

A. Monolingual Forms of Education for Bilinguals

1. Mainstreaming / Submersion (See Baker, (2017: 201-202)

- Typical type of child: Language minority
- Language of the Classroom: Majority language
- Societal and Educational Aim: Assimilation / Subtractive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Monolingualism

The fact that the mother-tongue plays no part in a child's education is a clear indication of the assimilation (or ethnist) political ideology which underpins this model of so-called '*bilingual*' education, the term only being applicable by virtue of the fact that the child provides the 'other' language involved. Assimilation ideology is discussed in detail in Chapter 18 of Baker (2017: 389-391) but is also referred to elsewhere since it is such a pervasive contextual dimension of bilingual education generally. Distinguishing between assimilation and ethnist ideology can be considered a rather vague, grey area at times. However, this may be clarified by what Skutnabb-Kangas (1977) refers to as *economic-structural* assimilation which involves the granting of legal citizenship and the social and economic benefits which go with it, thus reflecting issues of *equal opportunity* in the employment market and access to social security, for example. Whereas this is seen as being part and parcel of the assimilative process according to *assimilation* ideology, it is not an advantage which would apply to linguistic minorities according to *ethnist* ideology, despite the fact that both minority groups are expected to relinquish their mother tongue.

Gordon (1964) presents a range of specific aspects to which the assimilative process can apply, including those of a cultural, structural, marital, attitudinal, behavioural, social and civic nature. However, with regard to what can often be the unrecognisable and covert nature of assimilation, by referring to Tosi (1988), Baker (2011: 393) illustrates various forms as being *explicit*, *implied* or *concealed*, emphasising that "assimilation is multidimensional and complex" and "is neither easily defined nor easily quantified". Being also related to the concept of *internal colonialism* (Blauner, 1969) which was also mentioned in module ECDA-7011: Societal Bilingualism, Tossi's (1988) differentiation is very significant and can be reflected in a variation of attitudes towards children's mother tongue, despite a common aim of ensuring proficiency in the acquired second language for reasons of national unity and social integration and cohesion. Wiley & Wright (2004) describe *linguistic* assimilation as having two aims or components:

- deculturation to achieve subordination
- acculturation to promote absorption

The USA is an often-mentioned example of a country traditionally driven by strong assimilationist political ideology and the ‘melting pot’ psyche which reflects a determination to impose common political and social values on an ethnically diverse population, as crystallised in the often-quoted speech made by Theodore Roosevelt in 1917:

It would be not merely a misfortune but a crime to perpetuate differences of language in this country... We should provide for every immigrant by day schools for the young, and night schools for the adult, the chance to learn English; and if after say five years he has not learned English, he should be sent back to the land from whence he came. (quoted in Gonzalez, 1979 and cited in Baker, 1993: 254)

Those words can be complemented by those of President Reagan later in the 1980s which stated that it was:

absolutely wrong and against American concepts to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market and participate. (quoted in Crawford, 1989, from Democrat Chronicle, Rochester, March 3, 1981; page 2a and cited in Baker, 1993: 254).

We should be clear that assimilative educational policies such as No Child Left Behind in the USA (see, for example, Part 2 of Garcia & Baker (2007) and Chapter 9 of Baker (2017)) are underpinned by a very persuasive altruistic *equal-opportunities* rationale but which serves a dual purpose of benefiting the assimilator as well as the assimilated, the one gaining social and political cohesion from imposing a common identity on a diverse ethnic population, and the other the economic and social benefits of a common citizenship.

