

ECDA-7005: Models for Bilingual Teaching

Introduction

This is the fourth 30-credit module offered as part of the MA course, Bilingualism and Multilingualism and which addresses issues related to methods of providing education ‘bilingually’. As will be seen, *bilingual* is a term which requires clarity and precision when used, having acquired a rather loose and ambiguous usage even in academic and educational circles, not to mention common parlance. In a nutshell, even amongst educationist and academics, and particularly amongst policy-makers, ‘bilingual’ education can imply or even specify a range of varying linguistic provision.

Although this module can be studied as a discrete and independent unit within the MA structure, bilingual education cannot be studied in a vacuum and is impinged upon and underpinned by issues studied in previous modules. Indeed, reference will inevitably be made to aspects of bilingualism which have been covered previously. Bilingual education is an area of study which, almost inevitably, raises or reflects wider issues. The link with previous modules may be clarified by asking questions such as:

Do certain teaching methodologies contribute to traits of fossilized interlanguage and interference discussed in module ECDA-7010?

To what extent can effective bilingual education contribute to the process of reversing language shift discussed in Module ECDA-7011?

What kind of bilingual education is necessary to ensure balanced bilingual competence which, it is alleged, can secure the cognitive benefits mentioned in Module ECDA-7004?

It will be seen, therefore, that although the study of models of bilingual teaching can, theoretically, be confined to the pedagogical teaching and learning process which takes place *within* the walls of the classroom and which can be analysed in terms of input and output (Baker, 1988), the methodological issues underpinning the process itself has much wider implications in relation to *linguistic outcomes* on an *individual* and *societal* level.

Two publications accompany this module, namely *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* by Baker (2017) which has been used in previous modules, and *Bilingual Education* by Garcia & Baker (2007) which contains a range of articles designed to enhance and to enrich both knowledge and understanding of this specialised field. For this reason, the Readings included in this Guidance Booklet have been reduced to the following:

Reading 1:

Casanova, C. Bilingual Education: Politics or Pedagogy? In O. Garcia (ed.) *Bilingual Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991.

Reading 2:

Stubbs, M. Educational Language Planning in England and Wales: Multicultural rhetoric and assimilationist assumptions. In F. Coulmas (ed.) *A Language Policy for the European Community*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991.

Reading 3:

Genesee, F. The Canadian Second Language Immersion programme In C. Paulston (ed.) *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1988.

Reading 4:

Baetens-Beardsmore, H. The European School Model. In H. Baetens-Beardsmore (ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1993.

Dr Hywel Glyn Lewis

MA Bilingualism and Multilingualism Programme Director

Telephone: 0044-(0)1267-676680 / 0044-(0)1269-842413

Mobile: 0044-(0)7944426320

E-mail: h.lewis@uwtsd.ac.uk

h.lewis@pcydd.ac.uk

Assessment

This module is assessed by two assignments which have an *unequal* weighting. The following are provided as *exemplars* of both types of assignments:

Assignment 1: 60% (Approximately 5,400 words)

What evidence is there to show that certain models of bilingual education and methodological / pedagogical practices achieve higher levels of bilingualism and biliteracy in students, and are these the only criteria by which effective bilingual education should be evaluated?

Assignment 2: 40% Seminar (30 minutes)

To what extent can various models of bilingual teaching be said to reflect an underlying political ideology?

The Wider Context of Bilingual Education

Baker (2010) maintains that there are four basic perspectives to bilingual education, namely:

- language planning
- politics
- economics and cost efficiency
- pedagogy

stating that:

Bilingual education is not just about education. There are sociocultural, political and economic issues ever present in the debate over the provision of bilingual education, particularly politics. (Baker, 2017: 198)

This clearly indicates that it is impossible to separate any form of bilingual education from the social context in which it finds itself since its very existence is underpinned by various political aims which also have cultural, social and economic ramifications. The list of ten aims of bilingual education provided by Ferguson et al. (1977) (cited in Baker, 2017: 197) reflect these varying aspects.

Any political *aims*, however, which provide a basis or ‘raison d’être’ for the provision (or rejection) of bilingual education are, of course, a reflection of wider and deeper political *ideologies*. These are issues dealt with in Chapter 18 of Baker (2017: 388-389) with which students are advised to familiarise themselves. Bourhis (2001) adopts a typology of political *ideologies* in relation to the use of languages and places them on a continuum, referring to them as:

- pluralist
- civic
- assimilation
- ethnist

However, these, arguably, can also be partly coupled with a typology of language *policies* described by Wiley (2002) as being:

- *promotion-oriented* (corresponding to a pluralist ideology)
- *tolerance-oriented* (corresponding to a civic ideology)
- *repression-oriented* (corresponding to an ethnist ideology).

As will be noticed, Wiley (2002) does not include a language policy which corresponds to an assimilation ideology, which is surprising

considering that such a policy is so prevalent and widespread in countries which adopt major languages, such as the USA and the UK, as will be discussed later. However, in a later publication, Wiley (2015) suggests that assimilation is facilitated by what he refers to as *restricted-oriented* language policies.

In Chapter 10 of *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Baker (2017:197) makes a fundamental distinction between “(1) a classroom where formal instruction fosters bilingualism and (2) a classroom where bilingual children are present, but bilingualism is not promoted in the curriculum”; that is, the classroom may be bilingual but the educational *aim* of the teaching process is not *bilingual proficiency*. This could be a situation where minority language children who may have already achieved a certain level of bilingual competence are encouraged to only adopt the use of the dominant language of the majority. This rather glaring dichotomy between two linguistic and educational contexts clearly illustrates the fact that the languages used in classrooms (*deliberately or otherwise*) are often adopted with the aim of ensuring different linguistic, social and political outcomes. In other words, the language of the classroom may well reflect a wider educational and political philosophy or ideology. Baker (1993) states:

...bilingual education, whatever form it takes, cannot be properly understood unless it is connected to basic philosophies and politics in society... bilingual education is surrounded and underpinned by basic beliefs about minority languages, minority cultures, in-migrants, equal opportunity, the rights of individuals and the rights of language minority groups, assimilation and integration, desegregation and discrimination, pluralism and multiculturalism.'
(Baker, 1993: 247)

Bouhris' (2001) continuum of political ideologies may be said to reflect what are fundamentally two diametrically opposed attitudes towards or perceptions of languages in society; that is, languages as being either *problematic* or *advantageous*; after all, people either see a need for more than one language or they do not. Another way of expressing this is as having an *assimilationist* or a *pluralist* perspective (Baker, 2017: 389-392). Ferguson's (1977) ten aims of bilingual education may be categorised according to these basic criteria since languages intrinsically involve issues of power and authority, identity, as well as uncertainty and fear. Ruiz's (1984) three political dimensions of bilingualism, namely:

- Language as a right
- Language as a problem
- Language as a resource

which are discussed in Chapter 17 of Baker (2017) and in module ECDA-7011: Societal Bilingualism, also directly relate to Bourhis' (2001) continuum of ideologies. However, these categorisations again reflect languages being perceived as either problematic or advantageous, the first two (language as a right and as a problem) being diametrically opposed to each other and fitting the *socially problematic* category, whereas language as a resource reflects a perception of languages as being *socially advantageous*.

This, arguably, explains the ambivalent attitude to bilingualism which underpins bilingual education policy in the United States of America and, as Chapter 9 in Baker (2017) shows, has resulted in constant change, as summarised on pages 188-189.

Such ambivalence has been highlighted in some ironic aspects of policy-making in the USA as highlighted by Veltman (2000) who, on the one hand, points to a current perception of languages other than English as being economically advantageous, thus emphasising the need to promote the learning of additional languages amongst *monoglot* English speakers whilst, on the other, ignoring the wealth of a range of bilingual and multilingual skills which *already exists* amongst others. Ovando (1990: 354) describes the irony of the situation as follows:

On the one hand we encourage and promote the study of foreign languages for English monolinguals, at great cost and with great inefficiency. At the same time we destroy the linguistic gifts that children from non-English language backgrounds bring to our schools.

Ricento (2009) broadens the criticism to include the United Kingdom by referring to the irony of unsuccessfully attempting to teach the very languages which immigrant children are encouraged to forget.

The above discussion has served to highlight the importance of considering the relevance of the *political* context in which various forms of bilingual education exist, the political *ideologies* which underpin their aims and objectives as well as the political *dimensions* which can surround them. The next section will examine a range of models of 'bilingual' education with a view to investigate issues such as teaching *methodology*, but will again investigate aspects of political ideology when

considered crucial to gaining a better understanding of the educational model under consideration.

Models of Bilingual Education

Cazden & Snow (1990) describe bilingual education as ‘a simple label for a complex phenomenon’. As already mentioned, it is a term which is often used rather loosely and ambiguously when referring to any form of instruction involving the use of more than one language. Whilst covering a range of *methodologies* as well as *aims*, the term seems to have accrued such ambiguity due to the range of *purposes* for including more than one language within a classroom. Ironically therefore, so-called *bilingual* education does not always reflect the aim of achieving proficient bilingualism. To the contrary, in accordance with the political ideology of the context concerned, the aim can be to enforce *monolingualism* by a process of linguistic (and often cultural) assimilation with the dominant language of the majority; an example being the organisation formed in Wales in 1885 to promote the use of English and known as "The Society for the Utilisation of Welsh in Education (for the purpose of serving a better and more Intelligent Knowledge of English)" (Davies, 1993).

As mentioned earlier, Baker (2017: 197) refers to Ferguson’s (1977) classification of ten varying *aims* of bilingual education. These clearly reflect a wide range of political philosophies and ideologies, but they can also be categorised according to what we would consider their long-term outcomes to be *in terms of linguistic proficiency* and their orientation in promoting bilingualism and /or monolingualism. We can, therefore, similarly categorise various models of so-called ‘*bilingual*’ education according to the *purpose* of the educational instruction.

The educational scenario mentioned earlier where minority language children are encouraged to use the dominant language of the majority and to replace the mother tongue with their second language is called *transitional bilingual education*. This clearly reflects a political ideology which operates at least at an assimilationist (if not ethnist) level (Bourhis, 2001) and is underpinned by a process of *economic-structural* assimilation if not *cultural* assimilation (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1977).

Bilingual education which aims to foster a child’s competence in his minority language is called *maintenance bilingual education*. This is a term, however, whose sociolinguistic contextual connotations are, arguably, often *implied* but never made *explicit*. The word ‘bilingual’ clearly states the use of two languages, whereas ‘maintenance’ raises sociolinguistic considerations and issues of ‘maintenance against what’?

Maintenance bilingual education is rather seen in terms of the ‘defence’ of the mother tongue in a bilingual or, particularly, diglossic context which results in ensuring a functional level of bilingual proficiency for linguistic minorities (or linguistically *minoritised* groups within a hegemonic political context). It is, therefore, a term usually used when referring to the teaching of lesser-used or minority languages which exist as ‘low’ languages in diglossic contexts (Fishman, 1972, 1980) and need to be maintained in the face of a possible language shift emanating from the threat of a ‘higher’ majority language (see module ECDA-7011: Societal Bilingualism).

Reflecting this sociolinguistic context and *maintenance* aspect of educational provision, Otheguy & Otto (1980) distinguish between *static-maintenance* and *enrichment or developmental maintenance*, the former only aiming at avoiding language loss and maintaining *current* levels of language skills and use, whilst the latter aims to develop language skills to their *potential* levels of proficiency. Enrichment bilingual education, however, also encompasses programmes which *aim* to enable majority language children to speak an additional language. This includes the teaching of major modern languages such as Spanish as well as lesser-used languages such as Frisian.

Transitional bilingual education may, therefore, reflect an ultimate aim of *monolingualism*, whereas maintenance bilingual education can aim at proficiency in an *additional* language or *bilingualism*. In terms of the trajectory of eventual *linguistic outcomes*, the continuum of possible aims and methods of instruction extend from two extreme *monolingual* points:

- (1) the use of *only* the mother tongue *without* the addition of a second;
- (2) the complete transition from one language to another (i.e. the ‘entire’ loss of the mother tongue and its replacement by the acquisition of proficiency in a second language).

Arguably, the linguistic transition process from (1) to (2) *in an individual* reflects the *societal* language shift described by Dennison (see module ECDA-7011). Denison (1977: 21) illustrates language shift in the following formula:

$$1. A \rightarrow 2. AI / BII \rightarrow 3. BI / AII \rightarrow 4. B$$

A and B represent different languages and I indicates a higher language competence among speakers than II. As was mentioned in the previous module:

Despite appearing to be a rather simplistic model of the process of language shift considering the range and complicated interaction of factors involved, it does, however, provide a clear outline of the process in terms of its *incremental* stages ... The model does also seem to indicate the possible (some would say inevitable) role of the 'acquisition of bilingual proficiency' stages (stages 2 and 3) in the eventual death of a language. Depending on the status of a language in relation to another and the *subtractive* or *additive* context in which it exists, the acquisition of *bilingual* proficiency amongst speakers can signal its demise. (Denison, 1977: 21)

Whereas one cannot entirely divorce the educational experience of the classroom from the *societal* linguistic context in which it exists, yet, in terms of the linguistic process experienced on an *individual* level, it is arguable that the range of 'bilingual' instruction available and designed to achieve corresponding levels of linguistic proficiency relates to points on the continuum of transition described by Denison (1977). This is certainly true of transitional bilingual education in making a monolingual transformation (via a bilingual route) from A to B. To accommodate the possible linguistic proficiency of being a '*balanced*' bilingual however, the continuum needs to include an additional or new third stage, this being A1-B1 (which would also perfect the continuum).

Whereas such a continuum may also be said to reflect the 'continuum' of political ideologies described by Bourhis (2001), however, due to the limited number of ideologies which are described in terms of *discreet* categories (although hybrids may exist in practical, everyday political life), a much wider range of bilingual teaching *methodologies* makes it difficult to assert any degree of correspondence in any form greater than as a directional trend. For example, transitional bilingual education aiming at eventual monolingualism may be said to reflect an assimilationist political ideology whilst maintenance bilingual education seems to be consistent with both pluralist and civic ideology, reflecting both promotion-oriented and tolerance-oriented language policies respectively (Wiley, 2002). With regard to the educational and linguistic process experienced within a classroom, therefore, the dichotomy would suggest an inevitable wide continuum of teaching methodology in terms of *the balance in the use made of the two languages*. This explains

Mackey's (1970) description of ninety varieties which belies the over-simplicity of Baker's (2017) categorisation.

In Chapter 10 of *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Baker (2017) places eleven models of 'bilingual' education in three broad categories which he terms:

- Monolingual forms of education for bilinguals
- Weak forms of bilingual education for bilinguals
- Strong forms of bilingual education for bilingualism and biliteracy.

