading, and a third did "shared reading."

Shared reading

> is a method of sharing a good book with a class, several times, in such a way that the students are read to by the teacher, as in a bedtime story. They then talk about the book, they read it together, they act out the story, they draw parts of it and write their own caption, they rewrite the story with different characters or events. (Elley, 1998, pp. 1–2)

After two years, the free reading group and the shared reading group were far superior to the traditional group in tests of reading comprehension, writing, and grammar. Similar results were obtained by Elley (1991) in a large-scale study of second-language acquirers ages 6 through 9 in Singapore.

Elley's most recent data (1998) come from South Africa and Sri Lanka. In all cases, children who were encouraged to read for pleasure outperformed traditionally taught students on standardized tests of reading comprehension and other measures of literacy. Table 3.2 presents the data from South Africa. In this study, EFL students who lived in print-poor environments were given access to sets of 60 high-interest books, which were placed in classrooms, with another 60 made available in sets of six identical titles. The books were used for read-alouds by the teacher, for shared reading, and for silent reading. Table 3.2 presents data from different provinces; in every case the readers outperformed those in comparison classes, and the gap widened with each year of reading.

Shin (2001) examined the impact of a six-week self-selected reading experience among 200 sixth and seventh graders who had to attend summer school because of low reading proficiency. Students attended class four hours per day; during this time, approximately two hours were devoted to SSR, including 25 minutes in the school library. The district invested $25 per student on popular paperbacks and magazines, with most books purchased from the Goosebumps series. In addition, about 45 minutes per day were devoted to reading and discussing novels such as *Holes* (Sachar, 2000) and *Island of the*

TABLE 3.2 In-school reading in South Africa

Reading Test Scores						
Province	**Std 3**		**Std 4**		**Std 5**	
	Readers	Nonreaders	Readers	Nonreaders	Readers	Nonreaders
Eastern Cape	32.5	25.6	44	32.5	58.1	39
Western Cape	36.2	30.2	40.4	34.3	53	40.4
Free State	32.3	30.1	44.3	37.1	47.2	40.5
Natal	39.5	28.3	47	32.3	63.1	35.1

from Elley (1998)

Blue Dolphins (O'Dell, 1987). Comparison children (n = 160) followed a standard language arts curriculum during the summer. Attrition was high for both groups but similar (class size dropped from 20 to 14.3 among readers, and from 20 to 13.2 among comparisons), as was the percentage of limited–English-proficient children (31% in the reading group, 27% in the comparison group). The readers gained approximately five months on the Altos test of reading comprehension and vocabulary over the six-week period, while comparisons declined. On the Nelson-Denny reading comprehension test, the summer readers grew a spectacular 1.3 years (from grade 4.0 to grade 5.3). On the vocabulary section, however, the groups showed equivalent gains.

First-Language Reading and Heritage-Language Proficiency

Continuing development of the heritage language after English has been acquired has several advantages, including cognitive benefits, career-related benefits, and the attainment of true biculturalism (Tse's [1998] "ethnic identity incorporation stage"). It is, however, extremely difficult to develop and maintain high levels of competence in the heritage language (Krashen, Tse, & McQuillan, 1998). There is some evidence that pleasure reading in the heritage language can contribute to heritage language development.

Correlational evidence comes from Cho and Krashen (2000), a study of 114 Korean Americans, ages 18–30, who were either born in the United States or arrived at a very early age. As indicated in Table 3.3, free reading in Korean was a significant and independent predictor, along with several other significant variables, of self-reported Korean-language competence.

Tse (2001) examined a group of 10 bilinguals who developed high levels of competence in their heritage language. All were born in the United States or had arrived in the U.S. before age 6, none had studied for longer than two weeks in the country where the heritage language is used, all were fluent in English, and all could read the heritage language at a level typical of native-speaking adolescents in the heritage language. Tse found that a number of factors were present in each case: They had input from parents, a peer group that valued the use of the heritage language, and formal instruction in the heritage language (not always a positive experience). In addition, all subjects had literacy experience in the heritage language at home and in the community. Of interest to us, Tse notes that "the most frequently mentioned activity the participants engaged in independently was reading for pleasure" (p. 692). Two subjects were dedicated comic book readers in the heritage language

TABLE 3.3 Predictors of competence in Korean as a heritage language

Predictor	beta	*t*	*p*
Parental use of Korean	0.37	4.02	0
Visiting Korea	0.22	2.31	0.023
Watching Korean TV	0.245	2.67	0.01
Reading in Korean	0.22	2.49	0.014
Attending HL classes	0.072	0.85	0.4
Age	-0.103	-0.756	0.451
Length of residence (LOR)	0.162	1.06	0.293
r2 = .398			

from Cho and Krashen (2000)

(Japanese) in junior high school, two others reported heavy magazine reading in Spanish, and one other was a devoted nonfiction reader on a variety of topics in her heritage language.

Kondo (1998) also noted that one of her subjects who was successful at maintaining the heritage language was an enthusiastic reader of comic books ("manga" in Japanese).

