

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 (1995) 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 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.