The essential point to remember, however, is that these are rather broad divisions which, as Baker (2017: 198) admits, fail to encompass a multitude of models: "...one of the intrinsic limitations of typologies is that not all real-life examples will fit easily into the classification". By referring to Mackey's (1970) ninety varieties of 'bilingual' education as well as hybrid models (such as the one adopted in Welsh primary schools where first language heritage education for native speakers of Welsh is combined with immersion education for second language learners), Baker (2017: 200) concedes that this reduced categorisation is over-simplified and lists eight limitations to such a classification of bilingual delivery:

- models tend to suggest systems which are static and do not reflect the fluidity and evolutionary aspect of the bilingual education process
- variations of the 'same' basic model are numerous
- models suggest educational inputs and outputs but do not pay sufficient attention to the *teaching and learning process* of the classroom, an aspect of educational research which he has referred to elsewhere as the "black box" model (Baker, 1988)
- models do not provide evidence of their relative success or failure
- models are 'reductionist' and fail to reflect the complex nature of the educational process and experience
- they cannot be adopted by or 'transported' to a different context without giving due consideration to possible changes in the political environment
- they are generally prototypes which are based on practices in countries in the northern hemisphere
- model terminology is not generally part of the common parlance of professionals involved in bilingual education.

Nevertheless, despite the over-simplification, such a classification is necessary for discussion and understanding as well as useful in enabling us to tease out various issues of *methodology* and *aims*.

Baker's (2017) categorisation, however, marks a modification from that adopted in some earlier editions of the same publication where models were *dichotomously* described as either "weak" or "strong". Dividing the models further into three groups rather than two is evidently an attempt to reflect a wider *continuum* of outcomes in linguistic proficiency rather than a 'black and white' dichotomy, thus encompassing:

- monolingualism
- relative / limited bilingualism
- bilingualism and biliteracy

However, despite the danger of over-simplifying their linguistic *outcomes* in terms of eventual everyday *functional* use and application, one is nevertheless pragmatically tempted to continue defining these models of bilingual teaching dichotomously as:

- those which succeed in producing *functional* bilingual proficiency in individuals (strong models) and
- those which do not (weak models).

One should emphasise perhaps that, even in relation to those classified as 'weak' forms of instruction, the validity of such a categorisation would be questioned by many educational policy-makers who regard their programmes as genuinely aiming to achieve bilingual proficiency. However, those aims never become a reality in some bilingual education models. Therefore, we must be careful not to confuse what are overtly (and genuinely) positive *aims* with *effective teaching methodology* and assume that the two are synonymous or go hand in hand. Whilst bilingual education policy documents can often exude positive aims, as when emphasising the benefits of studying modern foreign languages for example, yet, even after many years of instruction, linguistic outcomes in terms of *proficiency* in a second or third language can often be poor. It is for this reason that we need to differentiate between *aims* and *outcomes*. Aims found in policy documents can even be *overtly* positive at times whilst deliberately being *covertly* negative. Stubbs (1991) in Reading 2, *Educational Language Planning in England and Wales: Multicultural rhetoric and assimilationist assumptions*, exposes the difference between *overt* rhetoric and *covert* expectations. Similarly, Fishman (2005) refers to "the soft smile and the iron fist".

Such ‘aims’, arguably, often reflect a *political equilibrium* model of bilingual education provision (Paulston, 1980, 1992) as opposed to a truly *educational* model. In general terms, the latter may be defined as genuinely aiming to produce proficient bilingual speakers whilst the former is provided as a form of political tokenism which allows education authorities to be seen as being politically correct, supportive and liberal, thus reflecting tolerance-oriented rather than promotion-oriented language policies (Wiley, 2002).

Baker (2017: 199) sub-divides the three broad categorises of bilingual education into eleven models as follows:

A. Monolingual forms of education for bilinguals

1. Mainstreaming / Submersion
2. Mainstreaming / Submersion with Pull-out Majority Language Instruction Support
3. Sheltered (Structured) Immersion
4. Segregationist

B. Weak forms of bilingual education for bilinguals

5. Transitional
6. Mainstream with foreign language teaching
7. Separatist

C. Strong forms of bilingual education for bilingualism and biliteracy

8. Immersion
9. Maintenance / Heritage Language
10. Two Way Dual Language
11. Mainstream Bilingual

With regard to what is indicated as their *societal and educational outcomes* however (p.199), an examination of these eleven models of ‘bilingual’ instruction clearly shows how they could be individually placed on different points of the above-mentioned continuum, reflecting polarised perspectives of being socially and politically problematic or advantageous, as well as Bourhis’ (2001) four political ideologies. Baker (2017), *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, a reference book accompanying this course, provides a detailed description and discussion of each of these models which makes it unnecessary to repeat what has already been clearly explained. Any further additional material which appears below under corresponding headings, therefore, will either be included to highlight salient points and issues or to enhance the discussion when necessary by providing further commentaries on

respective models. **Students should now read the broad classifications of models of bilingual teaching which are provided in Baker (2017).**

The seven which fall into the first two categories and which are not considered as aiming to produce proficient bilingualism are discussed on pages 201-210 in Chapter 10, namely:

- Monolingual forms of education for bilinguals
- Weak forms of bilingual education for bilinguals

The other four in the third category (Strong forms of bilingual education for bilingualism and biliteracy) are discussed in Chapter 11. As a conclusion, Baker (2017: 239-40) refers to various benefits which students as *individuals* are alleged to gain from receiving a bilingual education, as well as to *societal* advantages. For the sake of consistency, the terminology adopted for various models in this Guidance Booklet is the same as that adopted in the reference book (Baker, 2017).

Furthermore, the characteristics of each model as described on page 199 are also included here as an *aide-mémoire*.

At this point, the direct connection between this module and previous modules becomes very clear; for example, the need to ensure an effective model of bilingual teaching methodology which can produce the necessary levels of balanced bilingual proficiency in order to gain cognitive benefits claimed by the Threshold Theory (Cummins, 1976) as well as other advantages discussed in module ECDA-7004: Cognitive Aspects of Bilingualism.

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 L_x is effective in promoting proficiency in L_x, transfer of this proficiency to L_y will occur provided there is adequate exposure to L_y (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn L_y.

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”.

B. Weak Forms of Bilingual Education for Bilinguals

1. Transitional (See Baker, 2017: 206-208)

- Typical type of child: Language minority
- Language of the Classroom: Gradual transition from the minority L1 language to the majority L2
- Societal and Educational Aim: Assimilation / Subtractive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Relative monolingualism

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) aims to shift the child from a home minority language to a dominant majority language, the result usually being cultural assimilation. The idea, therefore, is that the L1 minority language can be used to *assist* acquisition of the majority L2 language.

The analogy adopted by Baker (2017: 206) is that of “a brief, temporary swim in one pool until the child is perceived as capable of moving to the mainstream pool”. It differs, therefore, from the ‘sink or swim’ methodology adopted in submersion bilingual education when minority language speakers are ‘thrown’ immediately into the ‘deep-end’ of the mainstream pool.

Despite its final aims of achieving predominantly monolingual proficiency in the majority language by relinquishing the mother tongue, such a methodology is again underpinned by a sense of altruism and a desire to promote equal opportunities and a share of economic and social prosperity by achieving functional L1 proficiency.

The linguistic ‘diet’ offered by this model is of two kinds:

- Early exit
- Late exit

Early exit Transitional Bilingual Education means a maximum of two years of use of the mother tongue in the primary or elementary school, this being the most common form of TBE in the 1980s and 1990s.

Late-exit, however, allows approximately 40% of instruction through the medium of the mother tongue up to the end of primary schooling or 6th grade. TBE provision, however, can also be adopted higher up the

education system, including high school, when individuals require transition to mainstream education at later stages of their school career. Baker (2017: 207-208) elaborates on some of the practical aspects involved in the process of providing TBE as well as on some micro-political issues and tensions which can arise occasionally within institutions.

The validity of the criticism levelled at this model by Ovando et al. (2003) is, arguably, questionable and open to debate since the only alternative models which could be adopted to ensure assimilation with a monolingual linguistic majority seem to be either Mainstreaming / Submersion or Mainstreaming / Submersion with Withdrawal Classes. These models, however, are also criticised by Ovando et al. (2003) for what seems to be the same reason, that is, “separating language minority students from the mainstream and thus reproducing differences in power and progress for those with lower class status” (Baker, 2011: 216).

Reference to the Latecomer / Newcomer Language Centres in Wales should not be construed as adopting the strict definition of TBE as described above, that is, effecting a gradual transition from the L1 home-language to *monolingual* proficiency in L2, since the aim at such centres is for pupils to acquire functional proficiency in Welsh (L2) whilst *retaining* equal proficiency in English (L1). It is for this reason that this provision does not fit tidily into any of the acknowledged models of bilingual teaching. Pupils are withdrawn from mainstream language teaching and are provided with specialised tuition at separate centres. Certain education authorities such as Gwynedd in North Wales will keep newcomers separate from mainstream pupils for up to six months for intense language tuition before they are allowed to join mainstream Welsh-medium education. Other authorities, on the other hand, whilst also making use of language centres and providing separate Welsh language instruction aimed at ensuring full proficiency, make such visits intermittent with school attendance; for example, alternating two days at a Language Centre with three days in a mainstream classroom.

2. Mainstream with Foreign Language Teaching (See Baker, 2017: 208-209)

- Typical type of child : Language majority
- Language of the Classroom: Majority language with L2/ Foreign language lessons
- Societal and Educational Aim: Limited enrichment
- Aim in Language Outcome: Limited bilingualism

The educational provision where a second language is only taught as an *individual subject* in the school curriculum at various times during the

school timetable (in the same way as History or Art for example) has been labelled by some as ‘drip-feed’ language teaching. Obviously adopted from a medical context, the term is nevertheless a misnomer due to its sporadic delivery and the student’s lack of constant contact with the language.

Despite the adoption of various approaches *within* the same basic model (e.g. the direct method, the bilingual method), it is generally acknowledged as being ineffective in promoting bilingual proficiency. However, this is the method of teaching an additional language commonly adopted in schools in the United Kingdom, whether it is French, Spanish, German, Italian or Welsh. In Wales, the model has been heavily criticised by academics and by the school inspectorate (Estyn) as being methodologically weak and not cost-effective. Nevertheless, it is a methodology which continues to be adopted. Finding that pupils from an English-language background in Canada were unable to communicate effectively with French Canadians after twelve years of ‘drip-feed’ language teaching, Le Blanc (1992: 35) made the following observation:

We all know how much our country invests in second language training. We are talking in terms of millions and millions of dollars...All these students are taking second-language courses and, once they have finished, should normally be able to function in the second language. But what happens in reality? (cited in Baker, 1993: 157)

With a view to bringing the ineffectiveness of this model as a teaching *methodology* to the attention of politicians responsible for formulating language policies in Wales, Lewis (2013) believes that questioning its *cost-effectiveness* may effect a political response more readily than emphasising its inherent *methodological* weakness.

Baker (2011) provides statistics from a survey which is conducted by the Center of Applied Linguistics (CAL) in the USA every decade. Despite already being very low percentages, the figures showed a decrease in the number of elementary schools teaching languages between 1997 and 2009 (from 31% to 25%) despite an increase in the previous decade. Of those actually teaching a foreign language in 2009 however, 88% were teaching Spanish, an increase of 9% on the previous survey. As pointed out, this “provides a paradox if not an internal conflict” and reflects Garcia’s (2008) reference to a developing interaction between Spanish as a globalised language and as the minority language of USA Latinos with Spanish being taught as a heritage language, a foreign language as well as in Dual Language bilingual programmes (see below). Whereas this

conflict is reflected in the decision of California and Arizona not to allow the use of Spanish in their education systems in the wake of Proposition 227 and Proposition 203 respectively, it also points to a far more fundamental *ambivalence* in attitude towards foreign languages; whether to treat them as a *problem* in accordance with what is perceived as the cause of social and national disunity, or as an economic and social *resource* (Ruiz, 1984).

The marked decrease in foreign language teaching in middle schools in the USA (from 75% to 58% within a decade according to the CAL 2009 survey) also seems to mark an indifference to bilingual or multilingual proficiency. Although remaining at a high percentage of 91% in *high schools* between decades, the acknowledged ineffectiveness and inefficiency of this methodology in terms of producing proficient speakers again points in the same direction, indicating nothing more than a tokenism to the development of bilingual skills.

However, as Baker (2017: 209) points out, one cannot argue that such proficiency is unattainable by this methodology since evidence relating to the learning of English, for example, in other parts of the world, including Europe, proves otherwise. Instrumental and integrational factors as propounded by Gardener & Lambert (1972) as well as Maslow's (1954) "hierarchy of human needs" (see module ECDA-7011) can often provide the required level of motivation to achieve success. As a developing and dominant global *lingua franca*, macro economic and social forces can provide the necessary motivation for people to acquire a proficient level of English, whereas in countries where English is already a dominant language, such inherent proficiency causes any motivation (or need) to acquire another language to diminish.

3. Separatist (See Baker, 2017: 209)

- Typical type of child: Language minority
- Language of the Classroom: Minority language by choice
- Societal and Educational Aim: Detachment / Autonomy
- Aim in Language Outcome: Limited bilingualism

This form of education in relation to a 'bilingual' content is extremely rare and aims at protecting a minority language community from a possible shift to a majority language. Whereas this can be for *political* reasons when and where possible, it can, however, have cultural or religious aims. It therefore resists both *economic-structural* and *cultural* integration (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1977) and any form of linguistic assimilation. Such education could also be said to reflect a 'preservationist' approach to securing language vitality (Williams, 1991), (see module ECDA-7011). Unlike the Segregationist model, the

Separatist model is adopted deliberately and *by choice*. An often-mentioned example is the language adopted by the Amish community in Pennsylvania. Having emigrated from Germany to the USA in the eighteenth century, the original settlers continued to use a German dialect related to that spoken along the Rhine. As an isolated community which has retained its own unique way of life and religious practices over the years, present members continue to speak Pennsylvania German. Although presently under threat of survival in a community where English is becoming increasingly more pervasive, it is an example of where a separate, self-imposed, isolated existence and its attendant religious practices have historically succeeded in protecting a minority language within a wider, dominant linguistic context.