McQuillan (1998b) reviewed several experimental studies of university students confirming the value of free reading in developing the heritage language, including one SSR study and two studies of Spanish for Native Speaker classes that focused on popular literature and literature circles (see also McQuillan & Rodrigo, 1998). Results included clear gains in Spanish vocabulary and improved attitudes toward reading in Spanish.

McQuillan also notes that heritage-language reading may not work in all cases. In Schon, Hopkins, and Vojir (1984), immigrant heritage-language students were more enthusiastic about reading in Spanish than were those born in the United States. McQuillan notes that those in the second group may have been in the "ethnic avoidance/ambivalence" stage, a time in which there is little interest in, or even disdain for, the heritage language and culture (Tse, 1998). This typically occurs during high school, the age of the subjects in this study.

Conclusions

There is good evidence for each of the following three roles for reading:

1. In early stages, reading in the primary language is of great help in promoting second-language literacy.
2. Free reading in the second language makes a strong contribution to advanced second-language development.
3. Free reading in the heritage language appears to make a strong contribution to continued heritage-language development.

In addition to demonstrating that reading has a positive impact on literacy development, research also shows what every reader of this chapter already knows: Free voluntary reading is also extremely pleasant (Krashen, 1994; Nell, 1988). The major problem in making sure that reading happens is access to books, and this problem is extremely serious.

There is very good evidence that providing access to interesting reading is the crucial factor in encouraging reading. In many cases, it is all that is necessary (Ramos & Krashen, 1998; Von Sprecken & Krashen, 1998).

For many children, especially those in high-poverty areas, there is little to read outside of school (Neuman & Celano, 2001). For children acquiring English as a second language, print resources outside of school in the heritage language are also seriously lacking. The average U.S. family owns about 137 books (Purves & Elley, 1994), but the average Hispanic family with limited–English-proficient children owns only about 26 (Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey, & Pasta, 1991).

It is therefore of great concern that school libraries, the only source of reading material for many children, are so inadequate in so many places. Current studies show that better libraries are associated with better reading (Krashen, 1995, 2001a; Lance, 1994; McQuillan, 1998a). The sad state of school libraries has been documented in several publications (Allington, Guice, Baker, Michaelson, & Li, 1995; Krashen, 1996, 1999; McQuillan, 1998a), and the situation is particularly grim with respect to books in Spanish (Pucci, 1994). Here is an additional report, focusing on the lack of books in the primary language.

Pucci and Ulanoff (1996) surveyed four school libraries in the greater Los Angeles area, focusing on schools with 90% or more Spanish-speaking children. Data were available only from two of the four libraries. The authors reported that three of the four libraries did not have regular hours or regular staff, and one was "periodically used as a storeroom." In the two libraries studied, only 15 to 22% of the books were in Spanish; of these, about two thirds were at the K–2 level and about 3% were at the grade 5–6 level. Pucci and Ulanoff also surveyed 32 school librarians: Fifty-four percent said that books written in Spanish were difficult to obtain and 70% said that their cost was "prohibitive." Of 5,000 books on an approved reading list for purchase for

libraries, only 300 were in Spanish. Pucci and Ulanoff note that "even if these books were age appropriate, a child reading two books per week would finish every Spanish volume in the library before entering fourth grade" (p. 114).

Children of poverty have little to read, in school or outside of school. If their primary language is Spanish, the problem is even more serious. There have been no formal studies of availability of books in other heritage languages, but we can be sure that the situation is even worse than it is in Spanish. (See Yaden et al., chapter 15 in this volume.)

All this gives us reason to be optimistic. As noted earlier, bilingual programs have been shown to be successful. If we add a healthy supply of books in both languages, they have the potential of being much more successful.

REFERENCES

Allington, R., Guice, S., Baker, K., Michaelson, N., & Li, S. (1995). Access to books: Variations in schools and classrooms. *The Language and Literacy Spectrum, 5*, 23–25.

August, D., Calderon, M., & Carbo, M. (2001). Transfer of skills from Spanish to English: A study of young learners. *NABE News, 24*(4), 11–12, 42.

Bosser, B. (1991). On thresholds, ceilings, and short-circuits: The relation between L1 reading, L2 reading and L2 knowledge. *AILA Review, 8*, 45–60.

Cho, G., & Krashen, S. (2000). The role of voluntary factors in heritage language development: How speakers can develop the heritage language on their own. *ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics, 127/128*, 127–140.

Cobo-Lewis, A., Eilers, R., Pearson, B., & Umbel, V. (2002). Interdependence of Spanish and English knowledge. In D.K. Oller & R.E. Eilers (Eds.), *Language and literacy in bilingual children* (pp. 64–97). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3–49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Cummins, J., Swain, M., Nakakjima, K., Handscombe, J., Green, D., & Tran, C. (1984). Linguistic interdependence among Japanese and Vietnamese immigrant students. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency: Research and application* (pp. 60–81). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Elley, W. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning, 41*(3), 375–411.

Elley, W. (1998). *Raising literacy levels in Third World countries: A method that works*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Elley, W., & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19*, 53–67.