Educational policy in Britain reflects the same assimilationist ideology. Since Enoch Powell delivered the famous (or notorious) “Rivers of Blood” speech on April 20th, 1968 criticising Commonwealth immigration as well as proposed anti-discrimination legislation in the United Kingdom (see module ECDA-7004), in-migration has, arguably,

been a central issue in British politics or, more specifically, English politics. In 1985, a report on education for ethnic minorities was published. What is known as the Swann Report, *Education for All: Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups* clearly expressed its resistance to any wishes for mother-tongue maintenance bilingual education requested by ethnic minorities in England:

...the committee does not support the arguments put forward for teaching school subjects using mother tongue languages as a medium of instruction (bilingual education). Nor does it think that mainstream schools should take on responsibility for the teaching and maintenance of ethnic minority languages. (Swann Report, 1985: Paragraph 3.18)

Here again, as in the USA, assimilation ideology had a clear ‘altruistic’, equal opportunities dimension:

We believe that essential to equality of opportunity, to academic success and, more broadly, to participation on equal terms as a full member of society, is a good command of *English* and that first priority in language learning by all pupils must therefore be given to the learning of English. (Swann Report, 1985: Paragraph 3.16)

In Wales, one of the constituent countries of the United Kingdom, Welsh (as well as English) is an official language having also been given additional status quite recently by the Welsh Language Measure which received royal assent on 9 February, 2011. Within the Welsh constitutional context, therefore, the provision of Welsh-medium education reflects a *pluralist* ideology and a promotion-oriented policy, whereas within the wider political context of the United Kingdom it could be interpreted as reflecting a *civic* ideology and a tolerance-oriented language policy. However, since Welsh has no legal status whatsoever outside Wales and the Welsh are also expected to be proficient speakers of English, the linguistic policy could be interpreted as *assimilationist*. An issue which does not seem to have been legally clarified is whether or not Welsh speakers *in Wales* have a legal right to be monolingual. It is, arguably, a good example of the covert nature of assimilation which, in Wales, may be said to operate on all three levels within the context of the United Kingdom, *explicit, implied and concealed*. Historically, of course,

there have been clear instances of *explicit* linguistic assimilation, the most notorious being the decree of Henry VIII and the Act of Union of 1536 which has left its mark on the Welsh language to the present day:

... from henceforth no Person or Persons that use the Welsh Speech or Language shall have or enjoy any Manner Office or Fees within the Realm of England, Wales, or other the King's Dominion, upon Pain of forfeiting the same Offices or Fees, unless he or they use and exercise the English Speech or Language. (The 'Language Clause' of the Act of Union, 1536)

Whereas one can present assimilation in the guise of the 'common good' or the altruistic rationale of ensuring equal economic and social opportunities for all, as in the USA's No Child Left Behind policy, nevertheless, there is no denying its intrinsic *defensive* political nature. This can be even more defined when the linguistic context concerned is determined to assert its cultural identity within a larger political hegemony. Quebec's predominant Francophile identity within the larger Canadian context is such an example. In 1977, in the context of passing Bill 101, Laurin (1977) asserted the need to ensure that the future education system assimilated newcomers and made them fully proficient in French:

[Whilst] it is fitting to guarantee the English minority in Quebec access to English schools, it is legitimate to make sure the persons who come to settle in Quebec in the future send their children to [a] French school. In other words, the English school which forms a special system granted to the present minority in Quebec must cease being an assimilating force and must then be reserved to those for whom it is created. (Laurin, 1977)

Chapter 18 of Baker (2017) also discusses the opposing ideological viewpoint to assimilation, namely, *pluralism* where the assimilative 'melting-pot' metaphor is substituted by the 'language garden' for example (Garcia, 1992). However, as Baker (2017: 392) points out:

The two positions of assimilation and pluralism differ in such fundamental ideological ways that simple compromises and resolutions are virtually impossible.

The difference between assimilationists and pluralists is rooted in basic human ideologies and politics, values and

motives, making resolution the more difficult [due to being] strongly affected by the economic reward system. (Baker, 2011: 396)

Schmit's (2000) balanced consideration of language policies in the USA within the diametrically opposed political and cultural dimensions of assimilation versus pluralism is also enlightening in that it raises *pragmatic* issues in relation to the fact that language minorities do not share a level playing field when it comes to valuing the *economic* capital of their respective languages, despite valid philosophical and intellectual arguments to the contrary. This can be crystallised in the words of (Spolsky, 1989: 451):

A Navajo student of mine once put the problem quite starkly: if I have to choose, she said, between living in a hogan a mile from the nearest water where my son will grow up speaking Navajo or moving to a house in the city with indoor plumbing where he will speak English with the neighbors, I'll pick English and a bathroom !