C. Strong Forms of Bilingual Education for Bilingualism and Biliteracy

1. Immersion (See Baker, 2017: 230-234)

- Typical type of child: Language majority
- Language of the Classroom: Bilingual with initial emphasis on L2
- Societal and Educational Aim: Pluralism and enrichment. Additive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Bilingualism and Biliteracy

Baker (2017: 230-234) provides a comprehensive description of this ‘strong’ model of bilingual education including a brief historical account of its origins. Its adoption as a method of educational instruction within the education system in Canada is generally associated with an experiment conducted in St Lambert in Montreal in 1965. The experiment of setting up a kindergarten comprising twenty-six pupils, as requested by English-speaking parents, can be interpreted as a determined attempt on their behalf to ensure the acquisition of bilingual skills for their children in order to “become bilingual and bicultural without loss of achievement” (p.230). However, as Baker (2017) points out, economic and employment advantages which could ensue from such instruction may well have been an additional *instrumental* motivation. Since then, immersion education has been adopted in various parts of the world and, despite some qualification, is generally acknowledged as being a model of bilingual education delivery which results in proficiency in *both* languages. The model, however, varies according to the *age* when a child starts and the total *time* spent in immersion.

Age:

- early immersion, starting from kindergarten or the infant stage
- middle or delayed immersion, from 9-10 years old

- late immersion, in secondary education.

Time:

- Total immersion, starting with 100% immersion in the second language and reducing gradually after 2-3 years to approximately 80% for the subsequent 3-4 year period, ending elementary education with approximately 50% of curriculum delivery through the medium of the second language.
- Partial immersion, where the medium of instruction is approximately 50% for both languages throughout the infant and primary stages of education.

In Canada, early total immersion has been the most common and popular model of immersion education, followed by late and then middle immersion. The histograms on page 231 of Baker (2017) illustrate the various models.

As Baker (2017:231) points out, the St Lambert experiment was considered a success, Tucker & d'Anglejan (1972) summarising the linguistic results as pupils being able to master both receptive and productive skills in English (L1) as well as those in conventional English-medium provision but with the added benefit of also having the same equal level of skills in French which had been denied to their English-medium peers. Swain & Lapkin (1982) made the following observation on the early total-immersion education provided to Canadian pupils:

In sum, students in the early total-immersion program are able to master the content of such subjects as mathematics, history, geography and science to the extent that their peers in the regular program have. Furthermore, the total immersion experience seems to have sharpened their work-study skills and has left them with no sign of cognitive confusion. Indeed, the results suggest that the immersion students may be reaping positive benefits, not only in enhanced English-language skills...but also in more specific intellectual skills.
(Swain & Lapkin, 1982)

The result of research carried out in early immersion education in Canada can be summarised as:

1. early-immersion education for second-language pupils being superior to the 'drip-feed' teaching-method used in mainstream schools
2. the acquisition of the second language not being at the expense of

- development in the first (L1), the first language development possibly being superior to that of pupils in mainstream (L1) schools
3. second language development not being at the expense of development in other subjects
 4. positive effects in terms of self-esteem, motivation and the ability to socialise with French-speakers.

Research in bilingual education in the Basque Country provides similar evidence (Sierra & Olaziregi, 1989).

Nevertheless, Baker (2017: 233) also draws attention to certain issues, one of which is the fact that some majority language students fail to achieve native-like proficiency in the *productive* skills of speaking and writing, even after twelve or thirteen years of immersion education; the productive skills, of course, perhaps being more readily observable than the receptive skills of reading and understanding. One can only conjecture to what extent the lower levels of achievement by some pupils in the productive skills could be due to teaching *methodology*. For instance, Baker (2011: 232) lists eight essential features of the growth of immersion education in Canada, the fifth being:

The content of the curriculum becomes the focus of the language. *Perpetual insistence on correct communication is avoided*. Learning a second language in early immersion becomes incidental and subconscious, similar to the way a first language is acquired. Emphasis is placed on understanding before speaking. *Later on, formal instruction (e.g. French grammar) may occur*. (Italics added)

This may remind us of the issue of fossilised interlanguage (FI) raised by Dodson (1995) and discussed in module ECDA-7010. It may be described as errors, even basic grammatical errors, made by L2 learners during communicative L2 acquisition becoming ‘frozen’ and almost impossible to eradicate. It can be characterised by a simplified form of the target language where use of vocabulary is limited, redundant features are ignored and many grammatical devices such as gender, tense, mutations, articles etc are avoided, eliminated or used wrongly, whilst at the same time a great deal of transfer from pupils’ mother-tongue causes grammatical or syntactical interference as well as lexical interference. This can result in the development of a new code of speech which is unique to a new generation of speakers mainly due to a lack of social contact between L2 speakers and the population which speaks the target language. The language of L2 speakers, therefore, ‘stagnates’ at some

level, this not being a matter of fluency but rather of being *fluent speakers of incorrect language* and varying in grammatical correctness according to use for different purposes or domains.

The issue of the interference of the L1 on students' development in the L2, however, has been a matter of academic debate with Dulay & Burt (1973) arguing that most inaccuracies connected with L2 interlanguage are *developmental* rather than derived from L1, that is, similar to inaccuracies in children's speech in the normal acquisition of L1. According to Dulay, Burt & Krashen (1982):

Studies show... that only 5% of the grammatical errors children make and at most 20% of the ones adults make can be traced to crossover from the first language. Learners' first languages are no longer believed to interfere with their attempts to acquire second language grammar..."

Hammerly (1989), however, when referring to French immersion education, offers an opposite view:

listeners to a second language interpret what they hear *on the basis of the language or languages they know*, eliminating what seems redundant, such as certain endings, little unstressed words like articles and prepositions and so forth even though they are important in the second language. Of course, the listener as *listener* cannot be corrected by anyone, so without saying a word faulty second language structures are internalised. (italics added)

Dodson (195) suggests that the use of fossilised interlanguage can also be due to and further compounded by the dilemma facing teachers when L2 pupils start using the target language which he explains as follows:

...when pupils begin to speak in their second language in the classroom, the teacher is so often glad that the target language is being used, that any faulty language produced will not be corrected. This, of course, is a signal for the pupils concerned that they have made themselves understood and, as no correction was made, that the utterance spoken was linguistically correct. (Dodson, 1995:121)

Dodson (1995) maintains that linguistic inaccuracies which develop in children's acquisition of the L2 are due to pedagogical practices and the avoidance of the use of the L1:

The development of FI in L2 immersion education is ultimately due to the fact that the mother tongue of the pupils is avoided in the teaching of the second language....based on the pedagogue principle that the learning of a second language should imitate as closely as possible the learning of one's first.
(Dodson, 1995: 117)

Some aspects of L2 acquisition are identical to L1 acquisition, but not all. Consequently, any differences between the two become crucial factors in an analysis of L2 acquisition and classroom practices.

Dodson (1995) distinguishes between

- message-orientated strategies and
- medium-orientated strategies

Medium-orientated strategies ("practice" strategies (Wells, 1975)) are those adopted by L1 learners at an early stage, including: imitation and repetition of utterances learnt previously; substitution to create new utterances; adding elements to extend meaning or function; chaining a number of utterances together in a flow of speech. However in L2 acquisition, message-orientated strategies can take precedence over medium-orientated strategies: simply stated, *communication of what you mean* is more important than *how you say it*. First-language acquisition is a fluctuating process between medium-orientated and message-orientated communication with the former decreasing as proficiency in the latter increases. However, the need for medium-orientated strategies never disappears totally.

Dodson (1995) argues that L2 learners have two major additional bilingual *medium-orientated* strategies which are not available to L1 learners:

- the use of L1 to ask for functional meaning of that which they have not understood
- the use of L1 to seek appropriate models of correct L2 utterances in order to express themselves correctly in subsequent *message-orientated* speech.

Medium-orientated strategies are, therefore, adopted in both L1 and L2 acquisition but these are *monolingual* in L1, *bilingual* in L2. However, the

use of L1 in many L2 immersion programmes is often taboo with pupils having to guess the meaning of L2 utterances or relying on non-verbal cues (context-embedded communication) and the previous acquisition of L2 vocabulary.

Researchers of French immersion programmes, therefore, mention the ‘stagnation’ of linguistic development amongst some L2 learners after having reached a stage of being able to make themselves understood. According to Baetens Beardsmore (1986):

Their communicative needs in the classroom are orientated towards the conveyance of cognitive meaning...there is no strong social incentive to develop further towards native-speaker forms.

No thorough study has been made of L2 pupils’ proficiency in Welsh at the end of secondary school after thirteen years of Welsh-medium education, although Mathias (not dated) draws attention to the significance of interlanguage in the speech of Welsh students. However, studies of students in Canadian French immersion programmes are available. Pellerin & Hammerley (1984) used unstructured interviews based on very familiar topics with 18 year old pupils in Vancouver who had received French-immersion education from the age of 5. The results showed an average of 53.8% of incorrect sentences (ranging individually from 40.3 to 72.4%) counting grammar and vocabulary only. Hammerly (1989) commented:

although the students managed to communicate nearly all of their ideas, they did so in Frenglish, not French. Frenglish is not a language nor a dialect but an embarrassment. A 6 year-old may sound cute coping with communication needs in very faulty French, but would you say the same of a 30- or 40 year old?

As Johnstone (2002) points out, interlanguage is characteristic of both Welsh and Scottish Gaelic-medium education and has given rise to discussion and differing viewpoints on whether this should be seen as a reflection of language standards deteriorating or of a language ‘developing’ and adopting new structures:

In both cases ‘new-age’ Gaelic or Welsh provokes a range of re-action. Some view it as a sign of linguistic degradation and argue that steps have to be taken to ensure that proper Gaelic or Welsh is taught, learnt and used. Others prefer to consider the ‘errors’ that the new

speakers produce to be a sign of sociolinguistic vitality as they create their own linguistic identity.

Typical strategies adopted by L2 speakers in the acquisition of the second language include *simplification* and *generalisation* where, for example, grammatical irregularities are made to conform to regular speech patterns. However, Jones (1988) and Thomas (1991) argue that these are not 'mistakes' as such since they are based on systematic 'rules' in their usage: "...these are not simply 'incorrect' forms which are at variance with the whole history of the language, but are, rather, entirely credible creations." (Thomas, 1991)

Despite academic disagreements, any deficiency in oracy can give rise to further pedagogical concerns and complications with regard to *literacy* and general educational progress:

Poor receptive and productive skills at the aural/oral level will be compounded at the written level, since inaccuracies which might pass unnoticed in speech become glaring, and worse still, virtually ineradicable when they appear in writing. Less easy to detect, and hence to correct, is any inaccuracy in the pupils' reading comprehension; yet this will affect their ability to study across the whole curriculum. (Dodson, 1995: 111)

Although primarily emphasising *pedagogical* aspects, Dodson (1995), like Cummins, argues for adequate attention to be paid to the role of the first language in the acquisition of the second. Whereas this is presently being discussed in the context of overcoming the issue of fossilised interlanguage in immersion education, it is also equally applicable to submersion education. Dodson (1995) mentions the written work of ethnic-minority pupils in Britain, for example, which is characterised by errors of syntax and the wrong use of tenses.

Regardless of the model in question, therefore, Dodson (1995) maintains:

It is... clear that a second language cannot be learnt properly through "osmosis" only, that is, where the learners are plunged into a monolingual 'second-language bath.' In that situation most of them will drown...If grammatical accuracy is not emphasised from the very outset, it is almost impossible to prevent the development of FI. (Dodson, 1995: 121)

In the development of linguistic skills for the purpose of teaching *through the medium* of a second language, teachers also need to be aware that fluency in *oracy* can also give misleading messages in relation to a child's *cognitive ability*. This is an issue which relates to Cummins' (1979, 2008) differentiation between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) and the warning that children's linguistic ability must be sufficiently developed to take on the cognitive demands of the curriculum. Whether in the context of L2 pupils in immersion education making a transition to Heritage Language Bilingual Education or L2 pupils in withdrawal or Sheltered English provision entering mainstream monolingual education, Cummins (1979) points out that children who perform on the linguistic level of BICS according to 'fluency' often *appear* to be capable of being educated through the medium of their second language. This can explain why the progress of some pupils in immersion education appears to lag behind that of their first-language contemporaries for a short while until their linguistic ability to deal with cognitively demanding issues allows them to catch up. It can also explain why minority language students underachieve academically after being transferred to submersion mainstream lessons, despite appearing to be capable on the basis of 'fluency' in their second language.

Cummins' (1984) distinction between BICS and CALP explains why such children tend to fail when mainstreamed. Their cognitive academic language proficiency is not developed enough to cope with the demands of the curriculum. What Cummins regards as essential in the bilingual education of children is that the 'common underlying proficiency' is well developed. That is, a child's language-cognitive abilities need to be sufficiently well developed to cope with the curriculum processes of the classroom. (Baker, 2011:172)

Characteristics of the rapid growth in immersion education in Canada as listed by Baker (2017: 232-233) are summarised as follows:

- The context is additive due to involving the acquisition of two major languages
- Immersion education is optional not compulsory and is aided by both the cultural and economic conviction of parents and the commitment of teachers which may, in turn, further motivate pupils
- Contrary to the belief of some, children in early immersion are allowed to use their mother tongue for up to one and a half years which is, therefore, seen as being appreciated and not belittled

- The teachers are competent in *both* languages, although perceived by children as only being able to *understand* rather than speak English
- Immersion classes, being mainly monolingual English, tend to be linguistically homogeneous with regard to initial skills in French, thus making teachers' work more manageable and being conducive to pupils' self-esteem
- Immersion pupils experience the same curriculum as mainstream students
- Immersion education is not simply an educational initiative but can represent a wider political, societal rationale which can vary from country to country.

A list of the core and variable characteristics of immersion education as drawn up by Swain & Johnston (1997) and Swain & Lapkin (2005) is given in Baker (2017: 234) which include contexts where children have French immersion as their *third* language. All are perfectly valid variables and do not require further comment, with the exception perhaps of the seventh variable feature relating to the commitment of administrators and politicians.

Immersion education is voluntary and not compulsory, parents usually being motivated to place their children in such educational and linguistic provision by a range of factors which underpin an *informed* and *deliberate* decision. In Wales, for example, there is evidence that parents even see immersion bilingual education as an elitist provision and as free 'private' education. Research undertaken by Campbell & Packer (not dated) found a range of reasons being given by parents which seemed to reflect the widely-held public perception of Welsh-medium education being academically superior in Wales, as supported also by reports from the schools inspectorate, Estyn. Welsh-medium education is, therefore, seen by many (including a very high proportion of parents from non-Welsh-speaking backgrounds) as promoting social mobility and employment opportunities, immersion education being the first step to such success.

As long as Welsh-medium schools are seen as providing social mobility to one group of parents, as institutions providing a pattern of a good traditional standard of education to another, a maintenance of culture to Welsh-speakers and an expression of elitism to others, their future as an unique phenomenon in contemporary Wales will be assured for a long time.
(Campbell & Packer, not dated).

However, *linguistically*, immersion education is also producing proficient bilingual speakers and continues to feed the Welsh-medium education system at the level of statutory education (despite the fact that, as in Canada, some academics have drawn attention to some differences in the standard of language between native-speakers and L2 students). Such success is not true of the Mainstream with Foreign Language Teaching model and the ‘drip-feed’ methodology being adopted (see above) for teaching Welsh as a second language in the majority of schools.