Escamilla, K. (1987). *The relationship of native language reading achievement and oral English proficiency to future achievement in reading English as a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Garcia-Vazquez, E., Vazquez, L., Lopez, I., & Ward, W. (1997). Language proficiency and academic success: Relationship between proficiency in two languages and achievement among Mexican American students. *Bilingual Research Journal, 21*(4), 395–408.

Gonzales, L. (1989). Native language education: The key to English literacy skills. In D. Bixler-Marquez, J. Ornstein-Glaicia, & G. Green (Eds.), *Mexican-American Spanish in its societal and cultural contexts* (Rio Grande Series in Languages and Linguistics 3, pp. 209–224). Brownsville, TX: University of Texas–Pan American.

Kondo, K. (1998). Social-psychological factors affecting language maintenance: Interviews with Shin Nisei university students in Hawaii. *Linguistics and Education, 9*(4), 369–408.

Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Krashen, S. (1994). The pleasure hypothesis. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 299–322). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Krashen, S. (1995). School libraries, public libraries, and the NAEP reading scores. *School Library Media Quarterly, 23*, 235–238.

Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Krashen, S. (1997). Does free voluntary reading lead to academic English? *Journal of Intensive English Studies, 11*, 1–18.

Krashen, S. (1999). *Three arguments against whole language and why they are wrong*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Krashen, S. (2001a). Current research: The positive impact of libraries. *California School Library Journal, 25*(1), 21–24.

Krashen, S. (2001b). More smoke and mirrors: A critique of the National Reading Panel (NRP) report on "fluency." *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(2), 119–123.

Krashen, S. (2002). Does transition really happen? Some case histories. *The Multilingual Educator, 3*(1), 50–54.

Krashen, S., & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Krashen, S., Tse, L., & McQuillan, J. (Eds). (1998). *Heritage language development*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Lance, K. (1994). The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement. In C. Kuhlthau (Ed.), *School library media annual* (Vol. 12, pp. 188–197). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Mangubhai, F., & Elley, W. (1982). The role of reading in promoting ESL. *Language Learning and Communication, 1*, 151–60.

McQuillan, J. (1998a). *The literacy crisis: False claims and real solutions*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

McQuillan, J. (1998b). The use of self-selected and free voluntary reading in heritage language programs: A review of research. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, & J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage language development* (pp. 73–87). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

McQuillan, J., & Rodrigo, V. (1998). Literature based programs for first language development: Giving native bilinguals access to books. In R. Constantino (Ed.), *Literacy, access, and libraries among the language minority population* (pp. 209–224). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nell, V. (1988). *Lost in a book*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Neuman, S., & Celano, D. (2001). Access to print in low-income and middle-income communities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*, 8–26.
Nguyen, A., Shin, F., & Krashen, S. (2000). Development of the first language is not a barrier to second language acquisition: Evidence from Vietnamese immigrants to the United States. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4*(3), 159–164.
Okamura-Bichard, F. (1985). Mother-tongue maintenance and second language learning: A case of Japanese children. *Language Learning, 35*(1), 63–89.
Oketani, H. (1997). Additive bilinguals: The case of post-war second generation Japanese Canadian youths. *Bilingual Research Journal, 21*(4), 359–379.
Oller, D.K., & Eilers, R.E. (Eds.). (2002). *Language and literacy in bilingual children*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Pucci, S. (1994). Supporting Spanish language literacy: Latino children and free reading resources in the schools. *Bilingual Research Journal, 18*, 67–82.
Pucci, S., & Ulanoff, S. (1996). Where are the books? *The CATESOL Journal, 9*(2), 111–116.
Purves, A., & Elley, W. (1994). The role of the home and students' differences in reading performance. In W. Elley (Ed.), *The IEA Study of Reading Literacy: Achievement and instruction in thirty-two school systems* (pp. 89–121). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
Ramirez, D., Yuen, S., Ramey, D., & Pasta, D. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit bilingual education programs for language minority students, Vol. I*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
Ramos, F., & Krashen, S. (1998). The impact of one trip to the public library: Making books available may be the best incentive for reading. *The Reading Teacher, 51*, 614–615.
Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(2), 199–219.
Schon, I., Hopkins, K., & Vojir, C. (1984). The effects of Spanish reading emphasis on the English and Spanish reading abilities of Hispanic high school students. *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingue, 11*, 33–39.
Shin, F. (2001). Motivating students with Goosebumps and other popular books. *CSLA Journal (California School Library Association), 25*(1), 15–19.
Tregar, B., & Wong, B.F. (1984). The relationship between native and second language reading comprehension and second language oral ability. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency: Education and policy issues* (pp. 152–164). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Tse, L. (1998). Ethnic identity formation and its implications for heritage language development. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, & J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage language development* (pp. 15–29). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
Tse, L. (2001). Resisting and reversing language shift: Heritage-language resilience among U.S. native biliterates. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(4), 676–706.
Von Sprecken, D., & Krashen, S. (1998). Do students read during sustained silent reading? *California Reader, 32*(1), 11–13.

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE CITED

O'Dell, S. (1987). *Island of the blue dolphins*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
Sachar, L. (2000). *Holes*. New York: Yearling Books.