The Mainstreaming / Submersion model of 'bilingual' education is intended to enable language minority students to gain alleged social and economic opportunities and advantages by acquiring a majority language and *replacing* L1 with L2. With regard to its effectiveness, Cummins (1979) maintains that functional second-language ability for everyday conversation (BICS) can be achieved in two years but that the development of linguistic skills capable of tackling the complexities of the school curriculum (CALP) can take five to seven or more years. Research conducted by Hakuta et al. (2000) in California showed that the development of proficient conversational ability in English took three to five years while academic ability could take four to seven. Either way, it seems that the current *monolingual* immersion policies adopted in the USA, for example, and intended for immigrants to acquire English in one year can be regarded as unrealistic and over-ambitious. Such policies, therefore, can be considered misguided on two fundamental criteria:

- the exclusion of the mother tongue (L1) in the teaching process
- the short time-scale provided to acquire the second language (L2).

However, these policies can not only be considered ineffective in terms of pedagogy and methodology but also counterproductive and *psychologically* damaging in undermining one's sense of self-esteem and empowerment. Consequently, the *outcomes* of an educational language policy can be assessed on wider criteria than the achievement of linguistic proficiency alone. Lack of suitable linguistic educational provision can also lead to high-rates of school 'drop-outs' and Rolstad et al., (2005) refer to the importance of assessing non-cognitive outcomes such as attendance at school, self-concept and self-esteem, social and emotional adjustment, employment and moral development (cited in Baker, 2017:245). With high 'drop-out' rates of 30% amongst Latinos in the USA, Krashen (1999) has argued that, whereas bilingual education is not the cause, it could be a cure.

This raises wider issues of minority rights, identity and empowerment which are discussed in Baker (2017) Chapters 17 and 18. In addressing issues of educational policy, practice and provision for language minorities, Cummins (2009: 30) discusses how "identity negotiations either reinforce coercive relations of power or promote collaborative relations of power". These are issues which underpin Cummins' (2000a) article in Garcia & Baker (2007: 108-36) as well as his discussion of four characteristics of schools (2000b) which he maintains enable minority language students to be empowered or disabled (see Baker 2017: 398-399), these being the extent to which:

- the mother tongue and culture of minority language students are incorporated in the school curriculum
- minority communities are encouraged to participate in their children's education
- education motivates students to be active in seeking knowledge as opposed to being passive receptacles
- the assessment of minority language students avoids locating problems in the student and seeks the root of the problem in the social and educational system or curriculum.

The crucial role of the mother tongue in the overall development of the minority language student, both *socially* and *linguistically*, is fundamental to Cummins' argument, the linguistic advantage being supported by the interdependence hypothesis which relates to the relationship between the L1 and the L2 and, as Cummins (1981: 29) states:

To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly.

As Baker (2011: 405) mentions, research by Verhoeven (1994) points to such transfer between languages in literary skills, sound systems (phonology) and communication skills (pragmatics). Cummins (2009) describes these transferred skills in terms of:

- concepts
- metalinguistic and metacognitive strategies
- pragmatic aspects of language
- meaning
- phonological awareness

This also reflects the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) concept of bilingualism discussed in ECDA-7004: Cognitive Aspects of Bilingualism. These issues, inevitably, add weight to arguments in favour of adopting ‘strong’ models of bilingual education which are discussed later.