As Baker (2011: 243-44) states, referring particularly to the success in Finland, Catalonia and the Basque Country: “Immersion schooling now occurs internationally... With over 1000 research studies, immersion bilingual education has been an educational experiment of unusual success and growth... It has influenced bilingual education throughout the world” (see also Baker, 2017: 233). Yet, education administrators and government officials fail to recognise the success of the immersion methodology in the early years and continue to spend money on a non-cost-effective methodology higher up the educational ladder with very little evidence of linguistic success. Despite this, the government in Wales has a clear vision with regard to language revitalisation as expressed in official documentation such as “Iaith Pawb”-National Action Plan for a Bilingual Wales (WAG, 2003):

Our goal is a bold one. We see no point in setting our targets low. We are no longer concerned with merely stabilising the number and percentage of Welsh speakers. We want to see a sustained increase in the number and percentage of people able to speak Welsh... We believe that the long-term well-being of the language is dependent on *enabling as many pre-school and young people as possible to acquire the language as early as possible*. Accordingly, we want to sustain the growth of the language which has been achieved over the last two decades among school-age children, improve the rate of language transfer from Welsh-speaking parents to their children and encourage those who have used or acquired the language at school to retain and use it once they have left.
(WAG, 2003: 11) (italics added)

There is, therefore, a marked discrepancy between the *formulation* of language policy and its *implementation*; between the vision and the means of realising it. Such a discrepancy reflects the fact that bilingual education in Wales continues to operate within a *political equilibrium*

paradigm (Paulston, 1980). Even when a so-called Foundation Phase was introduced in 2008 for all children of 5-7 years of age, the government decided to continue offering a linguistically differentiated curriculum.

Baker (2011: 243) compares Canadian Immersion and USA Structured Immersion approaches. However, it is well worth emphasising at this point that USA Structured Immersion is the *submersion* model aimed at monolingualism where the minority language is replaced by the majority language but where teachers may use simplified versions of the majority language or even allow children, initially, a certain amount of use of the minority language.

2. Maintenance / Heritage Language (See Baker, 2017: 224-30)

- Typical type of child: Language minority
- Language of the Classroom: Bilingual with emphasis on L1
- Societal and Educational Aim: Maintenance, pluralism and enrichment. Additive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Bilingualism and Biliteracy

Heritage Language Bilingual Education is where language minority children use their indigenous, native, home or heritage language fully or partly as a medium of instruction. However, theoretically, such linguistic provision can be of two kinds:

- **Static** maintenance, which is aimed at simply maintaining without improving a child's level of proficiency.
- **Developmental or enrichment maintenance**, which aims at progressively improving a child's bilingual skills overall.

Often existing in a diglossic context which includes another dominant or 'higher' language (Fishman, 1972, 1980) and which is either acquired or taught in school, the end result is usually full proficiency in both languages. Baker (2017: 224-225) provides a very wide range of examples which illustrate efforts to protect the vitality of minority languages at various stages of attrition or revitalisation, the aim being to protect the languages and to encourage their development alongside the adoption of majority languages.

Pages 227-230 provide an account of indigenous language education in the USA and the provision of Heritage Language Bilingual Education for American Indians, Alaskan Natives and Native Hawai'ians despite a previous history of forced assimilation (arguably cultural genocide) over a period of more than a hundred years. The words of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, J.D.C. Atkins, in 1887 are worth repeating here since they echo the words of four English gentlemen in a report published in 1847

on the state of education in Wales. Later referred to as “Brad y Llyfrau Gleision” (The Treason of the Blue Books), the report resulted in banning the use of Welsh in school. Children failing to conform were ridiculed and physically beaten, a form of linguistic coercion also known to have been adopted for Breton-speaking children in Brittany and Greek-speaking children in Australia:

Teaching an Indian youth in his own barbarous dialect is a positive detriment to him.

The first step towards civilization, towards teaching the Indians the mischief and folly of... their barbarous practices, is to teach them English.
(Krauss, 2000, cited in Baker, 2011:237)

With the obvious exception of the inhumane historical practices adopted to enforce linguistic and cultural assimilation on indigenous Indian tribes, the sentiment underpinning the words of J.D.C. Atkins could, arguably, be said to be in keeping with the main thrust of *current* mainstream thought on multilingualism in the USA. However, with regard to *indigenous* First Nation languages, legislation such as the Indian Education Act of 1972 and the Native American Languages Act of 1990 has again reflected a certain ambivalence over the years resulting in a change from repression-oriented to tolerance-oriented policies (Wiley, 2000). This represents a swing from ethnist ideology to a civic-oriented ideology and, with public funding, what may even be construed as a more pluralist ideology (Bourhis, 2001). The Rock Point Community School in Arizona (Baker, 2017: 228), established as early as the mid-1930s, provides a good example of developmental or enrichment maintenance bilingual education in the USA which protects and revitalises an indigenous language whilst also ensuring proficiency in English. Baker (2017: 229) also refers to an interesting initiative adopted by the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS) organisation, namely, the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Programs which pairs a fluent speaker of a native Californian language with a committed learner of child-bearing age, with the possibility of further transmission to children and others. Similar efforts to increase speakers have been adopted in Wales by means of the TWF (Growth) project which promoted the language amongst young parents who subsequently placed their children in Welsh-medium immersion education as a first step towards further Heritage Language Bilingual Education at a later stage.

Pre-school immersion programmes such as those in New Zealand, Australia, Ireland and Wales (see Immersion Education above) can contribute substantially to Heritage Language Bilingual Education by creating the need for continuity and a demand for further provision at elementary and secondary stages of education, and even higher education. In Wales, such continuity has finally resulted in the establishment of the Coleg Cymraeg Cenedlaethol which is a Welsh-medium federal university. The Te Kohanga Reo (language nests) full-immersion programmes established in New Zealand in 1982 are internationally renowned for their contribution to the revitalisation of the Maori language. The same is true of Wales where the organisation known as Mudiad Meithrin (literally ‘Nursery Movement’) feeds statutory elementary Welsh-medium education. In Ireland, the Naíonraí provide this service.

The provision of Heritage Language Bilingual Education can often be interpreted as a positive political gesture, as a government’s acknowledgement of the ethnic diversity of its population. It can be promoted as a means of ensuring political cohesion in the face of multicultural and multilingual diversity. Baker (2011: 233) mentions minority language education in China which, since 1979, has been provided for over twenty of the fifty-five ethnic minority groups which exist, apart from the Han who form the vast majority (91%) of the Chinese population. This political approach to the multicultural ‘melting-pot’ is in stark contrast to that of the USA and the passing of Proposition 227 in California or Proposition 203 in Arizona for example, thus illustrating two different possible perspectives on the ‘melting pot’ as described by Baker (2017: 390).

It is the possibility of offering social cohesion which prompted Malherbe to make this comment in relation to education in South Africa even as far back as 1946:

It must however be pointed out that, whereas the unilingual school is a device which avoids the solution of our difficulties by side-stepping them, the bilingual school is the hard way. But it is the only sure and true way in the long run." (Malherbe, 1946)

In response to efforts made by immigrants to maintain their indigenous languages, the provision of Heritage Language Bilingual Education has often been instigated by *community* initiatives. The survey made by Fishman in the 1980s in the USA (Fishman, 2006) which provided

evidence of the existence of at least 6,553 heritage language schools encompassing education through the medium of 145 languages is a mark of the determination of minority language groups to maintain language vitality even in the face of a heavily dominated linguistic context such as the USA. The fact that many schools are privately financially supported is further evidence of such determination, although many receive support from other sources such as religious institutions and foreign governments.

Contrary to being immigrants in a foreign country, however, the first Welsh-medium school established in Wales was also the result of a private initiative by indigenous individuals and a determination to provide children with an education in their home language despite the widely accepted dominance of English-medium education within a hegemonic political context.

The first Welsh-medium primary school was set up in Aberystwyth in 1939 by Ifan ab Owen M. Edwards, son of Sir Owen M. Edwards who had previously been instrumental in determining the right to use some degree of Welsh within the existing English-medium education system. Establishing the *private* school is today recognised as having been a key development in providing the necessary fillip to the further establishment of a network of Welsh-medium primary and secondary schools under the control of *local government* during the years which followed. However, rather than being a government-driven initiative, it is also recognised that these early developments were the result of *parental* pressure and parental rights provided by Section 76 of the 1944 Education Act, which allowed parents the right to have their children educated in their own language. It is well-documented that these early establishments were poorly equipped, often accommodated in church or chapel vestries, for example, and heavily reliant on parental initiative for teaching resources. Such initiative and determination, however, resulted in substantial growth which may be outlined as follows:

Stage 1: Designated Welsh-medium Heritage Language schools were established initially for Welsh-speaking (L1) children only who lived in non-Welsh-speaking Anglicised areas.

Stage 2: These schools later attracted the attention of non-Welsh-speaking parents i.e. L1 *English* speakers in Anglicised areas who wanted Welsh-medium education for their children for the academic, cultural and social advantages which it offered (Campbell & Packer, undated). The schools were now, therefore, also being attended by speakers of Welsh as a second language (L2).

Stage 3: Designated Welsh-medium schools were later established in Welsh-speaking areas ('Y Fro Gymraeg') to protect heritage bilingual education from the growing linguistic complexity caused by in-migration to Wales. Consequently, the designated Welsh-medium model was also adopted in *Welsh-speaking* areas for both L1 and L2 pupils.

Such a staged development and growth in both the number of pupils and the schools themselves, obviously, marks the success of these schools. However, success can bring problems in its wake. Schools which were originally intended to meet the linguistic needs of only L1 Welsh-speaking pupils in Anglicised areas now encompass pupils from Welsh-speaking, English-speaking and mixed-language backgrounds. Consequently, *within the same system*, they provide Heritage Language Bilingual Education for proficient Welsh speakers and, at primary level, early immersion bilingual education for pupils from non-Welsh-speaking backgrounds. They, therefore, meet the need to consolidate and enrich the language of L1 speakers (maintenance- enrichment education) whilst establishing firm foundations for those from non-Welsh-speaking homes (immersion education). However, classes which contain pupils from a mixed linguistic background, which are generally characteristic of Welsh-medium education, particularly in the early stages of bilingual acquisition, can also present *pedagogical* problems, as reported by the schools inspectorate in Wales (Estyn) in 2006:

Over recent years, the popularity of Welsh-medium schools in non-Welsh-speaking areas has increased. This means that the intake of pupils into Welsh-medium schools is becoming more diverse in nature, with more pupils from a wider range of social and cultural backgrounds than in the past....In schools in the traditionally Welsh-speaking areas of North Wales and West Wales there are more pupils who come from non-Welsh-speaking homes. These changes mean that the proportion of children in these schools who speak Welsh at home is falling. Many teachers in both North and West Wales are finding it difficult to change the way they teach to meet the needs of these new groups of pupils." (Estyn, 2006:46).

This is an issue which is equally prevalent in the Irish context as described by Hickey (2001):

The mixing of native-speaker pupils with L2 learners in the immersion classroom presents both an opportunity

and a challenge. While providing L2 speakers with an opportunity to interact with native-speaker peers, it provides a challenge to educators to support and enrich the L1 language skills of the native-speakers in a situation of language contact. The challenge is even greater when the target language is an endangered minority language (for example, Irish or Welsh) or a majority language spoken by a minority in danger of being assimilated (for example, French in Ontario) and when the speakers of that language are in contact with English-speaking peers who are acquiring the target language as L2.” (Hickey, 2001)

Teaching L1 and L2 students in the same classroom has attracted international research which has highlighted the following issues:

1. the *advantages* and *disadvantages* of teaching minority L1 and majority L2 in the same classroom: implications for *both* cohorts
2. the advantages and disadvantages of separating L1 from L2 for various periods
3. the balance between the number of L1 and L2 pupils in the same class. Little research has been carried out to determine the ‘ideal’ balance
4. the nature and quality of language, the methods of explaining and questioning used by teachers in mixed groups, and any linguistic modification required
5. the inter-relationship between L1 and L2 pupils in the classroom and the mutual effect on each other linguistically
6. the need for differentiated approaches to enrich and extend L1 development whilst establishing a firm foundation for L2 pupils.

The advantages of L2 learners being taught in the same classroom as L1 pupils have been highlighted by various researchers e.g. Christian (1996). However, what effect has this had on the development of the language of L1 pupils?

Hickey (2001) in referring to the ‘naíonrai’ in Ireland recommends more balance in achieving the linguistic needs of L2 learners of Irish and enriching the language skills of minority L1 speakers, emphasising the need to be proactive in ensuring that L1 speakers are not “short-changed” in the attempt to increase the number of L2 speakers. This issue also been raised in the Canadian context by Mougeon & Beniak (1994). Jones (1988) mentions evidence of the influence of L2 speakers on L1 pupils with regard to the tendency for the latter to adjust their language to make

themselves understood by learners. Inaccuracies characteristic of L2 speech can also be adopted by L1 speakers in the classroom in order to conform to the majority, but with the result that they are also used amongst themselves. By accommodating the interlanguage of L2 speakers, L1 pupils are depriving them of the target language norm at which to aim and an awareness of a need to raise the standard of their speech, thus enforcing the perception that they have achieved a level of correctness assumed to be characteristic of the L1 speakers themselves. Ramirez & Merino (1990) also found teachers tending to ask fewer questions when teaching L1& L2 mixed groups compared with teaching linguistically more heterogeneous groups, as well as modifying and simplifying their language 'register' and giving less feed-back. Jones (1998) expressed concern regarding the 'rub-off' effect on native-speakers attending Welsh-medium schools and called for further research into the nature and quality of Welsh among pupils from Welsh-speaking homes and non-Welsh-speaking homes who were in linguistically-mixed classrooms.

Despite catering heterogeneously for pupils of mixed language background and, consequently, serving dual linguistic aims by providing both:

1. heritage/ maintenance-enrichment education for L1 speakers and
2. immersion education for L2 pupils (usually in the primary sector),

nevertheless, Welsh-medium schools are perceived as being 'homogeneous' *within* the overall educational system in Wales due to their linguistic status which sets them apart from English-medium schools and perhaps justifies Morgan & Murgatroyd's (1993) reference to them as "niche schools".

Due to this dichotomy of Welsh-language provision, one can validly question and debate whether or not the present system could be interpreted as a political solution to an educational problem or, equally, an educational solution to a political problem. However, since these schools have made a substantial contribution to an increase in the number of Welsh-speakers over the years, as evidenced by official census figures, the Welsh-medium education system is considered to be "a major engineer of attempted language reversal". (Baker, 1990: 78)

Some clarification seems to be required, however, in relation to the use of the term "Heritage Language Education". Baker (2011:234) points out that, in Canada, educationists differentiate between:

- heritage language lessons which provide approximately two and a half hours per week of heritage *language* teaching and
- heritage language bilingual education in which the language itself is used as *a medium of instruction* for approximately 50% of the day.

Two points of clarification seem to be necessary here. Firstly, the present discussion of Heritage Language Bilingual Education is concerned with the use of the indigenous language *as a medium of study* (teaching and learning) and not only as a school *subject*. The percentage of total time for which it is adopted, however, can vary so much that it becomes impossible to draw a definite line. In Wales, for example, schools are categorised according to varying percentages of use. Secondly, in this Guidance Booklet, what Canada refers to as Heritage Language Lessons has, in the Welsh context, been discussed under the heading Mainstream with Foreign Language Teaching since, although Welsh as a *second* language is not a *foreign* language, nevertheless, its status within the curriculum to date, the ‘drip-feed’ methodology adopted, the time allocation of a few lessons per week as well as, regrettably, the level of success in terms of final proficiency, is no greater than that of other foreign languages in the curriculum. In the Welsh context, therefore, it is not considered to be *heritage* education, although one can appreciate the validity of the Canadian terminology.

Again, Baker (2017: 225-26) discusses the use of the terminology in relation to different contexts and perspectives on *heritage* and also highlights some of the main features of heritage language education. Some of these have already been mentioned in passing whilst discussing the Welsh context, including the issue of the balance of linguistic percentages. A related matter, however, is the chosen language for the teaching of specific subjects and the “tendency to teach technological, scientific studies through the majority language” (p. 226), particularly English, whilst the humanities and the arts are taught in the minority language. This raises two issues:

Firstly, the possibility that students may, consequently, associate only the majority language with modernity and scientific and technological developments; furthermore, believe that their own minority language is incapable of dealing with scientific and technological concepts due, for example, to a lack of terminology and corpus planning, thus reducing its status as a language which can meet the demands of a constantly developing range of twenty-first century domains.

Secondly, one needs to be reminded that subjects such as history, geography and social studies, for example, require a higher level of

language content than science and technology which are, arguably, cognitively more *conceptual* in nature.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that science and technology are academic disciplines which are becoming increasingly identified with and taken over by English as a medium of educational instruction, especially in countries such as the Netherlands whose majority language, although not endangered, cannot be categorised as a major language on a *global* scale. Language campaigners in Wales who defend the teaching of mathematics and science through the medium of Welsh draw attention to the fact that Einstein was not educated in English.

3. Two Way/ Dual Language (See Baker, 2017: 215-223)

- Typical type of child: Mixed language, minority and majority
- Language of the Classroom: Minority and majority
- Societal and Educational Aim: Maintenance, pluralism and enrichment. Additive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Bilingualism and biliteracy

Whereas immersion education usually involves a homogenous group of majority language children learning the curriculum through the medium of a second language, Dual Language Bilingual Education usually contains a balanced group of children from a minority and a majority linguistic background using *both* languages as a medium of study. The aim, therefore, is to achieve balanced bilingualism and biliteracy. Established as a model of bilingual education by a Cuban community in Dade County in Florida in 1963, the Coral Way Elementary School was meant to provide an educational stop-gap for children who were expected to return to Cuba after the Castro regime had been overthrown. However, local English-speaking children from middle-class families had also been enrolled. Although existing under differing nomenclature (e.g. Two-Way Bilingual Education), since that time the Dual Language bilingual school model has multiplied in the USA, especially during the last decade of the twentieth century; 27 states and the District of Columbia having a total of 346 schools, mainly in Texas, California, Illinois, New York and New Mexico (Baker, 2011: 230), (see also Baker, 2017: 221-222). Such schools are mostly elementary, although there are 40 middle schools and 11 high schools. Although the two languages involved are predominantly Spanish and English (92.5%), Baker (2011) refers to other combinations with English, including Chinese, Korean and Navajo. Whereas this might suggest a tolerance-oriented approach to bilingual education reflecting a civic ideology (Bourhis, 2001), yet, the heavy bias to English expected in order to conform with both *federal* and *state* policies (e.g. ‘No Child Left

Behind’ and Proposition 227 in California respectively) has presented a threat to their future.

The Dual Language bilingual school model perhaps presents another example of successful local parental initiative which is contrary to official political ideology and government support. Similar to the early history of establishing Welsh-medium schools in Wales which emanated from parental pressure and reflected different cultural values, the story of the James F. Oyster Bilingual Elementary School established in 1971 in Washington DC is again an example where parents and officialdom were at odds with one another. The initiative taken by both parents and local politicians was to create “a school that crossed language, cultural, ethnic and social class lines” (Baker, 2017: 222).

According to Genesee & Gándara (1999), Dual Language bilingual education schools in the USA have the following features in common:

- A minority language is used for at least 50% of the time for the duration of elementary (primary) schooling, up to six years;
- Only one language is used in each period of instruction which is adjusted to suit the level of proficiency of students whilst being challenging at the same time;
- Classes are formed of approximately equal numbers and the language minority and majority language groups are integrated throughout curricular instruction.

Baker (2017: 216) further discusses the importance of securing a minority-majority linguistic balance in classes with a view to ensuring that the language dynamic between the two groups does not favour one more than the other, and so that the development of each in the language of the other is assured. However, balance in *numbers* is not always the crucial issue since attention also needs to be given to the *power relations* between the languages and the perceptions of pupils regarding their respective status, including the greater possible use of one outside the school walls and in the community. The difficulties of ensuring this can be further exacerbated when a school tends to focus on certain curricular areas, as in Dual Language magnet schools. Furthermore, due to the need to attract sufficient pupils from majority language backgrounds also, achieving a correct balance can naturally be difficult when in competition with a favoured or equally-esteemed monolingual school. As designated Welsh-medium schools in Wales have found, the good academic reputation and success of these schools in the eyes of the general public becomes crucial as a marketing strategy, especially in the case of parents less committed to such linguistic aims and political ideology.

For this reason alone, the goals of Dual Language bilingual schools need to be clear which Lindholm-Leary (2000) describes as follows:

- high levels of proficiency in *both* languages
- Literacy (reading and writing) at grade level in *both* languages
- General academic attainment at or above grade level, as in Mathematics and Science for example
- Positive multicultural attitudes
- Positive social, economic and political outcomes in terms of producing bilingual and biliterate future citizens who can meet national needs for language competence, but who also adopt positive attitudes towards people of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and which are conducive to maintaining peace with other nations.

As Baker (2017) points out, therefore: “The aim of the Dual Language bilingual schools is thus not simply to produce bilingual and biliterate children” but rather “(compared with mainstreaming) ... to produce, bilingual, biliterate and multicultural children.” (pp. 217-218).

Such aims, therefore, demand that these schools perform at least as well academically as their mainstream monolingual counterparts, but with the added dimension of preparing their pupils as global citizens who, as well as having the competencies to compete effectively in the job market, have greater multicultural awareness, can appreciate and respect linguistic and cultural diversity, and are free from racial prejudice and discrimination (Genesee & Gándara, 1999). As stated on page 221, Salaberry (2009: 193) believes that these schools are instruments of social engineering “aiming to develop a more coherent and demographically representative new mainstream civic society” and reflecting a pluralist ideology.

In order for this cross-pollination of skills and attitudes to happen, Baker (2017: 218) describes the practices adopted in Dual Language bilingual schools as shown by a wide range of academics:

- Both languages have equal status within the school and are used as a medium of instruction, language and curriculum being integrated. Should both languages be used in certain subjects, care is taken not to be repetitive.
- The ethos is bilingual throughout the school. As well as the classroom and curricular materials, care is taken that both languages are treated equally in *all* respects including signage, announcements, extra-curricular activities etc so that one language is not perceived as being of a higher status.

- Whereas some Dual Language bilingual schools teach each of the two languages as *a subject* with emphasis on grammar and spelling etc, others deliver language skills indirectly through the curriculum content. Biliteracy is considered as important as ensuring productive proficiency in both languages and is acquired either simultaneously or by placing the emphasis initially on literacy in the mother tongue.
- Baker (2017) emphasises the importance of the length of the Dual Language bilingual programme, recommending at least a minimum of four to five years in order for skills in both languages to develop properly and warning us of the danger of a shorter period. We are again reminded, of course, of Cummins' (1979, 2008) differentiation between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive and Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) discussed in previous modules and of the time it takes for children to be able to operate in their second language at CALP level.
- Care is usually taken to ensure that staff members are bilingual so that teachers are able to use different languages with students on different occasions (see the discussion on compartmentalisation below). When not possible, however, teachers can be paired. Parents and auxiliary staff who are proficient in a minority language can also provide additional human resources which can enrich and broaden the student experience, thus enabling “the culture of language minorities [to be] shared in the classroom to create an additive bilingual and multicultural environment” (p. 218).

Baker (2017: 218-21) devotes a large section to the issue of the different use made of the two languages in the process of curricular instruction. One aspect is that of *compartmentalisation* which deals with the matter of keeping the use of the two languages apart and establishing clear boundaries with regard to:

- time
- curriculum content
- teaching

Various alternatives are available regarding when each language is used for curricular instruction, such as on alternate days, or in different lessons, so that *both* languages are incorporated within the teaching of *every* subject. Other alternatives are also possible, such as alternate

weeks. However, the allocated time for each language is aimed at developing productive and receptive skills in both languages. Whichever system is chosen may not necessarily mean an *equal* allocation of *time* to each language as this may vary. Although 50:50 is a common model in the USA, 90:10 is also common. Whereas the 50:50 model tends to retain the same ratio and balance throughout the various grades, the 90:10 model allocates 90% of time to the minority language in the kindergarten and first grade and changes to 50: 50 in later years. However, other in-between models are possible, but where the minority language will still be allocated more time in the early years. **Students should study the *content* model illustrated by Gomez et al. (2005) as shown in Baker (2017: 219) where different languages are allocated to different subjects rather than amounts of time.**

A so-called “differentiated model” is where the morning session is devoted to separate native-language instruction for respective groups up to Grade 2 before they are integrated in the afternoon for curricular instruction, this being subsequently the arrangement throughout the day from Grade 3 upwards.

Baker (2017:220) mentions further issues related to the matter of language compartmentalisation and classroom practices which can affect the dynamic relationship between the use of the two languages.

Whereas a teacher may try not to switch languages so that children have to respond in the same language, this may not always happen. Christian et al. (1997) report that this practice may vary resulting in the possibility that it may undermine the sense of *need* a pupil has to become proficient in a second language. As Baker (2011: 229) points out, Garcia (2009a, 2009b) shows that *translanguaging* is a common practice where children naturally move spontaneously and without conscious thought from one language to the other so that “Dual Language education that insists on strict boundaries and compartmentalization between languages may be now both dated, difficult and unreasonable”.

Reference has already been made to the danger of allocating different languages to different subjects, thereby reinforcing the possibility of associating certain languages such as English with modernity and futurism (e.g. science and technology) and the other with more ‘traditional’ and less forward-looking aspects of life. Student perception can inadvertently raise the status of one at the expense of the other in relation to employment prospects and economic power.

Dual Language education being the antithesis of assimilation, the quotation from Schmidt (2009: 147-148) is worth repeating:

...if linguistic pluralism were to *replace* assimilation to English as the dominant discursive formation in relation to language policy in the US, the probability that Latinos and other language minorities would retain and develop their native-language fluency will (sic) be greatly improved.

As mentioned previously, whereas this model can be promoted as a means of effecting social integration and harmony *within* countries, it has also been adopted to improve political relations *across* political borders and to establish peace initiatives between rival factions in the face of conflict. Examples include the Macedonian/ Albanian Dual Language programme, following the Balkan political conflict, whose aims were clearly implied in Tankersley's (2001) article entitled "Bombs or Bilingual Language Programmes? " Other initiatives include Hebrew-Arab schools designed to address the continuing conflict between Israel and Palestine. Just like the youth orchestra founded by the musician Daniel Barenboim, the object is to bring young Jews and Palestinians together to share cultural values and to learn through the medium of each other's language in social harmony and integration.

Although Cummins (2000) reminds us that such initiatives exist within wider social and political contexts and negative forces which can greatly limit and restrain their impact, nevertheless, as well as providing real practical attempts to solve what might appear to be insurmountable problems, they can also be beacons of hope for a more tolerant future.

4. Mainstream Bilingual /Bilingual Education in Majority Languages (See Baker, 2017: 234-239)

- Typical type of child: Language majority
- Language of the Classroom: Two majority languages. Pluralism
- Societal and Educational Aim: Maintenance and biliteracy and enrichment. Additive
- Aim in Language Outcome: Bilingualism

This model involves the use of two majority languages with the aim of achieving bilingualism (or multilingualism), biliteracy and cultural pluralism. Schools following this model of bilingual education exist in countries which are either already bilingual in nature or where native inhabitants and expatriates desire to acquire fluency in an additional language. 'Majority' language can also apply to a language which is very widely spoken in a certain country but not throughout the world. Baker (2017: 234-235) provides examples of a range of linguistic combinations in Asia. In many cases, however, this combination may be a

regional dominant language with English, the latter clearly becoming increasingly more in demand.

With regard to the curriculum, some of the curricular content in these schools is taught in the student's second language, most widely referred to in Europe as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) or Content Based Instruction in America. Influenced by Immersion Education and Dual Language bilingual education in the USA, CLIL was introduced in 1995/1996 as a generic term to refer to a range of practices which focused on both content and the acquisition of language. It involves the learning of what can be between 10-50% of the content of the curriculum through an additional language *whilst also studying that language as a subject*. However, the words of Baetens Beardsmore in Garcia (2009:211) (cited in Baker, 2017: 235) are worth quoting:

...the major concern is about *education*, not about becoming bilingual or multilingual, and that multiple language proficiency is the “added value” which can be obtained at no cost to other skills and knowledge, if properly designed.

The CLIL model has become popular throughout Europe, despite comparatively lacking the research-evidence base attached to immersion education in Canada and Dual Language practice in the USA. It varies in duration, starting age, percentage of *content* taught in the second language, and time devoted to teaching the second language *itself*. However, once again, as Baker (2017:236) emphasises:

CLIL cannot be understood from a purely linguistic or educational perspective. As with all forms of bilingual education, there is a political ideology underneath. CLIL has a strong political basis in the European Union's vision of a multilingual Europe in which people can function in two or three or more languages...CLIL is about helping to create Europeanisation, a multilingual and global economy, and transnational workers.