2. Mainstreaming / Submersion with Pull-out Majority Language Instruction Support (See Baker, 2017: 202-203)

- Typical type of child: Language minority
- Language of the Classroom: Majority language with withdrawal ‘pull-out’ L2 lessons
- Societal and Educational Aim: Assimilation / Subtractive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Monolingualism

This provision is simply a means by which minority language children are given extra support in order to acquire the majority language by being withdrawn periodically from mainstream classes for specialised language tuition. Students who need to acquire English as a second language in the United Kingdom and the USA are often provided with this form of additional support so that they can effectively integrate with mainstream English-medium education on a regular basis. Baker (2017: 202), however, also suggests the potential *pastoral* benefit of this kind of support in building a student’s self-esteem and confidence before engaging with the full curriculum through the medium of his/ her L2. On the other hand, Ovando et al. (2003) are critical of the model in that it can cause pupils to be labelled by their peers as remedial and backward,

children often equating lack of *linguistic* ability with general *intellectual* inability. Withdrawal and absence from a classroom can, therefore, stigmatise and set pupils apart. An additional issue is the loss of time spent on the mainstream curriculum and other subjects due to withdrawal lessons specifically for L2 tuition. Arguments for and against withdrawing students from mainstream tuition, of course, rest on a range of variables which will vary on an *individual* basis from pupil to pupil.

3. Sheltered (Structured) Immersion (See Baker, 2017: 203-206)

In the 2011 edition of ‘Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism’, Baker’s typology of bilingual education consisted of *ten* models. However, in the intervening period before publishing the 2017 edition, what was previously referred to as Sheltered English or Sheltered Content Instruction (or alternatively as Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)) has clearly developed as an independent pedagogical model (particularly in the USA) which merits separate attention, and this is now referred to as Sheltered English Immersion (SEI).

Being a more sophisticated pedagogical development of the previous model discussed above (Mainstreaming / Submersion with Pull-out Majority Language Instruction Support), and as in the case of its precursor, the detailed discussion of this model on pages 203-206 of Baker (2017) highlights academic, pedagogical and pastoral issues in terms of both advantages *and* disadvantages. This model provides a further angle on withdrawal from mainstream teaching in that it also pays attention to *curriculum content* and pedagogy as well as language. Being different from instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL), pedagogy can provide, for example, simplified vocabulary and the adoption of customised materials and teaching methods so that content and curriculum fit the linguistic proficiency of the individual pupil. Its adoption can also reflect pragmatic aspects as when faced with what seem to be insurmountable levels of diversity in pupils’ linguistic backgrounds. More sophisticated pedagogical procedures such as the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) or the Two Way Immersion Observation Protocol (TWIOP) (incorporating *cultural* objectives) reflect efforts to ensure its success in the teaching of English. However, such pedagogical methodologies, along with the other models discussed above, again only highlight its ultimate political *assimilationist* aims and objectives and the lack of input in maintaining pupils’ first language skills whilst endeavouring to secure the *allegedly* socially cohesive benefits of acquiring a common second language.

Attention to wider disadvantages in avoiding the use of the L1 in the acquisition of an L2 has been drawn by many academics, including Valdés (2001), (cited in Baker, 2017:205).

4. Segregationist (See Baker (2017: 206))

- Typical type of child: Language minority
- Language of the Classroom: Minority language (by compulsion)
- Societal and Educational Aim: Apartheid
- Aim in Language Outcome: Monolingualism

This is similar to the Separatist model (see below) in being a “minority language only” form of instruction. However, whereas the Separatist model is *by choice*, the Segregationist model is *by compulsion* whereby a minority language group is denied access to mainstream education provided to the majority. Therefore, it may be said to represent an ethnist ideology. Although Baker (2017:389) describes such an ideology as one which “encourages or forces language minorities *to give up their language and culture and adopt those of the majority group*” (italics added), he also states that “[i]t also attempts to prevent or exclude such minorities from assimilating legally or socially, even when such individuals seek cultural, linguistic and economic assimilation.” As Baker (2017: 206) also points out, such a policy can also be either “*de jure*” or “*de facto*” reflecting again a significant difference in overt or covert practices. Such an educational and linguistic policy can reflect apartheid or colonial attitudes and, as Skutnabb-Kangas (1981:128) points out, can be a means by which minority groups are disempowered from having any political or social influence by not having “a shared medium of communication and analysis”.