As Baker (2011: 246) shows, the rationale underpinning the learning of curricular content through the medium of a second language is clarified by Davison & Williams (2001):

- the acquisition of a second language is quicker when integrated with content

- it ensures competence in *academic* as well as communicative domains (compare Cummins'(1979) differentiation between BICS and CALP)
- two outcomes, linguistic and curricular, are achieved simultaneously
- it provides a purpose for using the language and a context of *meaningful and authentic communication*
- related to the previous point and in accordance with constructivist theory, it enables the learning to become holistic, the learner to make connections and to incorporate language in a context of authentic learning. Concentrating on meaning and understanding makes language acquisition more of an unconscious by-product.

Baker (2017: 236-238) discusses two examples of bilingual education in majority languages, namely:

- the international schools
- the European Schools Movement.

Despite having a ubiquitous presence, not all international schools seem to fit the strict criterion of teaching *content* through the medium of two languages, yet the curriculum of some can involve even three or four languages. Such schools may, arguably, be described as reflecting pluralist aims in terms of *curricular content*. However, being also selective and providers of private, independent education for the children of those in higher socio-economic categories who operate professionally in an international context, such bilingual education may also be said to reflect aims which are more individualist and career-oriented and less oriented to promoting social cohesion and political harmony than is the case in Dual Language bilingual education for example.

The European School is another model which adopts the use of two majority languages but is again an elitist institution mostly used by European Community personnel and operating in seven European countries. Up to eleven language sections are available in accordance with the number of native languages used by children for mother-tongue instruction but who also study French, German or English as a second language in the primary years and adopt it partly as a 'vehicular' language from the third year of secondary education to study geography, history and economics. However, students also study a third language and generally become functionally bilingual or multilingual with a fairly strong European identity. Compared with international schools, European schools also seem to be more deliberately oriented to assuring social

cohesion and instilling mutual multicultural respect in students by means of “European Hours” lessons which are taught from the third year of the primary stage and in which mixed language groups work on projects designed to encourage co-operation.

As Baker (2017: 238) points out, European schools differ significantly from immersion education in that the second language is taught as a subject *prior* to being adopted as a medium of curricular instruction and continues to be taught separately later, thus tending to result in a high level of grammatical accuracy and “in sharp contrast to many Canadian immersion programs” as noted by Housen (2002: 6). (Compare with previous remarks about levels of linguistic achievement in *non-native* speakers through immersion education). The words of Housen & Baetens Beardsmore (1987) (cited in Baker, 2011: 248) bear testimony to the linguistic and academic achievements of pupils in European schools:

This strong language commitment has no detrimental effects on academic achievement as can be gauged from the results on the final European Baccalaureate examination, on which 90% of students have been successful.

Housen (2002) summarises such success as:

- L2 proficiency close to native-speaker standards by the end of secondary education
- no cost to L1 proficiency or academic standards
- high levels of proficiency in a third language and sometimes in a fourth.

Apart from the European Schools Movement, other schools also make curricular use of two majority languages, as in the Basque Country, Switzerland and Luxembourg. The adoption of successful bilingual methodologies for the teaching of Basque and Spanish in the Basque Country has already been a major contributor to language revitalisation. However, recent interest in teaching English also has led to the language being taught to a very high percentage of Basque children (approximately 95%) from the kindergarten or Grade 3 upwards. According to Breton & Ruiz (2008: 33), in Navarre, for example:

The Basque-Spanish bilingual centres are becoming centres of innovation in implementing multilingual teaching with the introduction of a third language, aware of the importance of the use of different languages in the European context.

New methodologies related to the teaching of a third language have been introduced by the *ikastolas* through the Eleanitz project. This widespread introduction of English in the early stages of education, however, has been accompanied by a decrease in the demand for French. The early evaluations of *trilingual* education in the Basque country indicate that the introduction of English in the early stages has no detrimental effect on the acquisition or development of Basque and Spanish or on children's *cognitive* development.

The teaching of two major languages alongside the effective teaching of a minority language can often further strengthen the maintenance and revitalisation of the latter, as in a diglossic context for example. Faced with an argument for the adoption of two *major* languages accompanied by a negative reaction from parents to a school's promotion of *bilingual* education involving a minority language, such opposition can be effectively counteracted when the school is seen to teach *three* languages effectively.

Baker (2017: 239-240) lists eight advantages which can be offered in support of bilingual education for students:

- it enables a student to attain higher levels of proficiency in two languages, thus offering greater opportunities to engage in wider communication across generations, geographical regions and cultural groups
- it offers a wider enculturation experience in making students more sensitive and sympathetic to the languages, creeds and cultures of others and deepens their understanding and perception of cultural differences
- effective bilingual education models lead to biliteracy and the wealth of employment and leisure advantages which biliteracy can offer as economic and cultural by-products
- classroom achievement is increased by adopting two languages as a means of curricular instruction, as evidenced by research on Dual Language Education, Canadian Immersion Education and Heritage Education
- a substantial amount of research also shows that children who have adequately developed, age-related levels of bilingualism also gain additional cognitive benefits (see Module ECDA-7004)
- it has strong economic advantages in terms of increased employability

- it can offer a greater and more secure sense of identity in acknowledging and celebrating the culture of which the language is an integral part
- adopting a child's minority language alongside a majority language in bilingual education provision adds to his/ her sense of self-esteem and shows respect for the linguistic community which she / he represents, whereas replacing the minority mother tongue can undermine confidence.

In referring to Cummins' (2000a) discussion of the means by which schools can empower (or disable) minority language students, Baker (2011: 406) highlights an important issue about this last point:

[It] raises a question about why bilingual education which emphasizes the minority language is successful. Is it due to such education fostering cognitive and academic proficiency, as the interdependence hypothesis suggests? Or is it due to students' cultural identity being secured and reinforced, thus enhancing self-confidence and self-esteem (or both)?

Whereas the advantages listed above can be considered to be valid benefits to the *individual*, nevertheless, as has been clear throughout the previous discussion of the various models of bilingual education, there are also a range of social, political and economic benefits which bilingual education can offer to *society*; some models, arguably, having a much greater range of positive social and political by-products than others. Baker (2017: 240) also adds various *societal and ethnic group* benefits to the list (also mentioned in Chapters 17, 18 and 19) which can be summarised as: cultural vitality and heritage and cultural transmission; ethnic group self-determination and distinctiveness; empowered and informed citizenship; social and economic inclusion; and raising school and state achievement standards.

The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education

Chapter 12 in Baker (2017) *which students are urged to study* discusses the effectiveness of bilingual education where it is mentioned that "in the history of research in bilingual education, it is possible to find research support for most of the forms of bilingual education by selecting and emphasising a particular study" (p.244). The chapter also makes a very valid point in emphasising that effectiveness can be assessed on *different levels* ranging from the individual student, to the classroom, the school

and to an aggregation of schools which adopt a certain model, but that it is also influenced by a multitude of variables:

Effective bilingual education is not a simple or automatic consequence of using a child's home language in school (as in heritage language education) or a second language (as in immersion education). Various home and parental, community, teacher, school, stakeholder and society effects may act and interact to make bilingual education more or less effective. Any effectiveness equation is complex, variable across region and politics, multivariate, and often contested. (Baker, 2017: 246)

In the context of the USA, the chapter refers to various reviews of research which have been conducted with a view to inform policy-making in the provision of 'bilingual' education for language minorities, such as that of K.A. Baker & de Kanter (1983) for example which proved to be controversial and questionable in many respects, including the narrow range of outcomes being measured, its ideological bias as well as the methodological reliability of its sampling procedure. The discussion which ensues and which refers to additional reviews illustrates the range of variables which need to be considered and which explain how, even when employing the opinion of experts, one cannot guarantee total agreement on issues of effectiveness.

The conclusion of the expert panel of the US National Research Council (The Committee on Developing a Research Agenda on the Education of Limited English Proficient and Bilingual Students) whilst emphasising the need for all minority language students to be functional in English and to be given the same equal opportunities through academic provision as others, also highlighted the benefits of proficiency in a language *other than English* and an understanding of different cultures "in an increasingly global market and political world".

However, as Baker (2017: 250-251) points out, the essential and most significant conclusion of the expert panel of the US National Research Council was that trying to prove the effectiveness of various models of bilingual provision on a continuum of inferiority-superiority only succeeds in oversimplifying and polarising conclusions, since all models can be effective under varying circumstances "depending on the subtle chemistry of interacting ingredients, environments and processes (p.251), the key issue being to find "a set of programme components that works for the children in the community of interest, given the goals, demographics, and resources of that community" (August & Hakuta,

1997, 147). Baker (2011:261) refers to Brisk's (1998) list of five "situational factors" which impinge on the possible achievements of students in bilingual education and their schools, these being:

- linguistic
- cultural
- economic
- political
- social

However, whereas it is agreed that these factors have a particular effect on *linguistic* acquisition, they may also be said to be applicable to children's education generally.

Chapter 12 in Baker (2017) proceeds to examine recent reviews and research on three 'strong' models of bilingual education, namely: Dual Language, Immersion and Heritage Language, mentioning that these three have a large body of research attached to them which allows one to provide an overview of the conclusions compared with the relative dearth of evaluations of other models. Since the chapter provides a detailed discussion of each of these models, what follows is only designed to provide *a summary* of the research findings related to each as discussed in Baker (2017).

1. Dual Language Education

Evaluations of the effectiveness of this model and reviews of related research indicate relative success in producing bilingual, biliterate, curricular and multicultural competences. Some studies, however, are methodologically questionable due to having small samples, uncontrolled variables such as social class, being insufficiently longitudinal and not paying sufficient attention to variations in programmes. However, as Dual Language education is chosen selectively by parents and excludes a random selection of a population, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not extraneous characteristics such as student socio-economic background, parental support and motivation or the intelligence level of the students themselves are the actual contributory ingredients in the success of these programmes or the programmes themselves. However, the comprehensive Lindholm-Leary (2001) evaluation of Dual Language schools (pp.252-253) provides convincing evidence that "DL programs are effective in promoting high levels of language proficiency, academic achievement and positive attitudes to learning in students" (Baker, 2017: 253). Since, in comparison, English learners in submersion mainstream classes fail to make the necessary linguistic progress which enables them to understand curriculum content sufficiently, even after ten years of

English language instruction, it seems that parents supporting Dual Language education are recommending that the model should be expanded in order to raise the linguistic and academic achievements of other minority (and majority) language children.

Similarly, in comparing the performance of children in elementary Dual Language education with those in other programmes, research by Thomas & Collier (2002) concludes that Dual Language bilingual education at this *elementary* level is “the *optimal program* for the long-term academic success of language minority students” (Baker, 2017: 253). Thomas & Collier (2000) compared the linguistic development of language minority children in the English language in different bilingual education programmes, namely:

- Two-way bilingual education
- Late-exit transitional bilingual education
- Early-exit transitional bilingual education
- ESL pull-out programmes

Whereas there was no significant difference between any of the programmes at the kindergarten stage through to Grade 2 (but with ESL ‘pull-out’ pupils beginning to show greater progress in English in the early stages), however, by Grade 6, students in Dual Language and Late-exit transitional programmes were already ahead of the others in English language achievements and close to the performance of native-speakers. On an ‘English language achievement scale’ of 1-100, this performance was around the 50th percentile. However, by the time they reached Grade 11, the achievements of students in Two-Way Bilingual Education was above the average levels of native-speakers, being around the 60th percentile, the results for the four programmes being as follows (see Baker, 2017:254):

- Two-way bilingual education: 60
- Late-exit transitional bilingual education: 50 (native-speaker average)
- Early-exit transitional bilingual education: 30-40
- ESL pull-out programmes: 20

Even so, criticism was levelled at the Thomas & Collier (2000) study for reasons such as being based on selective research studies and well implemented programmes (i.e. not necessarily being typical of all Dual Language provision) and lacking in details about the 700,000 language minority students on which the language progress trajectories were based and which spanned the period from 1982-96 (Baker, 2017: 254).

2. Immersion Bilingual Education

As stated on page 257 of Baker (2017), “There are four decades of research and reviews of immersion bilingual education that paint a relatively uniform picture of success” with the conclusions of those conducted during the 1980s (e.g. Swain & Lapkin (1982)) being replicated by those of more recent years (e.g. Swain & Johnstone, 1997) and highlighting four major outcomes:

(a) The learning of the second language:

The evidence shows that students in early total immersion become more proficient in the use of a second language than those experiencing the ‘drip-feed’, sporadic teaching methodology of mainstream education with foreign language teaching. By the age of 11 years, performance levels similar to those of native speakers are achieved in the receptive skills of listening and reading although not in the productive skills of speaking and writing (Swain & Johnstone, 1997) (see previous discussion on immersion education). Reviews, however, attest to the fact that most students become ‘competent’ in both languages. Baker (2017: 257) raises an important issue by stating that “bilingual ability is not the same as being functionally bilingual”. This reflects the fact that use of the second language amongst immersion students may well be confined to the classroom and may not even reach the school playground, let alone the speech community. However, the community itself may also fail to provide the opportunities to engage in spontaneous conversation in the second language or the cultural occasions which would make this possible.

(b) The learning of the first language:

Due to placing the emphasis initially on the use of the second language in the early stages (approximately three years) of immersion education, the first language of students in *early total* immersion education tends not to develop to the same extent as that of students in mainstream education (as would be measured by school tests as opposed to the vernacular). However, despite this early lag, by the 6th Grade their proficiency in their mother tongue has generally caught up with that of their monolingual peers, including the productive skills of speaking and writing, so that early total immersion in the second language does not adversely affect the first. Any differences which do appear between the two linguistic groups tend to advantage immersion students which seems to be linked to the cognitive benefits of bilingualism discussed in module ECDA-7004, such as metalinguistic awareness for example.

The linguistic development of the first language of students in *early partial* immersion education also seems to follow a similar path despite

having greater first language content. Any significant differences in performance between them and mainstream pupils disappear by the end of elementary school, although they do not surpass them in first-language performance as in the case of early *total* immersion students.

Late immersion education has no adverse effects on the performance of students in the mother tongue either so that Baker (2017: 258) can summarise the evidence concerning the effects of immersion second-language education on the development of first language proficiency as follows:

The evidence suggests that immersion children learn a second language at no cost to their first language. Rather than acting like a weighing balance, early total immersion, in particular, seems more analogous to cooking. The ingredients, when mixed and baked, react together in additive ways. The product becomes more than the sum of the parts.

(c) The effect on other curriculum areas:

The evidence suggests that the attainment of competence in two languages is not detrimental to progress across the school curriculum and that the curricular achievements of early total immersion students are generally equivalent to those in mainstream education.

Evidence relating to those in early *partial* immersion education however shows a tendency, especially in the initial stages, to lag behind those in mainstream education. This may be due to the fact that the second language in which they study *other* areas of the curriculum is not sufficiently developed for that purpose which also applies to late immersion students. Whereas this reminds us of the BICS / CALP issue, discussion in Baker (2017: 259) centres on the need for language proficiency and development to be assisted by the adoption of “bridging programmes” involving, possibly, a content teacher of a particular subject and a language teacher working together.

However, generally, and particularly in the case of early total immersion, the evidence shows that most children can acquire competence in a second language relatively easily without adversely affecting their progress in the curriculum. Some research data shows that immersion education can also be beneficial to lower ability as well as ‘language impaired’ children and that those of below average IQ are not disadvantaged when compared with being placed in monolingual education.

(d) Attitudes and social adjustment:

The danger of evaluating the outcomes of bilingual education only in terms of gaining *linguistic proficiency* is a valid issue which is raised occasionally in this module. However, there is some evidence that immersion education has a positive effect on pupils' attitudes to education and their motivation, particularly amongst those in early total immersion programmes, with the response of parents also showing satisfaction with their children's academic and social development. Here again, however, one must ask to what extent one can ascribe these added benefits to the educational programme rather than students' upbringing and parental values.

Despite the predominantly positive evidence which surrounds immersion education, particularly early total immersion, Baker (2017: 260) lists seven limitations to which authors have drawn attention more recently and which were not perhaps expressed as being characteristic of the earlier evaluations:

(i) Canadian immersion students do not always become grammatically correct in their use of French and can be lacking in an ability to adopt appropriate styles of language to fit different social contexts. This was an issue referred to earlier and forcefully expressed in the words of Hammerley (1989). Baker (2011: 268) refers to the inappropriate use of "tu" or "vous" and the restricted use of verb tenses as examples (also observable in the language of children in Welsh immersion education), ascribing these characteristics to "the functionally restricted language of the classroom" and suggesting various practical solutions.

(ii) Students who have been educated in Canadian immersion programmes tend not to use the language after leaving school, and those who do are very few in number due to lack of opportunity, lack of confidence and a preference for English. Neither do they engage more with francophones than mainstream students do, nor with French culture or seek opportunities to speak French. The immersion experience, therefore, does not lead to any degree of enculturation, and French remains largely the language of the classroom.

(iii) Baker (2011: 260) states that identifying the crucial interacting factors which combine to create effective immersion education is difficult since there are other intervening variables such as teaching techniques, students' motivation and ethnolinguistic vitality that can influence results. Although some of these, arguably, do not apply more to language than they do to education generally, nevertheless, issues such as the *intensity* of language learning as opposed to the *length* of the provision is a very

valid consideration when evaluating programmes of second language acquisition.

(iv) Parents' deliberate opting for immersion education can have an adverse effect on various aspects of mainstream education involving a change in the linguistic and ability profile of classes as well their sizes and age-range.

(v) Immersion education which enables children to acquire a second language can be instrumentally motivated and seen by parents as a form of social or economic mobilisation. Children from higher socio-economic backgrounds are substantially represented in Canadian French immersion education which can provide anglophones with linguistic and cultural capital to gain a range of advantages in Canadian society and further career opportunities. This, however, can generate conflict in that francophones perceive such developments as competition and a threat to the strength of the linguistic asset which they already possess and are able to trade in the employment market. As Baker (2011:271) states: "immersion education is seen as a Trojan horse of further English assimilation by some francophones".

(vi) Research in immersion education has concentrated predominantly on *outcomes* with very little attention paid to the learning process from the experience and perspective of the student. In drawing attention to the fact that "we still know little about students' immersion learning processes from the perspective of the learner", De Courcy (2002:3) highlights the crucial role of internal or private speech in the immersion experience and in the acquisition of a second language through creating new sentences by speaking to oneself. Such a process contributes to *comprehensible input* (receptive skills) as well as *comprehensible output* (productive skills).

(vii) Since immersion bilingual education in Canada involves two major international languages, there is a danger in generalising from the *additive* context of the Canadian immersion experience to other contexts across the world where at least one of the two languages may be in a diglossic and *subtractive* situation. Any such generalisation should bear in mind that:

1. Immersion education in Canada is optional in which the conviction and motivation of parents who have opted for this provision is high and could play an influential role in its outcomes.

2. Immersion classrooms tend to be linguistically homogeneous where pupils start at a similar level, thus assisting the efficiency of the teaching methodology and the curriculum structure.

3. There is respect for the child's first language, thus creating an additive ethos. Parents also usually play an important role in the immersion movement and establish a positive and supportive relationship with staff and administrators.

4. Teachers in Canadian immersion education programmes are dedicated to the programmes. This high level of commitment is also characteristic of teachers in Welsh-medium education, as evidenced in research carried out by Roberts (1985), a characteristic which is recognised as having been a crucial component in the expansion of the system in Wales.

5. Canadian French immersion education must be seen in a wider political context than simply that of an *educational* model of second-language acquisition since it is underpinned by a particular social, cultural and political ideology as well as aims and motives of anglophones from a higher socio-economic group who seek social, economic and career advantages for their children. Ironically, however, as mentioned previously, despite contributing to the vitality of the French language in Canada, some francophones "question whether an increase in bilingual Anglophones will simply act to deprive them of their historical advantage in occupying bilingual jobs." (Lapkin et al., 1990: 649)

3. Heritage Language Education

Reviews of heritage language education apply mainly to the northern hemisphere although those related to the southern hemisphere are increasing. Generalisations from these reviews collectively point to four main aspects of the effectiveness of this model of bilingual education.

(a) It enables children to maintain their competence and use of their home language, especially when compared with those who are placed in mainstream or transitional education and who, either partly or totally, lose command of their mother-tongue. In such linguistic provision, minority language children often deliberately avoid using their home-language, an aspect of language attrition which, as mentioned previously, can also affect self-esteem and be psychologically damaging.

(With regard to pupils who transfer to Heritage Bilingual Education from immersion classes, NFER (1992) research (based on the results of standard assessment tests in Welsh as a first language for pupils aged 14)

showed very little difference between the performance of pupils from Welsh-speaking homes and those from non-Welsh-speaking homes).

(b) The use of the first or heritage language in education, therefore, can enhance a child's sense of identity and self-esteem. Perceiving the home language as being respected by the school, regardless of its 'public' status even as a minority language, can also be interpreted as an acceptance of the home culture and values, thus improving the student's sense of belonging, motivation and curricular performance.

(c) Children in Heritage Language Education perform as well as those in mainstream education in other areas of the curriculum, including mathematics and science. Therefore, there is no disadvantage or loss in studying the curriculum through the medium of the home language, albeit a minority language. To the contrary, academic performance can often be superior to the performance of students in mainstream education.

In Wales, Standard Assessment Tests (SATs) were conducted at various stages of academic development across the primary and secondary sectors up until the middle of the 2000s. In SATs conducted at the end of Key-stage 1 for 7 year-old pupils who had received statutory education since the age of 5, the performance of fluent bilingual pupils was higher.

Research conducted by the National Federation for Educational Research (NFER/BGD, 1991) showed that the performance of pupils in Welsh-medium schools was higher in Mathematics and Science. Similarly, research conducted independently by Leeds University (Shorrocks, 1992) also showed that pupils fluent in Welsh had higher results in Mathematics and Science than those who were not fluent.

(d) Whereas the third outcome above may not be surprising since education in one's home language is what majority language children generally receive and expect, yet the fourth outcome "tends to go against 'common sense'" (Baker, 2011: 262). Evaluations show that when children in Heritage Language Education are tested in the language of mainstream education such as English, their performance is comparable to that of their mainstream peers. "The explanation seems to lie in self-esteem being enhanced, and language and intellectual skills [being] better promoted by education in the home language" (Baker, 2017: 262) resulting in linguistic skills acquired in the first language being transferred into the second language, a cognitive process which Cummins (1981) explains in terms of the Interdependence Hypothesis.

Evidence from the Assessment of Performance Unit which the British government had established in the 1970s also seems to confirm this outcome. Based on research data in the achievements of pupils in the English language, Thornton (1986: 61) observed:

...the mean scores for second-language speakers (all but a handful of whom were native speakers of Welsh) were fractionally higher than those for monolingual English speakers.

McCarty (2008: 249) states that Heritage Language bilingual programmes “ensure that Native children receive an education that is pedagogically sound, culturally based, and linguistically and academically empowering”.

(e) Additional benefits which emanate from an effective bilingual education model such as Heritage Language Education are, of course, the *cognitive* advantages studied in module ECDA-7004: Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Education, but which have also been mentioned in the course of this module.

As Baker (2017: 262) points out, however, despite the positive aspects shown in evaluations of Heritage Language Education, some concerns are also expressed by Canadians on the basis of political ideology and the perception of this linguistic provision as a challenge to existing power relations. Whereas *official* policy supports French language education as well as English, providing such support to other ‘heritage’ languages is seen as a step too far. Due to the financial implications and the possible effects on the mainstream educational system, attitudes are, therefore, demonstrated more in terms of tolerance of other ethnocultural communities rather than support. Furthermore, language diversity in Canada has increased in the wake of higher levels of immigration since the mid 1980s owing to deliberate government policies to attract immigrants in reaction to a lower birth rate and an ageing population.

Despite what might be seen as some *public* concerns and regardless of certain obstacles such as the shortage of teachers and teaching materials, the opinions of those involved in Heritage Language Education, including parents, are very positive. As shown in Baker (2011: 273), the Canadian Education Association summarises the advantages as:

- positive self-concept and pride in one’s background
- better integration of child into school and society
- more tolerance of other people and different cultures
- increased cognitive, social and emotional development
- ease in learning of new language
- increased probability of employment

- fostering stronger relationships between home and school
- responding to the need and wishes of a community

Conclusion

An extremely significant perspective on the effectiveness of bilingual education, especially in times of austerity when governments tend to evaluate the benefits of public services in terms of *cost-savings*, is the *economic* evaluation of heritage language education provided by Dutcher & Tucker (1996) which is discussed in Baker (2017: 262). A World Bank paper examining international evidence gathered from a wide range of countries on the use of first and second languages in elementary education concluded that the linguistic development of the *mother tongue* is crucial to cognitive development and to furthering the acquisition of a second language. As Baker (2011: 274) shows, this has significant implications for language models such as mainstream and transitional bilingual education in that they are “internationally less effective in developing a child’s thinking abilities” and, furthermore, “[w]hen such development is slowed considerably by learning in a second language (e.g. submersion), then the second language will in itself be learnt more slowly”. The significance of the Dutcher & Tucker (1996) review is the *economic* savings created by ‘strong’ forms of bilingual education for the education system *generally* and for wider society, concluding that:

strong forms of bilingual education create cost savings for the education system and for society. For example, such bilingual education provides higher levels of achievement in fewer years of study. Student progress is faster, and higher achievement benefits society by less unemployment and a more skilled workforce. (Baker, 2017: 262)

The Dutcher & Tucker (1996) review highlights the fact that bilingual education which makes use of the mother tongue makes *economic* sense in terms of cost-effectiveness and should, therefore, be an essential consideration in the formulation of government educational policy since the ramifications can include lower drop-out rates, higher academic performance, a better skilled work-force and lower levels of unemployment. Dutcher (2004) refers to the case of Guatemala whose bilingual education policy resulted in a range of economic benefits and cost-savings. Sierra & Olaziregi (1989:17) testify to the same advantages:

At a time when education systems everywhere are experiencing financial restraint, economic aspects of language planning need to be taken into account. Immersion

or bilingual programmes...need cost no more than [monolingual] programs but they produce dramatically better results. In other words, they are considerably more cost-effective.

However, Baker (2017: 263) again emphasises that all models of bilingual education are underpinned by opposing political ideologies which reminds us of the “driving forces” and “restraining forces” in Lewin’s (1951) “force-field” theory discussed in module ECDA-7011: Societal Bilingualism. Consequently, any discussion and consideration regarding the *effectiveness* of various models is ultimately about measuring their outcomes against their fundamental *political* aims, in which education only plays a subsidiary part.

Baker (2017: 263) raises the issue of the impact of educational research on language policies and in terms of informing and influencing policy-making. However, due to the innumerable variables that impact on the implementation of various language programmes, Cummins (1999, 2000b) seems to argue that it is only research which coalesces into *theory* which can inform policy-making rather than reviews of a range of individual studies, or that “it is *theory* rather than the individual research findings that permits the generation of predictions about program outcomes under different conditions”. Students of module ECDA-7003: Research Methodology, however, might argue that this seems to be contrary to the view of Bassey (1981) who, maintaining that the number of generalisations which can emanate from educational research are very few in number, argues that the *reliability* of an individual research study to other cases is more beneficial than its generalisability. The wide range of variables which Baker (2017: 264-68) discusses and which impact on bilingual education research seem to support Bassey’s standpoint. Such a situation makes the reliability of research in bilingual education always open to questioning and any conclusions vulnerable to what can often be blatant prejudiced, political opposition. Such variables include:

- The sample of children. The huge range of variables which impact on pupil performance both *within* and *outside* school, make the *generalisability* of results from one group to another impossible.
- Interacting factors, which Baker (2017) deals with separately from those related to the sample of children but which, inevitably, can overlap: parental motivation and socio-economic background being the most obvious. Mackey (1976) mentions that, even within the confines of the classroom, up to 3,000 variables can be associated with teaching and learning. These variables can be categorised as

input, contextual, process and outcomes which can only be investigated properly by means of a ‘glass box’ model of research, including *observation* methodology, as opposed to a ‘black box’ model which only measures a narrow range of outcomes and fails to examine the *interaction* of the variables involved in the teaching and learning process. Consequently, “[t]here can be as much variation in outcomes *inside* a particular bilingual education programme...as *between* different types of programme...” (italics added) (Baker, 2017:265).

- The measures of success. For example, can or should the success of bilingual education be measured *only* in terms of competence in two languages? What about cognitive benefits, its effects across the whole curriculum, its contribution to inter-cultural relationships and social cohesion as well as its long-term economic advantages? What *criteria* should be applied to such measurements and who judges the *validity* of those criteria when judgement cannot be neutral and free of subjective values and political ideology?
- The style of the research. This links with the wide range of variables involved in bilingual education research and which can be difficult or impossible to control, thus resulting in a reductionist approach to research which places emphasis on *measurable* and *quantitative* outcomes to the virtual exclusion of *qualitative* data. Baker (2017: 267-268) also refers to some of the limitations of research methodology which were discussed in module ECDA-7003 and which can invalidate data and make them unreliable.
- The researchers themselves. Although it cannot be argued that all research on bilingual education is invalid, yet, “no educational research can be totally value-free, neutral or objective” (p.268) since researchers, consciously or otherwise, can often be directly or indirectly influenced by, or committed to, certain values and beliefs, be they social, political and /or religious. As Baker states: “There is a fine line between research and advocacy which some attempt not to cross; others cross it very quickly”.

Despite such limitations, Baker (2017: 263) raises a fundamental issue related to the impact of educational research on public policy-making which is that the formulation of policies by politicians is rarely based on theory or research but is subject to the forces of ideology, pragmatism, conflicting interests as well as the influence of stakeholders. Evidence to support a particular political opinion or ideology can also often be found by highlighting the conclusions of a particular research study. Therefore,

if research ever does succeed in having an input into policy-making, it can often be ‘cherry-picked’ to support a particular convenient viewpoint and, consequently, misconstrued.

Despite the weight of research evidence which seems to support the educational, social, political and economic benefits of adopting ‘strong’ forms of bilingual education and which could enable politicians and civil servants alike to evaluate such advantages objectively and (as far as is humanly possible) without ideological prejudice, yet it seems that, for the time being at least, one must accept that politics proves to be stronger. Therefore, as Baker (2017: 263) states, since “research cannot provide evidence-based policy, only evidence-informed policy”, it seems that “the researcher/ policy-maker relationship is not one of ‘truth speaking to power’ or ‘science providing evidence-based decisions’”. Whereas this may not be true of the field of medical science, it is certainly true of education, and of bilingual education in particular, the difference being, it seems, that ill-informed policy-making in education can damage lives, but is not life-threatening. However, as Baker (2017) reminds us:

... change will always occur in bilingual education policy and provision. Nothing is static. While there will be periods when bilingual policy is criticized, forbidden and rejected, there will be reactions, with the possibility of more accepting periods ahead. There is no certainty in the future history of bilingual education, only uncertainty and change. Yet uncertainty and change provide occasional opportunities for bilingual education to progress.

References

- August, D. & Hakuta, K. *Improving Schooling for Language-minority Children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1997.
- Baker, C. The Growth of Bilingual Education in the Secondary Schools of Wales. In G. Evans (ed.) *Perspectives on a Century of Secondary Education in Wales*. Aberystwyth: Y Ganolfan Addysg, 1990.
- Baker, C. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1993.
- Baker, C. Bilingual Education. In R. Kaplan (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics (2nd edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Baker, C. *Foundations of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2011.
- Baker, C. *Foundations of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2017.
- Baker, K.A. & De Kanter, A.A. *Bilingual Education*. Lexington, MA; Lexington Books, 1983.
- Bassey, M. Pedagogic Research. *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 7, No.1, 73-88, 1981.
- Blauner, R. Internal colonisation and ghetto revolt. *Social Problems* 16, 393-408, 1969.
- Bourhis, R.Y. Acculturation, language maintenance, and language shift. In J. Klatte-Folmer & P. Vanavermaet (eds), *Theories on Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages*. Münster, New York: Waxmann, 2001.
- Bretón, N.O. & Ruiz, P.S. Bilingual Education in Navarre: Achievements and Challenges. In J. Cenoz (ed.) *Teaching through Basque*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008.
- Brisk, M.E. *Bilingual Education: From Compensatory to Quality Schooling*. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.
- Campbell, C. & Packer, A. Cymhellion Rhieni Di-Gymraeg Dros Ddewis Addysg Gymraeg i'w Plant. *The Welsh Journal of Education*, Volume 3, No.1, not dated.
- Casanova, C. Bilingual Education: Politics or Pedagogy? In O. Garcia (ed.) *Bilingual Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991.
- Cazden, C.B. & Snow, C.E. English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education (*The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 508). London: Sage, 1990.
- Christian, D. Two-way immersion education: students learning through two languages. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 66-76, 1996.
- Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K. & Carranza, I. *Profiles in Two-Way Immersion Education: Students Learning Through Two Languages*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1997.

- Crawford, J. *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing, 1989.
- Cummins, J. The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 9, 1-43, 1976.
- Cummins, J. Cognitive / academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19, 121-129, 1979.
- Cummins, J. 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*. Los Angeles : California State Department of Education, 1981.
- Cummins, J. Alternative paradigms in bilingual education research: Does theory have a place? *Educational Researcher* 28 (7), 26-32 (plus p.41), 1999.
- Cummins, J. *Language, Power and Pedagogy : Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000a.
- Cummins, J. Putting language proficiency in its place: Responding to critiques of the conversational/ academic language distinction. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (eds) *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000b.
- Cummins, J. BICS and CALP: Empirical and Theoretical Status of the Distinction. In B. Street & N.H. Hornberger (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd Edition, Volume 2: Literacy. New York: Springer, 2008.
- Cummins, J. Fundamental psychological and sociological principles underlying educational success for linguistic minority students. In A. K. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (eds) *Multilingual Education for Social Justice; Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan, 2009.
- Davies, J. *The Welsh Language*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1993.
- Davison, C. & Williams, A. Integrating language and content: Unresolved issues. In B. Mohan, C. Leung & C. Davison (eds), *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2001.
- De Courcy, M. Learners' Experiences of Immersion Education: Case Studies of French and Chinese. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2002.
- Dodson, C.J. The Effects of Second Language Education on First / Second Language Development. In B.M. Jones & P. Ghuman (eds) *Bilingualism, Education and Identity*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1995.

- Dulay, H. & Burt, M. "Should we teach children syntax?" *Language Learning*, 23, 235-252, 1973.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M. & Krashen, S. *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Dutcher, N. *Expanding Educational Opportunity in Linguistically Diverse Societies* (2nd edn). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 2004.
- Dutcher, N. & Tucker, G.R. *The Use of First and Second Languages in Education: A Review of International Experience*. Pacific Islands Discussion Paper Series, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: East Asia and Pacific Country Dept. III, World Bank, 1996.
- Estyn, The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Inspector of Education and Training in Wales 2004-2005. Cardiff: Estyn.
- Ferguson, C.A. Houghton, C. & Wells, M.H. Bilingual Education: An international perspective. In B. Spolsky & R. Cooper (eds) *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.
- Fishman, J. *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley: Newbury House, 1972.
- Fishman, J. Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and as societal phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1, 3-15, 1980.
- Fishman, J. The soft smile and the iron fist. Prefatory remarks. In Ó Néill, D. (ed.) *Rebuilding the Celtic Languages. Reversing Language Shift in the Celtic Countries*. Talybont: Y Lolfa, 2005.
- Fishman, J.A. 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In G. Valdés, J.A. Fishman, R.Chávez & W. Pérez (eds), *Towards the Developing Minority Language Resources*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2006.
- García, O. *Societal Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. New York: Mimeo, City University of New York, 1992.
- García, O. & Baker, C. *Bilingual Education. An Introductory Reader*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007.
- García, O. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009a.
- García, O. Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A.K. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (eds) *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan, 2009b.
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. *Attitudes and motivation: Second language learning*. Newbury House, 1972.
- Genesee, F. & Gándara, P. Bilingual education programs: Across national perspective. *Journal of Social Issues* 55 (4), 665-685, 1999.

- Gómez, L., Freeman, D.E. & Freeman Y.S. Dual language education: A promising 50-50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal* 29 (1), 145-164, 2005.
- González, J.M. Coming of age in bilingual / bicultural education: A historical perspective. In H.T. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi (eds), *Bilingual Multicultural Education and the Professional: From Theory to Practice*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1979.
- Gordon, M.M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G. & Witt, D. *How Long Does it Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?* University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Policy Report 2000-1, 2000.
- Hammerly, H. *French Immersion: Myths and Reality*. Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises, 1989.
- Hickey, T. Mixing beginners and native speakers in minority language immersion: who is immersing whom? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 443-474, 2001.
- Housen, A. Process and outcomes in the European Schools model of multilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal* 26 (1), 1-9, 2002.
- Housen, A. & Baetens Beardsmore, H. Curricular & extra-curricular factors in multilingual education. *Studies in Second language Acquisition* 9, 83-102, 1987.
- Johnstone, R. *Immersion in a Second or Additional Language at School: A Review of the International Research*. Stirling: Scottish CiLT, 2002.
- Jones, B.M. *Beth yw gwall mewn iaith plant?* Aberystwyth: University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1988.
- Jones, M.C. *Language Obsolescence and Revitalisation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Krashen, S. *Condemned Without a Trial: Bogus Arguments Against Bilingual Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1999.
- Krauss, M. Statement by Michael E. Krauss, Director Emeritus, Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, July 20, 2000, at Hearing on S.2688, the Native American Languages Act Amendments Act of 2000.
- Lapkin, S., Swain, M. & Shapson, S. French immersion research agenda for the 90s. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 46 (4), 638-674, 1990.
- Laurin, C. *Quebec's Policy on the French Language*. Government of Quebec White Paper. Quebec: Government of Quebec, 1977.
- Le Blanc, R. Second language retention. *Language and Society* 37, 35-36, 1992.
- Lewin, K. *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.

- Lewis, H. G. Gwersi o Ganada. *Golwg*. Lampeter: August, 2013.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J. *Biliteracy for Global Society: An Idea Book on Dual Language Education*. Washington, DC: NCBE, 2000.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J. *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Mackey, W.F. A typology of bilingual education. *Foreign Language Annals* 3, 596-608, 1970.
- Mackey, W.F. *Bilinguisme et Contact des Langues*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1976.
- Malherbe, E.C. *The Bilingual School*. London : Longman, 1946.
- Maslow, A.H. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Mathias, J. Dwyieithrwydd a'r Ysgolion Cymraeg . *The Welsh Journal of Education*, Vol.3, (2).
- McCarty, T.L. Bilingual Education by and for American Indians, Alaska Natives and Native Hawai'ians. In J. Cummins & N.H. Hornberger (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 5: Bilingual Education*. New York: Springer, 2008.
- Morgan, C. & Murgatroyd, S. *Total Quality Management and the School*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1993.
- Mougeon, R. & Beniak, E. Bilingualism, language shift and institutional support for French: the case of the Franco-Ontarians. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 105/6, 99-126, 1994.
- NFER. Report on the 1992 Welsh KS3 Pilot. Swansea: NFER, 1992.
- NFER/ BGD Consortium. An Evaluation of the 1991 National Curriculum Assessment: The Working of the SAT. Slough: NFER, 1991.
- Otheguy, R. & Otto, R. The myth of static maintenance in bilingual education. *Modern Language Journal* 64 (3), 350-356, 1980.
- Ovando, C.J. Essay review: Politics and pedagogy: The case of bilingual education. *Havard Education Review* 60(3), 341-356, 1990.
- Ovando, C.J., Collier, V.P. & Combs, M.C. *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms: Teaching in Multicultural Contexts* (3rd edn). New York: McGraw Hill, 2003.
- Paulston, C.B. *Bilingual Education: Theories and Issues*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1980.
- Paulston, C.B. *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1992.
- Pellerin, M. & Hammerly, H. L'expression orale après treize ans d'immersion française. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 42, 592-606, 1984.
- Ramirez, J. D. & Merino, B. Classroom talk in English immersion; early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programmes. In R.

- Jacobsen & C. Faltis (eds) *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling* (61-63). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1990.
- Roberts, C. *Teaching and Learning Commitment in Bilingual Schools*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Bangor: University of Wales, 1985.
- Rolstad, K. Mahoney, K.S. & Glass, G.V. Weighing the evidence: A meta-analysis of bilingual education in Arizona. *Bilingual Research Journal* 29 (1), 43-67, 2005.
- Ruiz, R. *Orientations in Language Planning*. NABE Journal 8(2), 15-34, 1984.
- Salaberry, M.R. Bilingual education: assimilation, segregation and integration. In M.R. Salaberry (ed.), *Language Allegiances and Bilingualism in the US*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2009.
- Schmidt, R. *Language Policy and Identity Policy in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Schmidt, R. English hegemony and the politics of ethno-linguistic justice in the US. In M. R. Salaberry(ed.), *Language Allegiances and Bilingualism in the US*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2009.
- Shorrocks, D. et al., ENCA1 Project: The Evaluation of National Curriculum Assessment at Key Stage 1. Leeds: School of Education, University of Leeds, 1992.
- Sierra, J. & Olaziregi, I. *EIFE 2, Influence of factors on the learning of Basque*. Gasteiz, Spain: Central Publications Service of the Basque Government, 1989.
- Skutnabb- Kangas, T. Language in the process of cultural assimilation and structural incorporation of linguistic minorities. In C.C. Elert et al.(eds) *Dialectology and Sociolinguistics*. UMEA: UMEA Studies in the Humanities, 1977.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1981.
- Spolsky, B. Review of 'Key Issues in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education'. *Applied Linguistics* 10 (4), 449-451, 1989.
- Stubbs, M. Educational Language Planning in England and Wales: Multicultural rhetoric and assimilationist assumptions. In F. Coulmas (ed.) *A Language Policy for the European Community*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991.
- Swain, M. & Johnson, R. K. Immersion education: A category within bilingual education. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (eds), *Immersion Education: International Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1982

- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (2), 109-186, 2005.
- Swann Report, *Education for All. Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*. London : HMSO, 1985.
- Tankersley, D. Bombs or bilingual programmes? Dual language immersion, transformative education and community building in Macedonia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 4 (2), 107-124, 2001.
- Thomas, P.W. Children in Welsh-medium education. In K. Herberts & C. Lauren (eds) *Papers from the Sixth Nordic Conference on Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1991.
- Thomas, W.P. & Collier, V.P. *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-term Academic Achievement. Final Report*. Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, 2002.
- Thornton, G. A.P.U. Language Testing 1979-1983: An Independent Appraisal of the Findings. Cardiff: The Welsh Office, 1986.
- Tosi, A. The jewel in the crown of the modern prince: The new approach to bilingualism in multicultural education in England. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (eds), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1988.
- Tucker, G.R. & D'Anglejan, A. An approach to bilingual education: The St Lambert Experiment. In M. SWAIN (ed.), *Bilingual Schooling: Some Experiences in Canada and the United States*. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Symposium Series No. 1, 1972.
- Tyson Roberts, G. *The Language of the Blue Books: Wales and Colonial Prejudice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1998.
- Valdés, G. *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: NY. Teachers College Press, 2001.
- Veltman, C. The American linguistic mosaic: Understanding language shift in the United States. In S.L. McKay & S-L.C. Wong (eds) *New Immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Verhoeven, L.T. Transfer in bilingual development: The linguistic interdependence hypothesis revisited. *Language Learning* 44 (3), 381-415, 1994.
- Wells, C.G. *Coding Manual for the Description of Child Speech*. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1975.
- Welsh Assembly Government. *Iaith Pawb: A National Action Plan for a Bilingual Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government, 2003.

- Wiley, T.G. Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the US context. In J.W. Tollefson (ed.) *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002.
- Wiley, T.G. & Wright, W.E. Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the 'age of accountability'. *Educational Policy* 18 (1), 142-168, 2004.
- Wiley, T.G. Language policy and planning in education. In W.E.Wright, S.Boun and O.Garcia (eds) *Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp.168-184). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell (2015).
- Williams, C.H. Language planning and social change: Ecological speculations. In D.F. Marshall (ed.), *Language Planning, Volume III*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991.

